

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
March 5, 2013**

PRESENT: Board of Education: John Brodrick, Mary Doran, Jean O'Connell, Louise Seeba, Elona Street-Stewart, Anne Carroll (arrived 4:35), Keith Hardy (arrived 4:43)

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Elizabeth Keenan, Marsha Baisch, Matt Mohs, Michael Baumann, Ivar Nelson, Julie Schultz-Brown, Jackie Turner, Andrew Collins, Michelle Walker, Mary Gilbert, Christine Osorio, Donald Sysyn, Mary Yackley, Tim Caskey, Sharon Freeman, Joe Munnich, Steve Unowsky, Michelle Bierman, Darlene Fry, Willie Jett

Other: Mila Koumpalova, Tiffany Brooks, Selamawit Gebrewoldi

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. AGENDA

A. Legislative Proposals

The SPPS Legislative Liaison stated the February forecast shows the projected November shortfall of \$1.09 billion for the FY 14-15 biennium has shrunk to \$627 million (without inflation). This is due to revenues being up and spending reduced. The Federal sequester is expected to reduce job growth by no more than 5,000 jobs by the end of the year.

The February forecast balance of \$295 million for FY 12-13 automatically provides an additional \$290 million to repay the school and payment shift. This should be paid to schools beginning with the March 15 school aid payment.

She then provided a comparison between two pieces of legislation moving forward around Early Childhood Scholarship Legislation. Both are geared toward 3-4 year olds. One was the Governor's Budget Bill (SF 453/HF 530) and the second HF 1058 (Winkler)/SF 481 (Wiger), also referred to as the MinneMinds Bill. She outlined areas where modifications had been offered on the MinneMinds Bill to make it work better for SPPS.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education add the HF 1058/SF 481 (Early Childhood Scholarship) Legislation to this year's SPPS Legislative Agenda as one of SPPS's priorities. Mr. Hardy seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- How would this affect SPPS space availability projections? Is there a sense of confidence that the funding levels would remain the same? Response: The Governor's bill would probably be the "high water mark" for final proposals. There are efforts moving forward in the Legislature to put more money toward all day Kindergarten, Special Education, "the formula" so Early Childhood Scholarships are seen as competing with these.
- If this takes kids off the waiting list, will SPPS have the space to serve those kids who wish to participate in early ed? Response: A child must qualify as ELL, Special Ed. or be eligible for free and reduced lunch to qualify for the SPPS pre-K lottery. 1,100 kids

have currently been accepted as SPPS has space allocated for that number. If SPPS received the funding (scholarship funds) staff could be hired to support additional numbers; space is available at two sites for expansion of Pre-K.

- Would moving these Individuals who have to accepted scholarships off the waiting list be seen as preferential? Response: No, because of the qualification requirements in both SPPS and legislation.
- So there is space available if this should happen? Response: Yes, up to a limit.

Questions were then raised regarding the Stock Epinephrine Auto-injector Bill (HF 0688). Clarification was provided that this was an expansion on a current bill making it easier to stock EPI pens in schools for use by staff in various situations. The bill also contains immunity language protecting districts from liability. The bill's language is permissive allowing district's to decide if they wish to move in this direction or not. It was noted that under current policy SPPS does not oppose any bill that contains "permissive" language without a special action of the Board.

- How can this get before the SPPS Board at its next meeting to decide if SPPS can support this? Response: Refer it to the next COB for discussion.
- Are there instances of the Board taking an active stance or position on legislative items? Can Board do that? Response: Yes. Clarification was provided that SPPS does have an approved Legislative Agenda directing its Legislative Liaison on what to support. It was noted she does not have to oppose a permissive bill and can offer statements of interest relative to permissive legislation should it move forward.
- The question was raised whether the Board should move this to its Legislative Agenda at this point. Staff indicated it needed direction from the Board as to what the Board expects staff to do regarding this.
- It was noted that if the Board took no additional action this particular legislative item looks likely to continue to move forward through the process and, again, it does contain permissive language as stated earlier.

MOTION: Ms. Seeba made a motion that the Committee of the Board discuss the Stock EPI Bill at the next COB. Mr. Brodrick seconded the motion.

It was suggested that an option would be that the Board not take a position but that the Legislative Liaison note, to interested parties, that the Board is interested in implementation of this should the bill pass.

MOTION: Ms Seeba moved to amend her motion to state the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move support for the Stock EPI Bill to its Legislative Agenda. Mr. Brodrick seconded the amendment.

Reluctance was expressed regarding taking a position on this without extensive discussion and staff exploration of issue. Timing of the bill's progress through the legislative process relative to the Board's calendar was then discussed. Staff was asked if they would be able to gather sufficient information for the Board before the next board meeting so a decision could be made whether to support the bill in its current permissive structure or to add it to the SPPS Legislative Agenda. Staff indicated this could be done. Following extensive discussion on how support in its current form or adding it to the Legislative Agenda would affect the work of the Legislative Liaison and her other priorities, Director Seeba made a further amendment to her motion:

MOTION: Ms Seeba moved to amend her motion to state the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education support the Stock EPI Bill (HF 0688) with no further change relative to the SPPS Legislative Agenda. Ms. O'Connell seconded the motion.

The amended motion passed

B. SSSC Monitoring: Partnership VisionCard

The Chief Engagement Officer presented the Partnership VisionCard reporting out results in three major areas: building capacity, removing barriers and reaching out. The purpose of these three areas is to evaluate the effectiveness of District partnerships to ensure efficient and effective resource utilization, identify barriers that need to be addressed and prevented and to align all partnerships to accomplish SSSC goals.

The Task Force on Engagement provided a definition to direct the work in this area stating a partnership is a mutually beneficial relationship between SPPS and an external entity with the primary goal of improving learner success. Partnerships should align with SPPS goals; clearly articulate respective roles, responsibilities and resources of the school and external entity and ensure realistic timelines and expected outcomes.

There are four large categories of partnerships: 1) With students and families, 2) with the Community (including community-based agencies), 3) with philanthropic/business partners and 4) with the City, County and State government.

She then went on to review each of the measurement areas in the Partnership VisionCard.

1. **Building Capacity**

- Parent Academy Graduates – Vision is 2,736+. (10% of FRP-eligible lunch families). Fall 2011 was at 481 parents, Fall 2012 show 1,334 parents (Baseline) attending the Parent Academy program.
- Parent Academy Impact – Vision is 90% in two areas
 - a. Know how to help child prepare for MCA tests – Pre-academy was 44%, Post Academy shows 76% (Progress)
 - b. Understanding and able to navigate the public school system – 62% Pre-Academy, 83% Post Academy (Progress)
- On-time Kindergarten applications as a percent of total projected seats (not including Pre-K students continuing to K). Vision is 60%. 2012 showed 54%, 2013 56% (Progress)
- Competitive Grants – SSSC alignment as percent of all grant dollars received – Vision is 95%. 100% of grant dollars received were aligned to the SSSC Plan.

2. **Removing Barriers**

- A map showing the number of certified partners serving a given SSSC Area: A-23, B 35, C 49, D 19, E 42 and F 61. SPPS has implemented a Certified Partner of SPPS Program documenting and committing a certified partner to aligning their work with the SSSC Plan. The goal is to have all areas served equitably.
- Truancy and Neglect reflects the percent of students referred for attendance issues who improved attendance before they reach court petition. Vision is 80%. 1,135 students have been referred which is 72% or Baseline. There has been significant improvement in attendance for this group.
- Early Childhood & Family Education (ECFE) SY 2012-13 enrollment. Vision is no race/ethnic group more than 10 percentage points less than share of ECFE population compared to K-12.
 - o Caucasian – SPPS K-12 24% of population, ECFE 40%
 - o African American – SPPS K-12 30% of population, ECFE 20%
 - o Asian American – SPPS K-12 31% of population, ECFE 19%
 - o Latino – SPPS K-12 14% of population, ECFE 16%
 - o American Indian – SPPS K-12 2% of population, ECFE 3%
 - o Other/Multi-Racial is at 3%

3. **Reaching Out**

- Direct Contacts – Vision is 4,000/year. Results are at Vision with 4,144 contacts at 246 events.

- School Marketing – Vision is 100%. This represents schools implementing marketing and/or community outreach activities geared at increasing enrollment in 2012-13. Results are 61% (Baseline).
- Multimedia Connections
 - o Facebook
 - o Twitter
 - o E-Mail – 45% of SPPS families have provided their e-mail contact to SPPS (Vision is 85%)
 - o E-Newsletters – 35 staff editions (Vision is 35); 7 partner editions (Vision is 12)
 - o School Videos – Vision is 64 created for promoting/marketing individual schools. 34 have been created to date.
 - o School Website Redesign/Update – Vision is 64 updated. Results are 7 new and 30 under construction.
 - o District Page Views – 2, 514,485
 - o School Page Views – Approximately 7,600,000
 - o 1000 paid advertisements and PSAs have been created over the last year

Two parents, one from ECFE and one from the Parent Academy Program, presented their experiences of the programs and their value to the parent group.

The Superintendent acknowledged the work and effort put into community engagement by the Department of Family, Community and Partnership Engagement since the department was established. She thanked the parents for their willingness to share their experiences with the Board and staff.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Is there a comprehensive list of partners by area? Yes, it is on the website at partnerships.spps.org/search_alphabetical. It is available to the public and is updated regularly as new partners are added.
- The school websites, is the web master position centralized? Response: SPPS is aiming for standardizing the websites' look and content. District staff are available to assist and support school staff. Accountability has now been put in place to ensure schools keep websites current and the sites are monitored to track this.
- Parent Academy, the goal is to increase enrollment by 102% between 2012 and 2015, how is the program being marketed to single fathers? Response: There is a marketing strategy and an aggressive recruitment plan through the schools. If schools are not meeting their quota support is brought in to aid in the recruiting effort.
- What efforts are there to reach out to African American men? Response: Actually, there are quite a few male African American facilitators for the Parent Academy. SPPS keeps in touch with community organizations and makes vigorous efforts to bring Parent Academy graduates on as facilitators/recruiters.
- Truancy and neglect -- it is good to see SPPS working with partners and those partner's commitment to making themselves available for a broad network related to students especially to attendance. Is that part of their commitment? Response: If there is a need in a particular area such as attendance, SPPS seeks out partners that address that area as part of their on-going effort.
- The map on partnerships, is the purpose to look at equity across the District? It does not appear to reflect who is served, the number served or the relevance/alignment or if under-served populations are being served. Response: Yes, one of the goals was to provide equity and this map was developed to assist in showing that. If an area shows a particularly smaller number of supports, SPPS needs to seek out partnerships to work in those particular areas (such as A & D on the map). If a program serves kids in two areas, they show up in both areas. It is not just where the program is located but where it is serving.
- The map shows where the programs are not where the kids are that the program is serving. Does it reflect volume of programs and number served? Response: No, it does not. The Board indicated they would like to see volume and value and how it aligns with priorities represented on future cards.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the Partnership VisionCard with thanks. Mr. Hardy seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

C. FY 14 Budget Overview

The Deputy Superintendent Schools and Business Operations indicated this overview was to introduce the FY 14 budget schedule to the Board. He reviewed the key planning assumptions to be used in developing the budget:

- The SSSC Plan is first consideration in funding
- The budget is built on current law
- The Referendum Fund shows an additional \$9.0 million for PLTT
- The blended site-based and centralized funding method will be used again for schools in FY 14
- A table detailing the average salary and benefits will be provided for budget preparations
- The budget should maintain an unassigned fund balance of at least five percent of the general fund expenditures in accordance with BOE 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 2013-14 school year will be included in the Adopted Budget
- The budget for 2013-14 must be approved by the Board by June 30, 2013.

He then presented a chart showing the big picture projection of the FY 14 budget.

	FY 13 Adopted	FY Preliminary 14	Difference	% Change
Revenue	\$483.7	\$497.4	\$13.7	2.8%
Fund Balance	6.9	8.3*	1.4	20.2%
Expenditure	490.6	505.7	15.1	3.1%
Balance	0	0	0	

* Projected FY 14 unassigned fund balance will be at 7.9%.

Challenges ahead include refining school budgets and applying criteria from the SSSC Plan, a deeper look at Central Administration and Program budgets, finalizing transition funding relative to dual campuses, addressing sequestration when actual amounts are known and ensuring the SSSC promises are kept. .

He then reviewed the timeline for budget development.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Can you provide some information on the role of families, students and site based decision makers in the school-based budgeting process. Response: SPPS will continue with the assignment of flexibility for principals under baseline directives under the SSSC. The baseline flexibilities for principals will be defined and they can work with their community and constituency on the negotiable items within a budget.
- Can principals choose not to engage anyone in their schools in the process? Response: No, that is not what was said. The decision is, in the end, made by the principal.
- So, is there a process whereby families in the school have a chance to participate appropriately in the budgeting process? Response: Administration will ask each principal to provide the information on how they will engage their school and community in the process.
- With the new placement system, will schools know numbers sooner so they will have them to work with in the budgeting process? Response: Yes, they will have enrollment numbers prior to receipt of the budget. In the past, the budget process was tied to the SCIP process. Since there is now a centralization of the budget process it has been

separated from the SCIP process which follows the budget but is not tied to the budget. There is still a formal sign-off process for SCIP. The budgeting process is not at the same level of process as in the past, some of the budget is assigned centrally and there is less flexibility in the process than previously.

- The budget supports the plan and it is aligned with the SSSC Plan and the SCIP.
- When will enrollment numbers be available relative to the budget and when will sequestration impact be included? Response: Enrollment numbers will be released through the Assistant Superintendents to the principals tomorrow. The principals will start figuring things in terms of enrollment numbers and their impact on the budget. On sequestration, there is still no clear guidance on the full impact. Each main area in Academics has been asked to come up with ideas on how to address impacts based on estimates that have been received of 5-6% effective 7/1. Right now sequestration estimates have not been vetted at the Federal level by the OMB or each program so SPPS can only work with estimates at this time.
- Is sequestration built into revenue numbers? Response: What is there are general percentages for planning. Administration is using these planning assumptions at this point to help to establish parameters and to look at where backstops might be implemented. The figures are for general fund only and are conservative.
- Concerns were noted on 1) Key planning assumptions – do not see budget being aligned to the racial equity focus 2) The proposed schedule with a presentation to the Board on April 2, spring break falls just before that date how will you accomplish this? A request was made that an explanation of why administration is aiming for the 7.9% fund balance. Response: 1) The racial equity work is in the SSSC plan which is the first consideration in the budget and it is one of three major initiatives. 2) Not all staff are gone over spring break so the work will be done. As to the 7.9%, it is not a goal; it was arrived at through various factors that show up in the budget. The goal is always to stay within the 5% defined by policy. The request was made again that administration provide an explanation of the 7.9%, actually the additional 2.9%..
- There is a concern nationwide around the impact of sequestration on the Titled programs and the need to maintain a quality level of delivery of educational services. One planning assumption should be to include more than one year in the planning. What are the targets SPPS holds onto to guide this? There has to be some sense of where the district is going and that certain things are being held to. There must be greater assumptions underlying the one-year budget process that guide and direct it. Can administration identify some of those priority targets that go out beyond one year? So much work is being done in alignment but the district still needs to know where it is going to be in two to three years down the line. Response: This brings forward the question of the next Strategic Plan. Underlying goals are that all students perform well and moving toward closing the achievement gap. Specifics will vary by year with more money going into a particular area depending upon circumstances/issues. The district looks at the need then allocates dollars.

D. Special Education Update

The purpose of the presentation was to update the Board on how the full implementation of the SSSC Plan affects Special Education students and to inform the Board of the on-going communication regarding the changes related to Federal Setting 3 programming. Staff acknowledged timing has been less than ideal in finalizing some program locations because of space utilization issues, student projections and competing needs for limited space resources. Communication has been ramped up significantly. As with a number of general education students, some special education (ed) students will move under full SSSC implementation.

Special Education is looking at ways to disrupt deep-rooted patterns within SPPS; it is at the forefront of SPPS's racial equity work as a district. A significant mind shift is necessary to ensure equity and excellence for all students. Administration is moving to transform special ed from a virtually parallel system sometimes seen as a visitor in the schools to a fully integrated support system for students where students with disabilities are included and welcomed.

SPPS is working to improve services by:

1. Strengthening co-teaching and providing the most appropriate supports for special ed. students, based upon their individual needs.
2. Replicating quality programming across the district and increasing expectations for all in special education and
3. Providing pathways for students with greater needs in order to build stronger relationships with families and assist in transitions.

Special Ed has aligned to SSSC by ensuring community schools have special education teachers and staff to provide resources for special ed students. Pathways have been established for the specialized programs by area. The goal is to make sure every community school is a strong school and that every special education program is a strong program within each area.

The mission of the Special Education Department is a commitment to reverse the trend of isolation and segregation of students with disabilities by ensuring all students have access to high quality instruction responsive to their needs and delivered by effective and culturally responsive educators in the general education classroom environment as much as possible.

The update then provides a look at data on the percent of Special Education Students by Racial Group compared to enrollment (2011-12); a Student Count by Primary Disability (2010-2012) and Primary Disability by Racial Group (2011-12).

The report then moved to the area of instructional settings. This refers to the extent to which student with disabilities receive special education services in classes or in schools with peers who do not have disabilities. There are four main types of instructional setting for students with disabilities in SPPS. As determined by the IEP Team, students ages 6-21 with disabilities receive instruction along with peers without disabilities for:

- 80% or more of the day (Setting 1)
- 41-79% of the day (Setting 2)
- 0-40% of the day (Setting 3)
- Separate educational facilities (Setting 4).

Data was provided showing instructional settings

- By grade level (2010-13) -- Students in Middle School and Senior High have a higher rate of placement in more restrictive settings (i.e., less than 80% of the school day in general education settings) than Elementary Students.
- Instructional settings by Race (2010-13) shows African-American students have a higher rate of placement in more restrictive settings than other racial/ethnic groups.
- By primary disability (2010-13) – Students with emotional behavior disorders and Autism Spectrum disorders have a higher rate of placement in more restrictive settings than students in other high incidence disability categories.
- Special Ed math assessment results compared to statewide (includes MCA, MCA-Modified and MTAS 2008-12). The math proficiency rate for SPPS special ed students has remained 10-15 percentage points below the statewide proficiency rate for the past five years. The gap has increased from 9 points in 2011 to 15 points in 2012.
- Special Ed reading assessment results compared to statewide (include MCA, MCA-Modified and MTAS 2008-12). The reading proficiency rate for SPPS special ed students has changed little over the past five years. There was a two-percentage point increase from 2010 to 2011 and little change from 2011 to 2012. The gap between SPPS and statewide reading proficiency has gradually increased over the past five years.

The percent of students in Setting 1 has decreased over the past three years for Middle School and Senior High students.

In Level III or specialized programs, SPPS has a total of 625 students (173 in ASD, 271 EBD and 181 in DCD). Data analysis showed that 40-50% of SPPS special ed students in specialized programs were being transported out of their area community zone to receive

their specialized services. As a result, SPPS developed a new system to bring learning closer to home and aligned it with the SSSC Plan. This will,

- In the area of Achievement Special Ed, teachers will have the same expectations for standards and alignment to general education curriculum; Principals will have the same expectations for standardized instruction for Special Ed teachers and programs and Special Ed students will have access to standardized curriculum and inclusion to better prepare for general education expectations.
- In the area of Alignment, Special ed students will have access to standardized curriculum to better prepare for general education; special ed students in specialized programs will have Area Pathways to transition from elementary to middle school and middle school to high school. All Area Pathways for specialized programs will have aligned curriculum.
- Under the goal of Sustainability Special Ed, programs will be sustained in each school's community and culture; Special Ed programs will have equitable expectations for staffing and support. Responsibility and understanding of the programs will be emphasized at the principal level.

Under the SSSC Plan, In the Fall of 2013 all elementary schools become K-5 sites. Sixth grade moves to middle school, strengthening student/teacher relationships. New Community School Zones ensure families have the best chance of getting into their community schools. Busing will be provided to schools within areas as well as to regional and district-wide magnets. Special Ed specialized programs are offered in each area with some district-wide programs.

SPPS serves over 38,000 students. Special Education serves 6,850 students. Alignment to the SSSC Plan in Special Ed will require some students to move locations: 150 elementary students (out of area) and 50-60 middle and high school (out of area). Students in specialized programs will be aligned to their community area specialized program. Students currently in 5th and 6th grade will go to their area middle school. Students in district-wide programs will continue to have that status. Some Special Ed student for next year will have exemptions, provided services are still available at the school (these are students entering grade 12, grade 8 and grade 5.)

What are the choices available? Students in resource programs, have the choice of any community school in their area with busing, following district guidelines. Students in specialized program are placed by special education in their community area or in a district-wide program.

Special ed students will have area pathways for specific programs (EBD, DCD and ASD specialized programs – Setting 3). Parents of these students in a specialized program (Setting 3) can apply to out-of-area specialized programs. Parents must apply directly to the Special Education Department. Students who are out-of-area are considered by the following priorities: 1) if there is room in the specialized program and 2) if there is room in the general education program. Parents agree to provide their own transportation. Charts showing the pathways available for specialized programs (III) in each area were provided.

A review of the communication plan was also provided listing dates on which parent communications or other events would occur.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- How does SPPS plan to reduce the 66% shown for African American identification. Response: It will be addressed through Multiple Tiers of Support (MTS) interventions and SPPS equity work and by providing support on the pre-referral side to a greater degree to avoid identification and placing them in Special Ed. Also a realignment of staffing to work in pre-referral process.
- Why do you say it is difficult to get out of special ed? Response: It takes an actual process of showing the individual is ready to be in the general ed population without the support of special ed. Students are re-assessed every three years for status. It also involves looking at interventions and IEPs to be sure who are supporting and how race plays into that.

- In the departments' equity work, staff does a monthly equity walk for elementary and middle or high school to look at what Special Ed looks like and what General Ed looks like; where are the gaps and at ways to improve them and if there are the same expectations for special ed as for general ed.
- The Board requested an update report from Special Ed in about six months to look at progress and what is or is not working.
- What is Special Ed aiming for beside equity across? What is normative for aims in addition to equity? Response: There are National averages and State averages. Additionally, making sure Special Ed is not over representing any population in any given category over the general population.
- What is the norm for general ed students? Response: The State average for special ed is 16%; SPPS is at 18%. The goal is to continue to go down. The goal is to serve all students well, despite the "label" with the same expectations as all students. Students need to be put back into the classrooms, to provide equal opportunities with support for both staff and students.
- Websites - special area for special ed – can a "virtual tour" of space be provided so parents in the special ed areas. It was suggested Google Maps be contacted for virtual mapping – perhaps as a pilot.
- How many people are in the Special Ed staff? Response: Staff is based on caseload but right now, it is approximately 1,200.

E. Standing Item: Referendum Implementation Update

The Implementation Advisory Committee is fully underway. Action teams have been identified and notified. Implementation of action teams will be staggered as the process rolls out.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Can recommendations for participation on committees still be made? Response: Yes, direct them to Dr. Wilcox-Harris.

F. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. **Policy 533.00 Wellness -- Review of Recommended Revisions**

Staff indicated they were recommending a motion be made to substitute the revised policy provided for the originally submitted policy revision. The other option is to amend individual pieces.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- There was discussion on language options regarding food allergies added to the policy and those discussed during the Policy Work group.
- There was discussion on EPI pens earlier, are they addressed in this policy? They are not being addressed in this policy. They are being addressed on a procedural level. EPI pens are already covered in the Medications Policy on a prescription basis under individual student health plans.
- Staff was directed to clarify language in 2i.
- Discussion occurred on taking up a separate food allergy policy. A motion (below was made). Discussion was held on the best way to address this issue. Director Carroll formally opposed the motion.

MOTION: Ms. Seeba moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education direct staff to look into a stand-alone policy on food allergies. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brodrick. The motion failed with a vote of 2 Yes 5 No.

- Staff provided an explanation of how allergies are currently handled in the district.
- Administration suggested procedures could be developed and/or brought forward addressing the intent of this conversation to align with the policy and to bring those to the Board at an upcoming COB for their review. Staff clarified there are already

many procedures addressing various health areas in existence. Board accepted the offer.

- Where are food restrictions (cultural/religious) addressed? Response: In 3c and 7e.

G. Work Session

1. **Board Check-In**

Board members, with the assistance of the Assistant Director-Equity, discussed areas they saw as individual areas of strength or challenge in their approach to the process or in the process itself and how to balance focuses of input, intent and impact.

2. **Board Agenda Flow**

Discussion was held on the structure of public comment. A study group was assigned to look at this area and come back with recommendations by the next COB meeting. Recognitions and Consent Agenda were referred to the next COB meeting.

2. **Communications Tools & Protocols**

Time was provided, following adjournment, for familiarizing Board members with their computers and use of Lotus Notes.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:	Ms. Street-Stewart moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Mr. Hardy.
----------------	---

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk