

MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
April 3, 2012

PRESENT: Board of Education: John Brodrick, Louise Seeba, Elona Street-Stewart, Jean O'Connell, Mary Doran, Anne Carroll

Keith Hardy (Arrived at 7:31 p.m.)

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Jackie Statum Allen, Sharon Freeman, Willie Jett, Ivar Nelson, Tim Caskey, Deborah Kozak, Matt Mohs, Andrew Collins, Traci Gauer, Denise Quinlan, Michelle Walker, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Julie Brown, Christine Osorio, Liz Keenan, Mary Gilbert, Efe Agbamu, Michael Baumann, Suzanne Kelly, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Jackie Turner

Other: Sue Snyder, Mila Koumpilova, Cheri Reese

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m.

I. AGENDA

A. Standing Item: Referendum Update

The Chief of Staff stated she was providing an update on the work of the Internal Referendum Committee adding that the external committee has not been officially formed at this point in the process. She indicated the Internal Committee was comprised of representatives from the Board, SPPS, the SPFT, the Principal's Union, central administration, Finance and Business, Community Education and Communications staff.

The committee is advisory to the Superintendent and the Board. Its purpose is to examine SPPS data, financials and community needs in order to recommend to the Superintendent, for Board approval, a data driven strategy for referendum renewal in conjunction with the November 6, 2012 general election.

The committee has met twice and has identified three additional meetings each with a specific purpose. The next (April 23) is to review and approve the final version of the survey questionnaire for the Springsted feasibility study to determine which way the Board might wish to go on the November referendum ballot question(s). On May 17, there will be a presentation of the survey results and on May 21, the final recommendation will be made to the Superintendent to be brought forward to the Board for review and approval.

The survey will be done by phone and will be a random sample of 600 likely voters. The annotated data file to mirror district demographics. The survey will provide the Board with data to assist in making a decision in July about what the final package should be. The goal of the survey is to learn about the community's educational priorities. It will help to find out the community's views on how SPPS spends its resources, their tax tolerance and if it would be feasible to increase the referendum for technology, on-line learning, expanded pre-K or class size. The survey offers a precise measure of likely voters' current perception of the referendum specifically and SPPS and education in general. Specifically it will help align the content of question(s) and the amount to be asked for (the what and the how).

The Board Vice Chair stated the timeline is tight so the survey needs to go out on time. The survey pool will be reflective of the SPPS community.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Is there a good working roster of external committee members from previous referendums? Response: Yes, there are several individuals from the previous group serving on the current internal committee. The Internal Committee will inform the work of the External Committee. The External Committee cannot involve SPPS staff. The Board Chair noted there is a very detailed report from the External Committee from the 2006 referendum but has not seen rosters from the two before that.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the referendum. Director Brodrick seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

B. Summer Session 2012 Preview

The Director of Alternative Learning Programs stated Summer School Session I would run from June 18 to July 10, starting one week earlier than in 2011. There will be six hours per day (96 membership hours). High school students could earn up to six quarter credits. GRAD re-testing in Reading and Math will occur from July 3-10. Enrichment activities for elementary and middle schools in STEM, Arts and Environmental areas will be offered as well.

Summer Session II will run for an additional three weeks (July 16-August 3). It will be exclusively for credit recovery and located at Gordon Parks High School. High school students could earn an additional six quarter credits. Online learning will be provided at AGAPE (1037 University). The GRAD writing re-test will occur on July 24 at Gordon Parks and Washington.

Program locations will include 17 regular ed sites (9 elementary and 8 secondary), 4 special ed sites and 6 Discovery Club sites. The selection was based on capacity and availability. Students will have access to media centers, computer labs and materials at all sites.

Special Education will have a five-week session running from June 18 to July 20 with four hours per day. This will be for students who have extended school year on their IEP and will accommodate ages 3-21.

Community Education will provide youth enrichment classes/camps before and after academic summer school. Adult and family programming will operate in the evening.

Additional opportunities will be provided in collaboration with the University of St Thomas (National Youth Sports Program (grades 6-8 and 9-12), World Cultures and ELL World Cultures (grades 1-5). The American Indian Magnet School and Belwin Nature Center will run a Native American Camp for grades 1-5. Rondo Education Center will offer Freedom School for grades K-6 and a summer learning program through the Children's Collaborative and Promise Neighborhood for grades 1-5.

Projected enrollment for 2012 is 13,500. In elementary, teachers refer students based on student assessment data and parental registration. Secondary (6-12) students have received a letter to attend based on 2011 MCA or being flagged by schools for credit recovery. All ELL students are invited to attend and Special Ed students attend if their IEP contains extended school year. All students receive confirmation postcards in May and in June a letter containing additional information on location and transportation.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- When do parents need to sign students up, what is the deadline? Response: April 13 is the deadline but students are accommodated after that, even into the first week of summer school.
- Site Leader – what is that? Is there a difference between Site Administrator and Site Leader? Response: The Administrative Leader is a licensed principal. Site Leaders are teachers on special assignment and work with classroom teachers to ensure curriculum is in place, enrollment confirmed, etc.; they work with the intimate details to keep the program running and work with site administrators.
- Are these cohort based? Response: Yes.
- As SPPS moves forward on SSSC alignment students will be associated with school location but stay with cohorts. Yes.
- Will all Special Ed kids have their IEPs sorted correctly? Response: When coordinating at special ed sites and according to IEPs the proper procedures are followed and coordinated with ALC.
- Will all kids who need it, because of their special needs/academic performance, etc. get to where they belong? Response: Staff looks at students, at their goals and progress on goals being met at specific times; also at how long it took them to get back to where they were prior to a break i.e., winter break. This is looked at twice, winter and spring break. There are two opportunities to assess where the student belongs.
- Notification, particularly for the secondary kids, is there a mechanism in place to identify students who need credits to graduate in June. Response: The deadline is 4/13 however many kids are behind from prior to the last quarter. Students are offered two opportunities to recoup the missing credits with the opportunity to graduate in August. Summer school provides them with a fresh start to regain their credits. Counselors are working with students on passing the MCA reading, writing and math test and encouraging them to go to summer school to make up those credits.
- Was there a program for students at St. Paul College last year? Response: The Current Pathways Academy is not a summer program. Last summer students were using the space as a way to connect them with college as a future possibility. SPPS is looking at different ways to embed students with a belief they can go to college.
- Are all ELL students being invited? Particularly those with a five year limitation? Are all kids who need this support being hit? Response: The first five years they are automatically on the list. If they have caught up, are no longer ELL and are at grade level they do not need to go. It can be either or both.
- What about the learning loss over the summer? Response: When students have been in ELL for five years generally their proficiency is quite high and if they are on track this should not be an issue. For students in the middle, SPPS takes cut scores high to be sure to pick up the “bubble” kids.
- On the other opportunities, how many kids are served through collaborative programs? Response: Approximately 500-600 students.
- What about the St. Paul Park and Recreation and community-based programs, do those collaborations still exist? Response: Many of these initiatives have been folded into the SPROCKETS network. The EMID partnerships bring together the urban and suburban children. There are three major efforts there: NYSP, Belwin and Rondo. SPPS is working with the Mayors office for a summer push programming launch for June 7, which is late, however enrollment for SPROCKETS offerings are available online right now. Between SPPS and the City and other efforts there are programs coordinated over a specific calendar that offer 12 weeks of learning opportunities.
- The Board, at its Listening Session, heard about a threat to the West Side Circulator – will that impact SPPS summer programs? Response: For Summer School, SPPS provides transportation to summer school students. It may be an issue to other summer opportunities.
- For parents who want to take advantage of schools, is SPPS posting information at community locations (grocery stores, beauty parlors, etc)? Response: There are posters in the schools and SPPS has done flyers in coffee shops for recruitment of teachers. Materials have also been sent to libraries. At elementary and middle school,

information is provided at parent teacher conferences. Some of this has been provided to churches and community gathering spots as well. There is a Special Ed Parent Resource Fair on April 19 that will showcase summer school and summer activity opportunities for children with special needs.

- It was noted materials on summer school are handed to parents of eligible students by teachers at parent-teacher conferences.

MOTION: Ms. Seeba moved the Committee of the Board Recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the Summer Session 2012. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

Motion passed

C. SPPS Budget Update

The Superintendent indicated for the first time in over a decade Saint Paul Public Schools begins the budget cycle with a positive balance. The FY 2013 budget focuses on funding year two of SSSC strategic plan and features:

- More money in schools than has ever been placed there before – approximately \$16.0 million more than last year will go directly to schools.
- An estimated net increase in school staff. This reverses the trend of deep cuts and contentious choices.
- A projection of an Average Class size within range of the SSSC plan. SPPS is committed to continued work toward lowering this average to benefit students, staff, and families.
- With this budget plan, SPPS will be able to have science in all our elementary schools. This important capability will significantly enhance the educational experience of elementary students.
- SPPS has funded an ambitious Embedded Professional Development (PD) effort at most sites across the District. It wants to grow this capacity and capability as it moves forward with implementation of SSSC.

She stated this is an innovative, well focused, and ambitious budget plan that brings together the many parts of the Districts SSSC Strategic plan in a way that allows leaders and staff to succeed with implementation in year two.

The Deputy of Schools and Business Operations reviewed the key planning assumptions in building the 2013 budget “Funding SSSC – Year 2”:

- The SSSC Plan is the first consideration in funding
- The funding plan seeks to avoid taking money back from schools during the school year
- The budget is built on current laws, and
- The blended site-based and centralized funding method will be used again for schools in FY 13.

The goal is to look at the long-term funding success of core functions (teaching and learning) and guide decisions based upon what is known to deliver results for students.

The FY 2013 budget will allocate \$4,656,572 to central administration; \$85,963,817 to district-wide support; \$161,553,566 to school service support and \$237,217,478 to the schools. This is \$16 million more than allocated to schools last year. The total increase of this budget over FY 2012 is \$27,270,638. After facing 12 years of coming into the budget process facing shortfalls, SPPS is this year starting with a \$6.2 million positive balance. Things that have contributed to this include:

- The decision to orient to the full and on-going implementation of the SSSC Plan.
- Difficult financial decisions made by the Board with Administration
- Systemic changes in methods of operations for efficiencies and cost controls
- A fiscally responsible use of resources, including maintaining the SPPS bond rating through the economic downturn

- An increase in student enrollment
- Increased revenues, including – literacy aid, enrollment, basic formula, fund balance, compensatory education, OPEB levy and other things.

Key features of the 2013 budget plan are:

- Living within existing means (literally projecting means through the life of the plan, prioritizing funding in accordance with the SSSC Plan and allocation of funds to succeed.)
- Prioritization of funding (shifting funds within district budgets to effectively resource the SSSC Plan)
- Differentiation of funding (base funding on the requirements of the plan and not on status-quo process and procedure)
- Tracking and Reporting (utilization of detailed tracking and reporting programs to calibrate (quarterly) the financial effectiveness of the plan with recommendations for adjustments as required.

He then went on to outline the budget direction and impacts:

- FY 13 budget focuses foremost on funding to implement SSSC
- Allocates additional money to schools
- Provides for a net increase in school staff
- Embeds Professional Development
- Enhances staffing in certain areas and
- Allows for some additional money for SSSC initiatives.

He went on to review staffing allocations/methodology, class size ranges, staffing ratios, non-salary allocations to all sites and flexible options for elementary and secondary sites.

The Executive Director of PreK-12 CIPD stated professional development has \$6.4 million committed at selected sites. This provides time within the school day for structured professional development for teachers in professional learning communities at all elementary and selected secondary sites.

The Executive Director for Funded Programs outlined Title I use in SY 2012-13. He indicated there would be a greater alignment with SSSC, greater emphasis on focus and fidelity in line with the intent of Title I funding. Efforts are being made to minimize adjustments from the expected impact from the MN NCLB waiver through overall program alignment. He noted some activities and positions previously approved would not be allowable going forward. There are three areas of emphasis for 2012-13:

- Parental involvement and family engagements (new minimal staffing requirements)
- Professional development and
- Interventions (instructional and behavioral)

The NCLB Waiver requires Focus and Priority schools to reserve 20% of Title I allocations for use in alignment with improvement plans. Family Engagement remains an area of great focus for Title I programming at MDE and any reauthorization of ESEA will only strengthen this. SPPS has strengthened its commitment to Family Engagement and Community Partnerships (FECP) under SSSC.

In coordination with the Office of Family Engagement and Community Partnerships, Title I will require a minimal staffing assignment for parental engagement activities. Schools must fund a minimum staff position based upon the level of Title I funding received in 2012-13. Staff will be required to attend all training offered by the Office of Family Engagement and Community Partnerships but report to the principal. Schools will work with FECP to ensure appropriate staffing. Additional funds may be reserved for transportation, food and materials associated with family engagement activities.

The area of interventions aligns on instructional and behavioral interventions. The instructional needs of students must be met prior to budgeting for PBIS. Instructional interventions will involve highly qualified teachers in key areas of Math and Reading for students not yet proficient along with all materials necessary for intervention. PBIS intervention positions allow for various classifications dependent upon program design and needs of students. These interventions must tie directly to the SCIP and action plan and the positions must clearly have primary responsibility for PBIS.

In the area of Professional Development (an "optional" activity for 12-13) schools may fund a coaching position, if supported by the needs assessment, the goals of the building and the action plan in the SCIP. Schools may fund particular activities (PLCs, specific training) if supported by the needs assessment, the goals of the building and the action plan in the SCIP and must balance with the instructional needs for students not yet proficient.

Major changes for Title I include:

- Positions no longer allowed (nurses, nursing assistants, counselors and social workers disconnected from PBIS, instructional EAs/TAs (allowable for Parent Engagement and PBIS), any clerical and "other" and specially licensed teachers.
- Central, Como and Highland High schools were added to Title I
- Parental Engagement minimum staffing requirement
- Title I intervention focus – instruction and PBIS

Program changes include:

- Programs moves and expansion
- Communications, Marketing and Development
- Achievement Plus Support
- Research, Evaluation and Assessment
- Student Placement
- Parent Academy Support

The Deputy of Schools and Business Operations then reviewed the timeline with final approval of the FY 13 budget required from the Board by June 30, 2012.

Questions/Discussion:

- Is there a requirement to follow funding sources? Can they be moved around if necessary? Response: To a limited extent. The last referendum defined specific areas of investment: Pre-K, all day Kindergarten and staffing levels for classroom. Integration has specific areas that need to be met as well. Additionally, there are audits of various areas on an on-going basis to assess financial compliance for all State and Federal monies.
- Class sizes –are these windows SPPS wants to stay within – if one child impacts class size, who authorizes additional classes? Response: There is consultation between the Placement Center, staff and the school to address this. Once the areas come into effect it will be easier to maintain class sizes because of access to specific defined schools. For the most part, the District's focus is to stay within these class size limits.
- Regarding the concerns people have regarding class sizes. What will the range be next year that will get to these class size ranges. Response: The connection is staffing ratios along with class size ranges that create a financial distribution. What is the chain when you start to get outside the windows? It is the Principal, the Assistant Principal along the Student Placement Center and the Assistant Superintendents when there are special condition situations. There are intangibles that will change from year to year and administration is set up to deal with those variations through a chain of responsibility.
- The narrow "special classes" will affect these ratios so SPPS needs to be precise in how this is addressed. Response: SPPS is trying to move the timeline up so it has numbers further in advance through registration so it can address exceptions when they arise. Staff has developed a focused real-time ability to look at class size in order to mitigate variations and exceptions.

- In looking at the chart, you cannot have a range and an average. This should be projected class size so it fits with the ranges as implied. It will vary depending on financial distribution, staffing and support. The numbers are the averages, the lower number is for the high poverty schools, and the higher number is for low poverty schools.
- Learning supports -- what are they? Response: The "learning supports" are options allowing flexibility by allowing Principals and Assistant Superintendents to support schools with various "other" positions (nurse, behavioral specialist, academic interventionist, etc.).
- High and low poverty schools, does this reflect the economic diversity within the schools as well? Assumptions are that high poverty schools need additional supports; is the assumption then that low poverty schools need less. Response: The differentiation high to low poverty was looked at in terms of staffing and with regard to the testing and the "at risk" factors. Then there is a test for reasonableness and differentiation between schools by their different situations. High poverty does receive additional resources from the State (compensatory education).
- Science – what will students experience with the additional science? Response: This provides a baseline of 100 minutes per week for each student. It is required that every school offer that with the program aligning with the MN State Science Standards.
- There are intervention staff assisting middle and high school students in order for them to reach proficiency; is the same intervention being done in the early ages to catch kids sooner? Response: Reading is being offered for students who are behind in middle school. Historically English Language Arts is taught in middle school, so additional interventions are provided to catch the students who are behind. For elementary there are intervention specialist who work with students who are behind to bring them to standard. Early interventions are crucial for students so eventually all students get to 7th grade prepared.
- PBIS how will that be supported leading to full implementation at all schools. Response: There are pieces of PBIS in all schools. Some schools are further along in the implementation process than others. Schools are being moved forward in phases according to need. The Superintendent stated administration needs to look at the return on investment for this program by going deeper into three years of data to evaluate the implementation success. The District is at year three in middle schools; high schools are in year two. SPPS has targeted PBIS in two ways: from the implementation side district-wide and from the direct service side. The core of school wide behavior plan is in effect in all of the schools.
- Professional Development in the Secondary area -- implementation at Como and Johnson. Isn't Harding already doing a seven period day? Yes and also Washington and Humboldt. There are only two (Highland and Central) that do not have seven period days. It was suggested all of the schools doing this be listed.
- The Title I positions no longer allowed, is that a Federal mandate or a District decision? Response: It is a District adjustment to get more closely in line with Federal law. With the SSSC plan, shifting back toward more standardization across sites it keeps in mind the overall goals of SSSC and original purpose of the law. The funding avenue for those positions comes from other funding streams.

MOTION: Director Doran moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the initial report on the FY 2013 budget. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

Motion passed

D. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. Policy 716.00 -- Advertising in the Schools

The Chief of Accountability, Planning and Policy gave a brief review of the proposed changes that had been submitted on this policy. She stated discussion in this is to clarify questions and issues related to this policy.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Vice Chair noted comments provided to her by Director Hardy that he could not approve/support hallways and lockers added to the policy. He also has concerns on distribution of revenue and the area of advertising on the buses. It was noted by administration that advertising on buses is not allowed.
- Director Carroll and Seeba indicated they definitely wanted hallways and locker included as those are areas that most directly impact students
- Director O'Connell indicated she did not want hallways and lockers included because of their potential as a revenue stream in certain cases.
- Some individuals were not in agreement with the Board looking at all contracts relating to advertising. Concern was expressed about the amount of time involved in having all advertising contracts come to board and the difficulty of implementing it all fairly.
- It was noted the buildings are there for students principally and advertising would commercialize the schools.
- It was suggested that under "Guidelines" in items 1 and 2, the "such as ..." be removed.
- It was also suggested that under Advertising without Specific Board Approval Item 2 be removed with the understanding that in some manner the Board review the process over the first year as it evolves.
- It was suggested the Policy Work Group resolve the issues and submit a proposed amendment for Board review prior to the April Board meeting.

The consensus of the Board was not to address the "revenue" statement in the policy.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education refer the policy back to the Policy Work Group to craft an amendment addressing the concerns discussed, provide it to Board members for review and then to bring it to the April Board meeting for consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

Motion passed

2. Policy 520.00 – Technology Usage & Safety

The Chief of Accountability, Planning and Policy stated this policy revision was prepared to include language required by the Children's Internet Protection Act, namely education for students about on-line safety and cyber bullying. These changes need to be in place before July 1, 2012 so that SPPS will continue to be eligible for the Federal e-Rate purchasing program.

A purpose statement, definitions and updated language throughout has been added to recognize current and future technology and terms.

The draft policy submitted to the Board was prepared by the Information Technology staff, with input and review from Communications, Marketing and Development, Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development, Accountability, Planning and Policy and the Office of the General Counsel. It also includes changes submitted by Board members, which were reviewed by the Policy Work Group.

Several suggested changes were not incorporated, primarily due to specific language that was required per the Assistant General Counsel. Administration recommends the policy be moved forward to the Board meeting of April 17 for its first reading.

The Director of Information Technology and a staff member provided background on the reasons behind the various changes made to the policy.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Under User Responsibility further information/clarification from Legal be obtained on 3(j) – phrase in such a way that appropriate use does not violate language in policy. It was again noted the Assistant General Counsel specified the language needed to be as written.
- When was notice on these changes received by SPPS? FCC provided the changes in August 2011; notice was received by SPPS at that time.
- A request was made for more references to cyber bullying and social media usage. Response: These issues are being addressed more fully in the Guidelines for Acceptable Use which will be developed once the policy is approved. Cyber bullying will also be addressed in greater depth in the “Rights and Responsibility Handbook.”
- Protection measures – what about violent materials, i.e. gaming violence? Response: The filtering language is directly from the Children’s Internet Safety Act and FCC directions for CIPA. Filtering dynamics are set up under rules from the vendor and are updated regularly. SPPS can monitor and adjust those at various levels. The vendor is utilizing filtering specific to K-12 venues.
- Add “Rights and Responsibility Handbook” to #4 at top of page 3.
- It was again requested that more language on cyber bullying be put in under User Responsibility.
- It is important not to duplicate other policies. It was suggested perhaps a reference be added to the effect that SPPS is committed to protecting students as covered in its Policies and Procedures as referenced at the bottom of the document.
- It was noted there is a need to educate adults as well as students. Response: The act only addresses students; however, the Guidelines documents, which are under development, will educate students, staff and others in uses and behaviors, etc. This also needs to be reinforced through HR.
- Is the “Limits of Liability language” adequate under #2? Response: It was taken from the existing adopted policy. It was suggested this should be looked at by Legal.
- Under Protection Measures (Item 2c-iii) -- this is vague and needs clarification. Response: Again, this is language from Legal. This touches on censorship – whose definition of what is appropriate? Can this be removed, revised, clarified?
- Can Legal provide clarification on some of the issues discussed?

MOTION: Ms Seeba moved the Committee of the Board Recommend the Board of Education move the proposed Policy 520.00 Technology Usage and Safety forward to the April 17, 2012 Board meeting for its first reading. The motion was seconded by Ms. Doran.

Motion passed.

It was suggested that notes from the Policy Work Group be provided to all Board members on how the group addressed various issues addressed on the policies reviewed.

E. Work Session

1. Board Budget Review/Justification

The Deputy of Schools and Business Operations briefly reviewed the FY 2013 Board budget with Board members. Board members made three specific requests for addition to the Board budget:

- Add to travel (conferences) adequate funds to cover the travel costs so each Board member can attend one major conference per year.
- Add sufficient funds to pay for Board food for each meeting and/or special event (food for Celebration of Excellence, etc.)
- Funds be added to cover costs of Board retreats.

2. BFAC/CEAC Process

- BFAC -- The Deputy of Schools and Business Operations recommended the BFAC group be utilized in the referendum process. He suggested they work to assist and

support securing the referendum for SPPS. They would be under the guidance of the Referendum Team with some support from Finance.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- o What would the timeline be? Response: It was suggested this start in August.
 - o The question was raised if this was soon enough. Perhaps it should start sooner because of the year's hiatus.
 - o It was stated this is similar to using some individuals from the DAT groups to do more engagement of stakeholders; the same kind of concept -- engagement in a clearly aligned manner.
 - o One suggestion was they be Involved with the needs of referendum staff as they shape the process and indirectly with the campaign
 - o A point was raised if there might be a legal question on use of BFAC for this purpose. There would need to be (1) a clearly define purpose and task shaped within the confines of law; (2) this would need to be vetted with the referendum team and with legal counsel.
 - o Would the groups name still be BFAC?
- CEAC -- The Deputy of Schools and Business Operations stated this group is a challenge because there is really nothing for them to address this year. All of the capital bonding funds are committed to requirements for the SSSC plan. \$11.5 million of the \$15 million are committed to SSSC requirements with the balance remaining committed to cover other already defined costs associated with the process.

He went on to state that some members of CEAC are concerned about the cost of the strategic plan. CEAC has requested the Board Chair attend their next scheduled meeting on April 11.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Are there other options? Response: No, the budget is set with no other options for this year.
- How is unshuttering buildings handled? Response: Unshuttering buildings is enrollment dependent and funds for this would come from alternative bonds and maintenance bonds if the process needs to be implemented.
- Has the group met yet? They have had one meeting so far this year.. Another considerations is that MDE is being slow in disbursing capital bond funding this year.
- Would there be something for CEAC to do in FY 14? Probably.
- It was suggested the group be temporarily suspended and that current members be asked to return when the committee is reconvened perhaps for the 13-14 cycle.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee be suspended until a date to be specified when their perspective would be needed for future capital bonding needs and that current members be offered the option to be seated when the committee resumes. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Connell.

Motion passed

3. Approval of Board Meeting Dates Balance of 2012 into 2013

The Board reviewed the proposed dates and requested that the Annual Meeting be moved to January 15, preceding the COB meeting. Staff was asked to clear this with Legal before acting on the change.

4. Update on Protest at The Heights.

The Superintendent provided an update on the protest that had occurred at The Heights on April 2nd.

5. **Check-In on Board Processes**

Due to the late hour, this item was deferred to another meeting.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn; seconded by Ms. Doran.
--

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk