

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
September 13, 2016**

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

Staff: Superintendent Thein, J. Turner, T. Stewart-Downey, S. Walsh, I. Davis, T. Parent, J. Allen, T. Battle, L. Cathey, L. Sayles-Adams, A. Collins, K. Wilcox-Harris, H. Kilgore, S. Koppen, A. Mobley, J. Lowe, M. Gilbert, N. Cameron, M. Schrul, M. Walker, P. Matamoros

Other: T. Lonetree, J. Verges, L. Davis, R. McClain, K. Anders, S. Freeman, P. Grafton, S. Press

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. AGENDA

A. St. Paul Children's Collaborative

The St. Paul Children's Collaborative (SPCC) is a family service collaborative focused on children, youth and families living in St. Paul. Board members are: City - the Mayor and one City Council member; County - two county commissioners; SPPS - the Superintendent, the COO, one Board member and the SPPS liaison to community projects; Executive Director of the Community Action Agency and four community members.

SPCC's mission is to engage policy-makers, communities, business and other stakeholders in strengthening the social and economic fabric of St. Paul in order to support the healthy development of children. The Board sees to support St. Paul's children through distribution of Local Collaborative Time Study funds; its work to break down policy and program barriers that get in the way of families accessing needed services and bringing together of child/family serving community organizations.

The SPCC Youth Master Plan has six goals. St. Paul where all children:

- Learn - children are ready for Kindergarten and children are reading by third grade.
- Grow - children have health care coverage and are connected to one or more caring adult
- Thrive - children are safe and free from abuse and neglect and children graduate from high school.

SPCC and SPPS are partnering in GradNation through an Attendance Awareness Campaign – Attendance Matters Month (third year with this program), Project Return and student re-engagement work with national experts and the Mayor's office to reach kids totally disengaged from education. The graduation goal is 90% by 2020.

2016-17 Learn, Grow and Thrive grantees are:

- The American Indian Family Center
- Breakthrough Twin Cities
- Freedom School/St. Paul Promise Neighborhood

- Guadalupe Alternative Programs (Indigenous Youth Cultural Mentorship)
- Interfaith Action of Greater St. Paul
- Minnesota Reading Corps
- Network for Development of Children of African Descent
- Project for Pride in Living (Fort Road Flats & Selby Wilkins)
- Project Return
- YMCA Early Childhood Learning Centers (Midway and Eastside)
- YWCA (Permanent Supportive Housing Program)

Brief descriptions of the work of each program were provided.

Local Collaborative Time Study (LCTS) funding comes with a Federal Medicaid Waiver. Funds are generated by schools, public health and corrections. The funds are distributed to:

- Time study administrative cost reimbursement to schools, public health and corrections.
- Ramsey County All Children Excel
- Children's Mental Health Collaborative
- Suburban Ramsey Family Collaborative
- St. Paul Children's Collaborative

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What about the data sharing? Response: This is complicated. SPPS and the Collaborative have a joint powers agreement for some data sharing. State laws and regulations limit the type and amount of data sharing possible between entities.
- How do you seek out students and families needing the services the Collaborative provides? How to you get them involved and how do you retain them? Response: The Collaborative uses available data to target kids with the least outcomes with a focus on American Indian and African American boys. Three primary requirements of grantees in the work are evidence-based practices, cultural connection and family engagement. The participating community agencies know the families and kids in their community so those are the ones targeted for support. The Collaborative only funds direct services.
- What type of outreach is employed for African Am boys? Response: Breakthrough is using the SPPS PACs to develop connections before students are eligible to apply for the program. They also reach out to African American churches who have helped to double their recruitment.
- Is there a way help grantees do what they do more effectively? Is work being done for the groups to work together collectively? Response: Grantees working in similar areas are brought to SPCC meetings so they hear what others are doing. SPCC provides specific trainings. SPCC requires six month reporting and works with organizations to help direct the work if it is not moving forward as required.
- Have the budget cuts at SPPS impacted SPCC? Response: SPCC leverages its resources to increase its capacity to do the work. SPPS budget cuts have impacted the Breakthrough program and Freedom School in the area of transportation. SPPS now provides technical support or assistance in finding funders.
- How does SPCC determine what support entities give? Response: They all come to the table and discuss what can or cannot be afforded. The share is equitable -- \$50K Ramsey County and SPPS, \$20K from the City and \$10K from another.
- A Board member noted he was glad to hear SPCC is looking at the Asian community for services as well and hoped they would be included in the work soon.

B. Proposed Pay 17 Levy

The Chief Financial Officer stated school levy authority is establish in law. School budgets are a combination of State, Federal and local funding, including the voter approved referendum. The Pay 17 school levy funds the 2017-18 school year. City and County reflect the calendar year budget starting January 1. Districts receive payments after the May and October tax collections from the County. The Levy can only move down after October 1.

All figures in the report provided are based on Administration's best estimates, using the statutory authorized amounts. MDE provided preliminary Pay 17 levy calculations on September 9. MDE continues to make adjustments to the SPPS numbers through September. Most districts certify their maximum levy.

The CFO went on to describe how property taxes are determined and the major factors impacting property taxes. Factors impacting the levy this year include:

- Changes in St. Paul's tax base - home values continue to improve along with commercial values.
- Apartments also have a big jump - rates are heavily weighted on income production (rent).
- Net tax capacity in St. Paul increased 7.8%.
- Fiscal disparities aid is increasing \$1.57 million
- Change to Tax Increment Financing (TIF)
- Changes to pension contributions or unemployment
- Long term facilities and bonding, pay go, etc.

Other factors are:

- Changes in pupil counts
- Legislative changes to education formulas
- Referendum inflationary increase
- Pension contribution changes required by law
- Employment changes that drive severance and unemployment levies
- Capital bonding, refunding of bonds, abatements, long-term maintenance, health & safety projects, lease costs.

She then reviewed the timeline for the Pay 17 levy process.

The proposed Pay 17 Levy Ceiling is:

Levy Category	Certified Pay 16 Levy	SPPS Estimated Pay 17 Levy Ceiling as of 9/9/16	Difference
Operating	\$47,242,112	\$47,273,634	\$31,522
Pension/OPEB/Contractual	36,133,492	37,574,225	1,440,733
Facilities	54,572,087	59,940,909	5,368,822
Community Service	3,260,938	3,441,945	181,007
Total All Levy Categories	\$141,208,630	\$148,230,714	\$7,022,084
Percent Change			4.97%

The CFO reviewed the estimated annual property tax impact (2016 to 2017 assuming 0% increase in market value), for residential and commercial/industrial.

Administration requested the following action at the September 20 Board meeting: that the Board of Education certify the maximum Pay 17 levy ceiling at the 4.97% increase and that they set the Taxation and Budget Hearing for December 6 at 6:00 p.m. at 360 Colborne.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Discussion occurred on TIF and whether the District had influence on that.
- The money coming from the levy, is that lump sum money not based on enrollment? Response: A lot of the levy funds are tied to specific restricted items. State aid on pupil count is less restricted.
- So SPPS usually sets the ceiling which can be reduced later? Response: Yes, the County calculates taxes based on the highest amount. Once the final figures are locked in in December, the County recalculates and final statements go out.

- So SPPS must provide Ramsey County with the ceiling number by September 30. Can SPPS disclose that number on 9/20? Response: Yes.
- What is the history of previous Boards? Response: Many years they set the ceiling at the maximum, or that the maximum could not to exceed a certain percent. The last couple of years there have been big changes in how calculations were done which impacted the timeliness of receiving the data.
- The Referendum levy is in its fourth year of an eight year levy. It will renew with the next presidential election (2020) or SPPS could bring a referendum a year earlier.
- You said we can have two levies, what does that mean? Response: SPPS can do a second referendum levy, they can go back to voters with a new question. If passed, MDE would calculate both levies together.

C. Board Community Engagement Process

The Board reviewed and discussed the revised proposal submitted by OCDR and the Mitchell Hamline School of Law relative to moving forward with their community engagement process proposal. The Chair indicated a decision on this would be made at the September 20 Board meeting.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- We are looking at two things – the Superintendent search and dealing with engagement with a community trying to cope with things that have happened within the district. The Board will need to be flexible on the timeline with the Superintendent search to be able to get as much community input as possible. That is key to the Board's effectiveness in finding the right Superintendent. It is important the community weigh in but is authentic in that input as it will have an impact on the Superintendent search.
- Flexibility is also needed in the Board's ability to supplement or have ongoing discussion on the authenticity of the community engagement and that we hear from the larger community. The Board is open to find the best way to do this.
- The timeline is aggressive. The benefit is that the Board sits with the community and can react as the process moves along. The components being brought in will be beneficial.
- It is hoped the process will improve SPPS's relationship with the community and aid the Board in moving forward with its search for and selection of a Superintendent.
- The facilitated conversations, the Board is committed to substantial time commitments in these conversations -- that could be an issue.
- Will this set the Board up for unrealistic expectations from the community by engaging before the search? Response: We will need to manage expectations, use of a candidate review committee (yet to be designed) is included in the proposal. It will be made clear that hiring of the Superintendent is the Board's job.
- We may want to think about the number and length of sessions – ideal versus possible. I do not know if all the time is necessary. Response: If we go forward, the Board will build on where they left off from their retreats. We can do fewer session but one session will not be adequate, we will need at least two meetings of 3 hours. There is a significant time commitment needed to do this properly.
- The Board needs to learn more about the timing of Superintendent search processes and the most advantageous times to be on the market to get to the best pool of potential candidates. Response: A traditional search firm could provide that piece of information.
- The timeline could be dictated by community expectations on when they expect a new leader to arrive
- The engagement facilitators will be faced with different meetings/settings – they will need or should have had training and come from within the community and be able to function in the different environments they will be placed in. There needs to be a level of respect from the community about who is facilitating. It is critical the community respect the skills and abilities of those who commit to do this.
- The time commitment may not be feasible. Is there another recommendation/alternative to be able to have the necessary meetings? Response: Is it the length of the meeting or

number of meetings? We could potentially do two 3 hour or three 2 hour meetings, either would work. There will also need to be flexibility around the total amount of time needed (more or less).

- How will you manage people on the design team? The two students, would they be from SEAB or found some other way? Response: We need to get a better handle on the student area We are proposing 22 peoples on the design team.
- How will they be determined? Response: 2 Board members selected by the Board, 2 from SPPS leadership. the same for the Federation. Students – possibly SEAB. PAC representation would be two members representing all PACs (perhaps selected at a joint meeting of all PACs). The remaining representation from other areas so the team balance represents District population/stakeholders. The design team will structure the process, they will not be making decisions; they will be a design team only. There is a mechanism included to get to groups not typically represented.
- There needs to be a balance of numbers on the design team. It gets trickier with larger numbers. Response: We feel the 22 will work.
- The design team model is great. It provides an opportunity to connect with a community input in a process, if done right, that allows team members to also be advocates for the process. There is great opportunity for relationships to be built within the design team.

D. Standing Item: FMP Update

The Director of Facilities stated the value and economy of having a stated multi-year plan is largely being able to coordinate the requirements and impact of that work. It streamlines the process, coordinates the impact of work to yield the greatest benefit, allows closer coordination with regulatory authorities/agencies and gains economy of scale.

Systemically coordinating the impact of the FMP across public agencies elevates support and coordination, maximizes efficiencies for SPPS and delivers equitable projects across the district. SPPS has coordinated with the City of St. Paul (site, building and fire safety), the State of Minnesota (plumbing) and the Capital Region Watershed District (eight sites, with a total of 52 acres, within the watershed will see work in the next five years) it also allows a credit-banking system which allows SPPS to look at its water quality impacts holistically.

In order to support the FMP, and the increased number and complexity of projects, an organizational study is underway. The study will identify the department and people that can best steward the promise of the FMP. An update of the changes will be provided to the Board in October. The following organizations were interviewed and analyzed: Minneapolis Public Schools, U of MN, Minnesota State colleges and universities, 3M, Honeywell and Tegra Group.

1. **Project Labor Agreements (PLAs)**

In order to increase participation from solicited organizations and streamline Board and staff review, at the October Board meeting Facilities will be asking the Board to provide direction on PLAs for 14 projects, totaling over \$250 million in work. This is intended to be the only time the Board takes action on PLAs for the next year.

A PLA is a pre-hire collective bargaining agreement with one or more labor organizations that establishes the terms and conditions of employment for a specific construction project. The agreement is between SPPS and the St. Paul Buildings and Trades Council, dated 3/24/2009. Individual contractors assent to that agreement. A PLA ensures no work stoppages, strikes, sympathy actions, picketing, slowdowns or other disruptive activities. Staff provided a chart showing the flow involved in establishing a PLA. They also provides a history of PLA use by SPPS from 2009 to 2014.

Projects that will bid in the next year include:

Adams Spanish Immersion ----- Major Building Renewal &
Renovation

Como Park Senior High School -----	Major Building Renewal & Renovation
Construction of new Middle School in Area A ----	New Construction
District Service Center -----	Office Buildout, Sitework & Electrical
Highland Park Elementary -----	Major Building Renewal & Renovation
Horace Mann Elementary -----	Major Building Renewal & Renovation
Humboldt Secondary School -----	Major Building Renewal & Renovation
Johnson High School -----	Augmented Major Building System Renewal
Linwood Monroe - Upper (Monroe) -----	Augmented Major Building System Renewal
Linwood Monroe Arts Plus - Lower (Linwood) ----	Major Building Renewal & Renovation
Maxfield Elementary School -----	Fire Suppression System
New RiverEast Building -----	Adaptive Reuse and New Construction
Rondo -----	Flooring Replacement
St. Anthony Park -----	Major Building Renewal & Renovation

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- These projects listed, they have not been approved yet, correct? Response: No, before any work is done on the projects they will need to go before the Board for contract approval.

2. 1050 Kent/RiverEast

The City of St. Paul has agreed to include 1050 Kent in their application for DEED funding. There is potential for upwards of \$190,000 to cover the cost of environmental cleanup. Applications are due October 2, 2016 and awards are made in early November.

The public engagement level for this site is to "inform." The goal is to engage the neighborhood community and other stakeholders on key issues related to the relocation of RiverEast to 1050 Kent, while meeting the strategic needs of the District. Some of the stakeholders include: District 6 Land Use Committee, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI-MN), PACER Center, District # 916, Shiloh Baptist Church, Councilmember Brendmoen and the immediate neighbors.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- So engagement is informing the community? It will be important to define to the community what it is being informed about and where some engagement may come in so they know what their commitment is and what their input will be.
- Minority businesses contracting out as subcontractors – is there a process to ensure what guarantees are? Response: SPPS does not have any goals on this at this time nor goals on minority businesses. We have had discussion with the City on how they are evolving their goals. Generally the City has seen no adverse impact on how PLAs impact women and minority businesses. SPPS has met with City and they are open to helping SPPS come up with targets for minority owned business targets. The State is coming out with a report that should help as well. We will need to develop a framework to track this once goals and targets are set. In the past the scale of the work has been too small to allow measurement. With the FMP the scale will be such that it will allow for measures to be made. As to payment, SPPS has a prompt payment policy of 35 days of receipt of invoice.
- The Board needs to be kept informed regarding the communications with immediate neighbors to sites, places where concerns from neighbors arise such as Highland Elementary, 1050 N Kent, etc. Where is SPPS with the neighbors on Kent? Response: The Shiloh Baptist Church has been very positive about the project other engagement efforts are just beginning for this site.

3. Upcoming Board Actions re: the FMP include:

- October - PLAs, new job titles, RiverEast contracts and financing
- December to March - Multiple construction contracts
- April - Updated Five Year Implementation Plan

- E. Standing Item: Policy Update - No Report
- F. Standing Item: SEAB Update - No Report
- G. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - No Report

H. Work Session

1. **Levy 101 Discussion**

The CFO provided an overview of the District's levy process, timing, funding categories and its overall future budgetary impact.

Public schools are constitutionally established (MN Constitution). Funding is established in Article 13, Section 1: it is the duty of the legislature to establish a general and uniform system of public schools. The legislature shall make such provisions by taxation or otherwise as will secure a thorough and efficient system of public schools throughout the state.

School levy authority is established in law. School budgets are a combination of state, federal and local funding, including voter approved referendums. The Pay16 school levy funds the 2016-17 school year.

School finances are highly categorical in nature. Taxes are the primary revenue source (the Pay15 Levy funded 20% of the District's FY 16 revenue). Local Education Authority (LEAs) finances are highly regulated. Finances are administered publicly. Political issues have high relevance in LEA finance management.

Property taxes are determined through three entities. The State Legislature sets property tax policy, establishes property classes and class rates, determines levels of State aid, set school formulas, provides underfunded mandates to local governments and levies a State business tax. Taxing Jurisdictions determine the levy amount. The County Assessor determines market value and assigns property class.

Major factors impacting property taxes include:

- Whether the levy goes up, down or stays the same
- Whether there is additional money available to reduce the local tax burden (state aids - local government, county aid or school equalization increases and fiscal disparity distributions).
- How a home's market value changes relative to other homes or compared to other types of property.
- Whether there are increases to the tax base that are not the result of inflationary or deflationary changes to the values of individual properties (new construction, property moving from exempt to taxable or decertified tax increment financing districts).
- Legislative changes.

Factors that impact the District's levy include such things as:

- Changes in pupil counts
- Legislative changes to formulas and equalization aid
- Pension contribution changes required by law
- Abatements
- Capital bonding, refunding of bonds, abatements and health and safety projects, lease costs
- Employment changes that drive severance and unemployment levies.

Timing of property tax inflow is based on the certified levy which funds the next fiscal year. Taxes are collected twice a year (May and October) making payment timing predictable in June and November. Payments are adjusted based on taxes collected.

The timing of levy calendar for the District is:

- August-early September, District submits levy information to MDE. September MDE provides preliminary calculations, these are discussed in a COB meeting and the Board sets the ceiling (maximum amount the District can levy for) for the PayXX Levy. JPTAC (Joint Property Tax Advisory Committee) adopts a joint levy. SPPS provides its payXX levy ceiling data to Ramsey County and MDE by or before September 30.
- October-November - Ramsey County calculates taxes and prepares tax statements and mails them to home/business owners.
- December - SPPS holds a public hearing on the levy. State statute requires all local governments (cities, counties and school districts) to hold a public hearing prior to finalizing their levy authority. The hearing must follow the release of the proposed tax notices from the County. The notice provides information on estimated taxes as well as market value and other homestead adjustments.
- The Board of Education certifies the final levy amount at its December Board meeting following the TNT hearing. The final levy must be certified and provided to Ramsey County by December 31.

SPPS levy categories are:

- General Fund (36 categories) - levies authorized by the Legislature to fund school programs - some per pupil, some equalized with aid penalties, others based on costs. This also includes referendum levy. The areas are: Referendum first and second tier, equity levy, location equity, transition levy, student achievement, operating capital, integration levy, re-employment levy, safe schools, career technical, OPEB, health & safety, alternative facilities, building/land lease levy, health benefit levy, TRA levy, severance levy. Referendum first and second tier adjustments, location equity adjustments, equity adjustments, transition adjustments, other general adjustments, operating capital adjustments, achievement and integration adjustments, re-employment adjustments, safe school adjustments, career technical levy adjustments, annual OPEB adjustments, health & safety adjustments, lease levy adjustments, TIF adjustments, other general adjustments, abatement levy adjustments and advance abatement adjustments.
- Community Service Fund (10 categories) - this is a formula set by the Legislature and includes ECFE, general community education, home visiting program, school age care and disabled adult along with adjustments to them.
- Debt Service Fund (3 categories) - debt service (principal and interest) capital bonds, certificates of participation (COPs), alternative facilities bonds and abatement adjustments.

Areas affecting a levy increase include costs continuing to rise for the District, OPEB costs are increasing, statutory increases for pension contributions, referendum commitments, changes in debt structure, including issuing additional bonds or increasing Alternative Facilities "pay as you go" levy category.

Pay 17 areas to watch are:

- Ramsey County & City increases – to be discussed at JPTAC meeting on September 26
 - SPPS costs increasing, i.e. OPEB & TRA
 - Enrollment changes
 - FMP funding – tax impact levels

- Market value changes and impacts (run scenarios with Ramsey County)

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- How is SPPS viewed as to total debt? Response: SPPS has low to moderate debt level per bonding agencies.
- Fund balance, the bond rating agencies see that as important. What should district fund balance be? Response: It is currently projected at 5.8% for June 2016. Policy is 5% (\$30 million). It could be larger, the CFO stated she would like to see it in the 8% range. Realistically bond raters like an 8 to 15% range. Most of SPPS's \$80 million fund balance is restricted.
- What are important upcoming dates for income projection? Response: 10/1 for submitting official free and reduced lunch amount to State. 9/23 is enrollment adjustment date.

2. Discussion on PAC Reports to the Board

Between April 2016 and May 2016, the Board engaged in research to understand how PACs operate and present recommendations to SPPS. The purpose of this work session is to discuss the information gathered and to explore alternative/additional steps to the current process in the effort to best honor the work of the PACs.

The Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) are:

- Districtwide Parent Advisory Council (DPAC)
- American Indian Education Advisory Committee
- Gender and Sexual Diversity PAC
- Green and Healthy PAC
- Hmong PAC
- Karen PAC
- Latino Consent Decree (LCD) PAC
- Parents of African American Students Advisory Council (PAASAC)
- Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)
- Somali PAC

The PACs help highlight issues and concerns that impact the communities they represent and lift them up to help support SPPS to achieve its mission of providing a premier education for all students.

The current recommendation process is (1) PACs identify priorities and projects, (2) Staff helps with timeline and parameters and feasibility, (3) If SPPS has any projects/topics for study, they will present to PACs, (4) PACs complete projects and present their findings to staff and (5) Staff works with PACs to implement recommendations.

The proposed process would be (1) PACs identify priorities and projects, (2) Staff helps with timeline and parameters and feasibility, (3) If SPPS has any projects/topics for study, they will present to PACs, (4) PACs complete projects and present their findings to staff for refining and feedback, (5) PACs present to the Board at the January COB meeting and (6) Staff works with PACs to implement recommendations. In Step 4 presentation to staff for refinement and feedback, staff will be most familiar with what can be done based on human and financial resources available. Having staff review the recommendations and provide guidance will allow for a more productive discussion with the Board at the time of the presentation. Step 5 - presentation to the Board would see eight PACs presenting. Each would have 10 minutes to present and 15 minutes for questions and answers (timing allows for budgeting).

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- There were other committees beside PACs that reported to the Board. This resulted in unclear understandings as to where actions would be taken. It changed to current structure under Dr. Carstarphen.
- How did we get to this place? Response: Feedback from PACs on how recommendations were made and feedback received. The fact there was no opportunity for all Board members to hear recommendations from PACs, to hear what communities are doing. Also, timing is important for any budget implications.
- To go ahead with these recommendations must there be approval of the Board? Response: If there are issues in the areas of governance, policy or budget those items should move to the Board. Not all asks will come forward, some will be updates and information sharing, but there may be budgetary requests or policy requests.
- A lot of time has been spent with PACs on how to engage PACs. Some PACs felt their recommendations were not getting the same visibility with the Board. It would be a good opportunity for Board members to hear the information at the same time. There is a VisionCard to inform the Board about public engagement.
- Staff is excited about the potential for recognizing the work of the PACs.
- A PAC member advocated for all PACs to meet together once or twice a year.
- Does DPAC coordinate between/among PACs? Is it PAC driven? Response: DPAC was established as a direct advisory group to the Superintendent on policy issues, strategic plan, etc. They look at larger issues covering the entire district. DPAC has played a convening role in the past and could again. SPPS needs to be mindful of the number of meetings families are invited to. Perhaps at the beginning and ending of the year with everyone together. It would build community and connections and define goals/issues. SPPS tries to honor everyone's issues, it will try for one joint meeting this year.
- How does one get to be a member of a PAC? Response: Process varies among PACS, some are more formal than others. SEAC has an application process with a review process. Others are selected by a raise of a hand.. LCD has an application process and a requirement that staff cannot outnumber number of parents. Other PACs may have staff in the group as well.
- Does it make sense to formalize all PACs with same standards? Response: Administration suggested this not be done but that PACs continue to make their own bylaws and governing rules.
- These presentations to the Board could be informational as well or submitted in writing if they prefer that. Response: Based on experience, the PACs will prefer meeting with the Board to be heard. The logistics around language needs to be kept in the consideration as well, that will add time with translations, etc.
- As alternative, is there value in doing in smaller meeting group sessions with PACs? Response: There is a "prestige" perception around coming before the Board.
- I assume there will be some refining of what is brought to the Board? Response: Yes, what is presented will be as a result of conversations within PACs and review/feedback from staff.
- We need to be responsive to their requests. They are reporting to the Board but it will be administration's job to follow-up on recommendations from the PACs. There needs to be responsiveness to their requests.
- We need to lay out definite guidelines to manage expectations. Will there be a mechanism for reporting back to the Board on how recommendations have been addressed? Response: That can be done.

Staff reviewed areas needing board agreement as follows:

- PACs will present to the Board in January and February - Consensus was Yes
- It will be a voluntary process and format can vary? Yes
- Is the timing reasonable? Yes but can be adjusted.

3. **Discussion on Partnering with Student Engagement & Advancement Board (SEAB)**
Staff reviewed the history of SEAB. In 2014-15 the SPPS Board began discussing the possibility of a student member. In the summer of 2015, this was shared at a public meeting. SPPS staff members with expertise in youth voice were asked to come to the table. An alternative model was co-created to resist tokenization of youth.

A ladder (adapted from work by Roger Hart, et al. 1994) was used to outline the levels of youth engagement: Manipulation (bottom rung), decoration, tokenism, students informed, students consulted, student/adult equality, completely student driven and student/adult equity. SEAB felt this was outdated and not useful and preferred the image of a "bridge" between the Board and students.

In the fall of 2015 the SPPS Board voted to institute the Student Advisory Team. The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Policy and the Community Education Program Manager were asked to take the lead. Student recruitment began in October, 2015. SAT (SEAB) began in November 2015.

Inclusivity and equity were two driving forces in SEAB decision making. Strategies included: only two SEAB member prerequisites (SPPS Student and in 10-12 grade), an application process (what goes well in school or not going well, strategy for change), attempts at multi-leveled communication (seeks to reach student body through multiple media), meeting design (shared power) and project design(s)(youth participatory action model).. Adults can help support SEAB inclusivity through assistance in communication and recruitment. Helping to make the work meaningful to a broad base of students, . Trusting the process (inclusivity will take time – the way the work is done) and by being inclusive and encouraging others to be inclusive of student voice and perspective (more students who have their voices heard earlier the more likely they will apply to SEAB)..

Authenticity is a bridge with information flowing both ways.

SEAB was created as a bare-bones structure to support the development of an authentic structure. Strategies included: group re-naming process, creation of a SEAB manual and organizing principals, design of the group, requests for changes and assessment of facilitators and peers. Adults can support this authenticity by actively resisting asking SEAB to speak for all students (act as intermediary), believing everyone knows different things, sharing power and acknowledging age privilege, engage with the content of their work, say "why" when there is a disagreement and honoring the process.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Will SEAB be at the next Board meeting? Response: Yesn, the schedule is being finalized. There will be two at every meeting then later switches to one.
- What about lateness of meetings? Response: Students are committing to stay to 8:30 then can stay if they want to or leave.
- What about transportation? Response: Students are provided with bus tokens; so far that has not been an issue.
- This is also a leadership development opportunity. With an all girl group this year can we hope for better split next year? Response: SEAB made the decision that for recruitment they would not create a matrix of representation. The students insisted gender ID is a barrier and that they did not want a matrix. The district is so large and SEAB so visual it is felt representation will evolve.
- SEAB's first project is an informal gathering of data through six interviews -- someone of another gender, of another race/ethnicity, from elementary and from middle school.

4. **Integration Task Force Update**

The Board Chair updated Board members on a recent meeting he had with the President of the SPFT. There was discussion on the content of the meeting and the timeline proposed. It was decided the Board Chair together with input from administration would provide a response on SPPS's thoughts on the process proposed, aspects that it would make sense to discuss now and to lay ground work for a bigger conversation later..

III. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion was passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk