

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
July 10, 2012**

PRESENT:

Board: Ms. Street-Stewart, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Doran, Mr. Brodrick,
Ms. O'Connell
Ms. Seeba arrived at 4:49 p.m.
Mr. Hardy arrived at 5:34 p.m.

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Marsha Baisch, Steve Unowsky,
Andrew Collins, Michelle Walker, Matt Mohs, Ivar
Nelson, Jeff Lalla, Tim Caskey, Michael Baumann, Willie
Jett, Mary Gilbert, Jacqueline Allen, Nancy Cameron,
Darlene Fry, Jackie Turner

Others: Kaitlyn Egan, Ted Davis, Tim Harlow, Kevin Driscoll, Jeff
Risberg

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. AGENDA

The Board Chair extended the Board's thanks for the quick response and support by staff during the Harding tragedy.

The Chair also indicated that due to the later arrival of two board members; the agenda would be flipped starting with the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook.

A. Presentation on Student Rights & Responsibilities Handbook

The Interim Director, Leadership Development indicated the purpose of the review was to provide information on the Rights & Responsibilities Handbook and receive feedback from the Board.

She described the task force brought together for the revision of the Handbook. Their charge was to review the current Handbook, identify its strengths along with areas that needed to be addressed and align it with the strategic plan. It was also to ensure the practices developed in the Handbook align with equity values and finally, to edit or revise the Handbook as needed.

Guiding Principles in the development of the newly revised Handbook were to remain student focused on developmental needs, high expectations and excellence for all. Look at changes through the equity lens, ensure staff commitment and training and strengthen parent/guardian involvement.

The Interim Director then reviewed what is working in the current Handbook and what was not working. She went on to describe the process of review along with an extensive list of those involved in vetting the various drafts as the work progressed. She provided an overview of format/content changes.

The next steps will be planning for professional development and communication to staff, students and families.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- On page 6, it indicates it is an example only and site-specific information will be developed, does that mean different items at each location. What about consistency? Response: Yes, each site may have something different depending upon the agreements they have reached on their PBIS goals. These will all be tied to PBIS and will not be random across sites.
- It was suggested the Table of Contents be expanded in order to make specific areas/items easier to locate.
- In general, when a student violation is addressed by staff will immediate description of how/what the violation was be followed immediately by a discussion on the rights and responsibilities chart? This would provide consistency in talking about their responsibilities and the discussion could then move on to consequences. This would tie it all together and put it upfront for the students on standards and expectations.
- Violations have been defined in the Glossary. Can this be made more family friendly with more navigation tools, expanded Table of Contents? The explanation under Level 2 should be added under all levels and the statement "see glossary for more detailed definitions" should be added in the introduction and level headers.
- The description of responsibilities between schools and families in alternative educational services, does that apply to all homeless students and students in shelters? Response: The District's response is always the same regardless of where a student is. It was noted that families should not be out of the loop because of a homeless situation, they should still be held accountable and services should be available.
- The Board expressed its expectation that the Abbreviated Handbook will be vetted through the General Counsel's office prior to release to ensure it is legally accurate..
- What will be the distribution? Response: The complete Handbook will be put on line and will be available for reference by all administrators, staff, students and parents. The abbreviated version will be printed in limited quantities for all students/families. A power point presentation will be developed for principals to use during opening week so staff is brought up to speed on the revisions. Teachers will be expected to review the various levels with their students.
- It was suggested the Handbook be reviewed with all new students as they join the district throughout the year.
- The Board agreed that the individual names of Board members should be removed and just the Board of Education referenced in order to avoid having the expense of periodic revisions because of changes.

The Board expressed its approval of the changes made to the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbooks, provided their suggested revisions and stipulated a final review by the General Counsel's office before publication.

It was noted the purpose of the abbreviated Handbook is for easier use at the classroom level and with students and families to help them be more aware of expectations of students and staff.

B. Referendum

The Superintendent stated the purpose of her presentation was to provide the Board with additional information related to her recommendation's for the 2012 referendum. She stated the uses of the 2005 Referendum have been effective at improving student achievement and this funding should be continued. The approximate \$30 million/year is used for (1) early childhood education (all day Kindergarten, Pre-K programs and ECFE) and has resulted in stronger school readiness, reduced achievement gap and high demand for the programs. (2) K-12 education in meeting class size targets, more direct classroom supports and consistent improvement in MCA scores. (3) Programs for Special Education students and English learners providing improved financial sustainability by assisting with costs of required services that are not reimbursed by the State and in strengthened programs.

The Superintendent reiterated her recommendation to the Board that voters be asked to renew the current referendum levy, which is \$647 per pupil, for eight years and increase the levy by

\$175 per pupil for eight years. With these funds, approximately \$39 million per year, SPPS will continue to invest the funds in the areas covered by the current referendum and by investing in an integrated technology program for the classrooms.

She went on to say that SPPS has been working, for the last year and half, on the integrated technology plan. Through the referendum survey, the public has indicated that an investment in technology would make them more likely to favor a levy increase. Recommendations from multiple DAT teams included expanded investment in technology. Additionally, SPPS has sought stakeholder input on the initiative since last fall through presentations and focus groups of teachers, students, administrators and partners.

The Deputy of Schools and Business Operations then went on to discuss the integrated technology plan proposed for development with the increased referendum funding. Technology integration presents an opportunity to educate every child for a successful future. By integrating technology into more aspects of the classroom, students will be able to achieve the skills to be successful, contributing adults.

The vision for this plan is to engage every learner in the district, personalize learning plans and practices, provide learning landscapes without restrictions, develop an active triad of support for students (teachers, parents, communities) and extend authentic learning beyond the classroom while remaining focused on content formulation through core standards. The will provide learning in a positive manner in a permissive environment through content and curriculum.

Integrated technology will provide all stakeholders with greater access to lessons, supports and tools to become more engaged participants in student learning.

- For teachers and staff it will leverage tools to build effective lessons to meet the needs of various learning styles; provide access to and sharing of best practices; allow for collaboration and networking with colleagues in and outside SPPS and create a continuous cycle of curriculum development.
- For administrators it will allow for better monitoring of the needs of students and teachers and faster response with supports; deliver aligned curriculum and common assessments and provide cost savings associated with textbooks.
- For students it will provide access to lessons outside the regular school day; allow them to experience real-world 21st century tools in the classroom; connect them with tutors and supplemental supports to learn “their way” and allow for greater communication with teachers and classmates.
- For families, they will become more engaged with their student's learning, connect with teachers effectively and have access to tools to expand their own skills.
- For the community it will strengthen partnerships, align data sharing to improve student achievement and open new avenues of collaboration.

With the increase in referendum, funding 85% more students will benefit within five years as compared to the “status quo” rollout of the plan over the next 20 years. The plan will cost approximately \$9 million per year. It is estimated, over the eight years of the plan, investments will be approximately 37% in the area of technology hardware/infrastructure and systems; school support; 35% in school support; 6% in teacher training/support, 17% in curriculum/lesson development and 5% in leadership support. Investment in any one area may vary from year to year depending on the focus of the plan at that time.

The IT plan will be executed over eight years in overlapping phases with a key consideration being equity of access when determining the phase-in of schools and hardware plans.

- Phase 1: Development will include such things as assessing schools for readiness and development of a launch plan, installation of necessary infrastructure, development of curriculum and collection of lesson objects.
- Phase 2: Implementation includes training teachers, families and partners, launching at the schools, providing instructional and technical supports and increasing access to the community.

- Phase 3: Sustainability involves refreshing hardware as necessary and ensuring continuous curriculum development.
- Phase 4: Evaluation will mean on-going evaluations and improvements.

The SPPS integrated technology plan will be customized to best meet the needs of students and the community. It will provide a return on investment through how students learn and by providing greater access to dynamic, engaged learning environments. It will allow for expanded collaboration, communication and consistency within the continuity of the learning environment. It is about collaborative learning. There will be a strong focus on the core standards and delivery of an aligned curriculum providing worldwide access to information within a defined learning framework.

Next steps in the process are for the Board to make a formal referendum decision as its July 17 Board meeting; for the District to provide ballot language by August 1; preparation and dispersal of public and legal notices during the October 8-30 time period and the final decision by the electorate on November 6.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education renew the current ref levy of \$647 per pupil with the inflation factor for 8 years. Mr. Brodrick seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Detail of what has been successful in the current levy. Can you identify areas where SPPS has not met goals of the levy and how will those areas be addressed? Response: Foremost we have not closed the achievement gap. Early interventions have given students opportunities to learn earlier (Kindergarten, the 4-year old program). With early intervention, students perform better at the higher-grade levels; SPPS has been able to see student growth. SPPS has been successful in utilizing the referendum dollars for what was promised to the community. ELL students are doing a lot better with the support of the referendum dollars; SPPS has been able to hire added personnel to help with language barriers and special education (an unfunded mandate from the State) and has recently been able to provide greater support to autistic students.
- What areas have not met goals and how will they be addressed? Response: Student achievement, students need to perform at a higher level. The SPPS goal is that all students be successful. This is an education-based society; if all students are not successful, SPPS has not met its goal.
- It was noted the referendum dollars supplement the overall general fund. If the referendum monies are tied to all goals in the district that is not realistic. There were no specific goals established for the referendum funding other than the promised areas of use.
- How will use be adjusted going forward? Response: SPPS is moving to a 6-8 middle school model, working to improve classroom instruction, working to ensure everything is done with equity in mind. Staff is more aware and ready to educate new kids coming in. Graduation has increased from six years ago. Many more students are applying to post secondary options and taking their ACTs.
- It was stated the referendum monies spent over the past six years have helped in the areas designated.
- Will the portion to the charters continue? Response: Yes, it is required by law.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education renew the current ref levy of \$647 per pupil with the inflation factor for 8 years. Mr. Brodrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Street-Stewart	Yes
Ms. Carroll	Yes
Ms. Doran	Yes
Mr. Hardy	Yes

Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Seeba	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

The discussion then moved to consideration of the additional dollars through an excess levy referendum of \$175 per pupil for eight years.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Doran, the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of the Education approve the increase in its general education revenue by an additional \$175 per pupil for eight years.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Support was expressed because the referendum is about learners and learning. It will improve student learning currently and into the future. Technology is the means; the end is student learning in the 21st century. It is building success with multiple stakeholders. It is a sincere, transparent commitment to community access creating ways for many more people to access information. It is extended learning in a very deep community sense.
- Teachers' access to information would be rich with greater alignment with technology. Concern was expressed that as change is implemented and as money is spent what the teachers specific role in the change would be and who would support those teachers as they change the way they teach kids? Response: Teachers currently feel comfortable with technology to a point, staff use technology to adjust lessons or bring new things to lessons all the time. New teachers are more prepared to use these tools and have a different method of learning. Support will be provided at school level through coaching, programs, tutorials, etc. Students need to know that everyone is a learner at different time and stages. The American Federation of Teachers has launched a "share my lesson" platform. SPPS teachers have been involved in this. Some SPPS teachers are in the lead in this. There is a huge amount of support built into it, giving people tools to use technology as they get it. SPPS is a pilot in the Common Core; this is an example of a phase in with people who wanted to be involved with an expansion outward as development took place. SPPS teachers have been heavily involved in developing aspects of the Common Core.
- What will be the specific direction around different categories of students – how will the plan impact gifted talented and other special needs students. Response: An example is SPPS is pushing language teachers to use language technology where there are not sufficient numbers to make up a class. A core group was used to develop programs and technology was used to disperse it. This is now expanding to use in other areas. Technology offers many methods and means to get students to learn. It allows teachers alternative methods to help students learn.
- What is "Husbandry"? Response: In this case, it means to bring together resources from disparate places in a consolidated manner.
- Individualized learning plans, will each student have a plan? Response: This is not about IEPs; it is about meeting the learning style needs of students. Teachers will no longer teach to the middle but direct learning to each student in a personalized manner. It is more about customization within the spectrum of learning allowing for all learners, at whatever level, to be learning with content designed in a dynamic way. This plan adapts to individual needs in learning method/style. It is mass customization through technology in a learning environment; all kids are different and yet have the same need to learn. It is about equity.
- What about the term "individualized learning plans"? Response: This should be adjusted as this moves forward to be about personalized learning as opposed to individualized learning plans.
- As you look back at older style of learning and research – key components were relationships with the people in charge. Teachers in classrooms will have to become more technologically savvy, they will also need to develop personal, caring relationships with kids so they cannot devote all their energies to the technological portion of the process, they will need help. Is this being provided for teachers? Response: Technology will never replace having an adult in front of students and that relationship of teacher/pupil. It

will allow adults be better educators by helping students find different ways of learning with help of technology. Support will be provided in finding the best ways to implement and how provide support. It will be necessary to look at where schools are and where staff are and build from that point. This needs to be individualized not only for students but for staff

- A comment was made that the plan is exciting. You can already see how different today's learners are from previous students. This will do fantastic things for the kids and it is good to see support is being planned for teachers. This will take the best materials and spread them across the district. This is a great investment in St. Paul. The city needs people to be active 21st century citizens and to have an active workforce on all fronts. Response: This not only levels the playing field for all students but provides help for teachers and parents as well. This will do a lot for the district's equity work. The world is moving to technology, SPPS needs to be on cutting edge.
- Personalized learning how is that different from differentiated instruction? Response: IT is not different; it is what kids need to be successful. This plan makes it easier for teachers by providing the tools to differentiate the student's learning needs. This differentiated instruction allows the District to scale out practice and allows teachers to expand lessons to benefit all students. It reduces barriers, provides multiple means of engagement and preference. Personalization is what the integrated platforms allows.
- (1) The implementation phase, what is planned for students moving from grade to grade, (2) For all instructional staff and (3) what will be access at various grade levels to tools. Response: The scope and sequence is about alignment across the district, providing a learning depository of vetted, structured materials that all teachers have access to, access to common assessments to ensure students are achieving to the same standards so there are not gaps. Design of the platform and interface is critical. The platform needs to be intuitive for ease of use by staff. It is key that all staff be included in the transformation: of processes, technology and of people – students, adults and the community. Regarding access to tools, the scope of work for students will be incremental. A certain number of schools to start with (students, teachers, and staff) and then deploy into other schools in a logical, phased in manner. It will happen in elementary, middle and high schools simultaneously so costs will be higher on the front end. Key performance indicators need to be defined and evaluated and modifications made as needed. This will become the primary driver of the learning process. The process has already worked within the Nutritional Services/Custodial Support area. It is exciting to see how empowered staff has become in the use of technology to maximize resources and improve results. Their process provided improvement and design with the use of integrated technology support. Change is very powerful because it is from the bottom up, not top down.
- Support was expressed for this strategic direction and addressing the future of SPPS in a proactive manner. SPPS has gotten it financial house in order and is moving forward with a plan that is about the kids of the district who deserve this. SPPS has to compete with charters and private schools; this will help level the playing field for SPPS students.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell called the question. Ms. Seeba provided a second.

Motion passed, six in favor, one opposed (Hardy)

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Doran, the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of the Education approve the increase in its general education revenue by an additional \$175 per pupil for eight years.

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Street-Stewart	Yes
Ms. Carroll	Yes
Ms. Doran	Yes
Mr. Hardy	No
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Seeba	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

The Chair stated consideration now that the content portion of the referendum discussion is decided is the issue of how the ballot question will be presented.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved Saint Paul Public Schools call special election for November 6, 2012 for one question calling for a combined total of \$821.55 per pupil to support classroom instruction. Ms. Seeba seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION – Comments from Board members included:

- I believe the survey of tax payers has indicated a strong support for SPPS with a really positive perception of the welcoming nature of its schools and a strong B+ overall for the schools. Having one questions for renewal and increase will allow for a consistent message to St. Paul voters.
- I am against it for the following reasons: (1) In the last two election cycles 20 districts asked for increases and only a few passed and (2) you are jeopardizing renewal of the 2006 levy.
- Never underestimate the desire of this community to support education. The community supports the district through enrollment, volunteer hours and any number of other ways. We need to make clear what has been accomplished and what can be accomplished with the increase. We need to make it clear this is the right thing to do for St. Paul students.
- I would prefer to see two questions.
- The District has done its homework and research, it know what has been done with the 2006 monies and what it can do with the increase for all of its students. SPPS has asked for far less from its taxpayers than many other smaller districts. It has done more with less and this ask is the right thing to do for the kids, parents and the St. Paul community.
- The increase aligns with plans SPPS has in place. St. .Paul will vote for the kids. Particularly since the State is not financing its responsibility to education.
- I just want to reiterate on cold calls 57% supported the increase, 68% supported the technology push. I think we all understand the risk but we have had and continue to have great support from the St. Paul community. We need to take this opportunity to share the good news about SPPS.
- After hearing the discussion and for the sake of not having my vote misconstrued I will now vote yes.
- We need to tell everyone up front what we are expecting and what we need, We will make clear in our language and in our actions and by providing honest information to voting public what and why this is so necessary. It will take a strong effort but the importance of the impact of students driving their education model will make it possible for this next generation to be successful in their future
- One question makes it as clear as possible for the voters. This is a community that is not hesitant, will go for it or not.
- I have spent a great deal of time talking with the community and have received many recommendations to go with one question. We need to let St. Paul know what we need for the schools and ask them for it. We do not need to clutter the issue with multiple questions that cause confusion.
- St. Paul is a different entity; St. Paul supports its children.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend to the Board of Education that Saint Paul Public Schools call special election for November 6, 2012 for one question calling for a combined total of \$821.55 per pupil to support classroom instruction. Ms. Seeba seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Street-Stewart	Yes
Ms. Carroll	Yes
Ms. Doran	Yes
Mr. Hardy	No
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Seeba	Yes

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

- When does the language need to be acted upon? Response: At the July 17 Board meeting.
- Procedural question, when we adopt this today and/or next week we are adopting the entire resolution? Response: Yes
- Why is this called a special election? Response: A General Election recurs every four years. A Special Election is anything other than a regular recurring election.

The proposed resolution was reviewed.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO RENEWING EXISTING
REFERENDUM LEVY AUTHORITY, INCREASING THE
GENERAL EDUCATION REVENUE OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
AND CALLING AN ELECTION THEREON

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625, State of Minnesota, as follows:

1. The Board hereby determines and declares that it is necessary and expedient for the School District to renew its existing referendum levy authority for general education revenue of \$646.55 per resident marginal cost pupil unit and to also increase its general education revenue by an additional \$175 per resident marginal cost pupil unit, all beginning in 2013. The revenue will be used to fund classroom instruction. This amount would increase annually by the rate of inflation. The proposed referendum revenue authorization would be applicable for eight (8) years unless otherwise revoked or reduced as provided by law.
2. The questions of renewing and increasing the general education revenue of the School District shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the School District at a special election, which is hereby called and directed to be held in conjunction with the State general election on Tuesday, the 6th day of November, 2012.
3. Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 205A.11, the precincts and polling places for this special election are those precincts located within the boundaries of the School District which have been established by the City of Saint Paul. The voting hours at those polling places shall be the same as those for the State general election.
4. The Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to cause written notice of said special election to be provided to the Ramsey County Auditor and to the Commissioner of Education at least seventy-four (74) days before the date of said special election. The notice shall specify the date of said special election and the title and language of the ballot questions to be voted on at said special election.

The Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to cause notice of said special election to be posted at the administrative offices of the School District at least ten (10) days before the date of said special election.

The Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to cause a sample ballot to be posted at the administrative offices of the School District at least four (4) days before the date of said special election and to cause two (2) sample ballots to be posted in each polling place on election day.

The Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to cause notice of said special election to be published for two (2) consecutive weeks with the last publication being at least one (1) week before the date of the special election.

The notice of election so posted and published shall state the questions to be submitted to the voters as set forth in the form of ballot below, and shall include information concerning each established precinct and polling place.

The Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to cause a notice of the special election to be mailed by first class mail to each taxpayer in the School District at least fifteen (15) but no

more than thirty (30) days prior to the date of the special election. The notice shall contain the required projections and the required statement specified in Minnesota Statutes, Section 126C.17, subdivision 9, paragraph (b). The Clerk is also directed to cause a copy of this notice to be submitted to the Commissioner of Education and to the Ramsey County Auditor at least fifteen (15) days prior to the day of the special election.

The Clerk is authorized and directed to take such other actions as may be necessary for the proper conduct of this special election and generally to cooperate with election authorities conducting the State general and other elections on that date. The Clerk and members of the administration are authorized and directed to take such actions as may be necessary to coordinate this special election with those other elections, including entering into agreements with appropriate county officials regarding preparation and distribution of ballots, election administration, and cost sharing.

5. The Clerk is further authorized and directed to cooperate with the proper election officials to cause ballots to be prepared for use at said special election in substantially the following form, with such changes in form and instructions as may be necessary to accommodate a system other than a paper ballot system:

SCHOOL DISTRICT QUESTION BALLOT
SPECIAL ELECTION
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625
STATE OF MINNESOTA

November 6, 2012

To vote, completely fill in the oval next to your choice, like this: 

To vote for a question, fill in the oval next to the word "YES" for that question.

To vote against a question, fill in the oval next to the word "NO" for that question.

APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF EXISTING AND
SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENDUM LEVY AUTHORIZATION

The Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 (Saint Paul Public Schools) has proposed, beginning in 2013, to renew the existing referendum levy authority of \$646.55 per pupil general education revenue that will expire at the end of 2012 and to increase its general education revenue by an additional \$175 per pupil. The revenue will be used to fund classroom instruction. The proposed referendum revenue authorization would increase annually by the rate of inflation and be applicable for eight (8) years unless otherwise revoked or reduced as provided by law.

☐

YES

Shall the increase in the revenue proposed by the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 be approved?

☐

NO

BY VOTING "YES" ON THIS BALLOT QUESTION, YOU ARE
VOTING FOR A PROPERTY TAX INCREASE..

6. The individuals designated as judges for the State general election shall act as election judges for this special election at the various polling places and shall conduct said special

election in the manner described by law. The election judges shall act as clerks of election, count the ballots cast and submit them to the Board of Education for canvass in the manner provided for other School District elections. The election must be canvassed between the third and tenth day following the official election.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. O'Connell, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move the resolution to the Board of Education meeting of July 17, 2012.

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Street-Stewart	Yes
Ms. Carroll	Yes
Ms. Doran	Yes
Mr. Hardy	Abstain
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Seeba	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms Doran moved the meeting adjourn. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

Motion Passed

The meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk