

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
June 13, 2017**

PRESENT: Board of Education: J. Schumacher, S. Marchese, Z. Ellis, J. Brodrick, M. Vanderwert, J. Foster, C. Vue (arrived at 4:58 p.m.)

Staff: Superintendent Thein, A. Collins, C. Baker, M. Gilbert, M. Schrul, M. Hoerth, N. Cameron, J. Tuner, J. Engen, E. Agbamu, L. Sayles-Adams, I. Davis, J. Peterson, K. Wilcox-Harris, T. Stewart-Downey, S. Erickson, Z. Vang, H. Ott, H. Kilgore, T. Battle, K. Lombardi, J. Vollmer, L. Cathey, J. Ronnei de Avila, C. Musacho, J. Farnsworth, S. Carlstrom, G. Ghere

Other: T. Lonetree, J. Verges, Z. Lee, H. Thoj. S. Vue, T. Fang, X. Chang, K. Ying Yang, J. Sanchez, L. Sandoval, P. Perez-Tukirj, E. Schatlern, P. Grafstrom, K. Sterns, A. Marlowe, S. Nathan, J. Cox, J. Weigum

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:45 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Legislative Wrap Up

It is almost over, the next special session in the hands of the courts.

1. Session Politics

- There is a Republican majority in both bodies
- The Speaker is a potential gubernatorial candidate
- The Governor and Lt. Governor are not running
- Federal budget chaos – especially health care
- There is a \$1.6 Billion surplus
- Tax cuts and spending reductions were GOP priorities
- The Governor added investments, modest tax relief and retention for the structural balance.

2. Big Picture - Over Base

	FY 2018-2019		FY 2020-2021	
Governor	\$714 M	3.9%	\$956 M	5%
House	273 M	1.5%	287 M	1.5%
Senate	300 M	1.7%	435 M	2.3%
Conference C.	303 M	1.7%	424 M	2.2%
Special Session	483 M	2.8%	596 M	3.2%

3. E-12 Education Bills - Major Spending Categories (FY 18-19 Biennium State Appropriations - \$ in Thousands)

	GOVERNOR	HOUSE	SENATE	CONF.	FINAL
General & Spec Ed Funding	415,288	256,589	286,444	290,244	384,564
TRA Pension Aid	68,554	-	10,000	-	-
Early Learning	177,857	23,187	3,100	14,049	71,750
Other Ed Funding	31,291	11,057	10,582	16,168	21,498
Crosswinds Conveyance	-	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
State Agencies	20,513	(10,382)	1,323	(5,299)	16,841
Revenues	-	2,358	(1,189)	(1,680)	(1,401)
GRAND TOTAL	713,503	272,809	300,260	303,482	483,252

4. Major Money Provisions

- 2% (\$121) and 2% (\$124) on the formula (Governor) \$371.5 million
- Compensatory linked to formula - additional 1.7% tied to extended time in FY 18 and 3.5% in FY 19
- \$50 million over two years - VPK/School Readiness Plus
- \$20.75 million Scholarship - added criteria
- \$1 million home visiting
- ECFE linked to formula
- Transportation - awaiting foster care and pilot
- MA - all assessments covered
- Teachers of Color and Grow Your Own, Shortage
 - Para Professional \$1 million
 - CUE - \$440,000
 - Concurrent enrollment teacher training \$750,000
 - Teacher shortage loan forgiveness \$500,000
 - Tax credit for attaining masters - tax bill
- Reading and Math Corp \$3.15 million
- Sannah Foundation - \$1 million (limited to new sites)
- Recovery Program - \$500,000
- St. Paul Promise Neighborhood - \$200,000
- High School League Sales Tax Exemption

5. Policy Provisions

- Operating Referendum Notice - can be delivered bulk mail (current law - 1st Class mailing)
- Must negotiate lay-offs - Effective 7/1/19
- Lead testing requirement - SPPS already complies
- Directs Commission of Admin to offer Crosswinds for sale
- Districts must develop, update and post performance reports that comply with WBWF

6. Testing and Proficiency

- ACT/SAT - limits reimbursement to low income\
- Requires identification of third grade students not at grade level, requires report to parents
- Requires personal learning plans for students in grade 9 to inform parents of student achievement level on high school MCAs (requires school to tell students who do not meet or exceed MCA standards that public school is free until age 21).
- Adds ramifications of opting out of MCAs on State opt out form parents must sign.

7. Data Disaggregation - rollout sites a one year delay to allow testing at six sites and allow for stakeholder engagement and a working group to make recommendations for state-wide implementation.
 - Sites represent urban, suburban, rural and charter schools. St. Paul is one of the sites.
 - The stakeholders will be able to discuss adding or removing ethnicities and determine how frequently edits should happen into the future
 - Statewide implementation - two year delay
 - Data disaggregation limited to 23 ethnicities

8. Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board
 - Establishes an 11 member Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board - adopt rules by 7/1/18.
 - Creates Tier 1-4 system for teacher licensure
 - An ESL teacher that provided content instruction as a highly qualified teacher under NCLB can continue instruction until end of 18/19 school year
 - Requires Tier 3 and 4 Prep: cultural competency, behavior interventions, reading prep, MH
 - Converts current licenses to new system

9. Teacher Prep Programs
 - Prep Program Reporting
 - Alternative Teacher Preparation Programs
 - District, charter or nonprofit may seek approval to run a program
 - Grants for alternative teacher prep programs to fill teacher shortage areas (grants must be used to get program approval, expand programming, recruit teachers reflecting diversity or establish professional development programs.)
 - An ESL Teacher
 - Statewide Concurrent Enrollment Teacher Training Program
 - Expands Northwest Regional Partnership Program statewide
 - Partnership may contract with a post-secondary institution to establish a continuing education credit program to allow concurrent enrollment teachers to earn graduate credits.

10. Provisions Not Enacted
 - Opportunity Scholarships or expanded deductions for private/religious school exemptions
 - Metro Transit funding for Como & Central
 - Deep transit cuts in Legislative transportation bill
 - Complicated ballot language for future referenda
 - Cut to compensatory, integration and adult basic education and VPK and Pathway II scholarships
 - St. Paul Teacher Pension Provisions included in both pension bills.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Will the data disaggregation include information on whether a student participated in early childhood ed and which ones? Response: The process is under development, all parents will fill out the same form so they correctly self-identify. It will takes time to gather all this data so there is a viable base to work from. The focus is on ethnicity but once a sufficient database is built it can be sliced in any number of ways.
- It was stressed the state is not moving forward with current law on this but is working through six pilot sites to build implementation processes, etc.
- Which items will have a fiscal impact on the district? Response: The 2% is a given, compensatory is tied to extended time, others will have to be applied for. Slots are apportioned so SPPS has applied for more slots than were available. There is a Webinar

on Wednesday to further clarify this area. Other areas are teachers of color, foster care, concurrent enrollment. Opportunities are based on grant applications and timing is critical.

- A Director expressed disappointment that the SPPS proposal for Crosswinds had not been accepted. Is there a chance for that school to continue as it was intended as part of East Metro Integration Plan? Does SPPS have a chance to do what is right in this situation? Response: The legislative team lobbied hard to support the SPPS proposal. SPPS has contacted administration at Crosswinds School and will bring a team to meet with families, staff and students to inform them of opportunities available in SPPS and encourage them to attend SPPS. The Commissioner of Education and the Chair of the Perpich Board will also be visited. SPPS is continuing to pursue options.
- Crosswinds must go through a State surplus property process and then will be offered for interested purchasers.

B. March 31, 2017 Quarterly Financial Update Report

The March 31, 2017 Quarterly Financial Report is an update to the Board of Education on the current fiscal year 2016-17 budget and it includes a projection of Revenue, Expenditures and Fund Balance as of June 30, 2017.

A budget is a living, viable document. Once the budget is adopted in June, the Board is asked 3 times during the following year to look at and approve the changes that occur in the District's revenue and expenditures in each of the seven funds. The final determination, by fund, occurs each fall, following the acceptance of the audit report.

The fund balance accounts within the General Fund are prescribed by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, known as GASB 54. The unassigned fund balance in the General Fund is required to maintain a balance of 5% as referred to in Board policy. The fund balance in the Food Service fund is controlled by federal USDA regulations.

Highlights in the report include the following:

- The **General Fund** includes the five fund balance categories. Please refer to the financial definitions sheet for descriptions of fund balances. General Fund revenue is projected to increase by \$2.1 million due to the net effect of a projected decrease in State aid of \$3.9 million due to enrollment decline offset by increases in Special Education revenue of \$2.7 million, Misc. revenue of \$1.7 million, Levy adjustments of \$1.0 million and Voluntary Pre-K funding of \$.6 million.

General Fund expenditures are projected to be under spent by \$2.0 million in the areas of Intra-school \$2.0m, various programs & sites due to a fall adjustment for enrollment decline \$1.0m and operational savings of \$.8 m offset by an over expenditure of \$1.8m for transportation.

These changes result in a projected unassigned fund balance of 5.8% which is within the 5% Board of Education policy.

- **General Fund, Fully Financed:** The Fully Financed fund must have revenue that equals expenditures. Revenue and Expenditures are under budget by \$8.0 million due to lower expenditures in Title III \$.5m, Title II \$1.0m, Title I \$1.9m, Special Education \$1.1m, and other grants of \$3.5m. No change in fund balance is anticipated at this time.
- **Food Service Fund:** Revenue is projected to decrease by \$.2 million due to a decrease in meals served (.4% for breakfast and .6% for lunch). Reimbursement rates have increased by slightly over 2% to assist in offsetting the decrease. Expenditures are projected to decrease by \$ 1.1 million in labor, food and supply costs associated with the decrease in meals served. Fund balance is projected to increase by \$.8 million.

- **Community Service Fund:** Revenue is projected to increase by \$.1 million due to increases in levy, federal sources, tuition and fees which exceed a decrease in before and after school care fees. Expenditures are projected to decrease by \$.5 million due to reductions in labor and benefits from programming changes. Fund balance is projected to increase by \$.2 million.
- **Community Service, Fully Financed:** Revenue is projected to decrease by \$.8 million due to reductions in local aid \$.6 million and State aid \$.2 million. Expenditures are projected to decrease by \$1.2 million. Fund balance is projected to increase by \$.4 million.
- **Building Construction Fund:** Revenue is projected to increase by \$25.5 million related to proceeds and premium received on the 2017B Lease Purchase Certificates of Participation. Expenditures are projected to increase by \$3.4 million related to the 2017B Lease Purchase Certificates of Participation for Rivereast. Fund balance is projected to increase by \$23.6 million due to the 2017B issue.
- **Debt Service:** Fund balance is projected to increase by \$31.6 million due to escrow activity for bond refunding proceeds from the 2016B refunding issue and the net change of revenue and expenditures.

Results of Operations Budget vs. Projected as of 3/31/2017

	Revised Budget	Projected	Budget Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	
			Dollar	Percent
Fund Balance				
7/1/2016	\$91,510,306	491,510,306		
Revenue	\$518,784,440	520,902,439	2,117,999	0.41%
Expenditures	521,967,082	519,956,756	2,010,326	0.39%
Fund Balance				
6/30/2017	\$88,327,664	\$92,455,989	\$4,128,325	4.67%

Revenue is projected to increase by \$2.1 million due to the net effect of increases in Special Education revenue of \$2.7 m, \$1.7m in misc revenue, \$1.0 m in levy adjustments, \$0.6 m for Voluntary PreK offset by an overall projected decrease in State aid of \$3.9 m due to enrollment decline.

Expenditures are projected to be under spent by \$2.0 m in the areas of intra-school (\$2.0m), (\$1.0m) in various programs due to a fall adjustment for enrollment decline, and (\$0.8m) in operational savings offset by a projected over expenditure of \$1.8 for transportation services.

Fund Balance Details

	7/2/2016	6/30/2017	Increase (Decrease)
Nonspendable			
Inventory & Prepaid			
Expense	1,277,416	1,300,000	22,584
	1,277,416	1,300,000	22,584
Restricted			
Operating Capital	5,511,843	4,511,843	(1,000,000)
Health & Safety*	(5,722,006)	(5,189,375)	532,631
Area Learning Center	367,837	0	
Teacher Development	451,629	0	
Long-Term Facilities			
Maintenance	0	6,000,000	6,000,000
OPEB Revocable Trust	31,390,345	31,390,345	0
	31,999,648	36,712,813	5,532,631
Committed			

Severance Pay	2,538,018	2,538,108	0
Retiree Health Insurance	0	0	0
	2,538,108	2,538,018	0
Assigned			
Contractual Obligations	3,440,596	4,000,000	559,404
Strong Schools Initiatives	7,200,000	6,000,000	(1,200,000)
Site Based Operations	6,340,760	6,000,000	(340,760)
Intra-School Activities	2,897,273	3,000,000	102,727
	19,878,629	19,000,000	(878,629)
Unassigned			
Unassigned	35,816,596	32,905,158	(2,911,438)
	35,816,596	32,905,158	(2,911,438)
Total Fund Balance	\$91,510,307	\$92,455,989	\$1,765,148

* The CFO indicated she was watching Health & Safety closely as it phases out next year and if there is a shortage SPPS may need to adjust the fund balance.

The CFO noted the Unassigned Fund Balance is estimated to be \$32.9 million in the General Fund. SPPS must stay above 5% and is currently at 5.8%. Bond raters have been pleased with the projections. Bond raters rate fund balance as important along with previous year overall fund balance compared to the next year's.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- If we were to go from 5.8% to 5.0%, how much would that generate ? Response: \$4 million. The CFO recommended leaving it as is so that when fall comes SPPS has something to address surprises.
- How are bond ratings done? How much of a divergence could we make in fund balance and not affect bond ratings? Response: There are a lot of very detailed calculations – they look at overall fund balance and the district's ability to cover its liabilities. If we decrease fund balance over time that could lead to a decrease in bond ratings and increased interest costs. They look at financial management, is a district spending more than it gets in in revenue, does the district live within its revenue. They look at additional revenues, enrollment and economic factors. They work over a three year trend.
- Do they look at categories of fund balance? Response: Yes, each category, the why and what is in each.
- It was noted that maintaining fund balance results in interest saved on bonds, reduces obligations SPPS has in debt service fund and gives more borrowing capacity. We want to keep expenditures as reasonable as we can and maximize revenue as much as we can.

C. FY 18 Budget Update

The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) stated this budget meets required contractual obligations. She indicated all schools do not receive the same amount of money per pupil because:

- Some school funding is categorical (it has specific criteria on its spending)
- Funding for Comp Ed and Title I follows the students on a one year delay (previous year's October 1 count).
- Higher poverty schools have greater access to categorical dollars than lower poverty sites.

She also noted that school enrollment affects the dollars allocated.

Factors influencing the budget include:

- Fiscal yearend projections vs. actual revenue and expenditures impact fund balance
- Enrollment fluctuations impact revenue, class size and building capacity.
- Contractual settlements impact expenditure levels
- Legislative adjustments impact revenue
- Previous year's October 1 Free and Reduced lunch count impacts revenue

- Bond ratings
- Inflation

FY 2017-18 GENERAL FUND PRELIMINARY BIG PICTURE

	FY 17 Adopted (in millions)	FY 18 Prelim. (in millions)	Difference
Revenue (Current law)	\$518.2	\$514.2	(\$4.0)
Use of Fund Balance	0	0	0
Expenditures	518.2	541.5	(23.3)
Balance	\$0	(\$27.3)	

ADDITIONAL FY 18 REVENUE FROM LEGISLATURE

The FY 18 proposed budget includes a 2% increase in the General Education Basic formula.

Description	Fund	Amount
General Ed Formula 2%	General	\$7,200,000
Compensatory Education	General	TBD
Voluntary Pre-K (application-based)	General	TBD
Total		\$7,200,000

FY 2017-18 GENERAL FUND FACTORS IMPACTING PROJECTED SHORTFALL

Item	Amount \$
Inflationary impact of "rolling over" FY 2016-17 budget "as is" without any changes	(\$23.3)
Net Revenue decrease due to enrollment & Comp Ed	(4.0)
Total Projected Shortfall	(\$27.3)
4/25/17 - Restored \$4.0 million of funding to Schools: \$3.2 M (80%) to Programs \$0.8 M (20%)	4.0
6/13/17 - Recommendation to restore an additional \$3.2 M of funding to schools: \$2.6 M* (81%), to Programs \$0.6 M (19%)	3.2
Revised Projected shortfall as of 6/13/17	(\$20.1)

*\$1.5 is being reserved for Fall adjustments.

General Fund budget categories are:

- Schools - refers to all budgets for school sites in SPPS
- School Service Support - refers to program budgets that provide direct support services to schools (ex: Transportation, MLL, Special Education, Student Placement Center)
- District-wide Support - refers to program budgets that provide support to all areas of the district (ex: Operations, HR, Employee Benefits, Technology Services)
- Administration - refers to program budgets necessary to support governance, policy and staff support to the Superintendent (ex: Board of Education, Superintendent, Legal Counsel).

FY 18 PROPOSED GENERAL FUND BIG PICTURE - EXPENDITURES (FY 18 proposed amounts as of 6/13/17)

	FY 17 Adopted	FY 18 Proposed	Change	Percent Change
Schools	\$249,112,891	\$247,714,870	*(1,398,021)	(0.6%)
School Service Support	177,194,030	179,764,141	**2,570,111	1.4%
District-wide Support	88,237,474	90,433,697	2,196,223	2.4%
Administration	3,635,045	3,533,366	(102,679)	(2.9%)
Total	\$518,180,440	\$521,446,074		

* Due primarily to Compensatory Ed and enrollment

** Due primarily to Transportation

FY 2017-18 recommendations to address the projected shortfall include:

Programs:

- reduced inflationary allocations - 5.1 million
- Enrollment related service/staffing reductions - estimated at \$3-4 million
- Vacant positions, staff attrition/retirements, negotiated contracts - amount TBD
- Targeted and 2% reductions - \$0.7 million

Sites:

- Eliminate one time only FY 17 allocations of \$85/pupil and SSSC 2.0 program additions - \$2.0 million
- Enrollment related service/staffing reductions TBD - Legislative allocations will decrease impact
- Vacant positions, staff attrition/retirements, negotiated contracts -- amount TBD

FY 2017-18 school and program HR staffing impacts now stands at 20 FTEs (14 non-licensed EA/TA FTEs and six other FTEs [AFSME and Community Service])

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- There is no teacher impact? Response: No, does not include retirement or attrition.
- Do you have a sense of what attrition numbers might be – how many are needed to meet retirements or those leaving? Response: There are 119 open vacancies; 95 teachers we know are leaving. We can fill 29 positions before we need to consider cutting jobs. This is basically a licensure issue.
- So the teacher headcount 2016 to 2017 is down 29 positions?. Response: Yes, there are 29 fewer in the buildings compared to previous year.
- When we get the BOE meeting on the 20th will there be broad options for reinstatements, fall adjustments and other areas where money will be invested? We (Admin) would like to know what the Board is thinking before the meeting on the 20th. The CFO protects the district and its fund balance overall. Administration strives to give the best information possible so the Board can make the best decisions possible so we need to know where to put it, where it should it go? We need to stay within our means.
- We need to talk about the priorities of the Board rather than specific programs -- MLL programming (the admin team will be looking at this); keeping licensed teachers working, address the concern about EA and TAs. We need broad direction from the Board
- We need to think strategically as a Board about our priorities and focus. We need to decide where we want to make an impact. The \$3.2 million is not allocated so far. There is money allocated to fund the OPEB trust but to take that money now is not what I feel, personally, is a good choice. I would suggest taking the OPEB \$1 million from the unassigned fund balance rather than taking it from the General Fund.
- It was noted MLL needs a substantial investment; what is doable and sustainable? Response: The MLL cost will be substantial.
- Also, there is a staffing priority – EA and TA funding -- but that also needs to be sustainable and doable.
- What about music and art within the buildings, what buildings have had to make cuts?
- What about Crosswinds if SPPS were to want to purchase the building.
- Another Board member noted it is important to have additional staff in the classroom to help with ELL students. The Board needs to look at priorities and what can be done with additional monies. Strong concern was expressed about the achievement gap – there are models out there that have worked -- has SPPS looked at those? SPPS needs to be more intentional about needs and priorities out there to help struggling kids.
- Regarding EAs and TAs are the positions lost a result of right sizing or are we losing support for kids – those are real reductions. Are kids losing extra support too? Can HR get specific information for the Board? Response: This year vs. last SPPS is down nine EA FTEs. SPPS is up 53 TAs across the district. For School and Community Services the numbers are flat. The decrease in EAs is due in some instances to their moving into

teaching positions, etc. For arts and music there has been no reduction in art teachers and only two FTEs in music.

- What is Board member opinion on shifting OPEB funding? Response: First off, sustainability – what is added now, can we afford that next year? The next five years do not look rosy. OPEB is an operating cost agreed to years ago in contracts. It is an operating cost, a long-term operating cost that has to be paid now or in 30 years. Looking at the budget SPPS is doing pretty well with only a \$20 million budget shortfall. Also, there are other contractual needs, we still have an obligation to pay out on a Superintendent contract next year. Some of that is being framed and does have to do with sustainability and moving forward strategically rather than just addressing current/present issues. Music, arts and specialists being moved around is a long-term issue. MLL needs to build toward compliance. How we assess EL needs might need to be addressed. We need to build toward something viable and valuable.
- It was noted that what is hard in all this is a lack of vision around where we are going. There needs to be a larger discussion of what we want SPPS to look like and work toward it and fund toward it. We need to be visionary about what is being done in the district.
- We need to get clarity about what we want to guarantee in an education in SPPS and what we want outcomes will be. If we focus on that I believe progress can be made toward documented needs.
- ELL, PreK placements and minimize paraprofessional loses could be direction to admin for use of monies.
- Administration stated, remember back a year ago, there were no resources for the fall adjustments, no reserve. We did cover the shortfall . We are now faced with a \$27 million shortfall and we have put together a solid plan. What Admin needs from the Board is clear direction as to what the Board wants - voluntary PreK, MLL as a priority, retention of positions for TAs and putting them out in classrooms where they can help kids. We know kids are struggling and we need to target that. Is \$3.2 million enough to get moving or is additional funding necessary to invest back in schools, how much and give direction as to location.
- Is updating the Hmong materials a possibility?
- If the money is spread too thin it does not have impact, we want to invest dollars where they will make a difference and help kids move forward.
- To reach compliance in MLL what is the cost? Response: 28 staff members or about \$3 Million.

MOTION: Mr. Marchese moved SPPS look to allocate \$4.2 million dollars to schools and programs with priority on MLL, PreK and paraprofessional support to buildings. Mr. Schumacher seconded the motion.

For clarification he stated this would take \$1 million from fund balance for the OPEB trust and use the \$1 million allocated for OPEB from the General Fund to add to \$3.2 million. \$2.2 million would be used to address priorities.

Following extended discussion Director Marchese moved to amend his motion with approval from Director Schumacher (who seconded the motion).

MOTION: The Board directs the Superintendent to review the proposed current budget to increase the allocation by \$4.2 million. This includes \$3.2 million in additional revenue from the legislative formula plus \$1.0 million from the OPEB contribution budget line in the General Fund budget. To allocate the \$4.2 million, the Board directs the Superintendent to focus on the following priorities: (1) MLL staffing to meet documented needs as identified by MDE, (2) contingency for fall adjustments and (3) paraprofessional staffing at sites. The Board further directs a one-time use of \$1.0 million from the unrestricted fund balance to the OPEB trust for FY 18.

- The CFO was asked if we do not upset the fund balance is there any other place to find a million dollars. Response: To find a million would be difficult now, SPPS is a labor intensive organization so to find a million and not affect programming, etc. along the way would be difficult
- The CFO was asked to reiterate her reasoning for paying for OPEB from the General Fund. Response: Taking a million from fund balance would put SPPS in a tighter position closer to policy threshold, it would be viewed unfavorably by bond raters and could tip SPPS over the edge for bond ratings resulting in higher interest rates on bonds, fewer bids and savings to be used for facilities. In the long run, using \$1 million from fund balance would be very costly.

Again following extended discussion and indications of discomfort on the part of a number of Board members regarding the OPEB funding suggestion, Director Marchese, with Director Schumacher's agreement, withdrew his motion.

- Administration was asked what their priorities would be. Response: Voluntary PreK, MLL, EAs/TAs and Contingency.

The Board asked that Administration provide them with information on how the \$4.2 was achieved and where it is invested prior to the 6/20 Board meeting.

D. Latino Consent Decree Parent Advisory Council Annual Report

The purpose of the report was to update, review and evaluate the LCD Implementation Guide. The PAC's recommendation is made pursuant to the LCD Stipulation, Section VIII; evaluation of Section B, "Program Evaluation and Monitoring", this states that "there shall be from time to time, an evaluation made as to the home language background identification and assessment process and the other programs under this Stipulation to assure District compliance with all areas under the LCD." The current implementation guide as it is today does not address all the advancements and improvements and best practices in education. The LCD also wants to ensure that the LCD is implemented in the modern era in such a way as to meet its goal of advancing Latino students, closing the achievement gap and align it to the District's Strategic Plan.

District and LCD program goals are to: (1) Create a plan for full implementation of the Latino Consent Decree, (2) Go beyond compliance, (3) ensure that the Implementation Guide is created in a meaningful manner and (4) Have positive outcomes for students and families.

The PAC then moved on to review their 2017-18 Recommendations:

1. LCD Teacher responsibilities - update job responsibilities to include essential functions for all LCD teachers directly responsible for providing services to LCD eligible students.
 - Work in collaboration with the Office of Multilingual Learners (MLL) and HR
 - Consult with the St. Paul Federation of Teachers (SPFT).
2. Qualified Bilingual Teachers - prioritize recruiting and hiring EL-LCD qualified bilingual teachers. The reasons for this include:
 - There is a serious to non-existence of LCD teachers in the district
 - There are 2,500 LCD eligible students in 60 schools
 - There are only 8 full time LCD teachers (by job description) and they are not necessarily working with LCD students
 - There is a need to re-identify LCD teachers. The PAC will work with MLL and HR on this.
3. LCD Bilingual Education Assistants (EA2) - increase the number of EA2s. The reasons for this are:
 - There are 2,500 LCD eligible students
 - There are 17 LCD EA2 (six of them are split between two schools)
 - Only 21 sites receive direct support from an LCD EA2.

- The EA2s stretch their daily schedules
 - EA2s could be more effectively allocated in schools and classrooms with LCD eligible students. To achieve this LCD will work with HR and MLL.
4. LCD EA2 Job Postings - re-write job titles and description for all LCD EA2 positions.
 - LCD initials are being used incorrectly - SPPS should avoid using LCD initials other than related to the Consent Decree. The PAC will work with HR and MLL on this.
 5. The "LCD Flag" - create an LCD Flag be created in the Student Information System
 - All Latino students who receive EL instruction should be tracked using this record keeping tool. The PAC will work with MLL and the Office of Teaching and Learning on this.
 6. Parent Engagement - continue strengthening the collaboration with community-based organizations and SPPS district programs.
 - Amherst H. Wilder Foundation (Latino Leadership Program)
 - Parent Academy Program
 - CLUES (Sexual Health Program)
 - MLL Family Night
 - Special Education Family Groups

The next steps include continuing the task of evaluating and updating the LCD Stipulation Guide.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The LCD Flag – would that be part of the Parent Portal if implemented? MLL does have a flag used in the information system. There are also flags for special ed and gifted services.
- Any question regarding privacy? Response: SPPS would need to work on technology and logistics with Campus provider.
- Is it difficult to find LCD teachers, do they exist and why are we not hiring them or do we need to develop those skills? Response: It has not been a problem finding but we need a stronger focus on directly recruiting LCD teachers. SPPS will need to be first into the market for LCD teachers in order to get to the best teachers available. SPPS also needs to find institutions developing teachers in this area and build a partnership with the organization. SPPS needs to make connections early and identify SPPS as an employer of favor.
- Are MLL services distributed uniformly regardless of language issues? Response: ELL services are around English development – social relevant and socially responsible. ELL does not adjust to exact aspects of culture.
- Are LCD staff trained because of language competency or cultural competency. Response: LCD stipulates the need to teach in Spanish and English. If a child from another country who has had education there, that child should not be taught in English but continue learning in home language backed up by English. The difference is stipulated in the LCD.
- A parent noted, we want to know a student is not being taught a lesser course because of language.
- Where is SPPS at in regard to LCD teachers. What is recommended in numbers 1 and 2, what is good number ratio of LCD teachers to students. Also EAs? Response: The district needs to hire the number needed to meet need, it would be a high number which is why there is a need to re-identify teachers so we do have real numbers. We did not talk about ratios, just that there is a need for increase. Much classroom work falls on EAs because teachers are not there to take care of students. There is a lot of family engagement involved in the EA position.
- Are more LCD students have an education level that is similar or are there a number coming with limited educational backgrounds? Response: That information was requested two years ago, it is being worked on but do not have numbers currently.

- Misidentification of LCD initials, does that creep into data? Response: If those individuals were working under that title it would indicate they are working with LCD students. There are some Somali and Hmong staff members identified LCD who will not meet LCD needed.
- What is method and format and timetable in terms of the administrative response to the recommendations? Response: The administrative response is due back within 90 days, similar to American Indian Parent Committee. Admin prepares the report, brings it to the Board and then to PAC. What if the PAC does not like it, what happens? Response: Administration does not do the response in isolation, we work with the PAC in order to get to point where everyone is satisfied and so they are not surprised by the response.
- What is the process for placing LCD teachers, are they placed where there are children who qualify for services? Response: Yes, but misidentification needs to be addressed. If a teacher leaves an LCD position we need to address the issue of replacement so the teacher is replaced with another LCD teacher.
- The task of the Council is to monitor the LCD Stipulation. Today we are looking at 60 sites with Latino students everywhere. More things will come up as the Council continues to review the Stipulation. It will take time and collaboration to get to the desired end results.

E. 2017-2018 Rights & Responsibilities Handbook Updates

In order to review the Rights and Responsibilities Handbook a committee was formed where multiple perspectives could be shared, the "who" of the intended audience could be identified and efforts could be made to make the Handbook more student/parent friendly. Presentations were made to Principals and notes from the SEAB event were utilized. Intended audience is students and families and what can be done to make it more friendly. The opening letter was re-written.

Highlights of the changes include:

- Increased alignment and consistency in language used – matched Handbook and Campus system language along with PBIS.
- Minor format changes particularly in responsibilities area
- Additions to the Students Rights and Responsibilities - the Gender Inclusion Policy and more information on Transportation and R&R applies to buses as well.
- Information on Restorative Practices and the Transfer Committee was added.

The following behavior violation revisions were made:

- Level 1 - added statement explaining documented interventions needed if there are repeated instances of a behavior.
- Level 2 - Audio Alert Device downgraded
- Level 5 - Definitions added to the matrix

Next steps – review by Legal, then translation of summary document (Hmong, Spanish and Karen) and finalize plans to get book out to schools.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Is there just one R&R for all students or is it separated by age? Response: Only one R & R Handbook applies to all sites, ages and grades.
- Do schools have their own handbooks? Response: They have handbooks around other things – absences, names of administrators, PAC information, school-wide expectations at the school, etc.
- Standardization across district – is it standardized at every site and is orientation standardized across sites? Response: Every site does have school-wide expectations such as Tier 1 PBIS expectations. Staff could not say it is communicated the same at every site. Schools generally have their handbook on websites.

- A Board member stated we need to standardize access to information on sites for all schools.
- Is there an orientation for 6th and 9th graders so they understand expectations? How does that work? Response: 6th, 7th and 8th graders have the "Welcome to School" week which covers among other things the PBIS matrix and school-wide expectations. There is "Focus on Freshmen" which is an orientation for all incoming freshmen. High Schools have classroom orientation.
- How do we find the school handbooks and other information in this area? Response: When you go to a school website the information is pushed to the "ABOUT" tab. This will give you access the R & R Handbook, school handbook, etc. Students have a better understanding of their rights and responsibilities. It is the parents and community who lack an aligned understanding. All families have translated copies of the summary R&R Handbook. In future it would be beneficial for them to have a translated full R&R Handbook with supporting programs. Admin is setting goals to align understanding among students, families and schools.

- F. Standing Item: SEAB Report - No report
- G. Standing Item: FMP Update - No report
- H. Standing Item: Policy Update - No report
- I. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - No report

J. Work Session

1. **Resolution Regarding Use of Menthol Tobacco**

Representatives from the non-profit organization Beautiful Lie, Ugly Truth provided a brief overview of their work on an ordinance with the City of St. Paul that would treat menthol in tobacco the same way that other flavors are treated, that is, menthol products could only be sold thorough adult-only tobacco product shops. They requested support for their effort from the SPPS Board.

The Board briefly discussed the draft resolution language and asked the group to provide them with language that the Board could act on at their June 20th board meeting. They invited the group to make a brief presentation at that meeting as well.

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schumacher moved, seconded by Ms. Ellis to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by acclaim.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk