MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
July 26, 2016

PRESENT:

Board of Education:	S. Marchese, J. Brodrick, J. Schumacher, M. Vanderwert, Z. Ellis, C. Vue arrived at 4:44 p.m.
Staff:	Interim Superintendent Thein, L. Olson, J. Allen, M. McBee, K. Her, J. Turner, L. Cathey, J. Engen, M. Walker, H. Ott, T. Stewart-Downey, B. Huffman, J. Munnich, D. Abrams, E. Agbamu, I. Davis, T. Battle, M. Gilbert, T. Burr, M. Herth, T. Neal, A. Collins
Other:	Deputy Chief Loveno, J. Verges, B. Zick, T. Kinley, A. Ward, A. Oertwig, C. Pesklo, L. Jones,

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. FMP Update: Design & Engagement

1. Design

The Director of Facilities stated the benefits of a five-year plan are:

- Clear description of work that will occur at each school
- Start/continue design conversations years in advance of construction
- Clear definition of the role of the community in annually evolving the five-year plan (FMP-C)

He went on to outline major construction projects scheduled for 2016-2017:

- Adams Spanish Immersion
- Como Park Sr. High
- Highland Park Elementary
- Horace Mann
- Humboldt Secondary
- Linwood Monroe - Upper and Lower
- RiverEast and
- St. Anthony Park

Projects for 2018 that start the design process:

- Gordon Parks
- New Middle School

Projects for 2019 that start the design process:

- American Indian Magnet
- Highland Park Middle and High Schools

Phase one of these processes was data collection and evaluation, Phase two was to establish district-wide priorities, baseline and criteria. Phase 3/Part 1 is finalizing school design (consult) wherein schools form a School Design Committee to finalize conceptual facility improvement plans that address program considerations (number of sections/grades, lunch service needs, etc.), documents existing building conditions and make application for variance (if needed). Phase 3/Part 2 is construction (inform). The construction process begins, stakeholders are informed of progress, as appropriate and an announcement is made upon project completion.

2. Engagement
   During the engagement/communication process principals recruit members for their **school design team (SDT**) ensuring diverse perspectives. This process is similar to the FMP in that it needs an intentional mix of students, parents, teachers, administrators, partners and community. The SDT helps do outreach/communication to the school and the broader community.

   District Councils will be asked to clearly define how facility projects impact their community and to identify a representative to be part of the SDT and to solicit perspective on related community visions. They will also be asked to be a communication conduit to link to the FMP and individual project websites, e-mail blasts and provide articles for newsletters to inform mutual stakeholders of upcoming facility projects in their area.

   Community outreach will be done to identify projects with higher potential community interest and to provide more transparency on the variance/entitlement process. The will be accomplished through flyers to immediate neighbors living across from the school on all sides and through coffee chats. Tactics will include: e-news update list-serves, the FMP website with a page devoted to each school site project, interactive maps of projects and schedules and possible informational ads in community newspapers.

   The Director of Facilities provided a chart mapping the spectrum of public participation and communication process involved in each phase.

3. Implementation of 5-Year Plan
   The five-year plan will be updated every spring beginning with convening the FMP-C in March followed by a presentation to the Board in April/May.

   In the first year of having a five-year plan, an interim update on scope and budget will be provided in the fall outlining significant design evolutions since the end of FMP Phase III, any additional investigations of existing systems and increasing the specificity of strategic decisions regarding RiverEast and the new middle school.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What is happening this summer? Response: It is light this summer relative to construction. Facilities is deep into design the process for buildings. Work being done is strictly deferred maintenance with the exception of Johnson High School and the Transforming Central project. Work is being done to maintain building stock.
- The Board is sometimes asked to field community questions about specific projects – how are the most recent efforts going that start next year. What's working, etc. Response: Facilities has been very specific around the role of stakeholders. As we have moved to design and construction there have been some midcourse corrections because of disconnects between school communities and neighborhoods. Time has been spent addressing/clarifying community concerns. The Horace Mann and Highland Elementary school communities have a high understanding of the process and have been helpful in mitigating concerns that arise within their communities.
- You are thinking about the community around the various sites, some have greater capacity to address issues that they feel strongly about, what approach does Facilities

use in communities not as used to interacting with other community members or bringing their ideas or concerns forward? Response: Diverse communities have been a challenge but Facilities is working at it head on, promoting participation within the school community and taking advantage of a principal's relationship with the school community to encourage participation. We have to very intentional as to why they are being asked to be at the table in order to have a productive environment.

- Since there are two projects at Linwood Monroe, the Lower and the Upper, where are you at now in resolution of concerns from the neighbors? Response: In March Facilities provided a community presentation followed by discussions. The design has evolved for the better due to the process providing mutual benefits to the community and the school. The site is in a State designated historic area so SPPS is going through a process of review/approval. In the end the Lower campus does not lose a great deal of green space as the design has developed. Additional specifics on the Linwood Monroe Lower site will be provided.
- RiverEast where are we at? Response: Facilities hopes to have news on property acquisition within the next week. I would like to see a comparison of costs of site purchase vs. leasing space.
- What about Galtier and Hamline? Response: Both buildings are valuable to SPPS over the long term. The decision to keep Galtier open has not changed anything. There needs to be an engagement between Facilities, the Board and district leadership to develop a vision for all of Area E
- Where are the Washington fields in the scheme of things? Response: They are in need of a significant investment, they are now 21 years old. Facilities is working with the Athletic Council to develop a strategy including looking at this as a district-wide resource. In the interim maintenance work is being done to keep the fields in playable order.

B. SRO Contract Review

The Director of Security and Emergency Management provided a brief historical overview of the SROs in SPPS.

- Early 1980's - two School Liaison Officers (SLO) at Central and an SLO at each high school with junior high coverage (11)
- 1989 - six officers added to teach DARE - bringing coverage to 17
- 1997 - SLOs become SROs following the national model
- 2003 - School year DARE ends and the officers rolled over into the SRO program. Budget adjustments were subsequently made and the officer numbers reduced.
- 2016 - current staffing of 9 officers.

SRO training follows the National Association of School Resource Officer model covering 12 subject areas. SPPS also provides Beyond Diversity, Special Education-Non-Violent Crisis Intervention and Youth Mental Health First Aid of the officers.

Feedback on the SROs have been obtained representing multiple perspectives: students (SEAB and Pan African Student Union), the St. Paul Principal's Association, the community and the St. Paul Police Department.

SEAB shared the following concerns:

- The majority of students do not interact with their SRO and some do not have positive interactions.
- Most students (and some staff) do not know how to interact with their SRO and do not know what they do.
- The cost of the contract and
- Students being criminalized in school.

SPPD acknowledged the concerns and have proposed the following changes:

- SROs will be involved in opening week assemblies including a get to know your SRO meet and greet.

- Each high school will have a student led advisory group that meets monthly with their SRO.

The Pan-African Student Union's concerns included:
- SRO staffing concerns - they want input into decisions like hiring and training.
- SRO office hours not to exceed 20 per week
- Less intimidating uniform or plain cloths
- District to develop a complaint process to log and follow through on student concerns about SRO
- SROs should reflect the diversity of the SPPS students.

The St. Paul Principal's Association strongly recommended renewing the contract with SPPD for the following reasons:
- SROs support positive building climates through hundreds of positive daily interactions with students and staff .
- They establish positive relationships with students that repeatedly help schools prevent problems before they occur.
- With SROs, SPPS would have to rely on emergency response from the SPPD. This would make the climate in the buildings less safe because (1) schools would have to endure longer wait times for police during emergencies, (2) SPPD officers would not be available to proactively work with school leaders to address concerns and (3) SPPD officers would not have the time to develop positive relationships with students in the buildings.

SPPS has used this feedback to guide negotiations. SPPD has changed SRO uniforms to a light blue polo shirt with white lettering. SROs will be part of opening week assemblies with introductions and information about themselves. SROs will work to be more visible and promote positive interactions with students during the day. Whenever possible, if an SRO must have a hands on engagement with a student, a school administrator should be present. This includes arrests. The SPPS staff person will walk with the SRO until the student is placed in a vehicle. Quarterly progress check-ins will be done to evaluate the new initiatives. High school SROs will work with a school specific student advisory team meeting at a minimum once per month.

The contract proposal is nine officers at $79,273/officer for a total of $713,457 plus 37.99% fringe benefits for a total of $984,499. SPPD pays $100,000 and provides a full-time sergeant and covers all vehicle expenses. SPPS pays $884,499.

SPPD Deputy Chief Paul Lovino stated this is a critical time for police/community relationships and indicated the SPPD values this relationship greatly. Want expanded opportunities for greater community engagement. DARE was continued due to the relationship piece within the program. When school is staffed with a police officer diminishes potential for active shooter situations, knowing school layout. With patrol get officer who does not know the student's situation where an SRO will know the situation. SRO community police class taught in schools, opportunity to be in front of students to address questions students might have. Value input from students and staff.

SPPS is looking into best practice and engaging in a collaborative process with community and stakeholders. Efforts will be made to utilize school disciplinary processes whenever possible and avoid involving SROs in everyday disciplinary matters. SPPS will have a position at the table in selection of SROs and is working toward a formalized Memorandum of Understanding to define expectation and roles for all parties.

Next steps will include:

- SRO staffing model review (7 school-based and 2 mobile officers who also serve elementary schools)
- Exploration of future opportunities for student engagement
- Exploration of SPPS/SPPD authored Memorandum of Understanding to define roles and responsibilities.
- In collaboration with SPPD, develop an incident tracking system that will provide data on number and type of police contacts in the schools
- SPPS to develop a school-based concern/complaint process and
- Exploration around forming a district-wide advisory committee (community, administrators, SPPD, SEM).

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Why do students want SROs in the building for fewer than 20 hours? What kind of supervision do SROs have in working with kids. Response: I do not have specifics behind the 20 hour piece. Current procedure is if an SRO needs to make an arrest in school, before they move the student they have to call their supervisor, explain the situation and why there is a need for arrest. There is one supervisor overseeing SPPS SROs. In the selection process, SPPD looks for someone who does not require a great deal of supervision, who has a record of being good at making decisions. SROs meet with their supervisor or report via telephone on a regular basis. There are things better handled by school administration and the SROs emphasize that to administration.
- Does the supervisor have training in juvenile mental health? Response: SPPD is open to additional training to achieve the best impact for kids in the schools. Staff added , regarding the 20 hours, reasons for this request include reduction in cost of SROs, reduction of their presence in the schools and opportunities for fewer perceived negative interactions. Additionally, other staff would have the opportunity to step up to cover the SRO roles and, possibly, to provide the opportunity for some form of community policing.
- This is an expensive program; it primary purpose needs to be to serve the interests of the school district for safety and a supportive environment for students. The MOU is important but there seems to be a need for more specificity regarding interactions between SROs, administration and staff. There needs to be a reduction in the ambiguity in these relationships. There needs to be clarity on techniques officers can use in interventions. Training for officers needs to focus on understanding adolescent mental health and de-escalation techniques. There would be value in an active student voice in the selection process. There is a definite and urgent need to track information and data in all interactions, to understand what is going on so we know whether this is working or not..
- SPPD indicated the information does exist within SPPD. Every use of force is documented in a report. Response: The community wants to know every time an SRO puts hands on a student.

C. Standing Item: Policy Update

Staff indicated the Use of Social Media policy was up for its second reading. She also indicated a draft of Guidelines for Social Media Use had been provided for the Board at their places as requested.

Questions/Discussion:

- Concern was expressed about the policy and a request was made to have a statement of rights of employees be added to either the policy or the guidelines. Response: Staff indicated that it has been SPPS's practice that anything stated in law, rules and/or regulations is not restated within SPPS policies. The comment from the Board member was he did not want any policy that would make teachers feel less secure.

D. Standing Item: SEAB Report Update

Staff indicated the purpose of this presentation was to discuss and reach agreement on the recommendations presented by SEAB during their "Future of SEAB" presentation at the May 7 COB meeting. These included:

- More communication and connection with Board members - They would like to be able to request a Board member to volunteer as a liaison for some projects. They want to complete 3-5 projects each year and they would determine which would benefit from a Board liaison. The liaison would "check-in" with the students and offer assistance or advice. Liaisons would be assigned when projects are determined, based on Board member interest.

  Questions/Discussion: Does the Board accept the request to volunteer Board liaisons on some projects?
  - A Board member stated she would like to see a Board liaison as a full time part of SEAB.

The meeting recessed at 6:30 p.m. in order to hear public comment. The meeting resumed at 7:05 p.m.

- SEAB requested representation at Board meetings. They proposed two students seated at each COB and regular BOE meetings. The students would emphasize they were speaking as SEAB not as individuals. This would allow the opportunity for more SEAB members to gain Board experience. With two students participating it would ensure there is a SEAB representative in attendance. Students would serve for consecutive months, with rotations from all interested SEAB members. Various logistical issues were outlined.

  Questions/Discussion: Is the proposed model for rotating participation accepted? Are the logistics for implementation accepted?
  - The rotating model is interesting, has it been used anywhere else? Response: This is a model created within SPPS because SEAB wants a lot of students to have this opportunity. The process provides for consistency and continuity. Comment: It could be done and evaluated on how the process is working, perhaps as a pilot.
  - What would the annual Board training would look like? Response: It would provide an explanation on policy vs procedure, Roberts Rule of Order, how to express an opinion yet be respectful, strategies, etc.
  - The comment was made that originally the Board wanted a group that would engage students to gain information to assist Board in certain specific areas. There is a difference between individual, SEAB and student body opinions. Response: Using SEAB the students still have the job of engaging other students and providing recommendations off that feedback. By serving on the Board students will be more informed and understand the role of the Board and stakeholders. The students would speak as SEAB, they already reach out to the entire SEAB group to understand concerns presented among all SEAB members, about questions to be asked , opinions on agenda items, etc.
    The intent of the Board is to try to get authentic student voices from students who may not historically add their voice to the discussion. Response: These students are speaking on behalf of SEAB but will have engaged students to hear the unheard voices. It is not a perfect model where one could get perspective from 39,000 students but it is a step in the right direction.
  - The comment was made the Board has seen demonstrations of their presentations, they have been up front and specific about what their data represented. They have presented an awareness of students who feel invisible with their voices not being heard. This is one way in which the Board can hear the “unheard” voices.
  - The Board wants to connect with everyday concerns of students in the schools. I have a concern we are now placing too great an emphasis on students being present at a Board meeting where they will have limited opportunity to be heard. Their work

should be in making contact with the students not being heard from and bringing that to the Board. A pilot might be a good opportunity to see how the process would work. It could be valuable to hear their voice as part of the discussion to provide another perspective. Will they still be doing their projects? Response: Yes.
- What direction to be given to SEAB? Response: The Interim Superintendent strongly recommended a pilot be implemented it is an opportunity well worth taking.

The consensus was to proceed with a pilot.

- SEAB requested they be included in the search for a new superintendent. They would like to provide the Board with a list of qualities they would like to see in a superintendent and a list of suggested interview questions. They also would like to be included in discussions with final candidates. Participation have concrete impact on process.

  Questions/Discussion: Is the candidate quality list accepted Is list of interview questions accepted? What would be the method for interaction with finalists.
  - Candidate qualities – Okay
  - Interview questions – Share the questions developed so far with the Board
  - Interview process – in the past the Board has involved various interest groups in interviewing final candidates for the Superintendent position. The SEAB group might be one of those groups if that model is utilized in this upcoming process.

- SEAB requested they be added to Board policy. The Board Policy Work Group proposed a new Policy 211.02 - Student Voice in District Decision. This was developed with input from stakeholders. The Work Group recommends a first reading at the August Board meeting.

  Questions/Discussion: Is the policy approved for first reading?

MOTION: Mr. Marchese moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move Policy 211.01 - Student Voice in District Decisions to its first reading at the August 23, 2015 Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schumacher.

The motion passed.

E. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - Report moved to Board meeting.

III. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion passed

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk