

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
April 8, 2014**

PRESENT:

Board: Keith Hardy, Mary Doran, Louise Seeba, Chue Vue, John Brodrick, Anne Carroll, Jean O'Connell

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Michelle Walker, Steve Unowsky, Darlene Fry, Marsha Baisch, Jon Peterson, Julie Schultz-Brown, Andrew Collins, Matt Mohs, Lauren Cathey, Efe Agbamu, Rosemary White Shield, Suzanne Sansen, Martin Hoerth, Jackie Statum-Allen, Theresa Battle, Jane Sevald, Liz Keenan, Nancy Paez, Ryan Vernosh, Leslie Snow, Phi Vu, Caitlin Dowden, Brian Kinder

Other: Samuel Smith, Megan Mueller, Carlos Rucker, Carlita Heald, Caroline Lucas, Sebastian Alfonzo, Cecil White Hat, David Cournoyer, Donna Stein, Dianna Johnson, Naomi Berglund, Nina Berglund, Nolan Berglund, Nathan Berglund, Frances Brant, Arlana Santiago, Aleese Santiago

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. St. Paul Youth Commission - Metro Transit Passes

The St. Paul Youth Commission is made up of students who represent all wards in the city and most neighborhoods. The group came before the Board to speak for the use of bus transit for students' benefit. The group represented the Transit Access Subcommittee, tasked with finding ways to improve access to busing for St. Paul youth. Having an efficient means of transit for students expands their opportunities and increases academic excellence. They have, over the past three years, collected data about student access to public transit. In St. Paul, it is not what it should be. Access to transit is also an issue of college access. Access to bus passes solves many problems.

The group also addressed the issue of later start times for middle and high school students. They cited data indicating teens need over 9 hours of sleep. They noted that later start times have a positive impact on student mental health, attendance, academic performance, reducing the rate of car crashes and substance abuse. Use of public transport for high school students would allow adoption of later start times.

The group stated bus passes would influence the achievement gap noting 73% of students in St. Paul qualify for free and reduced lunch. With bus passes, students who miss the school bus would still have a means to get to school. Bus passes would also allow students to take advantage of after school and after hours programming and events providing opportunities for SPPS students to succeed academically, socially and economically (i.e., tutoring, sports, college prep, jobs, volunteering, etc.). All of these require access to transport after school. They noted that in Minneapolis 60% more students engaged in out of school time activities because of bus passes.

The group asked the Board and SPPS administration how SPPS could assist in working toward the use of bus passes in St. Paul.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Board indicated they were actively interested in helping accomplish this. It had been looked at in the past but because of where schools and boundaries were bus routes did not align and Metro Transit was not willing to put more buses on. With the change of the boundaries, possibilities will be explored further.
- Later start times for high school is now an active conversation that will occur in the spring of 2014 involving many different groups across the community. This will possibly lead to changes in start times in future years. There is serious interest in looking at this issue across many groups.
- It was noted some parents are uncomfortable putting their student on public transportation but it will be included in the start time discussions as an option. The students noted that once a person has experienced public transit, it opens up a great number of opportunities for them.
- The Superintendent cautioned that financially the use of bus passes might be too expensive for the District to fund.
- Is the Youth Commission working with Metro Transit regarding routes? Response: Yes, Metro Transit has indicated they would consider adjusting routes and/or increasing frequency of routes at certain times. In Minneapolis, student transit was implemented slowly one or two schools at a time in order to address infrastructure deficiencies. Metro Transit is willing to work toward making this happen.
- It was noted kids in New York ride the buses and subways to get to school almost exclusively.
- For what grades does Minneapolis provide passes? Response: Just high school. There is still yellow busing for special education students.
- How long did Minneapolis take to phase this in? Response: They did a pilot with a few schools for one year, and then incorporated all high schools over the next two years.
- The group was asked to provide the Board with information on the different types of bus passes available. What does the U of MN use?
- What has been the input from other students? Response: The ones who have never tried the bus were apprehensive but those who have used it are excited about the idea. It opens up lots of opportunities.
- It was noted that for many families the bus might be the only way students can participate in options provided by schools and community partners.
- The Superintendent asked the Commission to provide two persons to participate in the start time and transportation committee that will be formed later in the year.

Thanks were extended to the Youth Commission for taking time to come in and educate Board members on this issue.

B. Preview of Summer Term (S-Term)

The Office of Alternative Education stated the mission of their office was to offer a premier summer learning experience that would prevent summer learning loss and support alternative pathways to high school graduation. This supports a culture that is collaborative, solution-focused and which encourages students to become life-long learners. The District is moving toward the notion of making summer term part of a 12-month learning experience for students.

The values of Alternative Education is effective communication, a focus on racial equity, collaboration, innovation and flexibility to do things during S-term that might not be possible during regular school terms.

The guiding parameters for summer session were air conditioning, increased enrollment, high quality programming within SSSC 2.0 parameters and offering opportunities for seniors to do some credit recovery on college campuses with a possible dual credit option.

Summer term is offering two sessions and will include such things as instrumental music, Freedom School, visits to college campuses, immersion programs, on-line courses, streamlined transportation and breakfast and lunch for the students.

Summer term is being promoted through an 11-page enrollment guide that has been translated into the various languages, mailed to students and provided to the schools. Additional promotion has been through robo-calls, flyers, social media, school websites, employee and partner newsletters and a video presentation on S-Term. Students can earn a maximum of 12 credits during S-term.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The question was raised that why, if SPPS is moving to a 12-month concept are there still short S-term sessions? Response: There is the limiting factor of the number of hours attached to a student that can be reimbursed by the State. These hours include both after school offerings and summer terms. If SPPS wants a year-long experience for students, the State would need to fund for 300 hours per student.
- The Board indicated they would appreciate a report on S-term results (graduation, credit recovery, etc.) Response: Staff indicated they were developing a feedback form for students and families, as their input is critical to enriching the experience for future students.
- Will there be AP classes offered during summer? Response: No, SPPS can only get funding for students who are behind and students in 9-12 grades can only participate for credit recovery. If districts were to do more for students during summer terms, there will need to be more funding provided.
- So, SPPS uses summer school to target students for credit recovery or catch up. What other enrichment opportunities are provided? Response: There are a multitude of options for enrichment both in S-term and through community/partner programming.
- Does SPPS collaborate with community agencies – Sprockets, etc? Response: Yes.
- What is the actual percentage breakdown between credit recovery and enrichment? Response: 9-12 is aimed 100% at credit recovery. K-8 while offering “catch up” options also includes more applied academics –math, group experiences, engineering, robotics, music, etc. Reading and math are around 50-60%, enrichment 40-50% depending on individual students.
- Is SPPS working with EMID and community-based organizations to provide multi-district offerings? Yes.
- What about MMEP? Response: MMEP has a summer program catalog and that information is provided to school counselors and principals who provide the information to students.

C. Presentation of American Indian Resolution of Concurrence

The committee representatives stated that with this resolution of Concurrence the SPPS Indian Education/Title VII Parent Committee acknowledges the ongoing collaborative efforts of the Parent Committee, the Indian Education Department and the SPPS District in working toward better outcomes for all American Indian students in St. Paul. They stated the resolution recognizes many accomplishments related to the goals from last year’s Resolution and the Parent Committee wants to address new goals and re-assert an overall emphasis on culturally-based curriculum, pedagogy and assessment in alignment with the recommendation set forth by the Indian Education Supervisor in her report “*Oshki Giizhigad (The New Day): A Model of Native Education Resurgence in Traditional Worldviews and Educational Practice.*”

The Resolution is part of the process that is required as part of the Minnesota American Indian Education Act of 1988 (MN State. 124D.78, subd. 2). The Resolution along with the SPPS administrative response will be submitted to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). The Resolution asks that SPPS work with the Parent Committee and the Office of Indian Education on the following:

1. Develop and implement a culturally based, student-centered model for all American Indian students.
 - a. Implement and support the Culturally Responsive Educational Environment Support Project (CREESP) from Dr. White Shield's New Day model, focusing initially on students who are in the critical transition years of 6th to 9th grade
 - b. Implement native-authored, research-based best practices for curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment from the New Day model

- c. Prioritize district support to diversify and increase the funding portfolio for native education efforts
2. Provide a culturally based, culturally relevant and inclusive curriculum for all students (of all races) in SPPS to learn more about American Indian history, traditions, values and contemporary culture and life
3. Provide better training and support to all SPPS staff to serve American Indian students using Native authored culturally responsive models and best practices.
 - a. Continue and expand teacher and all staff training opportunities related to American Indian history and current needs and native-centered best practices for working with American Indian students, beginning with the most efficient ways to reach all teachers in initial efforts, followed by teacher training in the content strands in a focused, structured way, using AIS teachers as key curriculum experts.
 - b. Provide district support through the Communications Department to develop a native education communications plan, including teacher education
 - c. Provide resources and support related to MTSS/RTI to ensure staff have access to and can appropriately implement culturally appropriate interventions prior to making a Special Education referral for American Indian students
4. Implement solutions to improve American Indian student attendance.
 - a. Improve attendance tracking and consistency across schools to yield better data
 - b. Implement a district-wide attendance collaborative to address the attendance issues and needs of American Indian students
 - c. Evaluate the effectiveness of the "late bus" at American Indian Magnet School (AIMS) and make changes as needed to ensure this strategy is contributing to the goal of improving attendance for American Indian students who attend AIMS
5. Provide more culturally based district-wide out-of-school time activities.
6. Address behavior concerns
 - a. Increase understanding of the impact of PBIS on discipline outcomes for American Indian students by gender (and as compared with students of other races)
 - b. Assess the impact of bullying on American Indian student attendance and academic outcomes and address issues as needed
 - c. Support the formation and utilization of an Elders' Council and through the Office of Indian Education (as well as more informal kinship networks) to provide knowledge and support district wide for implementing native traditional methods to direct student behavior in positive ways and increase engagement for a successful educational experience
7. Address structural and resource challenges within the American Indian Studies (AIS) Program.
 - a. House the AIS programming in the Office of Indian Education, with the Supervisor providing oversight of AIS and with ongoing collaboration with the site administrators, AIS staff, parents and students
 - b. Consider funding two full-time Cultural Specialists (one at AIMS, one at Harding)
 - c. Assess and expand as appropriate the AVID program specifically for American Indian students
 - d. Identify opportunities to encourage Native language revitalization; consider funding two additional full-time Language Teachers
 - e. Address space issues at AIMS that hamper AIS classes and programming
8. Maintain and further improve communication between the District and the Parent Committee.
 - a. Continue wraparound meeting structure and participation of Marsha Baisch, Assistant Superintendent for Teaching, Learning, and Leading, as well as Jackie Turner and Tyrize Cox from Family and Community engagement, in Parent Committee meetings
 - b. Identify other opportunities to engage the Parent Committee and the Indian Education Supervisor in real conversations and actions toward systems change
9. Continue to improve the consistency of racial identification of American Indian students.
 - a. Continue to provide families with easy access to change their student's racial identification with the Placement Center; including informing parents/guardians of the implications of their selection and ensuring proper training and implementation by district staff, (this change was made based on last year's resolution.)
 - b. Provide additional support across the district to ensure that all students who are identified as American Indian are given an opportunity to complete a 506 form, and

ensure that these forms are provided to the Indian Education Department for proper documentation to determine eligibility for Johnson O'Malley services (and to ensure receipt of per capita funding)

10. Develop and implement culturally responsive evaluation plans to assess the impact and effectiveness of Indian Education and American Indian Studies programming.
 - a. Provide district support through the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
 - b. Provide district support to assist aligning Indian Education and AIS staffing with the New Day model

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- SPPS is now offering multiple options for identification of students, is it working? Are people identifying better? Response: Identification is easier however, the 504 Form also needs to be completed and that is being missed in many cases.
- Training and support – how do you see that being incorporated for other staff/leaders? Response: Information needs to be disseminated to staff and teachers who want it but the delivery system needs attention. There is collaboration with the Communication Department to get the information out so staff have best practices and ways to infuse the material into their work to support inclusivity and equity that supports achievement for native students and educates non-native students on the culture.
- No. 8 - communication between the district and parent group – what is being done to expand communication between and among stakeholders? Response: The wrap-around meetings are happening but information gets to the parent group last. The process needs to be more inclusive and fluid.
- What are wrap-around meetings? Response: Wrap-around meetings were created from last year's resolution. Staff and admin meet for regular updates on how things are going relative to points in the resolution. Updates from these meetings are communicated but would improve if there were more dialogue regarding what is in the wrap-around meeting notes.
- No. 7 - 2 full time cultural specialists? What is being looked for, what would they do and what about two full time language teachers? Response: The cultural specialists work to find opportunities for native students to have leadership within district. They meet with students and support families to make them educationally successful. It is currently a part-time position making it hard to find time to meet with students and do culturally responsive training. Regarding the language teachers, currently the language (Ojibwas) program meets every other day which is not optimal for learning. If there were another teacher students could have language class more frequently and at each school. If students have language full time and consistently it benefits them in other classes. If they have it only every other day they lose a lot of the cultural aspects of language.
- Do students get a language credit for the Ojibwas classes? Response: Staff will look into having Ojibwas as a language credit class. Ojibwas and Dakota are recognized by the U of MN as a language credit class.
- With two full-time cultural specialists, would they be available to other buildings with a few students? Yes. Language revitalization means being attentive to every native child wherever. Staff needs to look at how to provide the programming and it needs to be inclusive and tied to academic success. It needs to be culturally based, relevant, responsive – the district should strive to recognize diversity within the system and this will help other groups as well.
- Does SPPS adopt the resolutions? Response: Yes, however Administration will respond to the resolution then the Board votes on the combined resolution and recommendations. This meeting is to hear from the community as to what they would like to have done then administration comes back with what can realistically be done. The Statute wants parent committees and schools to work together, they should arrive at a consensus as to what will be done; it is a working relationship.
- Staff noted the New Day Report and Executive Summary has a three-year strategic plan with benchmarks built into it. It is designed to cost little additional money but works through restructuring of resources.
- It was noted that after school programming reaches out to the community and it might be a benefit to the American Indian community to take advantage of this by making native programs available within the community. After school, programming within the areas

would provide good opportunities for bringing native students together for culturally relevant programming.

- What successes were there from last year's resolution? Response: The main one was the hiring Dr. White Shield. The committee wants to see how New Day will be implemented within the district, how it will take form in a tangible manner.

MOTION: Ms Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the presentation of the SPPS Indian Education Title I Parent Committee Resolution of Concurrence. Ms. O'Connell seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

D. Preliminary FY 2015 Budget

The Controller indicated this was to update the Board on the FY 15 General Fund Budget in preparation of releasing the general fund budget allocations to the schools. The FY 15 budget focuses foremost on funding to support SSSC 2.0. A racial equity lens has been imbedded in the budgeting process (embedded in staffing criteria), professional development (PD) is embedded and staffing has been enhanced in defined areas.

FY 15 General Fund "Big Picture"

	<u>FY 14 Adopted</u>	<u>FY 15 Preliminary</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Revenue	\$505.6	\$526.8	\$21.2	4.2%
Fund Balance	12.7	5.1*	(7.6)	(59.8%)
Expenditure	518.3	531.9	13.6	2.6%
Balance	0	0		

All dollar amounts are in millions.

FY 14 (June 30, 2014) unassigned fund balance is projected as of December 2013 is 5.9% (\$5.1 million above 5% board policy).

FY 15 General Fund "Big Picture" Revenue

	<u>FY 14 Adopted</u>	<u>FY 15 Preliminary</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Revenue				
Comparison	\$505.6	\$526.8	\$21.2	4.2%
GENERAL FUND				
General Education	\$403.7	\$407.9	\$4.2	1.0%
Alt Facilities Levy				
(Pay as you go)	0.0	9.7	9.7	100%
OPEB Levy	9.9	16.1	6.2	62.6%
Integration Revenue	17.7	16.3	(1.4)	(7.9%)
Operating Capital/				
Health & Safety	14.9	14.6	(0.3)	(2.0%)
Categorical Special				
Education	59.4	61.4	2.0	3.4%
Early Learning				
Scholarship Program	0.0	0.8	0.8	100%
TOTALS	\$505.6	\$526.8	\$21.2	4.2%

It was noted Early Learning Scholarship monies are tied to where students are served.

FY 15 General Fund "Big Picture" Expenditures

	<u>FY 14 Adopted</u>	<u>FY 15 Preliminary</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Schools	\$244.8	\$243.1	\$(1.7)	(0.7%)
School Service				
Support	179.8	182.9	3.1	1.7%
Total School	424.6	426.0	1.4	0.3%
Support				

District-wide Support	89.3	101.6	12.3*	13.8%
Central Admin	4.4	4.3	(.1)	(2.3%)
TOTALS	\$518.3	\$531.9	\$13.6	2.6%

* Includes \$9.7 million of Alternative Facilities Levy (Pay as you Go) – new for FY 15.

Factors impacting expenditures are:

FY 14 Adopted Budget	\$518.3
Reduced use of Fund Balance (FY 15 \$5.1 vs. FY 14 \$12.7)	(7.6)
Inflationary Increase to Expenditures	8.9
FY 15 Support for SSSC 2.0	2.6
Addition of Alternative Facilities Levy (Pay as you go)	<u>9.7</u>
Total Proposed FY 15 Budget	\$531.9

The uses the additional \$21.2 million will be put to are: Inflation (\$8.9), Alternative Facilities Levy (\$9.7) and SSSC 2.0 Initiatives (\$2.6).

FUND BALANCE

The Controller provided an explanation of “Fund Balance.” It is a residual, assets over liabilities (or it could be considered equity). The fund balance can be part restricted and part unrestricted. Additional revenue can increase fund balance while additional expenditures can decrease fund balance. Fund balance plays an essential role to mitigate current and future risk. Unrestricted/unassigned fund balance level is crucial in long-term financial planning. Credit agencies monitor unrestricted/unassigned fund balance to determine credit worthiness. They favor increased levels of fund balance. The SPPS Board policy sets Unassigned Fund Balance at 5% of General Fund expenditures.

STAFFING THE SCHOOLS

SSSC 2.0 Class Size Ranges at Higher Poverty Sites

<u>Grade</u>	<u>FY 15 Target Ranges</u>	<u>FY 15 Projected Average Class Size</u>
Pre-K	20	20
KG	20-25	23.29
1-3	22-25	23.74
4-5	25-28	24.57
6-8	29-33	30.72
9-12	30-35	33.20

Higher poverty threshold is 76% (top 30 schools per teachers’ contract).

SSSC 2.0 Class Size Ranges at Lower Poverty Sites

<u>Grade</u>	<u>FY 15 Target Ranges</u>	<u>FY 15 Projected Average Class Size</u>
Pre-K	20	20
KG	22-26	24.75
1-3	22-27	25.10
4-5	25-29	26.57
6-8	29-35	31.24
9-12	30-37	33.75

FY 15 Staffing Criteria

Site Configurations will be PreK-5, K-8, Dual Campus, 6-8, 6-12 and 9-12.

Staffing Categories will include: Principal, Assistant Principal, Administrative Intern, Clerk (Minimum, Additional 10 month, Mobility & Attendance), Learning Support and Library Support.

Intervention Specialists have been removed from FY 15 criteria. Other factors which could influence the budget are: 3rd quarter projections, contract settlements, legislative adjustments and bond ratings.

The Controller finished by reviewing the proposed budget adoption schedule.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Are school budget sheets designed specifically for each site? Yes
- Disappointment was expressed at removing intervention staff which seems like a step backward. Kids need help and the District will need to be creative in helping them now.
- Distributing school allocations – how much of a surprise will the allocations be to the staff at the schools and what will be the process for them to negotiate/appeal their allocations? Response: The allocations will not be a great surprise as there were initial meetings around enrollment levels and staffing with all principals. The difficulty will be the reality of the numbers, there will be less room for change within amounts allocated. Schools will work with Assistant Superintendents on their decisions. After the budget has been developed and approved, the actual fall enrollment numbers will probably necessitate other changes. The budget is flat so schools will need to focus on meeting their needs within the constraints of funding available. Some schools will see fewer students because of class size restrictions this will be addressed as it occurs. Administration has been having discussions with principals on the impact of this on their budgets. The Superintendent noted additional dollars had been allocated to athletics for this year in order to provide safe equipment for the students.
- Will there be any possibility of schools having a unique situation that would be a legitimate reason to dispute numbers? Response: Yes, there are some schools where numbers do not work so decisions need to be made at that those locations. This occurs every year and is addressed on an individual school basis when it does.
- How will increasing the inclusion of school communities in the budgeting process be accomplished? This is vital and the Board wants to ensure principals communicate the budget to their community.
- It was noted SPPS has balanced the budget on the back of fund balance for several years yet the Board has expressed interest in increasing fund balance. Board policy states a balance of at least 5%. Does the Board need to look at Board policy for bond rating and debt service levels? Running several years with expenses higher than income, though done for the right reasons, is a concern should it continue. It was reiterated that the Board needs to look at fund balance policy in the near future.
- Based on the Federation contract, intervention specialist and coaches were moved out, what happens to them? Response: Every school used intervention specialists in a different way – some used them as reading teachers, coaches, social workers, part time nurses, etc. Staffing requirements will be sent to the schools who will need to address the issue in their budgeting process. Intervention specialists will remain in the schools but will probably be in a teaching position depending on licensure.
- Staff noted Title I monies have been reduced by about 10% and Comp Ed did change due to enrollment in middle schools and poverty level will change in some cases. It was further noted Comp Ed and Title I run a year behind which will also have an impact.
- The Board asked for talking points particularly on the \$21 million general fund revenue (new money) and how it is used in each of the three areas. This will be needed for the Listening Session on April 10.
- Does the District allow parent groups to “buy” a position? Response: Yes, they provide the funds but the hiring process is the normal HR process used in hiring all employees. The parent group does not “own” the position.
- Concern was expressed that schools with intervention specialist (reading and math) – need to keep that focus for students’ benefit. Response: Priorities have been built into the budget process for spending compensatory and title dollars.
- Inflation, why are new dollars be used for this? Response: In the end it is the same money – there are contractual agreements and inflation provides for salary increases that are there. The “new” money was used to keep the budget flat rather than having to cut staff.

E. Emergent Bilinguals in SPPS Update

The Director of the Office of Multilingual Learners (MLL) provided an overview of the responsibilities of that department which included: Spanish Immersion, French, Hmong, Hmong Language and Culture and Mandarin. Current work around immersion included the translation of 6th grade social studies books (Northern Lights) from English to French and Spanish; the translation of core content materials from English to Mandarin and creating, writing and translating the entire core subject materials into Hmong. The department is also responsible for all indigenous and world language programs for all of SPPS.

She indicated there is a need to shift paradigms from English Language Learners to Emergent Bilingual (EB) Students; from learning English to becoming bilingual, from a deficit perspective to a strength asset-based perspective and from English only instruction to linguistic interdependence and plurilingualism.

High stakes testing in English for EB students has several impacts: more remedial instruction, greater probability of assignment to lower curriculum tracks, higher drop-out rates, poorer graduation rates and disproportional referrals to Special Ed classes, being placed in sheltered courses that do not provide challenging content and delays enrollment in high-level courses required to graduate or to score high in college admission tests until full English proficiency has been acquired.

Effective instruction for EB students integrates rigorous content and academic language, addresses social and linguistic isolation of EBs, offers EBs access to language rich environments, meaningful contexts and grade level curriculum and provides opportunities for EBs to interact with English-speaking peers who can serve as language models. It also provides scaffolding that is adjusted as students gain competence with content and language and pays attention to academic language and literacy in the context of subject-matter learning.

The process for identifying EB students was provided along with level designation was provided along with exit criteria and graduation requirements.

Data on EB demographics was provided along with population trends, EL distribution and the total number of EB students Grades K-12. Current EL level progression mindset (cohort-based) was discussed along with individualized growth mindset. 33% of SPPS students qualify for ELL services.

The Title III: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act was reviewed. This is a component of the NCLB specifically targeted to benefit emergent bilinguals and immigrant youth. It is another source of funding to supplement the resources of a district providing quality education to emergent bilinguals and immigrant students. Its purpose (for SPPS EL students) is to ensure that emergent bilinguals and immigrant youth fully access the curriculum as they attain English proficiency and meet the same academic standards as their English speaking peers in the core academic subjects. Districts are required to use scientifically based approaches and methodologies in language instruction, provide high-quality professional development to ESL/BE, classroom and content teachers, paraprofessional staff, principals and/or administrators. WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment) was created to meet NCLB Title III requirements. WIDA has five English language proficiency standards:

- Social and instructional language
- Language of language arts
- Language of mathematics
- Language of science
- Language of social studies.

Data on ACCESS composites and course enrollment analysis data was provided. Course enrollment data showed:

- The average number of courses taken by Grade 9-12 is 6.5.
- EL sheltered students number of core course enrollment is 2.75 compares to 4 over all

- EL sheltered students number of advance course enrollment is 0.1 compared to 1.6 over all
- As EL students move into higher levels, they must take more core classes in order to make up for lost time, thus creating greater hardships.
- Emergent Bilinguals are less likely than peers to be in advanced classes yet as likely to pass if enrolled in those classes.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- It is refreshing to know the District has moved ELL students into rigorous classes with their peers.
- What are the primary concerns that make folks reluctant to have their student in advanced courses? Response: The concern is parents wanting students to have a better grasp of the basics before they are accelerated.
- It was noted co-teaching has existed in SPPS since 1996 but has been emphasized only over the past couple of years
- What is the intersection of race and ELL? What about advance placement, who is selected or encouraged, placed or not, is there a difference? Response: In the case of ELL students, the generally accepted language is ‘not able.’ In terms of race and ELL fit, in the African American category EL students are outperforming non-EL students in math and reading. When students have been given the opportunity to be in core content classes, EL students are outperforming black non-EL students.
- SPPS is working to make sure putting kids in rigorous classes is the right thing for the kids not because the State tells the district to do this but because it is the right way to go. It is rooted in the racial equity policy and equity transformation in the district.
- What is the correct terminology? EB, ELL or ELs? Response: EB is correct as the students are operating in two languages, their native and English.
- K-5 grades have 6,000 students, are there disproportionate caseloads at certain schools? Response: SPPS has language academies in nine elementary schools, three or four middle schools and five high schools and there has been a high level of Level 1 and new arrivals. ELL is staffed based on the needs of each school. EL is staffed as if teachers have twice as many students as they actually have because the students have need of greater services. ELL resources are limited so the most money is used for Level 1 and 2 and upper levels are co-taught..
- Advanced course work that EB students are taking, what is the percentage? Response: 10% EB compared to non-EL at 29%.
- Is SPPS encouraging EB students to take advanced courses? Response: There is no one standard practice, it differs from school to school. This is an area needing to be addressed under SSSC 2.0.
- The stagnation at level 3 and 4, is that just a place in time or based on ACCESS test? Response: If students are put into mainstream classes, there may be a shift in this.

F. Talent Development and Accelerated Services (TDAS) Update

The Chief Academic Officer and the Director of the Office of College and Career Readiness indicated the presentation would review the progress of the TDAS in meeting the needs of students and families, review the 2013 administration of the CogAT7 test and the results and provide program insights from 2013-14 and identify key issues moving forward.

The work in this area is being grounded in racial equity with the expressed belief that all children have talents needing to be nurtured and developed and ‘giftedness’ is not disproportionately bestowed upon white students. Data is still showing significant racially disproportionate results across these areas of services: identification, enrollment/access to services and performance in advanced courses. Moving forward, the challenge is to address the system SPPS has designed that produces the disparate results.

Major activities in SY 2013-14 included:

- Refinement and support for specialist position for the Capitol Hill to Highland Park Senior articulation
- Refinement of student learner and G & T identification assessment (CogAT&)
- Revision of the portfolio review process (standards and performance based).

Administration of the CogAT7 in 2013 was reviewed during opening week with site staff and changes were made based on their input. New site staff were paired with experienced staff to discuss various administration best practices (SpEd and ELL options). Kindergarten students took a screener (a 45-item test) with no student profile being produced. REA developed the suggested administration window to avoid overlapping grade testing processes. Testing practice materials were translated into Hmong, Karen and Somali by the SPPS Translations Department. (Spanish was available through Riverside.)

TDAS proposed using the latest test (CogAT7) which was approved by the Board in September, 2012. The benefits of using the latest test were that the ability profile provided teachers and parents recommended strategies to improve student performance, acknowledged multiple ways of learning and knowing of students, used local norms comparing SPPS students to each other rather than a national sample and students were identified in every school for accelerated services. The test consists of three batteries (verbal, quantitative and non-verbal) picture smart, math smart and spatial reasoning smart. Experts from various areas in education were utilized to create an assessment that is as culturally fair as possible.

Staff reviewed SPPS identification process using the CogAT7. Pathways to identification for accelerated services include district norms (the top 10% in each battery district-wide, building and community norms (the top 10% identified for each school) along with a portfolio review process. The Kindergarten screener required use of the overall score rather than the discrete batteries. Specific Kindergarten and Grade 2 data for 2013 and multi-year result data was provided along with charts showing the relative rates of change. The 2013 portfolio review identified 64 students (7 were non-public) out of 183 portfolios reviewed.

Future steps will include:

- Seeking stakeholder engagement in further development of systems and practices for TDAS
- Support for alignment of accelerated services district-wide to provide foundational offerings with fidelity to all students
- Engaging communities in the development of culturally relevant practices to enhance students' academic success
- Continuation of the use of multiple-measurements to illustrate and enhance student talents and gifts through the talent development model
- Expanding the technology scholars and student mentoring pilot programs to assist more students of color in their successful completion of advanced courses and
- Deepening Elementary and Middle schools opportunity pathways to increase student preparation for rigorous courses.

Areas for future consideration are:

- Finding a better balance between access to services across the system versus access at particular schools
- Review of the role of testing for identification including time spent on testing, value of Kindergarten testing, culture around eligibility for specialized services and the multi-year impact of CogAT on identification trends.
- Monitoring identification and implementation data through a racial equity lens and challenging systemic structures perpetuating inequities.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Is there a dollar amount tied to the Kindergarten testing? It is in the \$75,000 range for the total contract for each of 3 years. As an estimate, it would be about 30,000 as K and 2 have the largest populations.
- On portfolio review, is there a free and reduced lunch or race breakdown? Response: It will mirror other data, the most requests for portfolio review come from the non-free and reduced group. This is another equity piece.
- Are all 2nd graders tested? Response: Yes, all second graders not previously identified in Kindergarten or 1st grade.

- The question was raised about the value of testing at Kindergarten. Response: There is no research saying Kindergarten is a good place to test for giftedness.
- It was noted it is hard to measure talent and only 1% of the entire US population is gifted.
- It was further noted that this process is among the most inequitable thing done by SPPS. It should be about giving all kids the best education possible for them. This was indicated as an items for Ex Team discussion.

G. Standing Item: Policy Update – this will be provided to the Board in memo format.

H. Work Session

1. **Board Check-In**

- The Ex Team will look at timing for COB presentations/discussion. It will consider having two COB meetings in a month as needed or consider an earlier start time (4:00 p.m.)
- Board members were asked to respond to questions presented by the Equity staff.

2. **Board Listening Session Participation**

Board members worked out the assignment schedule for the three listening sessions.

3. **Superintendent Mid-Year Review Update**

Directors Carroll, Seeba and Hardy are working with the Superintendent on her 2014 goals relative to her evaluation. It was noted the mid-year renew would occur sometime in the July-August timeframe. Discussion occurred on the Board's understanding of what the evaluation should include.

4. **Racial Equity Training Follow-Up**

Board discussed a retreat with the Chiefs.

5. **Scheduling Board Representation at Graduation Ceremonies**

Board members indicated their preferences for participating in the various graduation and senior honor ceremonies.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Doran.
The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk