

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
December 6, 2016**

PRESENT: Board of Education: Z. Ellis, J. Schumacher, J. Brodrick, J. Foster, S. Marchese, M. Vanderwert, C. Vue

SEAB: Davina Newman and Rajni Shulz

Staff: Superintendent Thein, J. Allen, L. Cathey, J. Turner, H. Kilgore, N. Cameron, T. Burr, M. Hoerth, K. Wilcox-Harris, T. Battle, L. Sayles-Adams, K. Her, H. Ott, T. Parent, M. Gilbert, H. Lee

Other: J. Nathan, E. Henrick, S. Wasvedt, J. Verges, T. Lonetree, B. Zick, S. Snyder

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Re-Starting School Start Time 2016-17 Presentation

The purpose of the presentation was to re-iterate the draft proposal for start time change, review the proposed next steps for the work and present and refine the Board motion regarding school start times.

The draft proposal for start time change in SY 18-19 is:

TIER 1: 7:45-2:15

- All community elementary schools
- Some regional magnet elementary schools (7)

TIER 2: 8:30-3:00

- All middle and high schools*
- Except Washington, which would stay at 7:30-3:00 to maintain extended day model
- Other specialized programs

TIER 3: 9:30-4:00

- Remaining regional magnet elementary schools (7)
- All district-wide magnet elementary schools (10)
- Bridgeview / Focus Beyond

Cost increase vs. current cost: \$2-\$4.4 million due to shorter bus runs to accomplish no bus pickups before 7:00 a.m. for elementary students.

High Level Considerations/Implications - the implications of the proposed restructure, which will need to be considered as plans are finalized and implemented, include the following:

- Childcare concerns for elementary families
- Lack of research concerning impacts to elementary students
- Impacts to school choice options for families
- Alignment with other possible future strategic actions
- Increased costs to implement change.

The proposed next steps are:

- Board vote at December 13 Board meeting

- Continue analysis of options to develop plan for restructuring school start times
- Work with community partners to prepare for citywide changes and resolve issues.
- Identify lessons-learned and best practices from other districts that have implemented similar changes
- Continue community engagement
- Provide regular updates to the Board.

PROPOSED BOARD MOTION: The SPPS Board of Education directs the Superintendent to develop a plan to change school start times, with implementation beginning in the 2018-19 school year. The objective of the change is to align school start times with the health and academic best interests of SPPS students.

The restructured system will impact the entire SPPS system; therefore, robust community engagement must be conducted to inform, support, and receive feedback from the SPPS community.

Changes to the system must consider the following areas:

- Alignment to research-based recommendations,
- Budget implications,
- Expanded childcare needs,
- Student safety,
- Strategic alignment,
- Opportunities for expansion of Metro Transit partnership

Questions/Discussion:

- These changes may well impact the whole City of St. Paul. Doing start time change will provide opportunities for city involvement and a different look for the city.
- We are thinking of the transitioning during late spring and summer as we move toward 18-19, how does that tie in with how SPPS would be working through the spring. How does the Superintendent see that shaping up? Response: We are looking forward to starting the process so when the new superintendent comes on board we can hit ground running. It is important that families and community have enough lead time to adjust to the start time changes. The motion gives us flexibility to be creative and time to look at options not yet considered. Administration is always open to advice and counsel.
- This is something that needs to be considered during the superintendent search, whether candidates have experience in this type of change or how they would consider the changes.
- Thanks were extended to staff for their work on this. The motion provides direction to administration and flexibility on how to do it. It gives specificity on when they should plan to have the change come into effect and explains why this is being done so the Board's intentions are clear. There is one main logistical concern – transportation. The Board wants to be sure opportunity is taken to look at broadly look at how transportation facilitates the change but the Board does not want transportation to drive it. This will provide a chance to align all of what is being done in the district around being in the best interest of all students in the district.
- This issue has come up fairly regularly over the past 15 years, the Board has not acted on it previously. The areas of concern are the same as those brought up in the past. If we re-evaluate the areas would any of the concerns become a deal breaker? By passing this tonight and at the BOE meeting, are we saying that SPPS will have later start times in 2018-19 or is there a possibility this may not happen? Response: There is nothing in there about later start times for secondary schools. The focus is to align school start times with health and the academic best interest of all students. The things to be considered need to be looked at but the motion is clear that the Board wants to change start times.

- I think the motion is vague and that the public is concerned whether we will actually change start times for secondary students. Response: In reading the motion it is about developing the plan and providing opportunity to explore every option available. We are not making a decision at this time about changing start times but putting a process in motion to arrive at a plan that can be voted on at a later time.
- The Board has been clear in conversations about how the current system impacts students, particularly secondary students. The intent is that the board will be changing start times for secondary students in order to align with the health and academic best interest of those students. The Board wants to do something about how the current system operates. As to how this will be implemented, the final options are up to administration. They are to develop a plan that will work for the entire system/ community; one that is in the best interest of students.
- The Board needs to be clear in the motion that the later start time is for secondary students. I am glad we are doing it so secondary kids can benefit, my concern is there is little research on the impact on elementary students. There is also the impact to poor families, single parents, working parents, etc. We need to find ways to lessen the impact of these changes. At a time when the district is in the red, I question the merit of doing this. The budget is about academic achievement and how best use the money to impact all students. Start time is important but there are more urgent issues that the \$4 million could be used for. This change may not be prudent with our limited resources and other issues.
- The intention is to move to later start for secondary students, that is the result of best practices. The motion gives flexibility and direction so administration can look at ways to solve the issues. The monetary impact is not necessarily in one year – it depends on how this is phased in. The new superintendent may have ideas around this so we will need that input as well. There need to be conversations with the community on this and on integration. We are looking at new strategies to address needs and concerns and how those factor into the conversation, more/less choice, etc. The motion allows us to address concerns and find solutions to address needs of all students.
- SEAB comment - Being a high school student, it is true teens are the most sleep deprived group. My brain starts working around 8:30-9:00 a.m. My first hour class is not as valuable as it could be. A later start time would give students more sleep, it is a good idea.
- What I hear from community members is it is time to do this – we are talking about academics and health. The focus is on times which impact families. Families are very resourceful and will figure out what needs to be done. The district needs a solid plan but needs to avoid being fixed on times, there needs to be flexibility there. In order for the public to give feedback that has to be a proposal they can react to. There may be opportunities to refine the plan. Hopefully with good news from this legislative session there will be an expansion in the Metro Transit partnership which would help.
- A suggested change to the wording of the motion was proposed.
- Clarification was requested, this motion is to allow administration to develop a plan which would then be reviewed and acted upon by the Board, correct? Response: Yes - the planning needs to be done carefully and all options considered along with the structure of the schools to make this work for kids.
- Staff commented that by June 30 there needs to be a budget determined for the next year, a new superintendent will be in place at which point administration will be able to bring a plan to the Board by September or October in good time for the 2018 school choice process.
- It was reiterated the Board is asking administration to develop a plan for the Board to consider.

Following the discussion it was decided a couple Board members would work on the wording of the motion to be brought to the December 13 meeting. It was stressed the agreed upon motion must be ready prior to the 13th meeting so everyone has a chance to review it.

Administration indicated they would appreciate direction from the Board ASAP as there are a number of other issues coming up -- budget, the 17-18 school year, the superintendent search process, etc.

B. Superintendent Search Update

The purpose of the presentation was to provide an update on the superintendent search and an overview of upcoming events.

1. **Search Firm Selection Process**

The Board participated in group meetings to gather information. The Board reviewed data from four other districts (Minneapolis, Stillwater, Roseville and North St. Paul/Maplewood) on their process. An RFP was issued on October 18, 2016 and closed on November 1, 2016. The search firm selection committee, made up of representatives from Legal, HR, two Board members and the Board Administrator) brought forward three firms for Board consideration. The three search firms were interviewed on November 14 at a special Committee of the Board meeting. The Board voted to approved the finalist at the November 15 Board of Education meeting. The firm selected was Ray and Associates.

2. **Design Team**

In October, SPPS partners, Mitchell Hamline and Minnesota State Office for Collaboration and Dispute Resolution, worked with staff to form a Design Team. The team is comprised of students, parents, community members, district leaders, the school board and two of the district's collective bargaining groups. They were charged with creating the process for how feedback will be gathered to help inform the superintendent search process. Their purpose is not to provide feedback but to create the process for how feedback will be gathered. This team put together a comprehensive community engagement process that will provide feedback to both the search firm and the Board. Though they will not choose the next superintendent, they are the first step in creating a transparent and equitable process for the entire community.

Information gathering will inform two processes: feedback for the search firm to help shape the profile and feedback for the Board on what the community would like to see in a new superintendent. A survey to identify qualities of the new superintended has been reviewed by staff and approved by the search firm. SPPS is in the process of translating the materials. The team is also finalizing communication around the open meetings and the other opportunities to provide input.

Staff presented a timeline for the process beginning with the survey and community engagement and ending with the hiring of a superintendent by May 1, 2017.

3. **Next Steps** include finalizing the search firm contract, implementing communication for community engagement feedback opportunities and holding the community engagement sessions.

Questions/Discussion:

- In the discussions in the Design Team are there specific aspects regarding engagement meetings? Response: Yes, they will be held at high schools, there will be an introduction that includes what a superintendent does, district demographics, etc. Participants will then break into groups by home language to facilitate discussions, specific questions will be asked and recorded for the search firm.
- What will other community meetings look like? Response: They will be informal events. We will canvass at existing events that we can piggyback on to gain feedback. All PAC meetings, School Choice event, West Side Wednesdays, various ethnic group parent meetings, etc. This is a dynamic list that can be expanded. The search firm is gathering

information through mid-January for the profile. The remaining information will be provided to the Board to inform their decision.

- SEAB members noted they were trying to get a position in the superintendent search process. Staff responded they were keeping that in mind but specifics around finalists have not yet been fleshed out on the community forums.

Thanks were extended to the Design Team for their work in thinking of ways to engage everyone and for understanding how to connect with diverse voices in district.

- C. Standing Item: SEAB Report - No Report
- D. Standing Item: FMP Update - No Report
- E. Standing Item: Policy Update - No Report
- F. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - No Report
- G. Work Session - None

III. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn by Mr. Schumacher and seconded the Ms. Ellis. The motion passed by acclaim.

The meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk