

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
March 3, 2015**

PRESENT: Board of Education: Keith Hardy, Mary Doran, John Brodrick, Anne Carroll (departed 8:59 p.m.), Jean O'Connell
Louise Seeba - arrived 5:05 p.m.
Chue Vue - arrived 5:36 p.m., departed 8:59 p.m.

Staff: Superintendent Silva, M.Schrul, J. Schulz-Brown, L. Cathey, J. Peterson, K. Wilcox-Harris, C. Osorio, M. Walker, S. Freeman, M. Bierman, A. Collins, M. Hearn, J. Turner, R. Vernosh, P. Duffy, J. Statum-Allen, L. Sayles-Adams, M. Hoelscher, E. Agbamu, T. Battle, E. Keenan, M. Yackley, N. Cameron, C. Grady

Other: J. Carley, B. Pierson, E. Dandan, . Lonetree, J. Verges

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. AGENDA

A. Preliminary 2016 Budget Overview (General Fund)

The Chief Financial Officer reviewed the key planning assumptions for the 2016 budget.

- The SSSC 2.0 Plan is first consideration in funding
- Class size ranges will determine teacher FTEs
- The budget will be built on current laws
- A blended site-based and centralized funding method will be used for schools
- A table detailing the average salary and benefits will be provided for budget preparation
- The budget should maintain an unassigned fund balance of at least five percent (5%) of the general fund expenditures in accordance with Board policy.
- Non-school programs will be reported into three categories: Central Administration, District-wide Support and School Service Support.
- Fully financed budgets with anticipated revenues and expenditures over \$500,000 for the 2015-16 school year will be included in the adopted budget and
- The FY 2015-16 budget must be approved by the Board by June 30, 2015.

Factors which could influence the budget are:

- Third quarter projections impact fiscal year end fund balance
- Enrollment fluctuations impact revenue, class size and building capacity
- Contractual settlements impact expenditure levels
- Legislative adjustments impact revenue
- Previous year's October 1 Free & Reduced lunch count impacts revenue
- Bond ratings and
- Funding has not kept up with inflation.

The FY 2015-16 General Fund Preliminary Big Picture

	FY 15 Adopted (in millions)	FT 16 Preliminary (in millions)	Difference	Percent Change
Revenue	\$529.1	\$528.2	\$ (0.9)	(0.2%)
Use of Fund Balance	8.1	2.5*	(5.6)	(69.1%)
Expenditures	537.2	530.7	(6.5)	(1.2%)
Balance	\$0	\$0		

* The ending FY 2014-15 (6/30/15) Unassigned Fund Balance is projected to be 5.2% (as of the December 2014 quarterly report). The \$2.5 million use of fund balance for FY 15-16 has been accounted for in the projection.

The CFO summarized considerations for balancing the FY 2015-16 budget, they were:

- Maintaining SSSC 2.0 commitments
- Maintaining current class size commitments and funding the change in the high poverty Kindergarten range to 20-24 in 2015-16.
- Maintaining the Board resolution on the additional 32 FTEs for staffing support plus an additional 10 FTEs in 2015-16
- Eliminating one time only allocations
- Reviewing areas where there has been cost savings due to efficiencies
- Addressing program expenditures where revenue has decreased
- Reviewing program reductions in Central Administration, District-wide Support Services and School Service Support areas
- Keeping the reductions as far away from the classroom as possible.

SSSC 2.0 class size ranges at higher poverty sites are:

Grade	FY 16 Target Ranges
Pre-K	20
Kindergarten	20-24
1-3	22-25
4-5	25-28
6-8	29-33
9-12	30-35

The higher poverty threshold is the top 30 schools per the teacher's contract (these change from year to year). Effective FY 2015-16, the Target Range for Kindergarten changed to 20-24.

SSSC 2.0 class size ranges for lower poverty sites are:

Grade	FY 16 Target Ranges
Pre-K	20
Kindergarten	22-26
1-3	22-27
4-5	25-29
6-8	29-35
9-12	30-37

Site staffing criteria for FY 15-16 has the following site configurations: Pre-K-5, K-8, Dual Campus, 6-8, 6-12 and 9-12. Staffing categories are:

- Principal
- Assistant principal
- Administrative intern
- Clerk (minimum, additional 10 month, mobility and attendance)
- Learning support (counselors)
- Library support
- SSSC 2.0 site staff for program articulation.

FY 2015-16 additional site staffing supports per Board Resolution are:

Position	FY 15 FTEs	FY 16	
		Additional FTEs	Total Additional FTEs
Licensed media specialists	10	5	15
Elementary school counselors	10	5	15

Licensed school nurses	7	-	7
School social workers	5	-	5
TOTAL	32 FTEs	10 FTEs	42 FTEs

The CFO then reviewed the budget adoption schedule. Schools and programs will roll out at the same time, March 27 and due back April 24.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- You indicated you do make presentations to various groups, if a community group wished to understand the budgeting process how would they know how to request a presentation? Response: SPPS wants to make sure they are being transparent and providing information on how the budget process works. Last year's presentations contained elements of both budget and process and were presented to Central Administration and the schools; school sites offered presentations for their community. The Finance Office can do either or both presentations (the current budget and its impacts and/or how the budget is built and its components). Requests should be made to the Finance Office.
- A Board member commented the tiered approach is good. Response: SPPS is a steward of tax payer money so the community should be able to know how the budget works. Finance is putting together a tool kit for the community – Budgeting 101. That information will be made available to the PACs and Board members could be included. The Board indicated they would like to receive this and requested it be sent to the various district councils as well..
- Another Board member stated she was happy to see the gap between expenses and available revenue closing.
- What are the items impacting revenue reduction? Response: Stable enrollment results in a reduction in revenue. Compensatory dollars linked to the poverty threshold dropped by \$1.7 million for 2015-16 and a change in the integration formula resulted in a slight reduction.
- So the factors listed as having an influence on the budget means you do not know right now what will happen? How many of these will be known by next month? Response: Many will not be known until the actual monies are received. Finance, as it has over the past several years, has made very close projections about where they think the numbers will land. The Legislative Liaison is keeping Finance well informed on what can be expected as legislation evolves. Finance has a good sense of enrollment assumptions and the projections are updated over time.
- What about bond ratings? Response: The bond rating meetings will happen in May. Administration will present the state of the district to Moody's and Standard & Poors. This is a picture of where the district is and where it is headed and its ability to cover unforeseen circumstances. The rating agencies take all that into consideration when issuing their ratings.
- So at the April COB meeting Finance will bring their best projections to the Board, not actual figures, correct? Response: Yes, the budget will be built based on those projections. Administration noted that many districts in the state are coming up short and will need to make budget cuts because the State has not kept up with inflation. SPPS is in a better position than some but cuts may still be necessary. An additional consideration is SPPS is now doing "pay as you go" which needs to be budgeted for though in the long run it will benefit future tax payers by a reduction in bonding expenses.
- The high poverty school class sizes, how will SPPS help schools with higher poverty populations continue or increase services provided to the students? Response: High poverty schools get concentration and compensatory dollars and Title I dollars on top of regular funding to schools. SPPS tries to ensure that schools who need more support in a particular area get it and that schools maximize use of staff. In FY 15-16 there are 42 additional FTEs providing additional support to schools and families.
- Will extra supports continue to the high poverty schools so the schools can provide a stellar education to its students? Response: Cuts that have to be made will be kept away from the schools as much as is possible.

- Class size is dropping down one student at the Kindergarten level? Will this affect families with pre-K kids in those schools who want to move up to Kindergarten at that school? Does it affect enrollment at the schools? Response: Every time there is an increase or decrease in class size it will impact schools. Pre-K students moving to Kindergarten in the same school will not be affected, it affects only kids coming in.
- Program reductions, at this point in the process you do not know what or where the cuts will be, correct? Can you give an example of what would fall into those areas? Response: No, at this point specific cuts have not been determined. An example might be the "nice to haves" which have been trimmed over the past several years. One time only costs covered last year are not being renewed in the new budget..
- What is the timeline? Response: The budgets will go to programs and schools on March 27. The Board will be updated at the same time so you will have an idea of what program budgets are.
- Explain the three categories other than schools. Response: Central Administration would involve things such as Board governance and the Superintendent's budget. District-wide Support Services would be things such as facilities, finance, HR, transportation. School Support Services would be Special Education, MLL, counseling, etc.; areas where there is a direct correlation to the schools.
- Administration indicated that when the allocations are sent to schools and programs a message will be sent to the Board so they know the process has begun. Schools and programs will then have about one month to work through their budget. The Board should have a good idea about the budget by the April COB.
- A Board member noted it would be useful to see last year's budget figures alongside this year's budget for the schools and programs.

B. Wellness Policy Implementation Update

The Supervisor, Student Health and Wellness provided an update on the Wellness Policy implementation along with some background. The 2004 Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act required all districts establish local school wellness policies by SY 2006-07. The Board approved the original SPPS Wellness Policy in May 2006 and the subsequent revision in June 2008. The 2010 Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act expanded the scope of wellness policies and the SPPS policy was revised and approved in March 2013.

The 2013 changes to the policy reflect the changes required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. The revision process covered seven months and engaged stakeholders to provide input. The Wellness Policy aligns with the Racial Equity Policy with a link between race and health disparities and the final outline reflects the CDC. SHIP (Statewide Health Improvement Program) funds were used to facilitate the revision.

She went on to provide definitions for:

- SHIP (Statewide Health Improvement Program) -
- Site Wellness Teams
- Wellness Champions - have been identified at 46 schools to date and are there to promote wellness on the school site.
- District Wellness Team - is a 9-12 member group comprised of SPPS employees, parents and community partners. They are charged with supporting and evaluating the SPPS Wellness Policy, helping to ensure that staff and students are provided the opportunity for a healthy lifestyle during the school/work day.
- Annual Wellness Action Plan – developed at site level

Policy concerns expressed in 2012-13 included:

- A need for stronger language to "raise the bar" related to health education, physical education and physical activity.
- Accountability and enforcement
- Difficulty of implementation
- Mental health needs were not addressed
- Communication of the wellness message and

- A weak employee wellness section.

There is a close link between health and academic success. Research shows that students who earn mostly A's are almost twice as likely to get regular physical activity than students who receive lower grades. Physical activity has been shown to help students focus, improve behavior and boost positive attitudes.

Looking at the impact of the 2013 revision has shown that the District Wellness Team has a very engaged membership including parents, students and community partners (St. Kate's Public Health students, Health Partners, Allina Health and Children's Hospitals & Clinics). Strong leadership is provided by the SHIP lead (.6 FTE). There has been steady growth in the Wellness Champions program with varying levels of participation.

Key areas of the Wellness Policy are Physical Activity where efforts are made to find opportunities for increasing physical activity for students before, during and after school as well as offering professional development opportunities for physical education teachers. Healthy Eating and Nutrition helps teachers find ways to integrate nutrition education and healthier eating into the classroom. Staff Wellness and Family Involvement reinforces the importance of adult modeling of healthy behaviors.

Success in the area of wellness in 2013-14 was reflected in such efforts as: St. Paul Music Academy Ninja training, Johnson High School's GoVie Spring event, the St. Anthony Park running club, Chelsea Heights archery club and the Eastern Heights fruit of the month. Community Ed facilitated water safety classes for underserved populations and 300+ staff members participated in yogaCalm training.

2014-15 successes include: 55 Wellness Champions (up from 46 in 13-14), 40 action plans, the award of the Safe Route to School grant, expanded interest in biking partnerships as the city and county draft comprehensive bike plans, continued partnership with Community Education, the launch of the Wellness website, school yogaCalm residencies at select sites and increased interest in running clubs and events.

Next steps will involve:

- Working with Employee Wellness to inspire staff to model more healthy behavior
- Providing teachers with resources to make physical activity a classroom routine, including at the secondary level and
- Seeking opportunities for further collaboration with school communities and Community Partners.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- In the Wellness Report – 56% of programs reported taking recess away from kids as punishment, is that the case? Should there be some messaging to administrators on the policy on recess? Response: Actually this is a slightly improvement from the previous report. The physical education piece is in the buildings and alternatives are being explored. The 56% is not "of programs," it means 56% of Wellness Champions have seen or heard of it happening at least once.
- Obesity and Type 2 diabetes, does SPPS have data on this? Response: Yes on Type 1 diabetes but not on Type 2 as that information is only available if the parent discloses the condition. Type 2 is on a slow and steady rise. The Health Department is looking at that in relation to health equity. Data on obesity is gathered by the Health Department from health plans. There is no data specific to SPPS schools. Some reports on obesity go back to an SPPS report in 2004 but SPPS does not collect data on it; only on Pre-K between 3 and 5 years.
- Celebrations and the policy of allowing only one celebration per month involving food or beverages, is this being done consistently? Response: This is an area that needs tightening up. Some sites do it well but how this rolls out varies. There is an ongoing need for other ideas (i.e., extra time in the gym or outside).

- Food allergies are prevalent and it has been defined as a "procedural" issue. What is being done through procedures relative to allergies? Response: Significant things have happened. The language in the policy aligns food allergies with disability so individual health plans for students can now be integrated into their IEP. The 504 has moved from a paper document to an electronic document based in the student's Education Plan. This would include anaphylaxis and diabetes plans for those most significantly impacted and follows the student from site to site.
- A Board member suggested a reminder be sent to the schools outlining the liability issues of allowing food associated with celebrations in the classrooms.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved, seconded by Ms. O'Connell, the Board accept the Wellness Policy Implementation Update report.

The motion passed.

C. Out for Equity Presentation

Staff stated this presentation would provide an overview of the services and supports Out for Equity provides to students, families and staff in SPPS. Out for Equity is a school-based program that strives to maintain a safe and welcoming school environment that fosters positive self esteem, respect for others and academic success for all lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and questioning students, staff members and families.

Common terminology in the program is: GSD - gender and sexual diversity. LGBTQ+ - lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and other gender and sexual identities (intersex, asexual, gender non-conforming and two-spirit).

Identification of student need areas come from many sources:

- School requests for training and information and/or events
- Feedback on a need for family involvement
- Middle schools as an area of high need
- Transgender student experiences and
- Data (local and national).

The Minnesota Student Survey (done every three years) had 378 out of 3,570 students identified as other than heterosexual. They displayed a very low level of assets and very high levels of challenges.

School supports for LGBT students need to be provided earlier and include: comprehensive policies, student groups (GSAs – Gender and Sexual Alliance and SGs - Support Groups), LGBT-inclusive curriculum and supportive educators.

Programs offered by Out for Equity include: an evening out (AEO), Under the Rainbow Drop-In, Queer and Trans Youth Leadership Program, Special opportunities (Q-Quest, Youth Summit, Queer Youth Prom, Youth Pride and Twin Cities Pride). The racial breakdown of AEO participants in 2013-14 was: 54.8% white, 15.1% mixed race, 6.3% Hispanic/Latino, 19.8% black, 1.6% native American and 1.6% Asian.

Indirect student supports provided by Out for Equity include professional development for staff (the Safe Schools Manual), training for GSA advisers, "Beyond Courage: Leading for Gender Inclusion", "Safe Space" training and requested PD. Technical assistance is offered with such things as the Gender Inclusion Policy, the Safe & Supportive Schools initiative and mental health supports.

Student group participation has grown in 2013-14 there were groups in 8 high schools and 3 middle schools; in 2014-15 groups are in 8 high schools and 7 middle schools.

Out for Equity provides family engagement through the Gender & Sexual Diversity Parent Advisory Committee with support from the Office of Family Engagement and Community Partnerships. Through events (Twin Cities Pride, Queer Youth Prom, family meetings) and direct assistance with provision of resources and connections to services.

Out for Equity departmental support is provided through work with HR and other departments along with provision of individual support as requested through resources, perspectives about policies and coaching.

Alignment with SSSC 2.0 is through specific initiatives that include: racial equity, personalized learning, teacher development & evaluation (TDE) and safe and supportive schools.

Out for Equity is empowering students, staff and families to transform the educational experiences of LGBTQ+ students and families.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Is there data to show if SPPS is under serving certain groups? Response: The data available could not be disaggregated any further because of small number in the group. It may be available at the state level.
- How is SPPS helping students and families facing barriers? Response: It is important this is part of the curriculum from Pre-K through high school. It involves ways of speaking looking at differing perspectives, care for and support for all and materials that support the actual ways students live. Middle school is an important area and time in which to do this work. SPPS is a leader in this area and it tries to share its work with out-state schools and other districts.
- A Board member stated she liked the expansion, depth and elaboration happening in Out for Equity.
- What is being done to expand services to staff, to provide support within policies and procedures to ensure staff is also supported. Response: The GSA leaders are points of contact and support within buildings. There is no formal program for staff but it is being incorporated as part of new employee education. It is hoped that in future SPPS will have LGBT employee groups as part of the broader equity work. As a district, SPPS is advanced in work in this area but employees are still apprehensive about being open. They need to feel safe and comfortable before that happens.
- It was noted that supportive schools become known by parents and their children are taken to those sites. The hope is that this will become unnecessary and all schools will be viewed as supportive.

D. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. Gender Inclusion Policy

The one recommendation for revision was noted.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- For areas needing to be dealt with on procedural level, how will SPPS be sure teachers are well prepared and informed in terms of covering sensitive topics and so they will not be accused of being in contradiction to the inclusion policy? Response: By emphasizing what the policy actually refers to, avoiding arbitrary separation of students or curricular materials. Small case studies will be built as an exhibit to accompany the procedures as a learning tool. SPPS staff is already accomplished at navigating multiple perspectives.
- As the policy moves on with the new addition, the Board was asked to give its permission to the policy team to continue to do grammatical tweaks to the language and punctuation as long as it does not change the substance. The Board was amenable to this and they agreed if they had any suggested changes that they be provided to Mr. Vernosh no later than 3/10/15.

- A Board member stated the Board should be aware of the fact that there will be students coming from families who will disagree with the basic tenants of this policy and that their perspective will need to be dealt with in a respectful and inclusive manner. The Board indicated they understood there will be multiple perspectives and that they are important but they must be expressed and addressed respectfully for all, there will be no tolerance for intolerant or hateful language or actions.
- A Board member indicated it would be helpful if administration would provide on-going information to the Board about how staff and students will be assisted in navigating this in order to create a respectful learning environment for all. Such things as examples, micro-lessons, etc.
- A Board member stated, in the end the need is to be respectful of people who feel differently but to be actively and demonstrably in support of the policy.

E. Standing Item: PLTT Update - No Presentation

F. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - No Presentation

G. Work Session

1. Board Check-In

The Board reviewed how it will proceed with exploring its beliefs regarding the budget process – how better to serve students with funds available and keep funds close to the schools. Distributions, realignment, where the focus should be, where cuts might occur while still addressing achievement and making it clear to the community how funding has been constricted by Federal and State laws and mandates and their failure to keep abreast of inflation.

2. Public Comment Follow-Up Discussion

The Board consulted with its General Counsel on how to interrupt disrespectful comments/behavior during public comment at board meetings. Counsel stated the Board is governed by Roberts' Rules of Order and its own directives on public comment. She stated the Chair has authority to take action to ensure rules are followed. After extensive discussion the consensus was the most efficient option would be for the Chair to gavel the speaker and call a recess.

The General Counsel was asked to provide examples of how and when an individual Board member can take action to end a comment session. It was also noted that the public comment period is provided for the community's benefit and is offered at the discretion of the Board.

3. Student Representation on the Board /Student Leadership Opportunities

Board members were asked to provide input in two areas:

- Purpose & Objectives (why the Board is considering doing this):
 - To get student perspectives on issues the Board deals with
 - To get student perspectives on specific issues (school start times, transportation, etc. - issues would, more than likely, change each year)
 - To foster student leadership & empowerment
 - To get more intentional input on decisions affecting students
 - To formalize the student advisory/input process
 - To gather breadth and depth (design, approach, method) tailored to the issue/need
 - To provide an avenue to hear from a full range of students from different programs and from different experiences/backgrounds (especially marginalized students)
- Options:
 - An existing option was brought up in the Community Education 2013 Youth Leadership Team. The team is formed from grades 9-12 representing the nine

high schools. Each school provides 14-21 people, the goal being having a total of 120 youth from all high schools. The group is already functioning and is supported from staff is in place (Community Ed leads). The focus is Service Learning.

- o Director Seeba indicated public housing has "resident councils" in each building and each building sends a representative to the "President's Council."

Other options mentioned were:

- o Formal structures
- o Secondary students (6-12)
- o Interschool students
- o Include ALL high school programs
- o A student Board member
- o A school-based youth leadership structure the Board could tap into on specific issues
- o Ask student council advisors for ideas
- o Look at example of the Interschool City Council (Green Bay) or
- o Police Chief Smith's Council

A Board Work Group was established (Ms. O'Connell, Ms. Carroll and Mr. Vue) to look at different formal structures and the link between structure and addressing specific issues or other formats. Four areas will be researched: "formal" structures, school-based youth leadership structures to address specific issues, inter-school/city youth councils and the youth council established by the St. Paul Chief of Police.

III. ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk