

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
January 15, 2013**

PRESENT: School Board: Ms. O'Connell, Mr. Brodrick, Ms. Street-Stewart, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Doran, Ms. Seeba and Mr. Hardy

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Jeff Lalla, Darlene Fry, Christine Osorio, Andrew Collins, Michael Baumann, Kathy Brown, Tim Caskey, Steve Hoffman, Julie Schultz-Brown, Willie Jett, Joe Munnich, Michelle Bierman, Steve Unowsky, Matt Mohs, Michelle Walker, Jackie Turner, Sharon Freeman, Ivar Nelson, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Liz Keenan, Marsha Baisch, Jean Ronnie, Marie Schrul, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Taejai Anderson Schmidt, Dan Mesick, Stacy Akyea, Sarah Johnson, Mary Yackley

Other: Jaime Santiago, Erin Nielsen, Jackie Hugo

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:28 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. 2012 Audit Report

The Controller stated the report of the FY 12 Financial Audit and the OMBA A-133 Audit has been prepared by the firm of Malloy, Montague, Karnowski, Radosevich & Company, P.A. (MMKR) who was retained by Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) to perform both audits.

The representatives from MMKR presented an overview of the audit process and timeframe.

He indicated they had audited under auditing standards generally accepted in the United States, *Government Auditing Standards* and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133. The audit covered the financial statements of governmental activities, each major fund and the aggregate remaining fund information of the District for the year ended June 30, 2012.

He went on to state, based on their audit for the year ended June 30, 2012; they have issued an unqualified opinion on the District's basic financial statements. They reported two deficiencies involving internal control over financial reporting that were considered material weaknesses:

- The District recorded a prior period adjustment as a result of reviewing its interpretation of the recognition of the property tax shift mandated by the Legislature. The District has addressed this.
- The District did not have controls in place to ensure timely reconciliation of the general ledger. The District, moving to quarterly reconciliations of appropriate accounts, has also addressed this.

The results of their testing disclosed no instances of noncompliance that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*. The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards was fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements.

The results of their tests noted one instance of noncompliance with requirements that could have a direct and material effect on major Federal programs relative to the eligibility

requirements for students attending non-public schools and receiving Title I benefits. This has been addressed.

They also reported one finding on their testing of the District's compliance with Minnesota laws and regulations in that two of 25 disbursements tested were not paid within the 35 days of the receipt of goods or services, or receipt of the invoice for goods or services, as required by State Statute. The District is addressing this issue.

He then reviewed briefly the three handouts provided to the Board, the Letter of General Findings, the Basic Financial Statements and Supplemental Information book and the Special Purpose Audit Reports and then moved on to a very brief review of the District Balance Sheet. He stated that overall the District's financial picture is very good with the general fund showing an increase due to operating efficiencies and living within the budget. Other funds are stable. Cash flow looks good with the District having gained \$80 million with the tax shift and there are expectations of not having to borrow in May of 2013.

Staff noted this is the second year in a row where no Time and Effort deficiencies were reported; the District is now at 100% compliance.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What is the severity of the deficiencies and do they require a change in how the work is done? What is being put into place? Response: The property tax shift is a one-time issue and the change has already been made. The timely reconciliation of the general ledger has been addressed with quarterly reconciliations having been put in place. The Title 1 eligibility of students in non-public schools is also being addressed with the Executive Director of Title I. The District controls the funds for services provided to non-public students. Timely payment within 35 days is also being addressed.
- How many students go to non-SPPS schools? Response: Public schools provide Title I funding for services to non-public schools. The funding is based on free and reduced lunches. There are approximately 500 across 15 non-public schools. It is a Federal mandate to fund these services to St. Paul area students who choose to attend non-public schools.
- Does the district get paid back for the services? Response: The services were provided to the students so in essence this is an obligation on the District to meet their needs. SPPS is not paying non-public schools with funds; they are providing services to the students and are reimbursed for these services.
- Claims and disbursements not within 35 days. Response: This was due to a sample of summer expenditures. The District is implementing a method for tracking claims coming close to 35 days.
- What about prior year audit findings? Response: SPPS is in compliance with all of these.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the 2012 Audit Report as presented. Ms. Street-Stewart seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

B. Second Budget Revision 2012-13

The Chief Budget Analyst indicated this is the first revision for the 2012-13 school year. There were no changes in enrollments so no adjustment was required earlier in the year when the first report is usually provided. The adjustments for this revision affect only the general fund (re-appropriation of funds), the general fund fully financed, and the community service fund fully financed.

The fund balance re-appropriation totaled \$19,545,678 applied as follows:

- Encumbrances (open POs from FY 12) \$6,741,614
- Professional Growth (contractual carryover) \$239,839
- Sites Carryover (balance of non-salary items in schools only) \$864,225

- Assigned Fund Balance (additional fund balance) \$11,700,000.

The \$11,700,000 assigned fund balance has been allocated out to the SSSC Plan, Security and Media Center.

The unassigned fund balance after the re-appropriation stands at \$34,761,554 to the total FY 13 General Fund Budget or 6.1%; 1.1% above the 5% required by the Board.

The revisions to the Fully Financed (grants) General Fund was \$15,400,890 and to the Community Service Fully Financed Fund \$2,944,447. Of this increase, \$17.5 million is new and revised budget allocation. The remaining \$.8 million is carryover from previous year.

The adopted revenue budget (all funds) was \$646,870,535. With the adjustments of \$18,345,337, the revised revenue budget is \$665,215,872. The expenditures budget was originally \$655,776,385. With revisions of \$37,891,015 (includes the re-appropriation figure) the expenditures budget stands at \$693,667,400.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- With the site-based carryovers a high percent of funds are expensed in the year allocated. Does administration watch to see if any particular schools routinely carryover high amounts? Response: Yes
- In the \$7.5 million allotted to the SSSC Plan, what are some of the things included in this? Response: PeopleSoft implementation, increase to the substitute budget, the added costs for the 7th period, the middle school transition are some.
- With the Fund Balance – why is having a higher fund balance not a good thing? Why shouldn't it be above the defined minimum? Response: Fund balance is always a challenge. With the fund balance policy of not going below 5%, utilization of any funds above that amount (or utilization below the 5%) requires a very deliberate decision on the part of the Board and administration. Standard & Poors and Moody's see going below a defined fund balance number, as a negative and it will more than likely impact a district's rating. The financial strength of an organization is based on its strategic plan and strategic objectives. Generally, a higher fund balance, within reason, is viewed as an indicator of strength. The fund balance is a statement of the financial strength of an organization now and as it moves forward. SPPS being at 6.1 in a weak economy is in a good position.
- Why can't SPPS use the SSSC \$7.5 million or the excess fund balance now to reduce class size? Response: The \$7.5 million is one time only money needed to accomplish aspects of the SSSC Strategic Plan. (Buy additional materials for some schools, reopen some buildings, hire personnel ahead of program start, middle school transitions (teachers and students), writing curriculum for Hmong and Chinese programs, etc.) Administration is being very careful how these dollars are spent. If you recall, we did study class size reduction relative to the additional referendum dollars and that study showed it would only impact class size by one or two students at best. It would not result in a significant class size reduction. The same holds true here as well.
- What about using the 6.1 for expanding programs to draw in additional students. Response: The Quarterly Financial Report will be presented in February; administration will have a better idea of where the fund balance is at that time. That would be a better time to consider whether to schedule a discussion on this at an appropriate time.
- The comment was made there needs to be a Board supported commitment when projections are different from reality. Protocols are in place to address these things under the SSSC Strategic Plan. Administration is following the Board's approved plan aligning with the SSSC plan and the budget approval process commitments. The Board and District have been intentional about addressing priorities and keeping within the plan and budget. The Board should be thinking about its priorities for the future and thinking about what those might be.
- Administration stated it was tracking class sizes in depth throughout the district so it is being addressed. The District has actually achieved its promised levels one year ahead of time.

- Technology to keep in touch with the schools and the \$3+ million being applied to security, how will that be used? Response: The major component would be an upgrade to alarm systems across district to provide secured access, notification and enhance the ability to respond. It will include a move from analog to digital technology that is much more responsive and reliable. Administration thinks it is prudent to do this sooner rather than later.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the second budget revision for 2012-13 as presented. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

C. Common Core Implementation

The Executive Director of CIPD and the PreK-12 Literacy Program Manager stated Minnesota has adopted only the Reading Common Core Standards, not the math. CGCS has used SPPS as one of five districts to implement common core which brings with it high expectations for teachers and students. SPPS has been very deliberate in how it aligns goals so administration and the union can work in concert for the benefit of the students.

The Executive Director of CIPD stated the purpose of the presentation was to highlight efforts to support implementation, instruction and assessment of Minnesota Common Core English Language Arts (ELA) standards. Minnesota is a pioneer in common core. ELA includes reading, writing, speaking and listening and has alignment across other content areas. Kentucky is the only other state implementing and assessing common core. Minnesota and Utah are the only states doing on their own in assessments for common core.

The Common Core Standards are fewer, clearer and much more stringent.

A Gates grant allowed SPPS to begin work on common core. A gap analysis was done in SY 11-12. In the area of curriculum, teachers completed a K-12 analysis. The K-6 analysis found strong alignment in reading and a need to focus on Writer's Workshop units. 7-12 indicated the need to move from a genre-based framework to a standards-based framework. In instruction, Pre-K-12 literacy is now working toward a common goal and message, that standards and student data drive instruction. In professional development, over 200 teachers analyzed, revised, created and field-tested district curriculum and assessments. Over 60% of ELA teachers 7-12 had a hand in creating and/or piloting the new curricular framework.

Samples of the Writer's Workshop Units and Multimedia Projects offerings were reviewed. Information on Teacher Wikis was provided.

In SY, 12-13 K-6 there are 56 revised and new Writing Units of Study, on-demand pre- and post-assessments, rubrics and self-assessment checklists for students for every unit of study. Digital Media Presentations, projects and speeches for each grade level are available and an elementary literacy Wiki is available to teachers.

In 7-12, a curricular framework has been established. ELA common text studies and summative assessments 7-12 are in place, reading is aligned to ELA or content areas 7-12 and there is a secondary Literacy Wiki for teachers allowing them to collaborate within schools and across the district. The work in ongoing with assessment of what is working and what needs to be revisited.

The 2012-13 ELA instructional sequence and a draft of the Reading instructional sequence were provided and curricular supports were discussed.

Professional development has also been implemented Pre-K through 12 with 59 PD sessions, 10 on-line courses. 5,056 participants have logged 233 hours of PD work with 94% of the PD sessions outside of class time.

An on-line sampler for preparation and practice has been provided for the new MCA-III test covering test preparation following the curricular framework and instructional sequence along with common language/expectations across content areas. Test practice includes an MCA-III One-Stop shop and MCA-III Resources Grades 3-10, a "world tour" and an MCA-III Moodle Module. All principals, APs/interns, literacy coaches and teachers have taken the on-line sampler.

Outreach to families, tutors and community partners include a website and Parent Guides K-6. Presentations have been made to the following partners:

- Sprockets – over 20 community partners
- West Metro Curriculum Directors
- The Council of Great City Schools task review for CCSS assessments
- Hamline University – *Literacy Symposia, Literacy & the Common Core*
- University of Minnesota – Minnesota Reading Academy Research Consortia
- Common Core: Building Capacity Through Professional Development and
- The Literacy Leadership Symposia: *Meeting the Challenges of the Common Core Instructional Shifts.*

Major accomplishments in this area include:

- Curriculum K-12 (56 Writers' Workshop Units of Study K-6 and Instructional Sequences 7-12 completed).
- Professional Development K-12 (59 sessions, 233 hours, 5,056 participants with 94% outside contract time).
- Assessment K-12 (78 Common Summative Assessments created)
- MCA-III (100% of principals, assistant principals, literacy coaches and teachers completed on-line test samplers and technology-enhanced item banks, test preparation and test practice resources completed for every grade level 3-10)

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The web site and materials for different grade levels are great but what outreach is there for parents with other languages, reduced means, etc.? Response: Some work has been done at the district level and more at site level. Parent Guides have been translated to support parents without English. Students are the best advertisers for this effort. They are accessing learning outside of school and share pieces at home. In school, there are literacy work presentations on the walls, literacy events and media center visits scheduled. Schools are also developing partnerships with St. Paul libraries. Family and Community Engagement are reworking the parent standards booklets with common core standards. Information is also being provided through the Parent Academy, DPAC and other advisory groups.
- Administration was asked to measure the extent of penetration and usage over time.
- The new school libraries, do they have resources other than paper books? Response: Schools are aware of new materials and are beginning to assist students in where to go to use materials for reference and study. There are a number of different projects and activities to move to electronic media. The District is working with other programs, such as Achieve 3000, to provide resources for students. Currently many different platforms are being used (I-pads, Kindles and various on-line licenses).
- Minnesota and Kentucky are the only states testing common core standards and Minnesota and Utah the only ones doing their own assessments. Response: Yes
- What is being done regarding media literacy and including works of other race/cultures, Is there assessment around summer learning loss? Response: The assessment part of Common Core is the MCA-III. MDE's approach to get at summer learning loss is analysis of growth. The MCA-III assessment is not a good resource to look at growth. SPPS is incorporating other assessments to get at growth.
- The Pre- and Post-assessment – can that be tied into something that addresses this? Response: The pre and post assessments are designed to look at units of students and where they were at the beginning and where they are at the end.
- Use of the web site, is there a way to measure use of website tools by schools? Such things as who is using it and how accessible is it. Response: Not sure if SPPS is

measuring web site use in great depth, Urban Planet does track number of visits on a school site basis. With the current system there are different computer access capabilities in schools so this needs to be addressed as an equity issue. Sequencing and digital presentations are put into the schedule with intentionality knowing resources in some schools will be scarce. The District is sensitive to seeing that digital projects are placed differently so they do not tax systems within schools. We need to find a way to track access outside of school time

- Partners – is SPPS collaborating with successful K-12 programs outside SPPS in what they are doing? Response: Yes, on a limited basis at this point. SPPS is working on the possibility of an institute for teachers to work with outstanding innovators in this area. SPPS is also looking at what is working with other places as well such as successful charter schools, etc. We are looking both externally and internally.
- Why is Minnesota going its own way and what are the implications for kids? Response: Part of it is the way common core initially rolled out. Minnesota chose to take a position that its math standards are better than the Common Core so that excluded Minnesota from participating in the consortiums. Being independent does allow Minnesota to assess the full spectrum of standards including those not common to other states.
- What are the consequences on 10th grade students relative to the reading assessment results? Response: Because MCA-III is a new assessment results must be assessed by MDE before they determine what proficiency standards will be. Finalization will not be complete until some time in August with results back after that. Students will not know if they are on track for graduation, soon enough so they will have to adjust their learning regimen to take this into account.

MOTION: Ms. Seeba moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Common Core Implementation report with thanks. Ms. O’Connell seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

D. Standing Item: Referendum Implementation Update -- SPPS Personalized Learning Through Technology

The Assistant Superintendent for Academic Innovation & Technology Integration offered a review of the timeline on the SPPS Personalized Learning Through Technology effort.

- 2010 – Technology Plan requested by Board
- 2011 – SPPS SSSC Plan approved in March. Student Learning & Engagement Through Technology Integration Plan presented to Board in November with the goal of increasing student access and participation toward equity
- 2012
 - January - Beginning of conversation about personalized learning with January 25 Visioning Day
 - January - Positions for District Academic Innovation & Technology Integration Specialists created.
 - February - Request for Proposal issued with Integrated Platform Requirements – three options considered: open source solution, off-the-shelf commercial solution and a customized solution.
 - March – RFP Committee convened
 - April – RFP Committee reviews top three vendors, confirms final two vendors for deeper review
 - May – Full day participatory, hands-on, live demonstrations from final two vendors involving students, teachers, building administrators, district personnel
 - July – Board approves Referendum Request
 - November – General Election and voter approval of SPPS Referendum Request with levy increase
 - December – Community Advisory Committee and Action Team applications posted; position of Assistant Superintendent for Academic Innovation & Technology Integration approved; Positions posted for District Digital Media Specialists & District Academic Innovation & Technology Integration Specialists.

- 2013 – Personalized Learning Through Technology Integration Update provided to Committee of the Board – January 15

She stated the RFP Committee has recommended the Superintendent proceed with a Consent Agenda Item to the January Board meeting requesting SPPS enter into a contract with Dell to provide a Teaching and Learning Platform as per SPPS RFP A152353-K.

The Teaching & Learning Platform is a web site. Behind the web site are computer resources, both hardware and software, that are dedicated to and directly support the mission of the District. This includes:

- Application Licensing and Support for the 45,000 SPPS user community
- Integration with SPPS Systems
- System training and professional learning
- Integration of Digital Content
- Optimized for computers, tablets, smart phones

The investment will be rolled out over a five-year period.

The Platform is a collaborative and secure environment that supports students with anytime, anywhere access to learning opportunities. It provides teachers with effective ways to develop share and use innovative and personalized course materials and track student progress. It provides greater engagement with families and community to support student success. For teachers it will:

- Provide access to high quality curriculum content that matches their students' needs and styles
- Allow connection with individual students
- Allow quick review of student progress
- Allow monitoring of student collaborative groups
- Provide connection with peers and Personal Learning Communities

For students it will:

- Facilitate opportunities for new and blended learning environments
- Allow access to class materials and supplemental resources
- Provide connection with peers and collaborative groups
- Provide quick review of their individual progress
- Provide for participation in extra-curricular student groups
- Organize their academic life

For families it will:

- Allow continuous progress monitoring
- Provide access to class materials and supplemental resources to support their child
- Provide connection with teachers, administrators and school resources
- Provide access and information about community resources
- Allow active participation in their child's success.

The immediate next steps include approval of the contract to develop a digital learning platform, completion of hiring of digital media specialists and the planning and implementation of Visioning Day 2013. Additionally, Advisory Committee membership will be announced, applications for Action Team membership will continue to be sought with membership announced in mid-February.

This effort is all about students and achievement and the 2012 Referendum has made it possible.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The contract is for 200 days? Response: 185
- The comment was made it is important SPPS make sure teachers have time to be trained on the platform as it will transform learning. Also that SPPS needs to ensure it is

presented in such a way that teachers value it, they need to take ownership of teaching and learning assets.

- Can the Board be assured that Dell has settled its age discrimination lawsuit? Response: Administration is recommending Dell because it is the top vendor for the work that needs to be done. Administration is disappointed there is such a suit and it is being monitored. The whole purpose is to build the most successful teaching and learning platform for SPPS students and this is the best option to accomplish that.
- The Advisory Committee, what will be their work with the selected vendor? Response: Their focus will be on next steps at district level. The organization will bring forth design. The Steering Committee is internal. The Action Teams represent the end users and evaluators of the platform and drive the work. There should be little if any communication between Dell and the Action Teams.
- The comment was made there is currently some skepticism among staff and the individual was nervous that the first step is a purchase from vendors rather than looking at teacher buy-in and measurement of the needs of teachers and what they are looking for.
- Does SPPS have an analysis of its technology? Response: SPPS has inventoried all technology in buildings and does have a detailed audit/analysis of building capacity. Network capacity is monitored at all times. The analysis of SPPS IT capacity, has been comprehensive as to where the District is and what direction it needs to move in. SPPS needs the ability to provide technical support in a more comprehensive manner 24/7 365. The focus needs to be on instructional technology as the nexus of technology to learning in the district. Where SPPS is today has been guided by that analysis. The Referendum has given the District the chance to leap ahead. Work is underway and there is a great deal of synergy is for the next steps. Teachers are the 'buy-in' as they will be instrumental in developing, analyzing and using the product.
- The comment was made that if SPPS does not have the platform to build this upon the entire process will be in limbo.
- The comment was made that the District is and has been serious about technology for many years. The work has accelerated specifically in response to the meeting student needs. Approval of the platform begins the process to build the structure to bring it all together for the students.
- The comment was made that this should have been done sooner and the District needs to get started ASAP. It is urgent that this be moved forward as there is still a long process to get it to functionality.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education receive the update and bring the platform forward as a separate item recognizing it is a contract. After discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

Thanks were extended to administration for bringing the Board up-to-date on the process. Board members were instructed to e-mail specific questions to the Superintendent in a timely manner so they could be addressed prior to the January 22 Board meeting.

E. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. **Review of Policy 533.00 Wellness**

The Supervisor of Student Health & Wellness presented some background on the Wellness Policy. The original policy was established in response to the 2004 Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act that required all districts a wellness policy by SY 2006-07. SPPS established its policy in May 2006. The 2010 Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act necessitated the revisions being brought forward now as the Act expanded the scope of wellness policies.

There is a close link between health and academic success. Eating well and being physically active results in greater attention span, better concentration, better attendance, high energy levels and greater academic achievement. Discipline problems, anxiety, stress and tardiness results from lack of nutrition and activity.

Since the initial adoption of the Wellness Policy SPPS school meals have met Federal standards, nutrition education has expanded, guidelines have been established for food and beverages service during the school day, physical activity has been incorporated into the school day at most elementary schools, employee wellness opportunities have been offered to staff through Health Partners and all buildings have identified a “Wellness Champion.”

In revising, the Wellness Policy stakeholder input was obtained from school Wellness Champions, SPPS staff, parents/guardians, community partners, 11th and 12th grade students and the Superintendent’s Cabinet. They indicated they liked the format, the defined site and district wellness teams and they support healthy environments that do not restrict physical activity because of negative behavior or academic status and the use of non-food items as rewards. Stakeholders expressed concern that there is a need for stronger language to raise the bar related to health education, physical education and activity. Concern was also expressed about accountability and enforcement, implementation issues, the relative lack of addressing mental health needs, finding a way to communicate the wellness message to staff and parents and a concern that the employee wellness section might be weak.

The policy does need to be updated to reflect the changes in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. Also, because health promotion aligns with racial equity work due to the direct link between race and health disparities. Additionally, Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP) funding is available to support the work now in partnership with County Public Health.

The revised policy has simply rearranged items contained in the original policy for a clearer alignment into various areas. There has been no change in utilization of non-food items for rewards, exercise or physical activity not being used as a negative consequence for behavior, the healthy vending effort, wording around celebrations and fundraising.

Key points of change include:

- The outline using the CDC Coordinated School Health Model with nine categories
- Expansion of Site and District Wellness Teams to include more community partners and parents
- A move toward healthier options sold at concessions at extracurricular events
- Promotion of healthier practices for employees by partnering to provide incentives to sites and
- Removal of procedural details from policy to procedure.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- 7D – where did the language come from? Response: Both C & D are a result of discussions between district and external partners.
- It was suggested a cross reference be made to the Bullying Policy as a reflection of bullying which occurs relative to food allergies
- Consideration needs to be given on how to address food allergies in policy
- 2F & G is there a determining measure for these. Response: There is no change from current policy in either of these. They can be further defined at the procedural level.
- 3F – There are teachers providing food in the classroom for students coming back from lunch hungry. Why is this? Response: USDA required meal patterns reduced the amount of grain and protein offered in lunches. USDA has subsequently lifted that requirement temporarily. The USDA calorie limits are fine; however, students in middle school avoid fruits and vegetables so they do not fill up on what they could potentially have taken to eat.
- It was noted USDA has also loosened up their limitation on after school snacks for athletics.
- Students are not excluded from bringing their own food are they? Response: No.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hardy, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move Policy 533 – Wellness forward to the January 22 Board meeting for its first reading.

The motion passed.

F. Work Session

1. **Outside Committee Assignments & District Council Representation**

Board members reviewed their commitments, no changes were made. The Board Secretary was instructed to notify all groups of the 2013 representation.

2. **Reschedule of April 16 Board Meeting to April 23, 2013**

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education reschedule the April 16, 2013 Board meeting to Tuesday, April 23, 2013. Ms. Seeba seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

3. **Board Check-In**

A request was made that the Board re-evaluate the public comment period and look at other practices in other districts.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the meeting adjourn. Mr. Brodrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk