

**INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625**  
**Saint Paul, Minnesota**  
**MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING**  
**March 1, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Board of Education: Jean O'Connell, Elona Street-Stewart, John Brodrick, Keith Hardy, Jeff Risberg, Anne Carroll, Kazoua Kong-Thao

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Suzanne, Kelly, Sharon Freeman, Michael Baumann, Michael Walker, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Mike Kremer, Andrew Collins, Matt Mohs, Jerry Skelly, Jackie Turner, Jill Cacy, Tim Caskey, Darlene Adams, Howard Wilson, Marie Schrul, Jackie Felt. Mary Gilbert, Ivan Nelson, Lynn Gallandat, Jean Lubke, Joe Munnich, Traci Gauer, Darlene Fry, Meg King-Abraham, Mary Kelly, Heidi Bernal, Rich Currier

Other: Kathy Griebel, Doug Belden, Mary Gilbert, JoAnn Clark, Tonya Smith, Charles Foye, Thornton Powell, Megan Griggs LeRoux, Mary Kilboryd, Melvin Miller, N. Christopher, Michael Maddio, Latesa, Jeff MKartin, James Bush, Latasha English, Samantha Young, Peter, Windin, Kendra Lewis, Victoria Davis, Amanda McCohn, Tony Love, Tasha Virnig, DaVenna Sampson, Joyce Sampson, Jerry Sampson, Britta Levenhagen, Jennifer Ampelski, Sarah Gering, Rebekah Satke, Dan Davis, Susan Davis, Lisa Weiland, George English, T. & M. Topp, Kaela Meyers, Stephanie Dillard, Tina Ould Ndaig, Kevin Jeffries, Albert Goins, R.A. Smitz, Kathy Griebel, Leon Rogalla, Tonya Luis, Nancy Spack, Geraldine Blackhawk, Jeff Koon, Edward Kramer, Eileen Zachman, Michaela Burns, Jackie Lux, Pam Santoso, Bethye Jackson, Jackie Hicks, Tonette Clardy, Forest Clardy, Susan Cosebeer, Alex Cosebeer, Harold Travis, Mercedes Travis, Brionna Harder, Caryl Mousseaux, Joe Nathan, Kadetra Olives, Dr. James Shelton, James Oliver, Michael Walk, Talaya Polipe, Julia Hobody, Royora Christopher, ole Sperbenson, Bonnie Youngquist, Runney Patterson, Bruce Youngquist, Sonja Youngquist, Desiree Bergquist, Michael Ricks, Tim Rowell, Rus Carroll, Dr. McIntosh, Chris Rybisky, Ben Rybisky, Duane Dutriville, Tracy Linnatti, Katherine Goffin, Rve. Carl Walker, Carol Daly, Elizabeth Bryne, Terri Hanson, Steve Fletcher, Christin Schmitt, Chinonsu Onyeyachi, Erica Kragerud-Smith, Patricia Jamie, Darriel Keller, Lydia Nobello, Katie Sterns, Colleen Deunece, Becky Mangan, Alan Hodge, Susan Heegaard, Patricia Faseth, Estella Baker, May Kate Boylan, Frances Verner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

## II. AGENDA

**MOTION:** Ms. Street-Stewart moved approval of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Hardy.

**Motion passed.**

### A. Update on the Final Report and Recommendations of the Statewide Task Force on School Integration

Kathy Griebel, EMID Director of Elementary Teaching and Learning, stated she would provide an overview of the recommendations of the Statewide Taskforce on School Integration (Minnesota School Integration Council [MSIC]). A strong integration policy is a critical component of a larger agenda focused on eliminating disparities and creating educational equity and opportunity for all Minnesotans. Recommendations were developed in five key areas.

#### 1. **Clarification of the Purpose of the Integration Policy**

The purpose of the existing Integration Policy is to assist school districts in reducing racial isolation and promoting school diversity. A strong integration policy is linked to educational outcomes for all students.

The recommendation was to establish a new policy and program to address integration as a strategy to achieve equitable educational outcomes. Additionally to require all districts to participate in the program addressing the following outcomes:

- Equitable academic outcomes
- Access to opportunities (college and career readiness)
- Intercultural learning
- Racial balance (beyond classroom doors to staffing and eliminating predictability within classroom situations)
- Strong communities

#### 2. **Establish and Enforce Accountability Measures**

Increased accountability and attention to results is vital to achieving educational equity through integration. All partners (state, district and schools) will need clearly identified metrics against which to evaluate progress and measure success. Criteria need to be established against which participating school districts can submit integration plans and budgets that align to program outcomes. Metrics also need to be established for measuring the success and progress.

#### 3. **Identify and Support Effective Practices**

For true integration to emerge, a two-pronged approach is necessary. These would include structural shifts to address the arrangement of schools and the flow of students in a district or region and in-school strategies to address the policies and practices that affect students and staff.

#### 4. **Seek Partnerships and Encourage Collaboration**

Effective integration efforts are not done in isolation. Successful cross-district collaboration is an important component of a statewide integration policy. Additionally, integration strategies must address the relationship of school, housing and fiscal policy.

Who makes decisions matters and people of color need to be at the table to share in the decisions and responsibility.

#### 5. **Distribute Resources to Meet Outcomes**

Intentional integration efforts require categorical funding tied to educational outcomes. The funding formula must address variability in district needs while maintaining appropriate incentives for districts to reduce racial isolation and prepare children to thrive in a diverse world.

The group is moving to bring the report to the legislature and looking at how best to distribute resources across the state to meet the outcomes identified for every child.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- Please discuss how the work was accomplished and results of the listening sessions held across the state. The Executive Director of Family & Community Engagement stated the Committee brought in community members to discuss how they felt about integration in their communities. They noted the importance of integration in allowing them to become the person they were. Input was obtained from every area across the state. Regardless of whether they were rural or urban all had the same issues and desires for students. The outcomes truly represent the entire state and its students and parents.
- A director noted she had heard about this at the AMSD meeting. Appreciation was expressed on the heavy focus on outcomes in order to measure what is working and offering the ability to adjust it as it moves forward..
- Please talk about conversations from outstate Minnesota and the partnerships of urban and rural. Response: Some of the value in talking to the rural groups was finding they talk more about poverty and neighborhoods and not so much about race but their needs were just as strong as those in urban areas. It was interesting that the most effective practices in rural areas were community-based groups and collaboratives and showing the value new immigrants bring to the community. Without specific emphasis on integration within schools, integration of the community might not have happened. They do a lot of classroom partnerships and exchanges. They also use technology creatively. It showed immigration does not have to look the same in every community.
- When will the report be heard by legislature. Response: Testimony was heard in a committee today but work is on going to schedule more opportunities to bring forward the recommendations.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report of the Statewide Task Force on School Integration. Ms. Kong-Thao seconded motion.**

**Motion passed.**

**B. Update and Recommendation on Site-Governed Schools**

A new law was passed in 2009 (MN Statute § 123B.045) for the creation of site-governed schools within a district. Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) and the St. Paul Federation of Teachers (SPFT) agreed in a memo of understanding to explore the opportunity and bring a recommendation to their respective boards by May, 2011.

The Site-Governed Schools Exploratory Committee was formed, and, after reviewing several models of site-governed schools (including those in Minneapolis, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago and Los Angeles). Recommendations were developed after having solicited ideas from a wider audience through public input sessions.

The committee stated its belief that, as part of SPPS's commitment to school choice and improving student achievement and high school graduation rates, it should welcome site-governed schools as another way to offer students unique and excellent educational opportunities. They felt the key advantage to SPPS is the opportunity to stretch in new directions and respond to opportunities and to do so as a comprehensive package that combines educational innovation, operational supports, greater student achievement and robust financial and accountability systems. The opportunity could allow SPPS to evolve and adapt in a way that ensures both viability of educational offerings and results for students.

The committee specifically suggested that:

- The Board of Education approve this in concept and direct the Superintendent to work with SPFT to develop a request for proposal (RFP) that would be available before June 30, 2011.

- The District explored possibilities of start-up funding (from state, federal and private sources) as part of its overall efforts to improve student achievement.

Preferences and priorities for proposed school/program must align with the District's strategic direction and goals including one or more of the following:

- Demonstrated ability to close the achievement gap
- A program or approach that is not already offered
- Replication or extension of a high-demand, successful program
- Brings students into the district from outside (not currently enrolled in SPPS), and
- More efficient or cost-effective strategies

A proposed timeline was brought forward as well as proposed evaluation criteria.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- A board member spoke in favor of the recommendation. Particularly the fact it leaves room for many options to be developed. The timeline is ambitious but appears realistic. It is a complex process. Thanks were extended to everyone who participated on the task force for all their hard work.
- Is there a model in Minnesota which can be looked at and when will information be provided on how this proposal fits with strategic plan. Response: There is a model school opening in Minneapolis this year. Models were looked at outside of the state, all were different from each other but they had being an autonomous school in common. Relative to the Strong School, Strong Community (SSSC) Plan, it is important for SPPS that site governed schools fit into the context of the larger district strategic direction and goals. The District will review the options that are still available within the context of the strategic plan. The schools were part of the district not separate from it in all cases that were looked at.
- What is the capacity of this district, are the expectations to start with one? How far can the district go with technical assistance in arranging the resources? It sounds like the district is willing to take a risk to be an incubator for new work; so using the example of the Achievement Plus Schools (innovative schools), how can the "walk through traffic" impact be neutralized? Response: The district capacity was discussed in depth. It will depend on what is presented and whether it is an existing school within the district or a new entity. The Federation has offered help in providing technical assistance technical assistance to get the efforts started. The initial process will involve Letters of Intent before a full RFP process is implemented. The letters of intent will provide an idea of what is out there and what technical support might be needed. Infrastructure is another issue that needs to be carefully considered. The idea is to start small in order to be most effective. The Impact of the glass wall would be a benefit as these projects could bring incubators, sources of innovation to the district and it would be good for people to explore and see what is evolving in the models.
- Can you provide more on where the Dept of Education stands on this and where their support is? Response: Their part is yet to be determined. The Department has made this alternative available. Any supports available to traditional schools would be available to these schools, monitoring would be available to these schools as well. The specific type of support is a bit different for these schools but not a lot has been developed to date..
- How will transportation be provided if students are brought from outside the district? Response: There have been some discussions about finance, special education, ELL, etc. and how those would be provided. You do not want to be prohibitive at the beginning, you want to let schools demonstrate how they will provide those services or if they want to contract with the district to provide services. There are no restrictions at this point.
- What are site-governed schools, please provide some background about how they are different from typical schools or charter schools. Response: The differences will be determined depending on the proposal submitted by individual groups. The schools have autonomy around how they want to design the application process. The idea behind self-governed schools is to have schools that are more autonomous within a district led by the school community. They would have more freedom to design and run the school but remain part of the district. Revenue is determine by statute and funneled through the district. Teacher leader teams at the site would design and run the facility. This provides

for autonomy at the site, somewhat like charter schools, while keeping the school part of the district.

- What will be the process to be followed and what is the approval process? Response: What is being recommended are two stages. If the Board approves the concept, it would authorize administration to flesh out the process. The first step would be to receive "letters of intent" from interested groups in order to get an idea of what is out there in the way of ideas and interest. There would be a formal RFP developed so formal proposals could be developed and submitted for review and evaluation. There would need to be specific selection criteria, an assessment of technical assistance that might be needed, etc.

**MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education receive the Report of the Site-Governed Schools Exploratory Committee with its thanks and direct Administration to work with the Federation to begin the process of soliciting applications for site-governed schools, based on an appropriate timeline to be developed by the Administration. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

**Motion passed.**

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION:**

- At this point, the board would launch exploration specifically for the process. Does the Exploratory Committee end and where is the Board in the process? What RFPs will be accepted? Who can apply? Will they have connection with SPPS or from outside entities? Response: The committee looked at whether they should specify what groups could bring forward an RFP. The committee determined they did not have a legitimate basis to determine who should come first. It is completely open but it has to align with preferences and priorities; it will be a self-regulating system. There will be a framework where necessary but not more. The committee wanted official permission to move forward. The Chief Accountability Officer recommended that the Exploratory Committee sunset but that then there be an Implementation Committee formed to pull the process together. If schools are interested, they will need, at some point, to pull back from participation on the committee in order to make application. There are some specific guidelines that must be complied with in the Statute.
- Does a site-governed school increase the workload for teachers? In addition, how does that look to families in what teachers have to do in day? Do parents have increased involvement? Response: It may increase the workload of a teacher (a teacher led school would definitely add work with administrative responsibilities). It would provide opportunities to bring more parents to the table or bring them to the table in a different way depending on the design. For teachers, it would depend on the type of governance chosen. It will be empowering for teachers to be part of the process.
- Since the Statute specifies the District work with the Federation on the process, it was suggested the motion be amended to specify the District work with the Federation. This was agreed to.

**C. Legislative Update**

The SPPS Legislative Liaison provided an update on a number of policy proposals and hearings which were held on the Governor's budget. She noted the finance committee would have until March 25 to act on appropriation bills and until May 6 for policy bills. Some of the items reported on included:

- Good news in that the economic forecast looked better than past ones. There is approximately a billion dollar improvement in the forecast due, for the most part, to savings due to medical assistance expansion and revenue increased in tax collection driven by capital gains. There was warning the recovery is slow but there has been some improvement in jobs. The Governor has made some changes to the supplemental budget recommendations but there are no specifics available yet. There were no changes to K-12. There was some change to the income tax surcharge changes and some in the area of Health and Human Services.
- The Conference Committee resolved issues on the alternative licensing bill and the bill may come up by Thursday. The agreement was that not every licensing program need be

affiliated with a University but they must consult with a higher education facility. It established 200 hours of training, passing the PRAXIS test, testing in the specific area of expertise and some student teaching. The board needs to develop assessment for all teacher programs at graduation. The Board was given more authority to approve and revoke applications for alternative licensing programs. A District will need a site committee to evaluate teacher candidates for recommendation for a standard license. .

- The Committee heard the Education Excellence Foundation gave a presentation on the Florida education reforms. The reforms are several: Focused on ending social promotion, providing options for students who have a bad test day or are ELL, there is a grading system for schools, there are scholarships for special education students to go into private schools (The private school is not required to provide any special education services to that student compared to what is required for public schools). Some reform at the high school level but they have not had much success with closing gap at high school level. Their programs are more effective at the elementary level.
- There is a bill for a Grading Systems for schools moving forward with weighting on things like testing, growth, graduation rate, attendance, etc. There will need to be a rule making process for this bill so there will be a cost involved in setting this up.
- The mandates reduction efforts are moving within many separate bills.
- Integration revenue and the Legislative Auditors Report (several years old) were heard. Districts are using funds differently. Some history of the program, what funding is provided to districts, etc. were reviewed for the legislators today.
- The bill on the pilot project for innovation in school district design was introduced.
- HF511 – Mandate Reduction Bill, Standards, Benchmarks and Grad Requirements – passed out of House Education Reform Committee
- HF576 – Extend Education Aids Payment Shift
- HF441 – Repeal of the 2% Staff Development Reserve
- HF269 – Qualified Economic Offer for Teacher Bargaining
- HF88 – Safe School Levy
- HF563/SF372 – Full Service School Zones, Achievement Plus
- HF535 – Third Party Reimbursement for Medical Assistance
- SF42 – Integration Aid Cut and Compensatory De-Linking
- HF575 – MASA Bill on Tenure Changes

The House Education Finance Committee will visit Harding High School on March 2. A small group of House members will visit the Phalen Lake Hmong Studies Magnet School on March 9.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- It has been difficult to see what will impact the district financially. Because of the needs of SPPS students what would be the best approach for advocacy? March 24 is the MSBA Day on the Hill for schools, counties and cities should that be an organized effort? Response: The district continues to put together examples of individual school's work, quantified expenditures and how schools are using categorical funding. Work is being done on making a better definition on categorical revenue to ensure funds are better spent. Part of the difficulty in the General Fund picture is the budget includes an increase to education funding because of loss of federal money. It looks like funding is getting an increase when in actuality it is filling the hole created by the loss of Federal funds. There is also an increase in pupils. They are working to be sure the target for K-12 is adequate.
- Any day anyone can weigh in on the process on the hill is appreciated. The liaison suggested thanking the Governor for his support to education, urging the legislature to ensure they at least meet the Governor's commitment to education. SPPS employees should contact the St. Paul delegation and urge them to be sure adequate resources are there so every student in Minnesota can be college ready.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Legislative Update Report with thanks. Motion seconded by Mr. Brodrick.**

**Motion passed.**

D. Discussion on School District Primary

In 2009, St. Paul voters approved a charter amendment that adopted the ranked voting method for city elections and the elimination of the city primary. Both changes take effect in 2011.

The effect of this on the SPPS Board of Education is that it is left as the only entity conducting primary elections to fill its positions. Additionally, with the change, they would need to authorize primary elections for 2011 and beyond in order to comply with law no later than April 15, 2011 or, conversely to move to de-authorize primaries and move all candidates onto the ballot for the November elections.

Mr. Mansky, Ramsey County Elections Manager, provided information on primary participation and costs. He indicated that based on experience from four years ago, there is a reasonable possibility that the nominees for the school district general election could be chosen by less than 2% of the eligible voting population. He recommended the Board consider not authorizing the school district primary, effective this year. This decision would have two immediate consequences:

- It would save St. Paul taxpayers approximately \$125,000 in administrative costs (the costs would recur in each successive odd-numbered year) and
- It would cause each candidate filing for office to be placed on the general election ballot in November.

He also noted that not authorizing a primary this year does not prohibit the Board from authorizing one in future years.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What could be expected for primary turnout this year? Mr. Mansky indicated that in 2007 only 5,600 voted out of 209,000 voters. With such a very low turnout there could be the possibility for disproportionate influence on primary results. In addition, the primary this year moves to August 9 a time when many voters are not in town. This could also reduce voter participation.
- At the general election – how will School Board candidates be selected? Voters will vote for the top 4. Selection will be the top 4 vote getters. School district elections are conducted under State law and are not locked to City procedures.
- If there is no primary, filing dates will now change from May to 11-13 weeks before the general election or August 9 – August 23 filing dates.
- What is the filing fee? \$2.00
- Mr. Mansky asked that correspondence to be provided confirming the formal action of the Board.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education not hold a primary in 2011. Mr. Hardy seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed.**

E. Standing Item: Policy Update (No Report)

F. Standing Item: Strong Schools, Strong Community Update

The Superintendent reviewed the reasons the Strong Schools, Strong Communities plan was originally implemented. The Plan defines what SPPS should look like and what families should expect to get from SPPS and how it fits into the community. The reasons included:

- Giving families a choice among high quality schools within every community
- Providing a selection of specialized curriculum
- Providing Individualized instruction to meet the needs of kids
- Welcoming families to the SPPS community
- High expectations for all and of one another
- Maximization of resources offering a wide range of learning options

- Students who are college and career ready
- Enrichment opportunities for all students
- Students prepared for life (college and career ready)

She stated the current reality is that only one-half of SPPS students are proficient in reading and math and there is a predictable pattern of lower achievement for some students (African American, American Indian and low-income students). The core purpose of the plan is teaching and learning and there is a need to act now to improve how instruction is delivered. The plan is grounded on research and best practices.

Achievement (Goal 1) is the primary goal of the plan. Transformation will begin in the classrooms. The goal is that 75% of SPPS students will be proficient by Spring 2015 . By pairing managed instruction with Performance Management, uniformly high expectations are created across the system. Goals 2 and 3 support Goal 1.

The reform will take time. There could be dips in achievement in the first year, there should be modest growth over the next two years and the district should be well positioned to see double digit gains thereafter. The plan is spread over three years in order to build momentum and stability while implementing drastic change.

The Superintendent reviewed the planning, monitoring and reporting tools which will track progress as the plan evolves.

Goal 2, alignment supports achievement. This is alignment of all structures within the district and creates a better choice system by implementing six geographic areas that offer learning closer to home. The data shows student do better in schools closer to home. St. Paul is a naturally integrated city. The plan preserves choice by providing community schools, regional and district magnet schools. It retains 24 elementary magnet programs in 20 schools throughout the city.

She indicated administration has listened to staff, families and the community at the various group meetings held over the past two months. The feedback from these meetings informed the plan and is reflected in the amendments being presented at this meeting. The solutions provide increased assurances, expansion to successful programs and stays true to the pillars of the plan. The amendments made to the plan are:

#### 1. Area A

- Keep L'Etoile du Nord on the East Side by moving them in 2013 to a split campus design in the former elementary school sites of Ames and Prosperity Heights. This allows for program growth, keeps a high performing school on the East Side, recognizes the precedent set with Farnsworth-Cleveland and Linwood-Monroe and minimizes costs as both buildings are already designed for K-5 programming.
- Maintain the proposal for Nokomis Montessori dual campus design with current Nokomis site and former site of Sheridan Elementary School. This will allow for program growth, keeps a high performing school on the East Side, recognizes the precedent set with Farnsworth-Cleveland and Linwood-Monroe and minimizes costs as both buildings are already designed for K-5 programming.
- Hazel Park Preparatory Academy grows to become a PK-8 (no change) and offers additional seats for eastside students.
- Use the Parkway Building as a 6-8 middle school beginning in 2013. This provides for a community middle school in Area A, provides an East Regional Articulation for 6-8 MYP (articulates to Harding which allows east side students from Areas A & B and Area C east of 35E to participate in academically rigorous 6-12 programming close to home) and provide for citywide articulation for 6-8 Montessori program.
- Johnson High School becomes a regional AP high school for Areas A & B and retains district-wide articulation for Aerospace Engineering.
- Special Education programming planned for Sheridan moves to the previous site of Open World Learning.



- Johnson High School becomes the regional high school articulation for the district Aerospace-Engineering program and the regional AP for Areas A & B.
2. **Area B**
    - Harding High School becomes regional high school articulation for Hmong Language & Culture/Immersion for Areas A & B and C east of 35E and retains previously noted citywide articulation for American Indian Program. Harding becomes the east regional IB programming for Areas A, B and C east of 35E.
  3. **Area C**
    - Washington Secondary (6-12) becomes regional AP high school for Area C, the west regional Hmong language and culture articulation and articulation for district BioSMART..
  4. **Area D**
    - Humboldt 6-12 becomes regional AP high school for Areas F2 and D. District Environmental science program.
  4. **Area E**
    - Como Park High School becomes regional AP high school for Areas E and F1 and the area E high school.
  5. **Area F**
    - Benjamin E Mays Elementary and Highland Park Elementary – expand regional attendance area for both. Highland Elementary’s region expanded to serve all of Area F (1 & 2) and Area D. Expand Benjamin E Mays region to serve all of Area F (1 & 2) and Areas A, B, C and E. Both schools are physically located in Area F and both schools currently dare students from both F1 and F2. Students for both schools will follow articulation based on home address for middle and high school.
    - Create a gifted and talented high school articulation for Capitol Hill to Highland Park Senior High School. This supports the unique academic needs of gifted students, helps to stabilize enrollment at Highland without additional transportation costs. Students will have access to IB programming.
    - Allow Open World Learning Community to maintain grade 6-8 for two years to determine whether middle school can be made viable. Middle grades would be re-evaluated for viability prior to the start of SY 2013-14 and move to Wellstone site.
    - Relocate Four Season A+ Elementary to former Longfellow site. Placement preference would be extended to current OWL students in grade K-4 (grades 1-5 in SY 11).
    - The Area F1 High school would be Central which would also be Regional IB for Areas E and F1 and articulation for district French Immersion
    - The Area F2 High school would be Highland Park which would be regional IB articulation for areas D and F2 and district articulation for Spanish Immersion.
    - Area F -- Clarification was provided that ECFE would remain at the Wheelock site and ECFE at the Highland site would relocate to the Homecroft site.

Goal 3 is Sustainability. A stable revenue is critical to success. Flat and diminishing funding is the new reality for the future. The plan considers the long-term financial outlook and puts it on a sustainable path.

Increases in enrollment will provide \$22.5 million through support by the three-year enrollment campaign. More students mean more revenue. Greater efficiencies in staffing, transportation and administration should reduce expense by about \$10 million over the lifetime of the plan. The District is still facing a \$19 million shortfall this year and without the plan’s reduced expenses the district would see bigger cuts in future years.

Central allocation of resources to schools will occur. There will be a base line of what every school must have, funds will be allocated based on enrollment, class size targets and staffing. This should allow for the capture and reinvestment of about \$3 million in academic support to schools.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What actions will the Board be required to take? Response: The board will have to make policy-related decisions affecting the plan. The committee will move actions to recommend the Board vote to adopt the plan with specific motions around specific areas including grade configuration, articulation, transportation and preference areas.
- The Board recognized the work done to reach this point in the plan and recognized administration has listened to the input from the community and has made modifications recognizing some of that input.
- The fundamental basis for the strategic plan Goal 1 is achievement – convergence of leadership, community and critical focus on what the data says and the proven ability of the district to do the work successfully. Thanks were extended for the hard work to get to this point.
- Why is this particular configuration for the East Side the best overall plan for programming and cost? Response: Several overriding factors led to the proposal. (1) The sentiment from the East Side to keep strong academic programs on the East Side and allowing them to grow. (2) Hearing from other parts of the community about bringing together two school communities in such a way that it produced one school community that is strong and focused on closing the achievement gap successfully in a building that has been reconfigured to accommodate elementary learning space. The proposal to provide dual campuses for both French Immersion and Nokomis will allow them to grow and expand as much as they can by attracting families to them. It does not undermine these programs and keeps them on the East Side. It does not disturb the Hazel Park Academy students who were just relocated and allows that program to grow to a K-8 program as well. There will be some costs related to the changes needed to Parkway in order to meet the needs of the projected population for middle school. The proposal is a way to accomplish all of what is needed in a way that is most cost effective and serves the entire East Side community. With this plan in place, all schools on the East Side will be open and functioning and all SPPS property will be functioning as intended. It will bring in kids, it will open schools but there is still a need to increase market share.
- Please discuss specific ideas to market schools on the East Side? Is there a plan to market those schools and plans for community support? Response: Once the plan is passed, the District can market anything, there is a plan, a funder to collaborate with and the District will market schools through the illumination of the positive achievements by schools. The community has to unite together with the schools because education is the kids' and the community's future. Kids need to understand education is a necessity/priority. It is the responsibility of every citizen to educate all kids. The District needs to talk about what is great in the schools to everyone.
- The City's commitment to working with the school district will bring stronger communities for St. Paul.
- What is the benefit of having dual campuses? How will support be provided to families? Response: The District has done this already with two other dual campuses, it has the experience on how to do it. The students are still in the same school with one principal, one philosophy; teachers are working together. Families will still get busing and students from one family going to the same school (even with split campuses) will be on the same bus. At the end of the day, the Discovery Club will be utilized to accommodate elementary students. Where there are dual campuses, programs have gotten stronger and provided space for additional students. In those schools, an opportunity is provided so the growth is not overwhelming and time is provided for a culture to develop within the school. The current proposal allows the schools to work through the process over two and a half years. Ames and Prosperity are close to each other, the capacity of the buildings allows for more space with Ames specified for the elementary as it has more space to accommodate capturing more incoming students. Both schools are already set up as elementary facilities so that minimizes expense. Additionally both allow for space for the Discovery Club.

- Capacity – how can the District work with the City to enhance the capacity of those services to the East Side and the rest of the city? How can capacity be built along with partnerships with the City (and others) to create more synergy while building on services already there? There is a new recreation facility proposed for the East Side, learning campuses across the city, what other opportunities are there to partner with others to build capacity and services? Response: The District is in on-going discussions on how to partner better with the City and County to maximize resources and minimize cost. There will be learning campuses in each of six areas that provide opportunities for morning to evening enrichment options. The need is to make sure students learn wherever they are and that the after school programming is aligned with school programs as well as meeting the needs of families for a safe environment for their children. Finally looking at students and the future workforce, the business community is also realizing their responsibility to the future.
- The East Side has two strong middle schools – Parkway and Battle Creek. There is also a need for strong elementary programs that continue pathways on the East Side. Response: Some of the best performing schools do not have enough students so one proposal added into plan is to change to one-half miles transportation limit for Dayton’s Bluff, Johnson Elementary, the St. Paul Music Academy, Maxfield and Jackson (part of Promise Neighborhood). This is a pilot program to see if one-half mile provides a chance for families to choose neighborhood schools. It is hoped this will enrich the enrollment in some of those schools.
- Why does Johnson Elementary go to area C? Response: Past history plays into the plan here, Arlington did not have an attendance zone, to its detriment. In order to create feeders for Washington it was necessary to align area C to have elementary feeders. John A. Johnson and Vento align most naturally to Washington. Additionally, across the district when boundaries were considered administration looked at elementary capacity and projected how many students could be moved through to middle and high school programs in the areas.
- Programming – Policy 601 has a section in it on PreK-12 education programming that says, “programs will be coordinated systematically throughout the district”. This portion gives the District the right to talk about culture in education, to establish grade configurations and articulation of programs that will be able to address the issue of establishing a “culture of education” - how will the transitions over the next couple of years address the areas of predictability by poverty race and ethnicity so it is no longer a barrier to education but becomes a culture of education for families of color. Response; Articulation will not change results but it will help by providing a system for them. If the District does not change the way it teaches, instructs and looks at all students with the expectation that all can learn nothing will improve. The Plan addresses the fact that students are not learning and defines what needs to be done to ensure that all kids will learn. Managed instruction, assessments, feedback and opportunities for additional learning are being introduced to address this. The District is working with churches and communities so everyone understands what should be learned at all schools throughout St. Paul.. Education also happens after school and on weekends. It is about reframing how kids are educated and finding other ways to ensure to families and the community that education is a priority to everyone and that kids understand the importance of education for themselves. Over the next three years, the District will move toward getting everyone on board, moving in the right direction and working toward the same goal. A culture of performance is what is being established. One strategy is the managed instruction approach – it is aligning what is taught, what is written and what is assessed. Managed instruction is aligning the assessment and standard curriculum as well as what needs to be differentiated within the teaching. It does not take away the “art” of teaching. The District needs to build capacity with the right tools, background and training in order to build the foundation for managed instruction.
- Looking at the timeline of 3 years to bring to full implementation, what will happen within each of those years? Response: The Plan is built in layers and phases. There will be few changes in goal 2 in SY 11. The big change in high school will come in 2012. The big change in middle schools will come in 2013. Before then Implementation teams will need to be organized to develop preference areas, academic programming. Sustainability

depends heavily on what happens in the legislature and is multi-layered. Efforts will be made to include other voices in these areas.

- Once the plan is approved and it is ensured it is solid though with some flexibility for changes; how will that flexibility really work? Response: An example – a middle school Montessori in 13-14, if, after one year, the enrollment is not as expected, then assessments will be made to see if it is viable. Adjustments will be worked on, as adjustments would be made in any business plan. Quarterly reports will be developed to assist in assessing what and when intervention might be necessary. A system of checks and balances will be developed and assessment reviews will be made to know where change might be necessary. Everyone needs to be realistic about expectations.
- Managed Instruction does not mean managed pedagogy, there will be room for teacher creativity within Managed Instruction. There is a science of effective instruction and each teacher brings their own creativity and knowledge into it. Managed Instruction is not a threat, it is a tool.
- Why is Pre-K programming not specified in Motion 1? Response. The first motion references compulsory attendance in grades K-12.
- Teaching and programming – concern was expressed about having the resources needed in schools where the challenges are greatest. Specifics were asked for on how help would be provided so teachers succeed in schools with greatest need? Response: The achievement gap is not new in St. Paul. There is a need to be open-minded and believe it can be closed given the time and place. The District needs to find the programming that is getting the results regardless of where and who it belongs to. The District needs to be accountable to itself, the community and the kids.
- If have students are not reading at grade level, how will you get that student to grade level to can keep up with curriculum in order to get what they need? Response. Firstly, the students need to understand what being at grade level means. Goals need to be set for students. Goals need to be given to parents immediately upon their child starting school. Teachers need to be provided strategies to get kids to grade level. Interventions need to be individualized. If teachers do not use the right strategy, kids will miss the goals.
- Courageous Conversations – African American and African students – how will the plan help them? Response: First, everyone has to admit there is an issue with African American students. Goals then need to be set on how to change that. What is the organization doing when there is a curriculum that is not culturally relevant to those students. There is a need to bring diversity to all kids. Kids are all different, so teachers need to connect with them in different ways. The cultural proficiency training being done now needs to be internalized and implemented. Everyone needs to do more but differently.

#### **MOTION (Policy Reference 601.00)**

**Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move that St. Paul Public Schools operate schools with the following grade configurations, according to the implementation timeline proposed in Strong Schools, Strong Communities Strategic Plan, as amended on March 1, 2011.**

- **K-8 or 1-8 (Kindergarten or first grade through eighth grade)**
- **Elementary (Kindergarten through fifth grade)**
- **Middle (Sixth grade through eighth grade)**
- **Secondary (Sixth grade through twelfth grade)**
- **Senior High (Ninth grade through twelfth grade)**
- **K-12 (Kindergarten through twelfth grade [Bridgeview Special Education])**

#### **Motion Passed**

Ms. Carroll made the motion on articulations, which was seconded, and then posed the following question:

- Concern was expressed about Gifted and Talented (G&T) 1-12. A commitment was made long ago to offer G&T opportunities to all students in all schools. So when the articulation to Highland Park for Capitol Hill was mentioned that is not the same as what is being said here. Therefore, it was suggested the terminology be modified in the motion. Response:

The intent is that currently there is a school which students are tested to get into. What this motion is doing is articulating that school to Highland. The reason for using the word articulation is because there may be other G&T students coming into the district from elsewhere. By articulating Capitol Hill to Highland, administration is saying that all of the students who wish to be programmed at Highland will be guaranteed a seat. Those who "come in" are not guaranteed a seat but admission is based on space available. It is about the guarantee piece that goes with articulation from program to program, school to school.

- Concern was again expressed that there is a need to make both the Arts and Gifted and Talented more specific in order to avoid misrepresentation. Arts is not all arts, it is certain schools, is it only full time programming? The language needs to be made clearer that it refers to certain schools that offer those particular subjects as their formalized, full-time program. Response: The sense is there. Perhaps the motion could pass with the understanding that between now and March 15 the language will be clarified?
- A check was made with Board members, the consensus was that most were comfortable with the language presented.
- Clarification was made that the issue is offering G&T articulation specific to one school only and it should be clear to the community that it is one school to one school. There are G&T students who have chosen not to go to Capitol Hill so they should not feel that if they make a certain choice they will be deprived of those services.
- Regarding the arts question, arts refer to music, performing arts and visual arts.. On G&T the point is understood, the reasons for not naming particular schools is that anything can change and the motion went to intent – in this case this is the articulation for one school. G& T is a full gamut of offerings not limited to one school – that is the concern.
- Will it be a full-time G&T program in senior high?
- As the motions are moved through to the Board meeting, is there an opportunity for Administration to provide more narrative to explain more fully what the motion means so everyone can understand what is being voted upon?

Ms. Kong-Thao called the question.

**MOTION (Policy Reference 601.00)**

**Ms. Carroll, seconded by Mr. Hardy, moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education, in support of the Strong Schools, Strong Communities Strategic Plan, as amended on March 1, 2011, provide articulation for the following St. Paul Public School programs through the following grades:**

- **American Indian Language and Culture: Kindergarten through twelfth grade.**
- **Arts (Music, Performing and Visual Arts): Kindergarten through twelfth grade**
- **Gifted and Talented: First through twelfth grade**
- **Hmong Studies Language and Culture: Kindergarten through twelfth grade**
- **International Baccalaureate (PYP-MYP-IB): Kindergarten through twelfth grade**
- **Language Immersion – French: Kindergarten through twelfth grade**
- **Language Immersion – Spanish: Kindergarten through twelfth grade**
- **Language Immersion – Chinese: Final grade configuration to be determined**
- **Montessori: Kindergarten through eighth grade**
- **Aerospace: Kindergarten through twelfth grade.**

**Motion passed (6 in favor, 1 abstention (Ms. Carroll)).**

**MOTION (Policy Reference 502.00 and 707.00)**

**Ms. Street-Stewart, seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao, moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education, for the purposes of transportation, define six geographic Areas (A through F) within the City of St. Paul; assign each community school to a single Area; assign regional or district magnet schools to serve one or more Areas; and for purposes of school assignment direct Administration to establish individual community school attendance preference areas by September 30, 2011 as proposed in the Strong Schools, Strong Communities Strategic Plan, as amended on March 1, 2011,**

**Motion passed.**

- A questions was posed whether it is Important to differentiate F1 & F2? Response: At this point, it does not make a difference as the specifications are within the plan.

**MOTION**                      **Ms. Kong-Thao, seconded by Ms. Carroll, moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move that, in support of the Strong Schools, Strong Communities Strategic Plan, as amended on March 1, 2011, the St. Paul Public Schools discontinue the elementary school grades of Open World Learning Community (Grades K-5) effective June 30, 2011; and the elementary school programs at Museum Magnet and World Cultures Magnet Schools (Grades K-6) effective June 30, 2012.**

**Motion passed with revisions of grade levels.**

- The question was asked if the amendment to the plan allowing for two additional years at OWL at the sixth grade level, how would the District support the process of recruitment and marketing to gain students at grade 6? Response: There is a recruitment plan to help everyone, the District cannot support every individual program, but there are various entities talking about it and the parents are providing support as well. It is understood the District wants programs to be successful. Support is there.
- Why is the District proposing the discontinuance of the Museum Magnet and World Cultures programs? Response: The proposal is the discontinuation of those two program two years out. Therefore, in 2012 Museum Magnet will be co-located (Ben Mays/Museum) and the American Indian and World Cultures will be co-located. The decision was based on enrollment trends and the magnet designation moving forward along with which program designation will be used moving forward at that time.
- The question was asked, because of the definition of elementary school, there are still K-6 elementary schools, so perhaps for OWL it should be designated as K-5 and the other two as K-6. The consensus was this clarification should be added to the motion.

**MOTION:**                      **Mr. Hardy moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education adopt a resolution approving the comprehensive Strong Schools, Strong Communities Strategic Plan and implementation timeline, as proposed and amended on March 1, 2011. Motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

**Motion passed.**

### III. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION:**                      **Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.**

**Motion passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss  
Assistant Clerk