

**MEETING MINUTES  
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING  
June 12, 2012**

**PRESENT:**

Board of Education: Jean O'Connell, Elona Street-Stewart, Mary Doran, Anne Carroll, Louise Seeba, John Brodrick (arrived at 4:40 p.m.), Keith Hardy (arrived at 4:54 p.m.)

Staff: Joe Munnich, Matt Mohs, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Michael Baumann, Efe Agbamu, Sharon Freeman, Marsha Baisch, Denise Quinlan, Jackie Turner, Julie Schultz-Brown, Tim Caskey, Toya Downey, Jackie Allen, Ivar Nelson, Steve Hoffman, Darlene Fry

Other: Tim Harlow, Mila Koumplova, Veronica Pardo, Patricia Perez Jenkins, Luise Druz, Priscila Olvera, Martha Rodriguez, Helio Del La Torre, Farhiya Abdi, Erin Lappen, Lindan Vue, Heide Huelster, Kelley Nelson, Molly McAvoy, Paul Duncan, Felicia Widi, Angie Thornhill, Margaret Isom, Jean Zimmer, Leslie Gibb, Jeanne Zimmer

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:36 p.m.

**II. AGENDA**

**A. Bullying Prohibition Policy Review**

The Deputy Schools and Business Operations stated this item would provide information on the newly developed Bullying Prohibition policy.

The Policy, Planning & Intergovernmental Relations Administrator provided background information on the development process for this policy. He stated there is a compliance element as state law requires a policy addressing bullying with no further guidance as to content. SPPS has met this requirement through the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook in the past but the Board felt the District should have a definitive policy relative to bullying prohibition to amplify and clarify the issue to keep students safe. The draft is based on the MSBA model policy with modifications made by the SPPS Bullying Task Force.

The policy contains six sections: Purpose, Definitions, Prevention, Prohibition, Reporting, and Response. The policy does not stand-alone but is part of a broader strategy that includes several other policies addressing other aspects of harassment, violence and other offensive behavior. The definitions were derived from the "Stop Bullying.gov" site. The prevention element focuses on a positive behavior approach. Prohibition applies to all stakeholders but the policy is focused specifically toward students.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- A Board member noted there should be tighter cross-referencing to the Rights and Responsibility Handbook and other policies and indicated perhaps adding a

statement to the Purpose Section such as “as listed in the Cross References at the end of this policy”.

- The Board Chair noted it is Important to recognize the need for a Bullying Prohibition Policy and she expressed appreciation for the work done and the importance of putting the policy together to further protect children. She also noted the policy focuses on students; adults are covered under the Harassment Policy.
- Response seems to focus on prohibition and compliance, should there be a mention of support for individuals through counseling services, reconciliation efforts or recognition of the consequences of bullying. It was suggested it be recognized in all bullying situations there are two victim types – aggressor type and victim type.
- Hope was expressed that the policy version be revised with the comments made prior to publishing it in the Board Book for June 19.

Thanks from the Board were extended for all of the work done on developing this policy.

**MOTION: Ms. O’Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move the new Bullying Prohibition Policy forward to the June 19, 2012 Board meeting for its first reading. The motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

**The motion passed.**

**B. Report from the Latino Consent Decree**

The Chair of the Latino Consent Decree Parent Advisory Committee presented the report. She indicated the report is a status report on the 2010-11 administrative response to the last annual report and recommendations. The report relates to three major areas:

- Identification/Assessment/Placement
- Instructional Programs
- Parent Involvement

**1. Placement**

- a. Develop and implement comprehensive communication plan – LCD requested ELL conduct an analysis of the current protocol for informing Latino families regarding their children's eligibility for LCD services. This notification must take place within two weeks of enrollment. Schools without bilingual EAs receive assistance from the ELL Department and Office of Family and Community Engagement.
- b. Provide elementary and secondary EA's with data on LCD eligible students so they can follow-up with parents – A survey shows 88% of Latino parents never were contacted by any school personnel regarding the eligibility of their Latino students.
- c. Schools with no bilingual EAs must contact ELL Department & Office of Family Engagement for assistance/support – preliminary data supplied by schools does not match the nature of the recommendation. Schools are strongly encouraged to continue to make use of the resources. Few schools used this service during 2011-12.

**2. Instructional Program**

- a. Meet three times/year – During 2011-12 only two meetings took place, resulting in a disconnection between the purpose of the recommendation and the administrative response. Dates have been proposed to meet this

requirement for 2012-13. ELL has appointed a new staff person to work closely with the LCD Bilingual EAs.

b. Bilingual Content Support

- *Offer language specific session for LCD families in areas of Math, Social Studies, Science, Reading and Writing* – These should create a true parent engagement model. School should provide the LCD Advisory Committee and the district with access to the following information: names of schools that offered these sessions, topics covered and number of Latino parents who attended each session. A survey indicates that 71% of Latino parents never attended a language specific session. 25% of the schools did not offer any sessions.
- *Middle 6-8 and Secondary 9-12*
  - o Implement an effective communication system among parents, school counselors and LCD secondary EAs to inform parents of appropriate placement of their students – the information from schools is inconsistent with experience of LCD parents. The survey shows 62% of Latino parents were never contacted by school counselors or LCD Bilingual EAs about student placement. These practices need to be revised.
  - o Implement planning meetings in early fall to make Latino parents aware of the requirements and description of high school courses, advanced courses and programs – Data again shows gaps in implementation of this recommendation showing 42% of schools inform parents of requirements and course description during night events. This does not appear to be an effective practice. The survey indicates 68% of Latino parents neither attended nor had requirements explained at any night event.
  - o Train all school counselors on LCD Program; school counselors, as part of the LCD stipulation, need to coordinate with LCD staff the schedule of Latino student eligible for LCD – All k-12 school counselors were trained in November, 2011 by the ELL Department. LCD Advisory Committee recommends for 2012-13 LCD trained staff present at the Guidance Counselors' Meeting.
  - o Implement strategy for LCD secondary students to be guided to take advantage of advanced courses – Guidelines and strategies should encourage appropriate assessment that channels Latino students into classes that match their interests and educational abilities.
  - o Add a Spanish component (language specific) to the 2012 SPPS Thinking College Early Fair – Family Engagement provided interpreters for families in attendance.
- *Latino Culture*
  - o Implement multicultural school nights in every school – this is being complied with.
  - o Invite guest speakers into classroom & school events – Over 350 Latino students were served at school sites.
  - o Increase awareness of Hispanic Heritage Month and other celebrations – Best options will continue to be explored.
  - o Re-establish Latino Culture Studies courses at middle and secondary level – 32% of schools offer courses and 43% embed Latino culture in other courses.
- *Materials – Spanish Language Resources*
  - o Use various school events to inform LCD families of these materials – School data is inconsistent with response of LCD parents. The

survey of Latino parents indicated 77% were never informed of these resources. More effective communication needs to be devised.

- o Monitor use of these resources – There is a district-wide gap in monitoring the use of Spanish resources at school sites.
- o Communicate availability of new resources as they become available – Data shows minimal use of the resources among parents.

### 3. Parent Involvement

- *Recruitment of LCD Staff – Community Participation*
  - o Connect members of LCD Advisory Committee with HR Department – HR liaison assigned to LCD
  - o Hiring Committee -- HR will work closely with LCD Advisory Committee and HR liaison will screen for competent and capable candidates.
  - o Educate school administrators & PTOs in hiring process of LCD bilingual staff – HR will seek input from LCD as to what they would like to see in candidates.
  - o Continue collaboration with Latino-based organizations and programs – There has been a significant increase in this collaboration.
  - o Expand partnership with Dr. Carolyn Garcia – a texting project at Highland and Washington has been implemented under her auspices.

### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Thanks were extended for the honesty of the reporting by the committee.
- Thanks were also extended for following up on items submitted previously. Concern was expressed about the mental health issues affecting Latino students and families. What needs to be done to follow-up on this? Response: This goes to Recommendation 4.3 – middle & secondary counselors and their involvement with Latino students/families, there does not seem to be a good relationship. Communication also needs to be strengthened with the parents. This needs to be strengthened to help address this area.
- 4.2 – Use of Bilingual EAs, this seems it may make it difficult to have conversations with the people at the schools (counselors, teachers) who are in the best position to provide information on graduation and what each students need to do to get there. Concern was expressed that if these conversations do not happen detailed issues may not be addressed in order to benefit the students. EAs in this situation are not prepared to have those conversations; they are not trained for that. What has the committee considered in this regard? Response: This year's report focused on strategies addressed in past reports and those talked more about elementary schools. The concern now is secondary schools. Parents have found when students go into high school it is important parents be informed so a way needs to be found for parents and students to be informed about what the best options are. Parents are looking for options, how can they find out about options? Parents looking for ways the counselors can provide more time to explain to them what is best for their student and what their are options. The LCD will keep working on this. They state they have seen many things done but these have not been sufficient yet. As noted in the report on the survey parents were asked if hey knew about certain classes/programs and many had no idea. This is an area of focus for the LCD.
- 4.5 Thinking College Early Fair – it was suggested there could be opportunities for break out sessions that are culturally specific. It was also

suggested that prior to the beginning of the school year there might be opportunity for individual organized associations with the schools themselves to provide/share/identify ways to have a Spanish program. They could identify Spanish-speaking mentors, be sure some of their workshops are culture/language specific. Other areas might be the Honor Society; AVID students identify Spanish speaking culturally rich individuals as contacts to work with students and families.

- 1.1 – Please clarify, is the issue eligible families are not notified that their child is eligible or if students are not being identified as eligible or if families are being informed student are eligible and students are not receiving services or if they are receiving services and those are not helping? Response: The problem is they are not receiving information on what the services are, they know they have to go for something but they do not understand why. Parents need to know what resources are there for the students so they can then make informed decisions.
- 5.1 & 5.3 – If this were at 100%, what would you want to happen in Spanish Heritage month that is translated throughout the whole year to connect students to school and learning? Response: In reality, we know there are many schools that celebrate Spanish Heritage. The concern is because of the diversity of the culture that everyone has their moment. There has been the experience of only May 5 being celebrated. LCD would like to see children proud of Spanish poets, painters, to have more cultural exposure and know more about these people and where they came from to enhance the students' cultural knowledge and so they can be proud of the diversity of their culture and be more connected to their roots. To be proud to speak Spanish and English and be proud of the diversity of their heritage. It is important that they know Latin American history, not just Mexico, so a more general history of Latin America.
- .4 – These issues were carried over from last year was this an agreement from Administration or is it just a problem? Response: The Multicultural Resource Center Project to enrich the Spanish curriculum work with the Mexican consulate so all students have a diversity of studies for the schools – this is an ongoing project. They are trying to integrate student council recommendations about what they would like to learn as well.
- Dr Garcia – how can this continue to reach more students and families and provide extra expectations of what is provided to students at the youngest ages? What needs to be offered to younger students so they are better prepared for the transition to junior high? Response: This work is not finished; LCD is waiting for results from the project. Since this research is based on grant, funding it is beyond the control of the LCD. The project has deep impact but funding has limited the scope of the work. It is highlighting the gap in mental health for Latina girls.
- The question was asked if there could be a possibility for collaboration with the American Indian community on research work they are doing on suicide issues.
- The Superintendent stated SPPS has tried to collaborate with agencies who work with mental health issues and has accomplished some areas of cooperation with the City and the County to focus this work. Communities will have to work together to address this issue.
- 3.1 -- Reaching out to Spanish speaking families – as you look at this is it for the District to make it happen, would it be more helpful to offer sessions at different times of day or locations? How can this be implemented more successfully? Response: One barrier that prevents implement is where there are low Latino populations in a school. If there are fewer students in one or more schools, LCD would like to look at the possibility of combining

workshops by areas, combine schools in the area so these schools have the same opportunities as schools with high populations of Latino students.

- Do these sessions need to be offered at different time or locations? Response: There needs to be collaboration with organizations, perhaps the churches – before or after mass may be one way to get parents to meeting. Evangelical churches need to be added to the partnerships as they are serving more and more of the Latino population.
- Again, it is not clear whether the issue is schools not offering opportunities or whether the issue is people not being able to attend or families not receiving notification? It was suggested the committee and administration become clearer on the actual problems so the solution fits the problem. The surveys indicated schools reported there were efforts; parents reported there were none.
- 3.1 with the schools with smaller numbers, are you suggesting staff of the two schools not hosting the event also attend? Response: Yes, would like there to be collaboration between schools because if the curriculum is the same it is important that everyone attend, teachers, parents, etc. That is why there should be more than one session.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Annual Report of the Latino Consent Decree Parent Advisory Committee with thanks. Mr. Hardy seconded motion.**

**Motion passed.**

**C. Review of Referendum Survey Results**

The Superintendent stated this presentation would be a review of the survey results. An Internal Referendum Planning Committee was convened in February to review the district's options and make a recommendation to the Superintendent for replacing the expiring 2005 levy referendum that expires at the end of next school year. The committee reviewed or developed information gathered to:

- Gauge the effectiveness of programs funded by the 2006 Referendum
- Review costs and benefits of the 2006 referendum funds
- Identify risks associated with excess levy referendums
- Identify opportunities to help make the district more effective
- Gauge citizen support and approval of the district
- Gauge citizen support of different referendum scenarios
- Understand the referendum climate

The survey was conducted by The Center for Community Opinion, a subcontractor of Springsted, Inc. Between the end of April and the first week in May, telephone interviews were conducted with 605 registered voters in the SPPS district. The overall margin of error for the results of this survey is +/- 3%. The demographics of those interviewed match the demographics of the voter file.

The survey first asked participants to grade the district in various areas:

- General overall grade: 42.8% graded it A or B, 7.0% graded it D or F, 30.9% felt unable to evaluate it.
- Educating children for future success: 41.8% A/B; 6.7% D/F; unable to evaluate 26.3%

The next series of questions graded the district from excellent to poor:

- Planning for the future needs of the community: 35.4% Excellent/above average and 9.8% below average/poor; 30.6% unable to evaluate
- Managing the district's budget & finances: 26.4% excellent/above average, 16% below average/poor; 35.9% unable to evaluate

Participants were then asked if they agreed with several statements:

- SPPS meets the academic needs of our city's next generation: 16% strongly agreed, 38.5% agreed; 6.3% strongly disagreed, 14.9% disagreed and 24.3% didn't know
- Students, families and community members are welcomed in SPPS schools: 30.9% strongly agreed, 41.7% agreed, 1.8% strongly disagreed, 3.8% disagreed and 21.8% did not know.

The questions then moved to referendum questions with the first question being the uninformed base

- 77.2% favored renewing without change
- 11.7% opposed renewing without change
- 10.5% undecided

Five additional questions were posed each providing additional information about what would happen if the referendum were not renewed. The final question, would you renew it without change, being informed by the previous questions showed:

- 81.5% favored
- 11.2% opposed
- 6.9% undecided

The same process was used for renewing and increasing the referendum with the end results being:

- 64.0% favored
- 21.7% opposed
- 14.0% undecided

When an actual cost was added (\$65 per \$149,000) the results were:

- 57.0% favored
- 30.4% opposed
- 12.2% undecided

Additional information was provided for the question "I would never vote for a tax increase no matter what the money raised would be used for".

Information was provided on who were interviewed in the areas of gender, age, parent control, voting activity, zip code.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Voter activity was representative of what? Response: The voter file
- Demographics - is there correlation between ages and activity? Response: Those were isolated factors.
- Was data collected on race, ethnicity, and home language? Response: No, those are not factors in the voter file. Participants were asked to self identify.
- Was there any effort to reach out to unrepresented portions of the population? Response: The survey used a statistically random sample and there was an effort to avoid forcing it toward any particular population. It was a representative sample per the official voter file with a goal of understanding how voters would vote. It included various ages, genders, parents and the underrepresented fell within the sample.
- Was there an effort to use home languages? Response: The survey was conducted in English, Spanish, Hmong, Somali and Karen.
- Will differences among those samples be shared? Response: The data is there however, it was not requested from the survey company.

- A Board member noted there would be a need to encourage those who understand the issues to vote and to develop strategies to address the other 11%.
- Administration noted the data can be cut various ways, a can be very specific as to how it is cut (to gender, parent status on particular questions). It can be mined further as necessary.
- There seems to be a disparity among zip codes, is that simple the randomness of the sample? Response: This shows the sample for which interviews were conducted and is representative of the official voter file.

#### D. Referendum Recommendation(s)

The Superintendent indicated the expiring referendum generates about \$30 million and goes directly to support those classroom programs promised to the community under the old referendum. These included early education, class size, math & science education, technology, Special Education programs and ELL. Administration has been engaged in a process to determine the most prudent course of action for SPPS learners. They have also spent nearly three months of study and review of the current needs of the Saint Paul Public Schools, uses of the current referendum funds and the needs and opinions of voters in the City of Saint Paul as measured by the survey relative to providing a recommendation to the Board on referendum question(s).

She stated she will recommend (1) that the School Board ask the voters of Saint Paul to renew the existing referendum. She indicated that the renewal portion of the referendum closely resembles the current uses of the referendum. These are tested, effective and have become an integrated part of the school district. This work must continue. (2) She also will recommend increasing the levy in an amount \$175 per student for eight years, which will allow the plan to take hold and show long-term results. At this level, it will increase annual property taxes on a home of median market value (\$149,000) by approximately \$65.

The increased amount of the levy will be dedicated to the implementation of Student Learning and Engagement through Technology Integration. The Board has been introduced to this program over the past several months but the program has been in the development for several years. It is essential to the ongoing success of the district and currently does not have a sustainable funding source. This program will engage every learner, provide individualized learning plans and practices, offer multiple unrestricted learning landscapes, and provide an active triad of support for students which incorporates teachers, parents and the community. It brings authentic learning extended beyond the classroom and has the capability of making a measurable impact on academic outcomes for SPPS students.

The Superintendent stated she believed this recommendation respects and responds to the voters' wishes and will help Saint Paul Public Schools to maintain momentum while improving student achievement now and into the future. It will allow for the full implementation of the Strong Schools Strong Communities Strategic Plan. She went on to say she believes that this recommendation will be approved by the voters of Saint Paul in what is sure to be a challenging political environment because the voters of Saint Paul understand the importance of a successful public school district. The increase sought is modest and it must be laser focused on a small number of high value investments in teaching and learning.

This will still be lowest per student levy among largest districts in state and will help maintain momentum while improving student achievement now and into future.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Clarification was sought that this is simply accepting the report and then the Board will move forward with approvals in July? Response: Yes, that is correct.
- Clarification requested on how teachers can make sure technology is used to the greatest extent it can be. Response: One piece being looked at is providing training to teachers with a complete plan that imbeds learning for teachers and students phased in throughout the process. Infrastructures have been built over the last five years; the infrastructure is there with the ability to share teacher to teacher or across buildings or even countries. This will be a tool for students and teachers and for families providing full access to what is going on in schools for parents as well as providing an equity piece across the district and allow students to take ownership of their learning.
- Of the amount being sought, how much will go into training, support and will it put more hardware in the hands of students. Response: Access to information will be 24/7. Students are connecting and taking ownership of their learning. It will also allow for greater differentiation of instruction. It will combine meeting the needs of the kids providing them real world experience but also teachers will be more connected to students and parents, parents will be more connected to schools and the community connected to district. It is about technology as a tool for student engagement/success and for equity across the board.
- This is an engagement and learning plan supported by technology, what can SPPS continue to commit to for increased student achievement and decrease of the student achievement gap, what will the outcomes be? Response: The plan is to phase in, implement with the focus on the neediest first, and then expand through all buildings. Students are crying for more engagement and this will provide it.
- It was noted SPPS would need to be flexible because no one knows what technology will be five years out. Flexibility is built into the plan so it can grow as technology evolves.
- Will teachers be given enough time to learn? Response: Yes, training and support will be provided.
- Training, what will be parent and guardian involvement? What kind of training for them? Response: This needs to be put together as a piece so they grow with their students and is being worked on now.
- The community collaborating with SPPS, the community will not have access to specific student data – correct? Response: Yes, that is correct.
- What are the implications for student learning in ELL and Special Ed? Response: Technology has already been used with tremendous results. Having other English speaking role models available is fundamental as well as providing a platform for practice is essential and technology provides this.
- Clarification was sought on when funds become available. Response: July 2013 (SY 13-14), it is the fiscal calendar through the State.
- For the renewal of existing referendum, are there other uses/needs out there? Response: SPPS wants to be sure the focus remains on the majority of funds being used on the critical issues they are used for now. -- Early childhood, class size, math and science classrooms, Special Ed and ELL.
- Are you considering adding on to some of the current uses, would Pre-K, ECCE expand, what about Kindergarten? Is this being looked at? Response: Yes, it is being looked at but it is only \$30 million and that has been used for programs that are working.
- Can SPPS venture into the 3-year-old or younger area? Response: Renewal will provide approximately \$30 million – SPPS needs to continue what is working. SPPS is looking at ways to expand the 4-year old program, working

with the State to fund full day kindergarten. It is looking into how to become fully funded for Special Education with the State. Referendum funds must be used as they have been as this has proven to work and voters expect that this continue as it has been promised. Voters are willing to continue current referendum so they are happy with what is being done with it.

- Does the current referendum have an inflation factor built into it? Response: The formula is a combination of students multiplied by a dollar amount. The dollar amount increases because of inflation but enrollment cannot be ignored.
- How can SPPS make current funds even more effective, how will that be done? Response: SPPS has made adjustments over the past six years to achieve more consistency and equity. Delivery of programs has altered as experience has been gained. The amount dedicated has aligned consistently during life of the levy.
- The increase of \$175/pupil – as much as possible, how was that figure arrived at? Response: Different dollar amounts were tested on the community as seen in slide 19. Springsted tested various tax impact levels. \$65 would generate approximately \$9 million which is the approximate amount needed to support the integrated technology plan. \$65 was used as the primary impact point because SPPS did have unfunded projects which would impact student achievement that could be covered by this.
- How many people, resources will this cover? Response: The plan has been in the works for a year. Administration knew approximately how much equipment/personnel would be needed to accelerate the plan and the \$65 gets SPPS there?
- How will schools best-utilized technology as a tool for teachers and as a resource and learning tool for students? How will better and greater use help with all students? How will technology provide an advantage to all, not just those who already have it? How will it carry over to life outside the classroom, how will there be insured equity and outcomes? What studies were done on how this type of plan increases achievement? Response: There are multiple uses within the district now (Frost Lake, Harding, Washington, speech technology, Telepresence, Moodle); every building has access to wireless now. The structure is there to engage the environment of technology – SPPS needs a creation tool to extend learning outside the classroom through multiple collaborations. Tools need to be flexible as technology changes continuously; this change needs to be made as SPPS moves toward becoming a District of excellence. Students demand to be in that environment, they need the creation tool (iPod, smart phone whatever they have access to or are provided access to). They not only demand it but also must have it in order to be successful in the world. And, SPPS wants all of its students to be successful.
- How can SPPS be sure it does not create bigger gaps with haves and have-nots? Response: SPPS goes there because the Board instructs it to. There will be digital assets available to teachers. SPPS is already moving in that direction, all students can access the wireless, the integrated learning with technology will be there (it is not about machines, it is about learning). SPPS is going there with policy, practice and procedures. About 80% of SPPS kids have technology now.
- Equity and learning in the classroom, what about the diversity of learning styles? How will infrastructure be used to engage with those teachers they feel most inspired by to learn and participate at different levels with fewer barriers? Response: SPPS will make sure the opportunities exist and teachers, as they see this as a valuable aspect of learning, will create opportunities. The more this becomes the norm across the district and

accessible to students the faster acceptance/innovation will occur. Students are excited about the potential of this environment.

- Is there data that says technology does lead to greater results? Is there growth data that could be shared? Response: There is some data showing the impact, that shows more engagement. SPPS is moving toward engagement of purpose to be sure the tools are providing the results desired. Further Information can be provided.
- Practical outcomes – (1) Learning through technology vs. gain of personal skills (2) SPPS is having issues with support of technology how will support be addressed as this grows out. (3) Learning styles will still differ under the new plan, how will SPPS help teachers deal with inexperienced vs. experienced technology users? Response: Support – SPPS currently has support utilization data. The district is performing at a high level. It has a fully articulated ticketing system with data gathering which is analyzed. No organization is 100% 100% of the time. Support issues are experienced as turnaround capacity, how much support can be put on ground. As SPPS expands, it will be an incremental implementation process. SPPS is positioned financially and technically, to expand, both must move together. It all starts with how much financial support is there and how can you move forward from baseline and where do you want to go. SPPS has set conditions to put itself in position to meet the opportunity when it comes.
- Learning thru technology vs. social skills. Response: Technology is a tool; it is not the only way to teach. Teachers provide that skill, everyone needs to balance personal skills with technology use.
- Learning styles. Response: It is currently difficult to reach all of the learning styles out there, technology will add an additional opportunity for students with different learning styles.
- Would it be fair to say, in this budget cycle, that some principals with the competence in IT ticketing program elected to drop their IT person on site to get a support person into the classroom? Response: SPPS will need people on the ground to address tech issues as they occur as this rolls out. There will need to be more people on the ground to help with this as it begins.
- It is not just social skills, what about typing skills? Response: Kids pick up computer skills quickly.

Next steps include:

- July 17 – BOE schedule to make referendum decision at this meeting
- August 24 – The last day to adopt resolution calling the referendum election and notifying the Commissioner and County Auditor
- October 8 – First day district may mail required legal notice
- October 23 – Last day to publish first notice of election
- October 30 – Last day to publish second notice of election
- November 6 – Election day

It was noted the Ramsey County election office has indicated it will need the question verbiage by August 1 for inclusion on the ballot.

**MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report. Ms. Doran seconded motion.**

**Motion passed.**

E. Budget Update

The Chief Budget Analyst reviewed the budget key planning assumptions, the General Fund FY 13 vs. FY 12, staff engagement. He indicated the macros have not

changed. He also noted that this is a different budget cycle in that the district is not in a cut mode as it has been in previous years.

The total FY 13 proposed budget is \$655.8 million broken out into the following funds:

- General Fund \$490.6 million
- General Fund Fully Financed \$45.8 million
- Food Service \$24.9 million
- Community Service \$20.7 million
- Community Service Fully Financed \$ 2.9 million
- Building Construction \$29.0 million
- Debt Service \$41.9 million

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- Were school communities informed of this year's process? Response: Administration brought all principals together and walked through the issues, the change in method, etc. The Principals were instructed to share the information with their councils/communities. An on-line feedback mechanism for the general public was also made available. Reports back from principals through the Assistant Superintendents indicated a majority of feedback is positive. Every effort was made to be directly engaged with each principal.
- Did the Principals share the information with their communities? Response: Principals were directed to share budget information with school community
- Was any feedback provided on-line? Response: Some for some specific schools and some from the ministerial alliance.
- Naviance – is it in all secondary schools? Response: Yes, including the alternatives.
- The question was raised about the difference between budget and expenditure. Response: Budget refers to the amount of money spent, how resources are used. Expenditures are basically the same.
- Why the difference between revenue and expenditures? Response: SPPS is losing some fund balance while still maintaining the 5% fund balance.
- Request made of administration to provide talking points on the FY 13 budget in order to answer constituent questions particularly as the referendum will be out there.

**MOTION:** Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the FY 13 total expenditure budget as presented with expenditures of \$655,776,385 and revenue of \$646,870,535. Motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.

**Motion Passed.**

**MOTION:** Mr. Hardy moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the budget report. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

**Motion Passed.**

**F. Work Session**

**1. Race to the Top (RTTT)**

The Superintendent noted that the proposed application process needed for application for RTTT requires evaluation mechanisms for teachers, principals, superintendents and Board members. This needs to have a stakeholder component.

An outline of the application proposal process was provided along with implications around it. The deadline for submission is September. Concerns and questions were expressed and answered.

**MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education will not be a barrier to the submission of a successful Race to the Top application and will provide an evaluation tool if SPPS proceeds with the proposal. The motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

**Motion Passed with one abstention (Hardy)**

2. Reminder

The Board Chair reminded members of their agreement to funnel questions on the referendum which arise between now and the July 10 COB directly to the Superintendent.

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the meeting adjourn. Motion was seconded by Ms. O'Connell.**

**Motion Passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Marilyn Polsfuss  
Assistant Clerk