

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
May 2, 2017**

PRESENT: Board of Education: Ms. Ellis, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Schumacher, Ms. Foster, Ms. Vanderwert, Mr. Marchese, Mr. Vue

Staff: Superintendent Thein, M. Hoerth, E. Putnam, M. Schrul, E. Agbamu, J. Peterson, I. Davis, T. Stewart-Downey, J. Engen, A. Collins, C. Baker, L. Cathey, H. Ott, K. Wilcox-Harris, T. Melhus, H. Kilgore, J. Jonassen, T. Battle, L. Sayles-Adams, J. Turner, T. Parent

Other: J. Nathan, J. Verges, T. Dresser, S. Wastvedt, J. Nathan, T. Lonetree, R. Downing

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Budget Update - School & Program Allocation

The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) presented an update on the FY 17-18 general fund budget.

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)	

FY 2017-18 GENERAL FUND FACTORS IMPACTING PROJECTED SHORTFALL

Item	Amount (in millions)
Inflationary impact of "rolling over" FY 16-17 budget "as is" without any changes	(\$23.3)
Net revenue decrease due to enrollment and Compensatory Education	(4.0)
Total Projected Shortfall (as of 2/19/17 - subject to change)	(\$27.3)
BOE Action 4/25/17 Restored \$4.0 million to funding to Schools: \$3.2 Million (80%); Programs: \$0.8 million (20%)	
Revenue projection will be based upon 1.25% formula increase	\$4.0
Revised Projected Shortfall as of 4/25/17	(\$23.3)

FY S18 PROPOSED GENERAL FUND BIG PICTURE - EXPENDITURES

AREA	FY 17 ADOPTED	FY 18 PROPOSED	CHANGE	PERCENT CHANGE
Schools	\$249,112,891	\$245,798,889	(3,314,002)	(1.3%)
School Service Support	177,194,030	179,516,141	2,322,111	1.3%
District-wide Support	88,237,474	90,077,956	1,840,482	2.0%
Administration	3,636,045	3,533,366	(102,679)	(2.8%)
TOTAL	\$518,180,440	\$518,926,352	745,912	

Staff provided several handouts which broke the budget down into more detail in the following areas:

- FY 18 School Allocation Summary (regular sites only, no ALC or Special Ed included)
- FY 18 School FTE Comparison Report
- SPPS School Allocation Comparison FY 18 to FY 17
- FY 17-18 Proposed General Fund Program Budget Summary

FY 17-18 RECOMMENDATIONS TO ADDRESS PROJECTED SHORTFALL PROGRAMS --

- Reduced inflationary allocations (\$5.1 million)
- Enrollment related service and staffing reductions (Estimated \$3-4 million)
- Vacant positions, staff attrition/retirements, negotiated contracts (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 (TBD)

The Executive Director of Human Resources then presented a brief summary of staffing impacts to date. HR compares projected position cuts from schools and programs against current vacancies. HR currently sees 115 teacher cuts but does have nine openings (anticipated retirements). There are also 108 classroom support cuts proposed. He indicated aligning position cuts with licensing is a challenge. When there is a need to reduce positions, placement starts with tenured teachers, as they are placed there may be a need to non-renew some probationary teachers who have not achieved tenure. Layoffs would occur if, after non-renewals, the needed reduction in numbers has not been achieved. Right now the numbers are trending in the right direction due to the management of expectations over the past two years. Non-teacher and other classroom supports show 108 total projected cuts. There are currently 39 openings for a difference of 69 positions. Teachers are funded utilizing class size average numbers. Buildings cover teachers first and then offset dollars with other classroom supports at the building level. Additionally there are 50 people that do have recall rights. Personnel decisions are all currently based on the 1.25% addition of funds projection. SPPS is committed to putting any additional dollars that come in toward resources in the schools. It was also noted that there are additional teachers within the Program budgets and Title I that serve the schools as well.

The CFO reviewed the adoption timeline with the Board and then asked for questions.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What is Non-Salary Allocation? Response: The instructional material allocations
- What is the Compensatory Allocation? Response: Sites decide how to utilize the compensatory dollars on that spending for their needs; it is discretionary.
- The year-round schools why do they get more? Response: They are open for additional time and it helps meet some of the summer programming requirements.
- On the FTE Comparison Report what is included for the Non-Salary allocation? That is supplies. Comp Ed Discretionary? That correlates to poverty rates and enrollments with a one year lag. Total allocation cost? Applies to regular sites. Title I Allocation? The reflects a 13% reduction overall. SSSC 2.0 additions? These are areas that were not cut (AP/IB, etc.), the one time only allocations from the previous year were cut.
- We like schools to be diverse in terms of race and culture and socio-economic levels but it seems, in many instances, that schools trying to increase their reputation and work to attract a broader section of families sometimes end up not qualifying for comp aid and thus will get less money. Is this true? Response: In some instances. It is a funding issue. Schools are only funded to a certain level with the free & reduced lunch rate. If their population changes funding could change based on the previous year's count. The

information provided was built on our best professional guesses – enrollment, retirement, legislative actions, etc. At this point there is no reserve funding for fall adjustments in the budget.

- The Referendum Fund is that the dollars schools receive from the referendum dollars? Does it cover the iPads? Response: This is what is spent on staffing, Kindergarten, class size, PreK. The iPads have a separate budget on the program side. Sites are not charged for iPads.
- As we move toward the end of the referendum cycle for technology, what is being spent on technology in the building? The Board would want to have that information at some point. What else is it spent on in each building?
- For the OPEB trust, when will the impact of those benefits hit and when will the Trust come into play? Response: The purpose of the trust is to build it up to bring down costs and impacts to the district. Its performance is also very important in the bond rating process. Things have reached the start of the tipping point and SPPS will need to draw from the trust at some point in the future.
- The Board needs to make choices on how to designate funds and I am uncertain if we need to add to the trust this year, we need to consider where it falls as a priority. Would staff provide more information so we can make proper choices, if necessary, on the trust allocation? Could you share the results of the fiduciary study with the Board? Perhaps in the work session at the next COB. Response: It is part of understanding the overall budget. The trust is a long term liability that does not go away. The rate of return grows as funds are added to the trust. Comment: This is a value choice that needs to be put into the mix in finalizing the budget.
- Insurance what is included? Response: Property, liability and some cyber liability. These come forward in April or May for renewal. They are there to cover the District's liability needs.
- It appears MLL and Special Ed are going down. Response: MLL did not get an allocation for inflation and reallocated some money to the dual immersion program. Special Ed has staffing reductions and inflation reduction. Both still meet the maintenance of effort requirements. SPPS receives \$0.58 on the dollar and funds are pulled from the general fund to cover the balance of costs.
- Where does the American Indian Studies increase come from? Response: Integration funding.
- What about the unfilled positions? Response: Those are being left on hold for the new superintendent to decide on. We have also allowed some discretionary funds for the new superintendent to make choices on (1.25%).
- What about the fall adjustment? Response: There are no fall adjustment funds set aside at this point.
- If we were all to make a strong case to the Governor to hold to the 2% where would that extra money go? Response: Straight into the fall contingency.
- What are we projecting regarding enrollment? Response: We have projected a 3% decrease. Are there other decreases in funding? Response: Title funding by 13%. All in all the average amount per student is a little more than last year's amount.
- SPPS is trying to put more money into students even though there is a reduction in revenue. We have put the projected lowest Legislative increase of 1.25% into the budget; we can hope for 2% but are guessing at about 1.6%. We also need to set money aside for fall adjustments. We will include the new superintendent in discussions on final decisions even before he officially begins.
- This is a conservative budget putting money back into the kids and having reductions impact adults. The budget is not done, it is a work in progress; there could be additional revenue and then we will need to make additional decisions.
- A Director noted it is an apples to oranges comparison among SPPS schools, this makes it difficult to know where standardization is and where divergence occurs. Seeing the overall picture of equity in the schools is challenging. Response: If more standardization is wanted SPPS needs to go with site based or centralized budgeting

either would reduce flexibility. Kids are the first priority. If it is broken down by school levels there are many different factors to consider such as poverty, etc. The need is greatest in the middle schools and in schools with high poverty rates; there is additional money brought in under title programs and compensatory funding.

- There are really two things that need to be done: One – get this budget approved for next fiscal year. Two -- the Board needs to think about what it takes to run a school, what the baseline is and what expectations are to broaden beyond where we are now to accomplish great things for the kids. We need to think about programmatic needs in a broader way. What does it take to fund schools to achieve consistency, equity, etc.
- It was noted that over the last 10 years SPPS has moved from a district honoring site based management to a combination of site/centralized process. We now need to look toward what schools offer, the core specifics and move out from there.
- Where is achievement and integration; how do we get those numbers? There are two funding sources for integration – both incentive and achievement and integration revenue equal the "integration" revenue. Incentive funds some transportation and teachers and provides some support funds for the five racially isolated sites.
- This budget reflects revenue for the schools. Schools were given the allocations for budget, these were considered/reconsidered, some money was added back in to reach the current figures. In future SPPS needs to consider enrollment (how to increase it), class size negotiations in the contracts, legislative funding, referendum funds, grants for additional funds. The only other change possible to increase funding for this year is Q Comp or Title I from Federal legislation.
- Once all this information is published there are going to be questions from the community on particular budgets – are principals ready to address those? Response: The information will be posted to the website on May 3. There will be narrative along with the presentation. These figures represent what schools are allocated, they may take discretionary dollars to fund choice items. The Assistant Superintendents will also be available to address questions. Information will also be posted to "Happening Now" and "Trending Now" can be utilized to post answers to questions from the community on the website to share information as questions/answers becomes available.
- It was noted the Budget and Finance Committee will meet on May 10 and they will be reviewing this material as well.
- It was also noted that imbedded in program budgets are teachers assigned to sites -- Special Ed, MLL, etc.
- The proposed reduction to Family & Community Engagement and the Office of Leadership Development what is that? Response: It is a one position change with a reduction of an assistant in both departments.
- How does that impact programming? Response: Engagement feels it can offer the same programming quality but not at the same level/manner it has. It will make adjustments across current staffing to pickup processes. It will also make changes in how it offers programming across sites/locations. It will continue to provide support for certain other projects as well. For Leadership Development, its other three departments will assume various responsibilities across their staffing.
- What was the rationale for the 80/20 restoration of the \$4 million? Response: Schools were put first. Diminishing return programs had some surgical reduction so programming does not affect the schools. There were certain things that could not be cut -- busing, utilities, custodians - it was an administrative judgment call.
- Are retirements taken into consideration? Response: To some degree, to date have seen 62 teachers for next year.

The Board expressed its appreciation at how people have stepped up this year during the budget process.

B. Summer School Update

2013-14 redesigned summer term (2 sessions 2 4 week along with 6 week session in 2nd term)

Staff outlined the Summer Term (S Term) Goals: To prevent summer learning loss; focused alternative learning, credit recovery and on-track to high school graduation. She indicated 95% of teachers/administrator survey participants agreed or strongly agreed students benefits academically from attending S-Term 2016. S Term is an opportunity for students to actively explore, create, build and design.

Total projected enrollment for S Term is projected at 14,500; 3,850 Grades K-4, 8,500 Grades 5-12, 950 in the six week programs along with 1,200 from multi-district and charter schools. State's largest summer programming.

Grades K-4 Elementary will be located at Benjamin E. Mays, Hazel Park, John A. Johnson, Chelsea Heights, Dayton's Bluff, EXPO, Mississippi Creative Arts and Riverview. It will feature core academics (math and literacy), movement/yoga, health, economics, social-emotional skill building and STEM applied academics.

Grades 5-12 Secondary will be located at Central (1,300), Harding, Gordon Parks, LEAP and Washington (5,800) and St. Paul College (1,400). Curriculum features include: core academics (math and literacy), transition to middle school and art (grade 5), leadership and agriculture (grade 6), Why Try and Robotics (grade 7), leadership and transition to high school (grade 8), credit recovery (grades 9-12), online learning (ages 16+) and Writer's Institute (for levels 2 and 3 ELL students).

The six-week programs will be held at Children's Defense Fund (CDF) Freedom Schools (650, grades K-8), BELL Power Scholars (150, grades K-4) and Hmong Karen Youth Pride Program (150, grades K-4). This will feature core academics (math and literacy) and culturally affirming curriculum and development of leadership, pride and persistence.

The multi-district and charter school sessions will locate at Camp Teranga with Arts Us (125, grades K-8), the Native American Program (75, grades 1-5), National Youth Sports Program (300, grades K-11), Belwin Outdoor Science Program (100, grades 1-5) and Multiple Charter School Sites (600, grades K-12). These will feature core academics (math and literacy), cultural awareness, science and athletics.

Quality S Term programming for SPPS students involves district-wide departmental collaboration, security badges for S Term 2017 employees, an Emergency Operation Plan (EOP), a website promoting online registration, accessible technology for teachers and strong partnerships with community-based organizations. The programs provide focused, alternative learning opportunities so students can experience educational success and graduate to something great.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Multi-district and charter – where do they come from? Response: the multi-district is available for students from other surrounding districts on a first come, first served basis. Charter schools are within the City of St. Paul. They enroll their students as SPPS students but hold the programs at their own sites to save on transportation costs as SPPS does not pay for transporting these students.
- The immersion schools at Ben Mays, how is that done? Response: Immersion programs are all co-located at the one site and students are bused citywide to the programs. Each is run individually on the site.
- What data is collected around outcomes? Response: For elementary there are pre and post assessments in math and literacy. Secondary is based on credits earned. The Minnesota Council of Economics also does pre and post assessments. A report-out is made that the at end of term to allow for planning for next year.

- Has there historically been more or fewer sites? Response: Originally there were 12 elementary sites. This was decreased for the economy of transportation and facility costs. Enrollment has been quite consistent. Secondary has remained consistent in number of sites. There has been an increase in online enrollment so the website, the marketing, etc. is working.
- Are there end of term events at each site? Response: Yes, each site has end of term events. Freedom School also offers many parent empowerment opportunities and offer an end of term evening on August 25. Board members were invited to read at Freedom School during S Term.
- What about Break Through St Paul? Response: That is not SPPS programming but they do their programming in SPPS buildings. Many SPPS partners work in SPPS buildings to provide supports.

C. New Employee On boarding

Human Resource's (HR) mission is to lead as a strategic business partner to meet the district's evolving workforce needs. Its vision is that SPPS is a national destination employer, that collaboratively recruits, employs and retains top talent. They foster a culture of achievement and success, where proud employees build pathways that ensure exceptional outcomes for all students. To this end they created and implemented a systematic, effective, informative, engaging and collaborative year-round employee on-boarding program.

They did consider an online on-boarding and implemented a Moodle Online Training. However, there was no accountability or measurements and it lacked collaboration with District-wide stakeholders. Additionally, not all staff had access to a computer, it was missing the SPPS "family welcomeness" and some new hires missed their 30 day benefits eligibility. According to *Forbes* (May 2015) "*the first 90 days are the right time to introduce new hires to new colleagues, share with them expectations and help them to understand the specific values your company espouses.*"

The SPPS on-boarding covers:

- HR's support (benefits)
- Technology services to get electronic devices
- Employee badge
- District Policies (Staff's Section 4, Technology # 520, Tobacco Free #414, Social Media #426, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (You Belong Here).
- Mandated reporting within SPPS
- Office of Equity (Racial equity and gender inclusion)
- Office of Teaching and Learning
- SPPS organization chart
- Anti-Bullying PD and
- A bus tour of ISD 625.

The program is attended the pre-scheduled Premier O-boarding includes staff who are benefits eligible, rehire with more than a five year break in service and any employee promoted into a Teacher assignment.

The program provides clear expectations, explains how to navigate the SPPS systems, provides information on equity and gender inclusion, helps new employees form relationships and networks and includes all benefits eligible employees.

A survey was done of new employees from August 2016-April 2017. It included: 22 clericals, 24 EA, 33 facility service personnel, 31 nutrition service personnel, 17 School/Community School professionals, 196 teachers, 183 TAs and 34 others. During this time period 602 of 712 new employees have attended the program.

- Over 90% of new employees have found the training beneficial (62.0% very useful, 34.3% useful, 3.3% less useful and 0.4% not useful).
- Over 80% of new employees found the benefits information to be useful and enrolled in benefit plans within their 30 day eligibility. (63.8% very useful, 26.6% useful, 8.1% less useful and 1.6% not useful).
- Over 70% of new employees enjoyed the bus tour (31.9% very useful, 42.5% useful, 13.8% less useful and 11.8% not useful)
- 93.1% of new employees shared that all information provided was work related with only 6.9% not finding it so.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Where do you tell new employees to go for help, support, mentoring that will not be threatening? Response: HR is the first call for employee questions. The Office of Teaching and Learning has added a week of training for new hires to onboard teachers with an additional five days of training. Principals and APs and veteran teachers can also be resources for mentoring within the schools.
- How does SPPS work to foster a "family atmosphere" for new employees? Response: Beyond the on-boarding there are other things available. SPFT offers PD sessions during the teacher probationary period. Employees can go to HR, Benefits for personal needs or for help with the job. IT offers technology resources. Other resources include the racial equity group, academic leaders, Special Ed leaders and MLL leaders, content area leads, elementary teachers spend time in literacy training and in math. There is a mentor/mentee program to partner new teachers with veteran teachers as mentor. In the second year PAR is added in and SPFT offers effective instruction classes. There is an evaluation process done three times per year over the three year probationary period that provides input/development opportunities. New teachers have more flexibility in the third year for PD in identified needs. School staff build a community within the buildings that offer supports as well.
- Homelessness, gender inclusion, equity, trauma informed work -- is there on boarding around those? Response: Those issues are address under Title I. Family involvement nights, school climate and culture address trauma informed care.
- School climate and culture are addressed during the new educator week – all departments are brought together to plan the training – equity work, trauma informed work and the initial touch point on homelessness happen there. Support comes at the building level. Title I liaisons at the schools address that area as well with additional resources at certain times of year.

D. Standing Item: SEAB Report - None

E. Standing Item: FMP Update

1. Major Project Budget Updates

- RiverEast - construction timeline provided, school opens September 2018.
- Adams -- groundbreaking February, completion December 2018
- Como Park Senior High School -- redo artificial turf on competition field - groundbreaking May 2017, completion Fall 2017. Building additions - break ground Fall of 2017, completion late 2019.
- Highland Park Elementary -- break ground March 2017, completion August 2018
- Horace Mann Elementary -- Break ground May 2017, completion August 2018
- Humboldt Senior High – Construction begins June 2017, completion August 2020
- Johnson Senior High – Construction began June 2016, completion August 2017
- Linwood Monroe Lower – Construction begins Summer 2017, completion Fall 2018
- Linwood Monroe Upper -- Construction begins Summer 2017, completion Fall 2018

- St. Anthony Park Elementary – Addition to be built to house main office, cafeteria and kitchen. Second Story will be built over current single story to add instructional space. Construction begins June 2017, completion August 2018.

2. FMP Governance Committee

This committee was defined by the Board's 5-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Plan resolution. Its purpose is to annually review and update the next five year's projects. Membership is reflective of the original FMP Planning Committee with broad district perspectives, racial diversity and geographic distribution. Parents, students, teachers, district staff, local businesses, local government agencies, community partners and neighborhood joint-use partners make up the membership.

The parameters of the FMP-G is to uphold the integrity of the FMP engagement process, to adhere to the FMP vision, principles and standards. To use agreed upon criteria to guide decisions and to consider emerging factors such as enrollment projections, demographic changes, educational pathway/program realignment or changes, technological advances and changes to federal or state law impacting capital funding.

The Committee will inform Board action on the 5-Year Plan on May 16. It will meet for two sessions on April 13 and May 9. Additional work needs to be done to bring in additional members for the Committee.

Criteria for prioritizing projects (in rank order) include:

- Permanent construction
- Growth and alignment
- Quality of learning spaces
- Identifiable main entries
- Building condition
- Core space
- Overall alignment

Additional criteria may be considered to address the following:

- Enrollment enhancement opportunities
- Geographic distribution
- Large impacts
- Partnership opportunities
- Program requirements.

At the April 13 meeting the group had opportunity to reflect on SPPS priorities via the criteria. They had no desire to change the criteria for prioritization. They listed some opportunities:

- New Superintendent/Mayor - utilize new leadership
- Increase access for families with young children (B-5), PreK/Early Childhood
- Urban school district and the benefits of a diverse community - open schools to the community (revenues), look for community partners (like the 3M partnership), look for mentors and partner with local colleges.
- Career readiness opportunities
- Energy efficiencies
- Dining space/how food service affects the students' day

They also offered input on challenges:

- Looking at over vs. under capacity buildings
- Public understanding of what "facilities" encompass and in turn, how its impacts students
- Volume of buildings - consideration of impact and variety

- Planning in uncertain times - placing funds to meet future needs, financial constraints (funding great visions), specialized programs in the right place/do buildings support programs?, building age, diversity in design, engagement of community and parents, respect for teachers and environment and building security.

At the May 9 meeting the group will consider input on middle school capacity (3 scenarios will be presented to fill capacity), the impact of emerging factors (enrollment projections, etc.), co-creators of engagement framework for broader middle school engagement and BOE consideration.

At the June COB and BOE meetings the Board will review and act upon the updated five-year Implementation Plan (FY18-22) and hear strategies for how to address middle school/Crosswinds decisions and actions.

3. Solar Energy

The Board Chair asked the Facilities Director to update the Board on solar energy since they have been receiving inquiries on the subject.

SPPS has two types of arrays on two schools, one for domestic hot water needs and the other for electric capacity. There has been substantial movement and interest in community solar gardens and the sale of energy; SPPS has been approached to consider these opportunities. There is a District Energy Team looking at the possibilities for energy efficiency and lowering energy costs and at what creates the biggest impact along with pros and cons involved. Historically SPPS has invested in fast payback projects; solar creation/consumption is a long term liability and as such needs thoughtful consideration of the process. The Energy Team will look at leveraging what has been done recently and how that might apply to SPPS.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- When (and if) SPPS moves from thought to implementation on solar what will the plan be? Response: There are opportunities out there and SPPS may not want to miss out on those but right now it is in the exploration phase. There is no timeline yet, the industry is moving quickly on this. SPPS is evaluating it systemically and will be talking with Public Housing on what they have done. This will help to create a framework around what the right solution might be but we still need additional time for exploration
- Has there been consideration on collaboration in this process? Perhaps with the City or someone else? Response: We hope that will be the case. The speed of the industry is fast and there have been changes in legislation that are positive.
- A Board member requested staff to capture the commentary from the FMP-G in a systematic way so the Board can hear/see the information and incorporate it into future community engagement opportunities. The Board asked their Administrator to keep the information for the Board. They also asked who is on the Governance Committee.

F. Standing Item: Policy Update -- None

G. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update -- None

H. Work Session

1. Administrative Response to American Indian Resolution of Non-Concurrence

Administration indicated that there is a perception on the part of the PAC that Board should have been more involved. Historically the Administrative Response has been made from administration. The community brings forth concerns and the district has 90

days in which to respond to those concerns. SPPS has been using the requested "wrap around" meetings to write and share the response with the PAC. There have been questions around the clarity of the response and at least one indication of dissatisfaction with the response. When the response has been "vetted" it has typically been brought to a COB meeting for the Board's information along with further discussion with the PAC.

Administration has discussed the response process and in this instance the Parent Committee has not wanted to meet with the Board to discuss the administrative response.

Has administration adequately responded to what concerns were expressed? The concerns have been worked through at the quarterly meetings and has been moving in the right direction. SPPS has done target marketing, recruitment and quarterly meetings in attempts to increase American Indian participation. There is a staff person housed at the Placement Center to capture American Indian families for recruitment and to welcome them into the school/program.

So they came with a statement of non-concurrence and SPPS responded as required. Yes, one person has expressed dissatisfaction with the response but the committee, as a whole, has been working through the response at their quarterly meetings.

The consensus was that the Board would discuss the response with the PAC when they are ready to come back to the Board. Administration indicated it would work with the PAC and encourage them to come to the Board to discuss the response.

2. FY 18 Board of Education Budget

The Chief Financial Officer and the Board member worked through the Board budget line items to arrive at a proposed final board budget.

3. School Choice/Enrollment

The Chief Operations Officer provided a further review of the choice/enrollment process.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- At JJ Hill they use an "intent to return" letter, do other schools use this? Response: It is used throughout the district under school choice. Some schools send out a survey on intent to return but SPPS does not use that data for projections at district level as it has not proven to be accurate to the level needed. SPPS works off a three year trend of historical data to achieve its enrollment projections. With the intent to return, parents often find it difficult to say they are not coming back to the school. SPPS has hard confirmation of those moving out of the city but otherwise there is simply not complete information.
- If, at a school that is popular, parents want to be sure to have a spot they will fill the form out. Also, many other factors come into play in choice decisions – childcare, work schedules, transportation, etc. The completed form is a good indicator that families will return. The intent to return works well in private schools because it must be accompanied by a check. With public schools there is only a verbal commitment.
- The act of asking for that information is a first step toward getting families to commit. Can SPPS make all schools use it? Response: Real data is much more beneficial so REA uses the three year average of actual student return – historical data. If trends do change, that trend is captured as well. REA has been right on with its retention rates. The Placement system is a live online system so if a seat is given up at a school it is listed as open and if the student moved to another school that school will be shown as having one less seat.

- Concern was expressed about declining enrollment, SPPS has a transient population. We need to identify why a family left for a different district, charter or parochial school.
- Does SPPS have exit interviews from people willing to provide it? Response: We have found the online version response is not as strong as having a person called for the information for immediate feedback. Ideally as soon as SPPS gets a records request there would be a call to asking why they are leaving and if something can be done to change that decision. This would need a dedicated staff person and ideally a bi-lingual/multi-lingual one as well. SPPS is trying to partner with Charter schools so it can capture any students leaving the charter or when they transition to middle/high school. Perhaps the Enrollment Task Force will bring some ideas forward.
- Perhaps there is expertise from other sources that can be taken advantage of. SPPS needs to get customer satisfaction information for use in planning and understanding where it needs to go. In a competitive situation such as we have we need that information in order to understand what families want. It was noted that person to person contact is the most effective invitation to come into the district.
- So how do we divide capacity? Response: The goal is to be sure every school has a viable program. We generate programs off enrollment and have to distribute students equitably. Any school with less than two sections per grade is going to find it hard to have a viable program. We also have to align with class size requirements. We have reviewed every school to see if there were any large discrepancies.
- Reflecting St. Paul, SPPS attempts to hold places (20%) for students in poverty. Response: Yes, we release groups periodically through the summer but have to keep some for later arrivals. Kids showing up in August number 6,000 to 8,000. There are under privileged kids we want to save seats for so we need to be flexible and use good judgment. If families are under served they will go to that community to address the possibility of enrolling. We need to make every school desirable through programming, building design, etc. We do see value in a variety of different options. We need to look at what is in place, unpack it, see what needs to be developed, let go, etc. We need to establish where the district is moving in terms of community expectations.
- We can't be all things to everyone all the time – we need to address schools and use of resources. We need to invest in early childhood and we need flexibility and to be nimble (such as Jie Ming) and willing to make it work.
- A Board member asked for further discussion on this at the June COB.
- A request was made that the Board consider a neighborhood preference for both Open and Capitol Hill.
- A Board member asked a discussion on early childhood be added to an agenda.
- Staff stated they felt good that 92% of Kindergarten got their first choice.
- We need to change the SPPS narrative and perhaps do professional marketing.
- When will the next enrollment update be coming: Response: June.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:	Mr. Schumacher moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Mr. Brodrick.
----------------	--

Motion passed by acclaim.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk