

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
February 10, 2015**

PRESENT: Board of Education: J. Brodrick, K. Hardy, M. Doran, J. O'Connell, L. Seeba, A. Carroll (arrived 4:36 p.m.), C. Vue (arrived 4:51 p.m.)

Staff: Superintendent Silva, M. Walker, J. Peterson, K. Wilcox-Harris, I. Davis, J. Engen, J. Schultz-Brown, M. Gilbert, L. Sayles-Adams, J. Ronnei, C. Osorio, R. Vernosh, H. Ott, M. Schrul, E. Agbamu, A. Collins, N. Cameron, L. Cathey, S. Freeman, M. Bierman, T. Battle, P. Duffy, J. Statum-Allen, E. Keenan, M. Hoerth, J. Turner.

Other: D. Phillips, J. Herron, D. Brown, J. Martin, T. Lonetree

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. AGENDA

A. Legislative Update

The SPPS Legislative Liaison reviewed the Governor's budget as it related to education. She also provided an overview of the press conference held by Senator Wiger and several members of his committee which covered areas such as funding facilities state-wide, free breakfast for all grades K-6, PreK child care credits, requirement for eye exams on entering Kindergarten, Pathways to College and technology funding.

Other areas covered in her report were:

- The Teacher Licensing Bill SF 298
- The Teacher Development and Evaluation Task Force
- Directory Information for Library Collaboration
- The House Chairs Visit to Washington Technology Magnet
- The Comprehensive Finance Bill
- The Integration and Desegregation Rulemaking Proceeding
- Federal ESEA Reauthorization (Senate)
- Rep. Kline's Bill HR 5 - Student Success Act

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Staff was asked to provide information on block grants. Response: Issues with block grants are the funds can be used for other purposes or the distribution/amount is locked even if changes in target population occur. Once in place, block grants redistribute money and there are usually no inflationary increases. In the case of Title I the concentration factor and per pupil allocation are in the current formula, if that formula is changed or eliminated it will dilute the impact.
- How likely is it the MTLA test will be dropped? If it were, urban teacher programs with 50% minority students and SPPS "home grown" could be moved into the employee pool as well. Response: The Legislature is looking at options and has heard testimony that the MTLA is a bad test and is punitive to teachers of color and second language students who have an average ACT score that is lower thus creating a barrier to teachers of color who want to enter the profession.

- Are there efforts through work force development for programs locally where EAs and TAs could work to progress to teacher status? Response: Yes there are.
- In SPPS's internship for EAs, can an EA go back to their original job? Response: Yes, if they go through the internship process their EA position is secure but not necessarily at their original location. This applies only to EAs on the Teacher Pathway.
- Regarding the Healthy and Hunger Free Kids Act reauthorization and the free breakfast bill before the legislature, what is being discussed on who provides the food and what is planned? Response: There are some discussions on more flexibility but the biggest issue is the question of should the State be paying for breakfast for every student, even those who can afford it? The price tag is very high to do this program across the state and many want to put the money back into the formula or funding for special ed. The list of wants at the Capitol is large and the proposed 1% increase in formula will put districts state-wide in the position of having to make cuts. More information will be available once the supplemental budget recommendation is made in March. Also, there is no money for nursing homes or the disabled community in the Governor's budget and both are asking for large amounts. Once the Legislature puts its finance bills together in April a comparison can be made of the House, Senate and Governor's proposed budgets.
- There is a challenge when you have a particular political persuasion putting forward priorities – what role can the SPPS team and national groups take to help ensure our State representatives are at the table to negotiate on behalf of Minnesota school districts. What can we do to get Minnesota representatives at the table? Response: Normally it is best to find allies that share your same concerns. SPPS now has lots of allies facing the same concerns. You should seek regional centers with similar size and demographics and ask them to share with their reps not just issues that affects cities but rural cities as well. Federally SPPS aligns with CGCS who is working on a position for 2015. It would be beneficial to find districts with Republican representation who would be willing to say the bill does not help them.
- What about the move toward LIFO? Response: There was a hearing this morning. There is a recognition that something needs to be done and the intent is that it is for teacher improvement not a tool for laying off teachers. Staff will keep the Board updated as this develops.
- It was noted, with regard to integration, that some portion will be applied to charter schools but specifics are not clear at this point. The Board will kept informed.

B. Quarterly Financial Report

This report was an update to the Board on the current fiscal year 2014-15 budget and it included a projection of revenue, expenditures and fund balance as of 6/30/2015. Once the budget is adopted the Board is asked, three times a year, to look at and approve the changes that occur in the district's revenue and expenditures in each of the seven funds. The final determination, by fund, occurs each fall following the acceptance of the audit report.

The Board was reminded that the fund balance accounts within the General Fund are prescribed by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (known as GASB 54). The unassigned fund balance in the General Fund is the balance of 5% as referred to in Board policy. The fund balance in the Food Service fund is controlled by federal USDA regulations.

Highlights of the report included the following:

1. General Fund (which includes the five fund balance categories) revenue is projected to have a decrease of \$6.5 million in the areas of Special Education (\$4.2 m in excess cost revenue due to change in formula), Intra-school (Student fundraising, etc. revenues must match at year end) (\$1.5m) and Early Learning Scholarship revenue (\$0.8m) that was reallocated to the Community Service Fund as required by UFARS reporting.

General Fund expenditures are projected to be under spent by \$16.5 million in the areas of Alternative Facilities (Pay As You Go) anticipated fund balance due to project timing (\$5.3m), Personalized Learning Through Technology (\$1.0m), Intra-school (\$1.5m) and operational savings in various programs including Transportation.

These changes resulted in a projected unassigned fund balance of 5.2% which is within the 5% BOE policy for unassigned fund balance.

General Fund (which includes the five fund balance categories) revenue is projected to have a decrease of \$6.5 million in the areas of Special Education (\$4.2 m in excess cost revenue), Intra-school (\$1.5m) and Early Learning Scholarship revenue (\$0.8m) that was reallocated to the Community Service Fund as required by UFARS reporting.

General Fund expenditures are projected to be under spent by \$16.5 million in the areas of Alternative Facilities (Pay As You Go) anticipated fund balance due to project timing (\$5.3m), Personalized Learning Through Technology (\$1.0m), Intra-school (\$1.5m) and operational savings in various programs including Transportation.

These changes resulted in a projected unassigned fund balance of 5.2% which is within the 5% BOE policy for unassigned fund balance.

Overall, revenue is flat and this is being offset by efficiencies and reduced costs. It is too soon to see an accurate picture for FY 16.

2. General Fund, Fully Financed shows no change in fund balance at this time.
3. Food Service Fund has revenue slightly decreasing due to decreases in participation, however reimbursement rates and commodity rebates have offset most of the revenue loss in this fund. Expenditures are projected to have a slight increase due to food and milk expenditures. Milk costs are expected to decrease as of January which will assist in lowering expenditures. A phase out of the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program is anticipated in April as grant funding is spent down. Fund balance is projected to decrease by \$0.4m.
4. Community Service Fund revenues are projected to increase by \$0.4 million due to additional Early Childhood Family Education revenue. Expenditures are projected to increase by \$0.3m to support additional community service programming. Overall fund balance is projected to decrease by \$0.6m due to use of fund balance when preparing the FY 15 adopted budget..
5. Community Service Fund, Fully Financed revenues are projected to remain unchanged and expenditures are projected to decrease by \$0.4m due to decreased expenditure in pre-school screening. Fund balance is projected to increase by \$0.4m.
6. Building Construction Fund revenue is projected to decrease slightly as less interest is generated due to the expedited rate of spending proceeds. Expenditures are projected to increase by \$3.3m as projects are completed in preparation for the Facilities Master Plan. Fund balance is projected to decrease by \$12.5m as the remaining alternative facilities proceeds are fully spent and capital projects are completed.
7. Debt Service fund balance is projected to decrease by \$13.8m due to the net effect of the escrow activity for bond refunding and the net increase of revenue over expenditures.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Community Service Fund, is that where the adult education fund is (ABE). Are you seeing a decrease in people coming in? Response: Yes and yes, a slight decrease in revenue,
- The Hubb Center are those costs covered by ABE? Response: There is a charge back to the fund for the operational cost of running the building.
- In the Fully Financed General Fund, is it correct that the revenue does not come in until it is spent on specific grants? Response: Yes, SPPS cannot be reimbursed until the funds are spent. This area does not reflect a revenue loss, it is a reflection of the timing of when money is used and reimbursed. The budget is built on what we know SPPS is getting in in revenue.
- The Unassigned Fund Balance is now at 5.2%, do you expect to pull funds from this area? Response: \$2.5m has already been set aside off the bottom line.
- It was noted there is uncertainty about sustainability – how does that translate into services? Will there be some that can no longer be provided or will this result in cuts? Response: SPPS will not be dipping into fund balance to bring it below 5%. The Board makes the final decision on how funds are used. Administration is working through each program to determine what it can keep and not keep. It was stated it is very important to keep any cuts away from the classrooms.
- Staff indicated the numbers will reflect what can be delivered to students.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board accept the Quarterly Financial Report. Ms. Doran seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

C. First Budget Revision 2014-15

Re-appropriations to the assigned fund balance in the General Fund are:

Category	Amount	Description
Encumbrances	\$2,463,095	Open PO's from FY 14 carried into FY 15
Professional growth	292,071	Contractual carryover
Site carryover & adjustment	1,239,131	Balance of non-salary items in schools only
SSSC 2.0 initiatives	1,100,000	Additional allocations to schools/programs
Special Ed	1,500,000	Budget adjustment to Special Ed program
		FY 14 balance in Referendum PLTT budget
PLTT	3,022,008	carried over to FY15
TOTAL Re-Appropriation	\$9,616,305	

Revisions to Fully Financed budgets reflect the approval of grants under \$500,000 that were not adopted in FY15 as well as revisions to adopted grants.

General Fund Fully Financed	\$10,711,666
Community Service Fully Fin.	1,906,941

Revenue changes (all funds) are:

Fund	Adopted Budget	Revision	Revised Budget
General Fund	\$529,117,689	(789,110)	\$528,328,579
GF Fully Financed	39,518,088	10,711,666	50,229,754
Food Service	26,306,100	0	26,306,100
Community Service	20,090,888	0	20,090,888
CS Fully Financed	4,826,592	1,906,941	6,733,533
Building Construction	15,100,000	0	15,100,000
Debt Service	45,091,000	0	45,091,000
TOTAL Revenue	\$680,050,357	\$11,829,497	\$691,879,854

Expenditure changes (all funds) are:

Fund	Adopted Budget	Revision	Revised Budget
General Fund	\$537,217,689	\$9,616,305	\$546,833,994
GF Fully Financed	39,518,088	10,711,666	50,229,754
Food Service	26,306,100	0	26,306,100
Community Service	20,804,172	0	20,804,172
CS Fully Financed	4,826,592	1,906,941	6,733,533
Building Construction	24,272,906	0	24,272,906
Debt Service	41,517,000	0	41,517,000
TOTAL Expenditures	\$694,462,547	\$22,234,912	\$716,697,459

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Board approve the revised budget for Fiscal Year 2014-15. Mr. Brodrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

D. FY 2016 Budget Guidelines

The 2015-16 Budget Guidelines document sets parameters on how the FY16 budget will be compiled as it supports the District's SSSC 2.0 strategic plan. In accordance with Board of Education policy, the budget must maintain an unassigned fund balance of 5% of annual general fund expenditures. Administration will begin presenting the FY 16 proposed budget over the next several months and it must be approved by the Board no later than June 30, 2015.

The FY 16 Budget Guideline Philosophy is that the Proposed Budget will reflect the District's Strong Schools, Strong Communities 2.0 (SSSC 2.0) strategic plan as adopted by the Board of Education (BOE). The budget is the District's financial plan that must sustain the academic plan. The District must maintain a stable financial system and effective operational practices, so that students and staff have the resources they need to succeed inside and outside the classroom. School and Program budgets will use the five focus areas: Racial Equity, Personalized Learning, Program Articulations and Alignment, Post-Secondary Preparation, and Infrastructure and Systems, in their budget preparations.

1. Preparing Budget Calculations

- Budget Model: A modified roll-over budget method will be used.
- Revenue Projection: Revenue will be calculated using current law (Governor's projected budget)
- Inflation: The Finance Office will project salary and fringe benefits using actual salary and benefit amounts if labor contracts have been negotiated and all non-personnel budget items will reflect no more than two percent (2%) inflation except for items related to contractual commitments.
- Enrollment: The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (REA) and the Finance Office will prepare overall enrollment projections.
- Average Salary and Benefits Calculation Data: A table detailing the average salary and benefits will be provided for budget preparations.
- Fund Balance: In accordance with BOE policy, the budget will maintain an unassigned fund balance of five percent (5%) of annual General Fund expenditures. District administration will inform the BOE on potential use of unassigned fund balance during the initial budget planning presentation to the BOE. The District will continue to increase its future unassigned fund balance level to six percent (6%) or greater.

2. Creating the Budget

- Schools:
 - ✓ Continuation of a refined blended Site-Based and Centralized funding method will be used for schools in FY16.
 - ✓ Class size ranges will determine teacher FTEs.
 - ✓ Office staffing (Principal, AP, Clerk) and other staffing are determined by enrollment and type of school.
- Non-School Programs:
 - ✓ Non-School programs will be reported into three (3) categories: Central Administration, District-wide Support, and School Service Support.

3. Compiling and Presenting the FY16 Budget

- Presentation Format: Summary information will be presented for schools and programs in the preliminary budget document. Each summary page will include an analysis of the changes to the current year budget that are impacting the schools and programs.
- Fully Financed Budgets: Fully Financed budgets with anticipated revenues and expenditures that are over \$500,000 for the 2015-2016 school year will be included in the Adopted budget.
- Other Resources Allocated to Schools: The Adopted budget document will include a school by school detail of resources allocated to schools such as grants, special education, operations, and student activities, to name a few.
- The Adopted Budget: Administration will present a balanced budget to the BOE. The budget for 2015-2016 must be approved by the Board of Education by June 30, 2015. The Adopted budget will be published on the Business Office website (<http://businessoffice.spps.org>)

Staff provided a draft timeline on the budget adoption schedule with proposed adoption of the final budget on June 23.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Will budgeting impact MCA testing? Response: MCAs are done mid to end of April. The budget should not impact testing
- Budget assumptions based on Governor's budget and 1% formula increase.
- The Board passed a staffing resolution last year, are those staffing number included? Response: Yes, they are built in.
- Guidelines for schools – Board resolutions additional staff allocations will be built in
- Will funding from the State be at 1%? Response: If it is, an increase of \$2.4 million does not keep up with inflation and for comp ed, the free and reduced lunch count dropped so projections are very flat. SPPS is planning a bottom line based on all these assumptions.
- When do Principals get to know how much money is available? When does that come out? When are school allocations distributed to schools? Response: The enrollment meetings will provide the first sense of the budget to principals and the budget documents are released at the end of March. Other Title 1 dollars and compensatory dollars both impact schools as well and those are not determined at this point.
- What is a Modified Roll Over Budget? Response: It is a budget model that takes everything in a current budget, applies inflation, takes out one-time costs and then is rolled into the next budget cycle. This is the starting point for budget consideration for the next year's budget.
- What is the degree of flexibility at site level and what is the role of site-based decision making at a site? Response: Under the new agreement SPPS has to be very

prescriptive about how many students are in classrooms. This took away a lot of flexibility for principals. With funding from both State and Federal in flux almost yearly, SPPS has a minimum of flexibility and it seems to reduce more each year.

- How will retirements come into play with this budget? Response: Retirements look to be average compared to the last two years. About 82 are projected at this point.
- How do retirements impact the budget? Response: It does not impact the budget but it does impact staffing.
- Is ELL and special ed changing? Response: There will be substantial change in FY 16. Details will be provided as details are received.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board approve the FY 2016 Budget Guidelines. Ms. O'Connell seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

E. Standing Item: Policy Update

Staff provided the Board with information on the outreach being developed. The overarching purpose of the outreach is grounded in the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in contributing perspectives to the decision making process along with a continued commitment to inform stakeholders how their input has impacted policy and procedure development.

Policy design principles included involvement, work to ensure that the concerns and perspectives of those most impacted are directly reflected in the policy and outreach included targeted stakeholder workshops. A continued commitment to stakeholders was made

Procedure design involves consultation and meetings with stakeholders (youth, families, staff, community organizations) to inform and gather feedback about prospective procedures and sharing how stakeholder input influences draft procedures. Outreach includes public comment, focus groups and information sessions.

Key learning from outreach to date shows the policy will support health benefits for youth, educational equity for all students regardless of gender, State and Federal law, an environment of safety and respect and the right for students to be their full selves.

Procedures need to support privacy concerns of all students, encourage parent support, in compliance with State and Federal law and provide clear guidelines for building principals and instructional staff. The learning trends will be used to help dictate further outreach.

General public feedback has been overwhelmingly positive. The feedback has been used to help guide website development and further outreach and educate stakeholders as move forward.

Next steps include continued work with the Board on policy revisions during the second and third readings, continued consultation on procedures. Upon Board approval of the Gender Inclusion Policy, procedures will be ready for final Superintendent authorization by the end of March.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What has been done really well is the engagement of people in policy and procedure development. What has been learned that can be taken forward in development of further policy and procedures? Response: The process has created more contact and a structure for further use but it is time consuming to reach out to meet community expectations. A similar process will be used with bullying prevention and harassment procedures as well.

- SPPS has a racial equity policy and equity teams at schools, can these be used to broaden the equity effort and create bridges with and among schools. Response: Because SPPS had the racial equity policy in place and expectations of having a community voice in development has made inclusion easier. Where procedures enter into the process has been made clearer through this experience of working on the inclusion policy. SPPS has learned who and how to engage around procedure development through this process.
- Concern was express about item 2 under Ensure Gender Inclusiveness around placing the classroom teacher at the forefront of presenting materials in such a way that it is in the spirit of the inclusion policy. SPPS needs to be sure teachers are well prepared to deal with those subjects that bring up the topic of gender so as not to contradict policy. Response: The belief is that good teaching is good teaching and is not gender or racially specific. The broader conversation should be on how to engage all students regardless of race or gender and to get way from arbitrarily labeling curriculum pieces based on race or gender.
- Thanks were extended for this very important work.
- Staff indicated they were learning a lot in the procedure area and whatever is learned will be used on the next big policy.
- A concern was expressed about the need to do more outreach to address some of the concerns that might arise as there are a lot of people who may not really understand the issues in this area and what is being addressed. It was indicated that if certain groups came to mind, that information should be provide to Ryan Vernosh so he can follow up.
- It was suggested that "mini-cases" within the procedures might be helpful to illustrate points.
- Staff noted they have not heard anything on language changes for the policy. Staff was asked if they are hearing anything in the procedure development process that might indicate language in policy needs addressing. Response: #2 as noted in an earlier comment is the one that comes to mind.
- Are you hearing pushback or solutions on implementation? Response: The area that has generated the most questions are gender neutral bathrooms. This is being addressed long-term in the Facilities Master Plan. In the meantime various procedural process to address this are under consideration.
- A Board member noted the policy needed a number and an implementation date. Response: Staff indicated they would look into this and get back to the Board.

F. Standing Item: PLTT Update - Budget

The Chief Financial Officer presented information on the voter approved levy for Personalized Learning Through Technology (PLTT) FY 14-21 budget.

FIRST YEAR (2013-14) EXPENDITURES SHOW:

DELL PLATFORM

Category	Total Expenditures	% of Total Spent
Computers (site technology labs)	\$2,993,185	50%
Salary & Benefits (Technology Services, Building Support, Office of Personalized Learning	2,134,493	36%
Purchased Services	409,355	7%
Supplies & Software	114,477	2%
Technology Equipment (Other Than Computers)	326,481	5%
TOTAL FY 14 Expenditures	\$5,977,992	100%
Assigned Fund Balance/FY 15 Carryover	<u>\$3,022,008</u>	
Total PLTT Budget	\$9,000,000	

2014-15 PROJECTED EXPENDITURES (APPLE)

Category	Total Expenditures	% of Total Spent
Lease #1 (iPad Airs, iPad Minis, MacBook Pros)	\$5,892,482	54%
Salary & Benefits (Technology Services, Site Support for iPad deployment, OPL)	3,948,666	36%
Purchased Services	439,966	4%
Supplies & Software	565,379	5%
Technology Equipment (Other Than Computers – servers, routers, etc.)	102,348	1%
TOTAL FY 15 Projection	\$10,948,841	100%
Assigned Fund Balance FY 16 Carryover	1,073,167	
Total PLTT Budget	\$12,022,008	

LEASE #1 DETAILS 2014-15 SCHOOL YEAR (TERM BEGINNING 8/1/14)

Devices	Total Number	Total Cost
iPad Airs	22,340	\$4,365,925
iPad Minis	5,420	855,860
MacBook Pro Laptops	1,385	499,670
TOTAL		\$5,721,455

In addition to the devices listed above, Lease #1 includes: AppleCare Plus, Rugged cases, Device Management Software, Apple Professional Development Services and Apple Tech Support.

LOOKING AHEAD FY 16-FY 21**LEASE #2 - YEAR 2 TEACHERS/PROGRAMS (BEGINS 8/1/15)**

Devices	Total Number	Total Cost
iPad Airs	2,000	\$576,170
MacBook Pro Laptops	950	488,630
TOTAL		\$1,064,800

Lease #3 - Year 2 Sites (Begins 8/1/15)

Devices	Total Number	Total Cost
Planning in progress to support 2015-16 rollout to sites	TBD	Estimated \$2,076,000

In addition to the devices listed above, the lease includes: Apple Care Plus, rugged cases, Device Management Software, Apple Professional Development Services and Apple Tech Support

SPPS is in the final planning stages for Lease #3, accessories and services for Year 2 rollout to sites. The FY 16 Budget of \$9,000,000 will include site lease costs along with identified salaries and benefits for technology services/site support staff for iPad deployment. A portion of Lease #2 includes devices for programs that will be paid for by each program's technology budget (not Referendum funding).

Future district-wide savings include: textbooks and other printed material, instructional resource redundancies, paper and copier costs and inefficient technology purchases (PLTT provides a unified format)..

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Did SPPS get any funds back from Dell? Response: Dell provided SPPS with a rebate of approximately \$660,000 in purchased services/items. This is a credit outside of the total Dell spend and is being held separate to be utilized for IT or PLTT needs.
- Did SPPS incur more in salary and benefit costs than anticipated? Response: There were tradeoffs, OPL used more FTEs than Tech Services. IT has been creative in

filling positions through promotions, etc. No overtime was used. Flex time was utilized to meet rollout needs. PLTT also offered opportunities for volunteers to participate as well. Handouts will be finished by the end of February. The capacity within classrooms is tremendous and this has become a collective, cooperative process.

- Can staff track the Dell rebate and how it is spent down? Response: So far it has been used to offset some server costs and other items needed in order to save future costs. A possible additional use would be a security analysis. This is a credit, not cash and can only be used for Dell services/products.
- It was stated Apple is providing project management support at no cost. Apple has stepped up and met expectations
- What in all this is not device specific? Response: SPPS needed devices in order use them in classrooms as a teaching tool. Staffing (tech integrationists to support personalized instruction) are the face of the process at sites. As part of the leases a significant amount of work has been done by Development Specialist that builds capacity throughout sites. Principals, their staff, OPL and IT staff have been working to develop background to support PLTT supports to build capacity.
- It was requested that as this material is communicated going forward the devices be identified separately from the personnel and other areas (i.e., management software, etc.) to provide the bigger picture.
- Regarding savings, what savings are being seen now? Is there a concern about how publishers might change processes? Are textbooks on line? Response: SPPS reviews a lot of resources in its curriculum review cycle (to meet new standards) and has consistently been looking at digital assets in the process. In the last adoption SPPS collected a number of resources for each grade level and the total adoption was from multiple vendors to get materials to meet standards. The next review cycle is world languages and the standards guide the review process. Additionally SPPS is looking to eliminate outdated resources and fill gaps by finding the best resources to teach to standards. It was noted that many digital resources have costs associated with them, subscription fees, etc.

G. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - None

H. Work Session

1. Board Check-In
The Director of Equity led Board members through a racial equity check-in using an equity model called the iceberg to model how to bring out deeper, priority questions and how to use the process in building agendas/presentations.
2. Further Discussion on Board Budget
The Board reviewed specific areas within its budget for FY 14-15 as it began the process of working on its FY 15-16 budget.
3. Renaming & Next Steps on Listening Sessions
The title "SPPS Board Community Conversations" was suggested and accepted. It is the Board's expectation that there will be at least one staff member present at the meetings. For the time being the focus will be on meeting with the PACs though other groups were discussed for future sessions.
4. Review of Public Comment Process and Practices
It was decided that as of the July Board meeting Public Comment will run as a separate meeting from the Board meeting. It will be scheduled from 5:30 to 6:00 p.m. The comment sessions will be taped but not broadcast. Announcement of the change will be made at the May and June Board meetings.

5. Receipt of LGB Disparities Results in 2013 MN Student Survey
The Board indicated they felt the material should be presented at the March Board meeting as a lead in to approval of the Inclusion Policy
6. Finalize New Date for March Board Retreat
The Board provided three possible dates for the retreat (March 6 – 4:00 to 8:00, March 20 - 4:00 to 8:00 and March 21 - 9:00 to 1:00). The Board Secretary was instructed to check into moderator availability.
7. Student Representation on the Board (Initial Discussion)
This was moved to the March COB agenda and it was requested the topic be expanded to look at leadership opportunities for students.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:	Ms. O'Connell moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Ms. Doran.
----------------	--

The motion passed

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk