

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
May 1, 2012**

PRESENT:

Board: Elona Street-Stewart, John Brodrick, Mary Doran, Jean O'Connell, Anne Carroll, Louise Seeba
Keith Hardy arrived at 4:56 p.m.

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Michael Baumann, Jackie Kelly, Tim Caskey, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Sharon Freeman, Julie Schultz-Brown, Joe Munnich, Jean Ronnie, Christine Osorio, Nancy Cameron, Andrew Collins, Willie Jett, Marie Schrul, Denise Quinlan, Lynn Gallandat, Mary Gilbert, Elizabeth Keenan, Darlene Fry, Jennifer Seehan

Other: Mila Koumpilova, Daarel Burnette

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Legislative Update

The SPPS Legislative Liaison presented an overview of the status of various pieces of education legislation which had been before the State legislature through April 30, 2012. She stated the Legislature had failed to meet its self-imposed deadline for adjournment, that most of the omnibus bills have been passed and many have been signed by the Governor. Many provisions with a potential impact on the district did not pass. These included: Referendum levy portion to Charter Schools, Mayoral control, A-F grading system, vouchers and expansion of Private School Tax Credit and mandated digital learning courses.

She provided an overview of various articles within the Omnibus K-12 Bill including:

- Transportation Technical Changes for Homeless Transportation
- Career and Technical Credit and Levy
- Early Graduation Scholarship and Military Service
- Commissioner's Reporting AP/IB and PSEO
- PSEO for Career and Technical
- Pay Differential for Reservists on Active Duty
- Early Childhood Scholarships
- Parent-Child Home Educator Program Grant
- Statewide Testing of GRAD Allowed for Students Failing Basic Skills Math Test
- Principal Evaluation
- Collaborative Charter District
- Proficiency and Growth Aid
- Teacher License Grace Period
- Care & Treatment (Special Ed)
- LIFO Conference Committee Report

Other bills which have been passed and forward to the Governor or are in the approval process include:

- School Bus Crossing Control Arm Requirements
- School Food Service Fund Equipment Purchase Approval Simplified
- Service Interruption for Adult Basic Education (ABE) Programs
- Social Worker and Drug & Alcohol Counselor Licensure Provisions

- Professional Development Repeal & CPR Mandate
- High School Transition Plan for Students to Successfully Pursue Postsecondary Education and Employment
- Absent Days – Child Care for High Schools Restored
- Part C Referral of Children with Substantial Cases of Maltreatment
- Autism Studies and Foster Placement
- Visible Child Work Group – Homeless Youth
- School District Pilot Project to Examine Joint Operations and Provide Innovative Delivery
- Digital Learning
- Settlement Agreements for Public Employees
- Omnibus Pension Bill
- Prevailing Wage

She noted the Legislative Audit Commission is to do a study on Special Education this year.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Career Technical, what is the impact on SPPS? Response: They will use the same formula with roughly the same proration so it will depend upon what all districts file.
- When does PSEO come into effect? Response: FY 13
- What are the implications for SPPS with the Early Childhood Scholarships and Parent-Child Home Educator Program Grant? Response: It is not clear right now how that will be implemented but more than likely less this year and more in future years.
- How is ALC handling interruption of service? Response: At this point everyone seems to be coping but ALC is also looking at alternative sites particularly on the East Side.
- With the autism study, will they look only at the Somali in Minnesota? Response: They will look at those in Minnesota and will in all likelihood also look for statistics from other areas of the country as well.
- If the tax bill freezes business property taxes, how will that affect residential property owners in St. Paul? Response: These are taxes that are collected at the State level. They are not co-mingled with local funding so there should be no impact.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Legislative Update as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion Passed

B. Quarterly Financial Report & Budget

1. Quarterly Financial Report

The Chief Budget Analyst presented the Quarterly Financial Report for the period ending March 21, 2012 focusing on changes since last reports with a view to seeing what the budget situation will be year end.

The General Fund showed a favorable revenue position to budget of .69% (\$3.2 million) and a favorable position in expenditures of 1.30% (\$6.2 million). Of the total fund balance as of March 21 (\$70.6 million), \$6.9 million is assigned to next year's operations. The unassigned fund balance as of 6/30/12 of \$26.7 million represents 5.1% of current year general fund expenditures which is within the limit of current Board policy.

He went on to review the Fully Financed General Fund (grants), the Food Service Fund, the Community Service Fund, the Fully Financed Community Service Fund, the Building Construction Fund and the Debt Service Fund. The decrease in the Debt Service Fund is primarily the result of restructured debt payments from the FY 2012 refundings which increase current debt service expense but reduce long-term debt service expense.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Restricted Operating and ALC funding explain the unfavorable budget variance in that? Response: It is a reduction in the fund balance, they started the year with a fund balance of \$1.9 million, they are going to use \$900,000 of that.
- Next year's operations, is that the \$6.9 million? Response: Yes, that is being brought forward for next year in order to start the year with a positive General Fund Balance.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Quarterly Financial Report as presented. Mr. Hardy seconded the motion.

Motion passed

2. Budget

The Chief Budget Analyst presented the Budget Book to the Board members and walked them through its contents. He noted two items are receiving extra attention because their potential impact on the District budget.

- SPPS's existing levy referendum, approved by voters in 2006, makes it possible to provide the pre-kindergarten program and all-day kindergarten with no charge to participating families. Because this referendum funding ends in 2013, SPPS will be asking voters to approve another levy referendum in November 2012.
- Integration Revenue – SPPS has relied on state integration dollars to support the district's new SSSC choice and grade articulation. This funding is also used to support all day kindergarten and intervention programs. Allocation of these funds to Minnesota's urban core is now at stake during the current legislative session.

He stated the Board must approve the budget before July 1, 2012. He then proceeded to walk Board members through the book. Pages 3-21 are the Executive Summary with an overview of each fund individually.

Page 4 SPPS At a Glance shows student enrollment as of October 1, 2011, this figure drives the funding from the State. The page also shows Student Demographics, the number of schools and programs, staff numbers by FTE and a Report on the Referendum. SPPS is continuing to honor its promise to the voters in using it according to the promises made. Charter schools receive the State aid portion of the referendum dollars. That number will continue to go up; as the property value (referendum market value) continues to go down the State aid share increases so the Charter schools will have a greater portion of the State aid funding.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Does that mean, from a property tax owner perspective, the money will come out of property taxes? Is State aid from a different pool of money or just how property taxes are allocated. Response: There are several different components outside of SPPS scope which are handled by the county. The correct statement is total taxes will collect less for the referendum portion.
- Explain when the current referendum start? Response. It was approved in November 2006. Money was first used in budget year 2007-08 (July, 2007). The referendum runs through June 30, 2013. The new referendum, if approved, will start to be used in July of 2013 (SY 13-14).

Page 5 shows the allocation of the total budget of \$655.8 million. It is allocated out to the seven funds as follows:

- \$490.6 to the General Fund
- \$45.8 to the General Fund Fully Financed
- \$24.9 to the Food Service Fund
- \$20.7 to the Community Service Fund
- \$2.9 to the Community Service Fund Fully Financed
- \$29.0 to Building Construction Fund, and

- \$41.9 to the Debt Service Fund

The General Fund is further allocated in four areas:

- \$237.2 (49%) in direct allocations to the schools
- \$163.0 (33%) to school service support
- \$85.6 (17%) to District-wide support and
- \$4.8 (1%) to Central Administration

The SPPS general fund budget in 2007 was \$476.5, the budget for 2013 is \$490.6 or a 2.96% increase from the start of the referendum.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The \$6.9 million, SPPS will spend more next year than last year, correct? Yes. How can the District be \$6.9 in black? What did the District do to achieve this position? Response: There have been additional fund balance gained through greater efficiency, systemic changes and reduction in budgets over the years, benefits from these have accumulated over the years. Most of the \$6.9 will be used to strengthen the SSSC plan and its implementation. Revenue increases are in a large part due to the levy, state increase in compensatory education funding (more students qualifying for free and reduced lunches) and enrollment increases.

Pages 8 through 21 show detailed explanation of each of the funds, explanations on the even pages, detailed numbers on the odd pages.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Will SPPS maintain the 5% fund balance? Response: Yes, it should stay slightly above the 5% threshold.
- What will the breakfast participation for next year be and how does SPPS identify the numbers of kids eligible for free and reduced lunch? Response: SPPS probably will not go beyond the 64% participation in Breakfast to Go (BTG). The increase was because all schools were added. Lunch participation is 78%. SPPS has done a good job getting information out on free and reduced meal applications. This year SPPS had significantly greater numbers of students qualify through various programs. SPPS is also seeing a significant increase in applications being made on line.
- What is the next exciting thing for next year in Nutrition Services? Response: The most exciting this is year is the collaboration with Family and Community Engagement. Through the various advisory groups families were asked what they wanted. The executives from the various advisory groups were given a tour of the Nutrition Center. They wanted more people to come through the Nutrition Center and learning about nutrition for families. Four tours will be provided next year.
- There is a lot of information made available on the menu page. How does that coordinate with the Communications Office? Is there an intentional plan for the use of that menu page as a critical communication page for the District? Response: Yes that is being looked at.
- Will there be a provision for nutritional information? Is exploration being done to find other ways to share menus, food information, nutrition concepts crossing cultures in a broader way? Response: Nutrition will learn a lot through collaboration with Family Engagement. Nutrition would certainly like to do more information sharing.
- What about the Health Partners initiative. Response: That was a good learning opportunity for the students to become aware of what they are eating by tracking it. It encouraged consumption of the right foods (fruit and veggies).
- What about the arrangements with Charter Schools? Response. SPPS has joint agreements with four Charter Schools. The schools have to be of a certain size to make the program a break even or better for Nutrition Services. SPPS provides the staff, food and cleaning. They provide the infrastructure and equipment. The participating schools have higher numbers of free and reduced students which makes the program economically viable.

- Will meals be provided for Summer school (breakfast and lunch)? Response: Yes, that is built into the budget.
- When BTG expanded to all schools, there were concerns, how is that working out? Response: The majority of the concerns were around allergies. Those have been addressed in a very proactive manner. Negative feedback is at a minimum.
- Adult Basic Education challenges include how to expand services, provide more opportunities for service, reducing backlog. What are the projections for reducing backlog and serving more people? Response: ABE is primarily served through the Hubbs Center which is often at capacity with a small waiting list. Staff has been working closely with principals on the East Side to expand program opportunities to reach a broader audience on the East Side. Staff hopes to be able to do this at the Community Service Center connected to Harding. ABE is holding its own right now despite the challenges posed by the light rail construction. ABE funding has a built in 2% revenue increase in the formula which remained in effect though it is a reduction from the former 3%. There has been a reduction on the Federal side which has always been about 1/8 of ABE's revenue.

In the Fully Funded Community Services Fund. The major changes are the ending of two grants: the 21st Century and the Project Early K.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- At the end of these grants, what are the implications for the people served? Response: The 21st Century Grant has been an incredible asset to the district allowing it to provide high quality youth enrichment paired with ALC programs. They are Federal funds from the Department of Education. They have a three year duration with the potential to be invited to reapply for two additional years. Cohort 3 is sunsetting, Cohort 4 continues and an application for Cohort 5 has just been submitted. Funds are reduced but the likelihood of receiving funds is good since the program has been successful but competition for these funds is always stiff. SPPS has applied for \$2.5 million to support all middle schools in the district with youth enrichment programming. In terms of the McKnight Pre-K Grant, the budget was put together with that which is known currently. There is a grant being submitted to McKnight to continue the Pre-K work to take it from Pre-K through 3rd grade. This is for two school only however.
- Are there other major sources of funds being applied for? Response: The 21st Century is the largest grant. In addition to that ABE has supplemental service grants for a particular group. ABE also has a number of small grants as well.

For the Building and Construction and Debt Service these are all of the projects approved by MDE prior to issuance of bonds.

Page 23 through 30 provide additional supplemental information and analysis of the General Fund. This includes components of the revenue stream along with a summary of the enrollment trends.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- THE ELL students, is this an actual drop in EL students or is it a drop in students who are defined EL by the State? Response: It is a drop in ELL ADM, the total number of hours serviced for eligible students. When EL students reach the five year point they fall out of eligibility. SPPS continues to provide the services but no revenue is provided by the State for this group.

Pages 32-43 outlines school funding/budgets including school staffing allocations with a summary per school, school funding allocations by major funding source including a per school summary. It was noted that high poverty schools (71% or higher) have lower class sizes intentionally. There has been an additional \$18.9 million allocated to the schools over last year's allocation. Since the budget is allocated on the premise money will not be taken back from the schools once the budget is established, a \$3.5 million contingency fund is held to allow for response to special situations that might arise.

Pages 44-46 provide an analysis of the changes to the General Fund programs from the adopted FY 12 budget to the proposed FY 13 budget.

Pages 49-51 outlines adjustments, reallocations and expansions in the proposed budget and the last four pages supply additional information in the form of an Appendix.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- How are schools fairing in the budget processes, has training been available, how are they adjusting to the changes? Response: Elementary principals are happy not to have had to cut any staff and with adding science specialists. Principals sat with the Assistant Superintendent, their staffing specialist and accountant and looked at every budget and signed off as a team on the budget. They looked at the needs of the school, through data. The focus was on reading by 3rd grade. The process allows staff to establish a relationship with their HR and Business staff counterpart allowing them all to understand what the needs are and become familiar with each other and for the accountant to fully understand changes. It is a very effective team process.
- Where are the Site Councils in the process? Response: Schools will be presenting the budget to staff and the school community.
- At the middle level it has been a similar process to the elementary process. It was kept in context of the SSSC plan with adjustment to secure staff in the light of future changes planned. The budgets provide staff an opportunity to meet for PLC work in math and reading for MCA testing and address state requirements in core content areas as well as electives. Few adjustments were necessary and support in reading, math and response to intervention continue to be offered.
- At the secondary level it was again a similar team process. Principals were appreciative of having collaboration and the new methods and processes. At high schools they concentrated on discussion of PLCs in common core areas.
- What about the alternative sites? Response: The process was the same. Administration is working to change the dynamic to a team-oriented process that creates synergy around what leaders need and what support is needed. The process leverages technology in order to share information quicker with core focus. The differentiation is providing District support to push concentration to the classrooms.
- There seems to be a great deal of commonality and integration in the process. What is the role of school stakeholders -- students, families and teams within the buildings? How is the District engaging/involving them? Per DAT recommendations, where are the school stakeholders in the budgeting process? Response: Allocations are sent to the schools and schools are asked to work with staff and their teams/stakeholders and come to a meeting with the Assistant Superintendents with their recommendations and needs. This year, with the DAT recommendations, the movement is for site-based groups to move toward supporting the school through enrollment efforts and volunteerism and moving away from involvement with the operational side, moving away from site-based decision-making. DPAC supports the DAT recommendations to work on enrollment and to rally around schools with volunteerism and to have less involvement in operations and budgets.
- A concern was expressed that the District make sure that when school-based stakeholders are engaged at a consultative level that there are authentic ways to engage families in making those decision about how their children are best served. Granted the new, more centralized control makes it easier for administration but schools should not abandon their community stakeholders and resources.
- How does this budget address recommendations from the DAT committees? Response: In Family Engagement partnerships are becoming more centrally concentrated. SPPS has about 1,200 partnerships. There will be a new model to streamline partners to provide structure, training and guidance as to what it means to be an SPPS partner. This will include accountability and evaluations to be sure the partnerships are providing real support in the areas which they are addressing.

- The Budget DAT team expressed very strong support for the formulaic approach with feedback and input from stakeholders.
- Another area was to relook at enrollment and strategies to increase enrollment particularly in the areas of retention at the transitional areas.
- In the timeline, what is not there is when the proposed budget will be presented to stakeholders. Are there plans to make a budget presentation to partners and stakeholders? Response: Typically, the Principal does that kind of presentation in the school for community, parents and close stakeholders.
- Concern was expressed about asking for input from the community and the community's response if SPPS fails to take their input. The budget is pretty far along for this type of input. It seems better just to have the Principals present the budget at each site.
- A major recommendation from the Site Governance DAT was to reshape site councils from a decision making entity to a stakeholder engagement entity. It would be important to define the parameters of the presentation, it needs to be shaped clearly so there is understanding about expectations/results. The Board and administration need to remember this is taxpayer money that runs the District. Concern was expressed that there does not seem to be any thought toward making SPPS stakeholders aware of the budget processes, criteria, expectations and results.
- Remember this is a referendum renewal year - there needs to be opportunity to allow stakeholders hear about the budget (volunteers, DAT members, stakeholders) they need to be allowed to weigh in.
- The suggestion was made to go to the PAC meetings to make a presentation to them, possibly to call back the DAT teams. This would be an opportunity to take what is planned and provide an opportunity to engage stakeholders in understanding the budget.
- Thought needs to be given to taking what is already planned and arranged and make sure that it is enhanced to continue to engage stakeholders.
- Add some community engagement to the timeline – schools may wish to make a budget presentation that is school specific to school communities. There are opportunities within established timelines/scheduled to accomplish this.
- For Special Education funding, how have some of the suggestions from the Special Ed audit been addressed in the budget? Response: SPPS did not have the audit results until they were finalizing the budget. The suspension and dismissal pieces will be used to develop a plan to offer an alternative to suspension. Professional development is required to enhance co-teaching and to get more special ed students into general ed classes.
- What about EBD over identification? This ties into the RTI initiative and the PBIS pieces. Staff is working to be more proactive in interventions. The over identification of students lies with general ed. It needs to be owned in general ed. There is a consultant working with SPPS to develop how to use data and how to develop a problem-solving approach using the data. Attendance, achievement and behavior data needs to be understood to address these issues in a tangible manner. The CGCS is assisting this effort with financial support.
- Where are Bridgeview and Focus Beyond located in the budget? Response: Their support comes from the special ed budget.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the presentation on the proposed budget. Mr. Brodrick seconded the motion.

Motion passed

C. SSSC Monitoring: Resources VisionCard

The Deputy of Schools and Business provided the report on both VisionCards.

Resources were measured in five key areas

1. Maintenance of a 3% Net Favorable Variance from Approved Budget for SY 10-11 -- Vision is <3%. This area is at vision being 2.7% below budget.

2. Maintenance of Fund Balance for SY 10-11 --Vision is >5%. The fund balance was 5.7% and has consistently be above 5% for a number of years. It was noted this has been accomplished during difficult financial times.
3. Time & Effort Certifications on Federal Grants for SY 10-11 - Vision is 100%. This is at vision of 100%. There are \$59.4 million in Federal grants to SPPS.
4. Percent of Market Share for SY 11-12 – SPPS students divided by all school age students in St. Paul. Vision level is:
 - K-12 >74.5% currently measure is 71.1% baseline
 - K-6 >76% current measure is 72% baseline
 - 7-12 >73% current measure is 70% baseline
5. % of Students Staying in SPPS – Vision is 88% (i.e. SY 2010-11 Pre-kindergarten enrolled in SY 11-12 Kindergarten)
 - PreK to K is at 82% (Concern)
 - 5th to 6th is at 86% (Progress)
 - 6th to 7th is at 82% (Concern)
 - 8th to 9th is at 85% (Baseline)

Information was provided on various “other” resources to enhance the knowledge of the numbers dealt with within the district.

- Staff: 5,777 regular employees. 27 Bargaining Units. 61 Principals with a combined 1,173 years of service. 3,193 teachers with a combined 39,381 years of service. 18 senior staff with a combined 174 years of service. \$17.5 million in average bi-weekly payroll paying an average of 6,858 employees per pay period.
- Buildings and Grounds: 71 buildings owned. 3 buildings with space leased by SPPS. 13 portables owned. 7,330,930 owned and leased square footage. 64 acres in parking lots. 274 acres in green space. 870 exterior doors (with a total of approximately 20,000 total doors).
- Energy & Sustainability: Savings in rebates for energy efficient retrofits & new construction since 2002: \$1,770,000+. Savings through recycling since 2007: \$830,000 (inorganic \$40,000; organic \$790,000). Since 2007 SPPS has recycled 3,900,000 lbs of paper, 500,000 lbs of plastic bottles, 1,900,000 lbs of cardboard, 400,000+ lbs of electronics and has salvaged over 10,000,000 lbs of scrap tin. Over 13,000 pieces of broken furniture have been repurposed with an estimated value of \$1,300,000_.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Are there comparisons with like organizations on the “other resources” areas? Response: This has not been done but might be possible with Minneapolis or with entities within the City.
- Are the non-transition years tracked? Response: The focus for the SSSC are the transition areas as they are the areas of major vulnerability and when post-secondary options come into play. The others could be done.
- PreK to K, not every school has Pre-K, so there must be some movement within the district itself. Can individuals be tracked? Response: Yes. It was noted that tracking allows the District to see results in measured manner.
- Some students are lost, some leave town, correct? Yes When looking at the numbers, was a significant portion students who moved? Response: Yes, that is correct. Retention is looked at as creating an environment in which students want to stay. There area a host of factors as to why students leave a district. SPPS doesn't want students leaving because the system is not the best option for them. SPPS wants to create the best system it can within Minnesota so students want to stay in its schools.
- What is the rationale for benchmark numbers, are there industry standards? Response: 3% or less is industry standard. A market share of 74.5% allows for 3 to 4% increase in market share and is an achievable number, a bold goal and communicated in the SSSC plan. 88% (October 1 to October 1) uses firm enrollment numbers. Grades 3 and 7 hit 88 or 89% so that is an achievable goal.
- Target is 88% because SPPS wants to report mobility accurately with real numbers, looking at other grades it reflects an ambient number across several grades.

- Statistically you want to know what numbers are not what you might want them to be – the District needs to know areas where there is difficulty so it can be accurately measured.
- What is being done to improve or track why and wherefore for kids who leave schools?
Response: SPPS is starting to track beginning small (pre-k) and moving upward.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the Resources VisionCard as presented. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

Motion passed

D. SSSC Monitoring: Operational Excellence VisionCard

This area is measured in seven areas. One area was removed from the original list of key areas but will be revisited when tracking is available. (Employee issues resolved in 90 days)

1. Teacher Retention – Annual – Vision is >90%. 2008-09 was 94%, 09-10 was 93.5% and 10-11 was 92.4% this is at vision level.
2. Information Technology Resolution within 24 hours (industry standard). Vision is >70%, 11-12 target is 60%. The actual measure was 68.4% (progress). This area has been improving steadily over the first three quarters.
3. Bus at School Within 5 Minutes of Scheduled Arrival – Vision is 97%; quarter 3 SY 11-12 is at 99% (vision). This is GPS system verified.
4. Students per Bus (average each day across all runs) – vision is >90 students. Results for 08-09 were 99, 09-10 96, 10-11 101 and 11-12 103 students (this DOES NOT mean 103 students on a bus)
5. Number of Runs per Bus – vision is 5.5 runs. Results for 08-09 was 5.3, 09-10 5.6, 10-11 5.4 and 11/12 6.3 at Vision.
6. Breakfast Participation – vision is >58%. 2008-09 results were 37%, 09-10 43%, 10-11 56% and 11-12 64% at Vision.
7. Lunch Participation – vision is 78%. Results were 2008-09 78%, 09-10 76%, 10-11 78%, 11-12 78% at Vision

Additional "other" data was provided for these seven areas as well:

1. Proficient teaching staff: 1,006 with Bachelor's degrees (31.5%), 2,114 with Master's degrees (66.2%), 28 Specialists (.9%) and 45 with Doctorate degrees (1.4%).
2. Information Technology: District supports 79 different applications. 403 servers are currently in operation. 5,948 VoIP telephones in service. 38,552 devices are supported on SPPS network.
3. Bus Numbers: 35,000+ students transported by school bus daily for a total of approximately 12,600,000 rides annually. 348 buses operated with 34,785 miles per day with over 6,000,000 miles traveled on district routes in 2011-12. 2,196 average routes trips per day (963 AM route trips, 959 PM route trips, 148 Noon route trips, 126 EDL route trips average on all per day)
4. Food Served YTD: Chicken drumstick 382,300. Chicken Breast Filet Sandwich 194,800. Hard Boiled Eggs 539,900. Bananas 506,500. Apples 516,600. Fresh Red Potatoes 25,300 lbs. Fresh Corn on the Cob 88,200.
5. Meals Served YTD: Breakfast 2,966,267. Lunch 3,640,704. After School Snacks 26,318 (2010-11), Summer Breakfasts 143,487 (2010-11). Summer Lunch 222,409 (2010-11) and FFVP Served to Students 1,313,616 YTD.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Teacher retention – how do you factor in things like retirements, funding restrictions, SSSC adjustments to set vision level? Response: Retirements are not calculated in this, retirement is a decision about moving on. These are terminations against a cohort group. If an employee is terminated it is counted as it is considered a loss. Any termination (for any reason other than retirement) is included in this number. This is common HR practice.
- Can principal retention be added? Response: Yes

- Information technology resolution is password reset at employee level? Response: No, SPPS is not a single sign on system.
- Breakfast participation, is it possible to track students who participate in breakfast against their test scores? Is it tracked by anyone? Response: That data is not currently matched. It could be done but there is currently not staff capacity to do it. It requires taking data from two separate systems so it is complex and time consuming. The purpose of course would be to tie nutrition to outcomes SPPS has the data but not the capacity to match the data in an automated way.
- Transportation measures arrival time, is pick up time being measured? Can targets be set matching scheduled pick up time? Response: Yes, that can be done. SPPS is moving in that direction.
- Is SPPS looking at duration of bus ride for kids, especially over time? Response: That can be measured.
- Is SPPS looking at reducing it or keeping it at a good level? Response: SPPS does not have a common operating picture across the district but it can look at it on an individual basis.
- What about keeping track of kids? Kids not being picked up, dropped off at the wrong location, etc. Is this being tracked? Response: This is not being tracked. Transportation and security are on that; when it happens many resources are employed and the issue is resolved in the quickest possible manner.
- Will there be changes in the items measured as transportation changes under SSSC? Response: Yes, this is not static, it is a dynamic process. Behavior issues will be tracked next year.

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the Operational Excellence VisionCard as presented. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

Motion passed

E. Standing Item: Referendum Update

The Board Chair indicated the survey questions have been finalized with the survey having started on April 30. Preliminary data should be available in mid-May. A recommendation will be made to the Superintendent and the Board on what the question(s) will be and what SPPS will move forward with.

An external committee will be formed soon. Melvin Carter will co-chair this with Ms. O'Connell. There is a list of community representatives who have shown support and a working team group will be selected from among that larger group. Names are being collected for various activities.

F. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. **Policy 520.00 Technology Usage and Safety** -- There were no questions to be addressed.
2. **Policy 816.00 Environmental Health and Safety**
The Administrator of Policy, Planning & Intergovernmental Relations provided a brief overview on the reasons for and purpose of the new policy. Districts were recently notified by MDE that they would be required to have a policy in place in order to receive Health and Safety Funding. This needs to be approved by July 17. MSBA is developing a sample policy which should be available within the next week.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move Policy 816.00 Environmental Health and Safety forward, as advised by the Policy Work Group, for its first reading at the May 15 Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Seeba.

Motion Passed.

3. Status Update on Policy 506.00 Student Discipline -- Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook

Staff indicated they were still working on refining the *Rights and Responsibilities Handbook* and were planning to have the Handbook available for review at the June COB.

The Superintendent indicated the Handbook would be produced in two formats, the full book for administration, staff and publication on-line and a streamlined version for distribution to students and families in order to make it more easily understood by them.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Handbook in its full format has been written for a different population with the primary focus of readability and understandability lacking from the student/family perspective. Some of the layers will be taken out to make it more understandable to students/families.
- The Handbook is punitive rather than proactive which is not the manner in which the District wants to present the issue of correct behavior.

Clarification was made that the Handbook does not require three readings but can be approved by the Board with one action.

The Board Chair asked how Board members wanted to approach the subject of a "bullying policy." It was suggested that all of the various policies related to student behavior be pulled together for review. Once the review is made, a conversation can then take place to decide if they are adequate to address the subject of bullying or if a policy directly addressing bullying needs to be added or if a different format for all of these related policies needs to be considered. The consensus was to review the various policies in existence on student behavior and then decide how to move forward.

G. Work Session

1. BFAC

It was agreed that the referendum would be the focus of BFAC for this year. Once the referendum question(s) are decided further discussion on BFAC process and direction can occur. It was suggested that the Budget DAT group be approached to participate on the committee.

2. Check-In on Board Processes

Discussion and observations were made on the internal processes of the COB meeting as to what was done well and what could be improved upon.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn. Ms. O'Connell seconded the motion.

Motion Passed.

The meeting adjourn at 9:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk