

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
April 5, 2011**

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

Absent: Kazoua Kong-Thao

Staff: Suzanne Kelly, Steve Schellenberg, Barbara DeMaster, Michelle Walker, Denise Quinlan, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Matt Mohs, Marie Schrul, Tim Caskey, Marilyn Baeker, Sharon Freeman, Stacy Lackner, Michael Baumann, Jackie Turner, Mary Kelly, Mike Kremer, Patrick Bryant, Dr. Karen Duke, Sonal Desai-Redd, Judy Kaufmann, Linda Goers

Other: David Kirchner, Doug Belden, Daarel Burnette

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. AGENDA

The order of the agenda was approved.

A. Proposed 2011-12 School Calendars

Staff provided a presentation on the 2011-2012 SPPS School Year Calendar which included:

- District-wide regular calendar
- The year-round school calendar for Crossroads.

Highlights noted regarding the calendar were:

- The first week of school will provide the opportunity for parent/teacher conferences for all grade levels, not just kindergarten. This will help to set the stage for the coming school year with goal setting, meeting the teacher, reviewing spring MAP data,
- Kindergarten and pre-school teachers will also have two full days for conferences and two days of job-embedded professional development during the first week of school.
- All student release days occur during the week of October 17 that also includes the statewide teacher meetings.
- Winter break is eight days with students returning to school Wednesday, January 4. The primary reason for the shorter break is due to where Christmas and New Years fall and the impact a 10-day break would have on the last day of school (moving it into the second full week in June).
- Friday, April 6 is professional development day for all grades.
- The school year will end on Friday, June 8.
- Summer school, including GRAD preparation, begins Monday, June 18.

A communications plan is being developed in collaboration with the Office of Parent Engagement and Community Partnerships and Office of Communications so staff and families will know about the new calendar and the rationale for the changes. Communications will include: the *Bridge*, letters in backpacks, the Board Action Update, Connect Ed, the district website, local media and the student placement "Apply" website.

The Calendar Committee will begin work early this spring on the 2012-13 calendar. This committee will have more parent representation and will have the goal of creating a calendar that will best meet the needs of students and families and align with goals of the SSSC Strategic Plan.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- A concern was raised about the early release of students during the first week. The Office of Family Engagement and Communications need to bring this to the attention of parents to alert them of the to change made to the first week.
- Will the April 6 date cause a problem with absences as many people celebrate that date? Does making it a professional development day put that development at risk? Response: There was a similar situation in 2010 and there were no unusual absences.
- REQUEST: Put the total number of student days onto the calendar.
- Concern has been expressed in the past about the number of Fridays students are released early – was this discussed by the committee? Response: This was a concern and it is one of the reasons the early release days were moved to the first week. The specific Friday issue was not discussed but changing the first week also dilutes the cumulative affect of sprinkling the days throughout the year bringing them into a more concentrated block.
- Is March 9 a parent conference day? Response: Yes, there is a parental preference for having conference days at the end of the week. The committee tried for as few interrupted weeks as possible. There has been extensive discussion on how parent conferences fit into the new assessment model and whether the District was stuck in an old model. There was discussion on developing a three-year calendar as well.
- It will be interesting to see how these conferences at the start work out and how parents take advantage of it. Will there be an opportunity to survey parents to get their impression of how this works and how it affects families? This should be a good way to get the year started.
- What are the differences in parent conferences between elementary and secondary, on some of these days is there school for secondary but not elementary with the secondary conferences in the evening? Response: The grading and reporting day (1/27) coincides with the professional learning for secondary schools. So when elementaries are holding conferences the secondary is doing something else. Response: This continues the existing model of parent conferences. Elementary schools hold conferences with no kids in school utilizing a full day plus some evenings. Secondary conferences are only in the evenings. There are two days during the year when the elementary schools are dismissed and the secondary hold classes. There are also a couple days where the elementaries are involved in conference preparation or conferences and secondary is having a professional day and there is one day in January when the elementary are doing professional development and secondary are doing grading. The goal is to have as few days with kids absent as possible. Elementary have 173 school days and secondary has 175 days.
- Please provide some clarification on the first week. The conferences are only for PreK on the 6th & 7th during the day and the other two days are professional development days for teachers, right? All levels will have early release? Response: Those days will be early release because there are parent teacher conferences for all grade levels.
- Why conferences the first week? Response: It is due to the nee to provide orientation for parents and establish expectations for children for the year and establish rapport early on. It is hoped this will enhance parent engagement and participation early on. November has been too late in the year for the first parent conferences and this solves that issue.
- The first opportunity for feedback on the year's progress would be in November? Response: The 11th. Administration has not yet formulated the schedule for the first week as far as structure and parameters on how week will look. It is expected that use will be made of the spring MAP data during the first interaction with parents and as feedback on academic performance on where the child is as the year begins.

- When will the Board vote on this calendar? April 19. Will there be an opportunity for a draft of the calendar to be revealed to teachers and parents prior to the 19th? Response: The proposed calendar will be put up on the district website. Feedback will be obtained from DPAC and the SPFT Executive Committee.
- It was noted the SPFT has been heavily involved in the development of the calendar.
- When will the first quarter MAP results available? Response: Once the calendar is approved, staff will be able to establish dates for MAP testing. MAP testing dates can be set at the district's discretion. The first quarter MAP results should be available by the November 11 conference date so parents can be made aware of the results at the conference.
- The Spring break is set how? Response: The goal was to schedule spring break prior to when the State opens the window for MCA testing so there is uninterrupted time prior to the State testing window for student prep.
- The Winter break, what feedback was provided by teachers on having a full two-week break? Response: There were two teachers on the committee and both sit on the Executive Board of SPFT. There was in-depth discussion on the benefit of 10 days. The discussion was tempered by the reality for parents and families of when parents would be expected to return to work. If the 10-day option were scheduled the most logical option would be to have break extend through January 6 so there would be four days when students would be home while parents worked. There was give and take and the difference was split for the eight-day option. The lack of continuity in coming back later in the week and having a two-day week was considered but not felt to be optimal for instruction. The consensus, given the timing of holidays, was that the eight days would be the best option. Director Hardy indicated he would abstain until he had heard the feedback from DPAC prior to the vote on the 19th.
- Back to the 11th, conferences could not realistically be moved back prior to November 11 because the MAP data would not be available, correct? Response: The Board can do whatever it wants but the challenge with MAP is there is a window when students come back and when testing can logically be completed. There is a need for at least one and a half to two months to do the testing and get the assessment results back.
- It was suggested administration clarify the basis of the recommendations relative to the calendar, perhaps do a FAQ sheet.
- Care needs to be taken with feedback from DPAC and SPFT to try to avoid individual opinions. It was suggested the next year's calendar committee do some form of on-line survey of families and staff to establish a collective opinion of the community view on the calendar. That should provide a full range of perspectives.
- How does the district tap into individual parent advisory committees (site councils, PTOs, volunteers within schools)? Response: Historically, getting broad parent feedback is a challenge. The District tries to ensure there are secondary and elementary parents on the calendar committee but there have been questions from that group about the value of their input. With the 12-13 calendar there will be a "survey monkey" so there is a broader base of input from the entire parent opinion base.
- It was noted interest had been expressed by some site councils about having certain topics brought to them for discussion without their having to join a "special committee" in order to provide feedback.
- On the winter break, did the committee discuss the 21st and 22nd as an option for a full 10 days? Did they look at that? Response: Yes, that was discussed. Having the break begin on the evening of the 20th was discussed but it was felt this would have a negative impact on instruction. The consensus was the 23rd was good middle ground, allowing families to begin travel on that day while helping to mitigate absenteeism. Adding the two extra days would also push the end of the school year into second full week in June, not a popular option.
- Concern was again expressed about moving spring break earlier. There would be weather issues to consider. The end of March may be better and kids would not be stuck in the house. The response from DPAC will be of interest.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move the 2011-2012 SPPS School Year Calendars, as presented, to the BOE meeting of 4/19 for final action. Motion seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart.

Motion passed five in favor, 1 abstention (Hardy).

B. ARRA Update

Staff provided a Year 2 Implementation Update on the ARRA Funding. It was noted funding ends as of June 30, 2011 (per MDE) and does have staffing implications on the upcoming budget. This is a revenue stream that will not be available in the future.

There were seven key areas evaluated; the data warehouse was removed, as it is no longer ARRA funded.

- Response to Intervention (Rtl)
- Work with Leadership & Learning Center (LLC)
- Strengthening Literacy Instruction (MONDO, RIS)
- Assessment (MAP, End of Course)
- Cultural Proficiency (CP)
- Special Education Redesign (special education collaboration and Universal Design for Learning, reform of EBD programming)
- Positive School-wide Behavior Model (PSB)

The report reflected Step 1 review of implementation, Step 2 evaluation of short-term effectiveness (formative evaluation) and Step 3 the final report evaluating long-term outcomes (summative evaluation) which will occur later (possibly October-November).

1. **Response to Intervention (Rtl)**

The District Rtl Leadership Team established a framework for the district. The Leadership & Learning Center (LLC) conducted Rtl audits at 45 sites to determine baseline for district-wide implementation. Changes made for 2010-11 included focus on strengthening core instruction first, then moving on to focus on Tiers II and III. LLC has been providing coaching during site visits and has introduced the LLC Data Team Process to AYP 3.0+ sites (schools at the corrective action level). The Rtl Leadership Team developed a comprehensive Rtl Plan in December 2010. The team determined that more work was needed on strengthening core instruction and use of data.

2. In 2009-10, the **Leadership & Learning Center (LLC)** conducted district-wide K-12 implementation audits. Priority standards were created for all content areas in Grades 7-12. Over 500 staff was trained in one or more of the LLC strategies: Engaging Classroom Assessments (ECA), Five Easy Steps to a Balanced Math Program (FES) and Write to Learn (WTL). 30 staff members were trained as trainers in ECA and/or FES. Changes made in 2010-11 include 18 secondary sites now have a .5 FTE LLC coach on staff. All LLC coaches have been certified as trainers for WTL. Work is proceeding on getting an SPPS staff members certified in Rtl.

Program areas reported various stages of implementation of LLC components for 2009-10 and all plans include added focus on ECA development and use for 2010-11. An electronic survey of secondary staff for understanding and use of ECAs, FES, WTL and Data Teams is planned for the spring of 2011. Generally, reception of Data Team work in buildings is positive; accomplishments and challenges have been identified.

3. **Strengthening Literacy Instruction (MONDO, RIS)**

In 2009-10 all elementary K-5 classrooms that teach reading in English (97%) received MONDO materials. Reading Intervention Specialists (RISs) were hired (seven were funded through ARRA, six were funded with non-ARRA funds). The RISs provided professional development to teachers in their assigned building as well as other literacy support throughout the district and community. The change which was made in 2010-11

for elementary was the addition of DataZone for MONDO assessments. At the secondary level, the focus was changed from district coaches to internal building coaches. These coaches are now called Reading Intervention Coaches (RICs). Most secondary sites have an internal .4 FTE RIC. The two district RICs service buildings that do not have their own RIC.

2009-10 reports on K-5 implementation show district-wide implementation was 55% (ranging from 22-90% by school). Nine of 34 (26%) schools had a MONDO-recommended coach to teacher ratio of 1:12. A principal's focus group indicated principals find their building coaches invaluable, that ARRA-funded district coach positions are spread too thin and that the personnel filling these positions are often not perceived as the right people to fill the position.

Secondary RICs provided the following service to buildings during the first semester of 2010-11:

- 554 hours direct coaching to teachers
- 480 hours of professional development for teachers
- 504 hours of assistance in content area PLCs
- 580 hours developing ECAs across content areas and
- 751 hours collecting and analyzing student achievement data.

4. **Assessments**

2009-10 implementation included hiring a MAP test coordinator and administration of the MAP tests at 37 sites (grades 3-9) along with two one-day workshops for staff. Changes which have been implemented in 2010-11 included implementation of MAP district-wide (77 sites grades 3-9). A one-day workshop for all new sites and hiring an End of Course (EOC) assessment coordinator. A cohort of math teachers has been trained in test building procedures and has written items for Algebra 1.

5. **Cultural Proficiency**

In 2009-10 5,400 Intercultural Development Inventory logins were sent out; 4,500 were completed. Most district staff received at least three hours of Cultural Proficiency Phase I training with deepSEE. Based on feedback, changes were made to the structure of Cultural Proficiency programs in 2010-11. The district is now working with Pacific Education Group and Phase II of cultural proficiency development focuses on training district leadership to explore institutionalized racism and its impact on student learning. There has been a positive response to the change in direction.

6. **Special Education Redesign**

In 2009-10, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) conducted 36 trainings on twelve topics for 700 participants. Three coaches conducted 243 site visits. Over 500 general and special education staff attended training and/or a conference. 35 Special Education Resource Coordinators (SERCs) were hired (17 with ARRA funds; 18 with federal funds) and a District EBD specialist was hired. In 2010-11 Universal Design for Learning expanded its topics, collaboration training has slowed down at the elementary level but training has continued at the secondary level through an MDE grant. An itinerant EBD teacher was hired to serve schools that do not have a licensed EBD teacher on staff.

A UDL survey indicated that teachers who attended UDL training use more technology and differentiation within the classroom. Collaboration among special and general education teachers is developing at the elementary level. Data is being collected on the secondary implementation.

Learning Centers have worked to revise their programs to better align with general education and to provide more positive behavior supports. District data show the number of EBD students served in more restrictive settings has decreased and the percent of LC students suspended has also decreased.

6. **Positive School-wide Behavior Model (PSB)**

In 2009-10 a PSB Leadership Team was established and 12 PSB district coaches were hired to serve 42 sites. District support and prioritization has changed for 2010-11. PSB is now paired with Leadership Development and Turnaround Schools and is no longer housed in special education. PSB training is being provided to every assistant principal, administrative assistant and "behavior specialist" in the district so they can serve as internal building PSB coaches.

Of 36 sites that reported on their first quarter (10-11) implementation:

- 89% have fully implemented PSB teams
- 97% have established 3-5 behavioral expectations
- 92% have established a behavioral matrix for student instruction
- 39% have established school-wide student reinforcement systems and
- 36% collect, analyze and summarize building discipline data.
- 24 schools utilize the School-wide Information System
- 12 schools use the Self Assessment Survey and
- 13 schools utilize the School-wide Evaluation Tool Assessment.

In general substantial progress was made during the first year of ARRA implementation. Everything that was scheduled in the first year was either implemented or is in progress. Where there were changes, additional activities/projects were introduced that added value. Progress toward full implementation has been made with all seven key ARRA components. Where there are conflicts or concerns, adjustments were made to address them.

A long-term effectiveness report is planned for October of 2011 that will assess:

- What was the level of implementation
- What was the impact on student achievement and
- What was the impact on student engagement and behavior.

Long-term impact of the efforts will continue to be tracked to assess value.

Projections on the status of expenditures on NCLB related programs show:

- Title I, Part A (\$18.15 million) is projected to be fully spent by 6/30/11 (excluding some PEG costs obligated through 9/30/11).
- Title I District AYP Grant (\$1.75 million) is fully expended (Turnaround Office and LLC Year 2 costs).- got more Title I money out to schools in the second year.
- Title I School Improvement Grants (\$2.9 million – Maxfield and Humboldt) show the first year expenditures are on target with the renewal applications due 4/22/11 with potential for award increase.)
- McKinney-Vento (\$125,000) – fully expended by 6/30/11. – Homeless Education Program – economic impact has been great on SPPS population
- Neglected & Delinquent (\$264,415) – on track for full expenditure by 6/30/11
- Title II Part D Ed Tech (\$299,232) – on track for full expenditure by 9/30/11 for one-to-one laptop project at Harding.

Projections on the status of expenditures for IDEA-related (special ed) programs show

- Targeted Program (\$9,181,873) is projected to be spent down by 6/30/11
- CEIS – Early Intervening Services (\$1,613,440) is projected to be spent down by 6/30/11.
- Preschool 3-5 (\$442,293) is projected to be spent down by 6/30/11.
- Birth-2 (\$362,327) is projected to be spent down by 6/30/11.

As the Board and administration move forward into budget discussions some of the key priorities which need to be considered for continuation beyond ARRA's expiration include such things as:

- Sustaining the work of LLC – contract and internal capacity

- Literacy Reform – Reading Intervention Specialists – elementary and secondary
- Continuation of cultural proficiency/racial equity with PEG
- Peer Assistance and Review – funding for continuation and desired expansion
- PSB support – potential mix of funding to continue work in some form
- Peer Assistance and Review
- Office of Turnaround Schools
- MAP testing – annual cost and support personnel
- Reading Intervention Specialists – elementary and secondary

This work is considered good work but it would be unrealistic, considering the situation facing the District, not to realize that not all of ARRA funded positions can be rolled into general funding. As the budget process evolves, prioritization will need to occur and it is not likely the current level can be sustained. All ARRA funded personnel were notified their positions were funded for two-years and everyone is aware that funding is going away for those positions and that they are at risk.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Clarification was sought on whether the State would extend ARRA funding for another year. Response: The turnaround grants (Humboldt and Maxfield) have a special provision to carry forward for two additional years. SPPS has funding to carry out plans for the first two years but for the third year will need to look for sustainability support. The State has requested a waiver to allow for some additional awards and if that were granted then Maxfield and Humboldt would potentially be in line to receive additional funds.
- Will the priorities be ranked or will all of them be axed? Response: The Superintendent will bring forward a prioritization related to the SSSC Plan as part of the budget discussion with the Board.
- How are ALC students benefitting from the literacy and special ed efforts funded by ARRA? Response: The two floater RICs work with the other sites that do not have a .4 FTE so they work with AGAPE, Gordon Parks, LEAP, etc. This year Gordon Parks was a Title I school as is AGAPE and did receive some additional special funding. The UDL effort that was opened district-wide and was available for any staff from ALCs. Most of the ongoing activities and projects were open for ALC participation.
- REQUEST: Further information on involvement of ALC in the transformational efforts to be sure everyone is moving forward inclusively.
- Do RICS have direct contact with students? Yes - .4 of their time is devoted to RIC duties; .6 of their time is devoted to classroom teaching.
- Are RICS spread too thin? Response: Under last year's model, secondary reading intervention specialists were doing strictly professional development work. Under the "improved model" this year the centrally funded FTEs were sent to the schools at .4 and the schools picked up .6 so there are staff members within schools in direct contact with students and having .4 of their time to keep grounded in secondary literacy reforms which are occurring.
- How many people were funded by ARRA? Response: The exact number is challenging but the actual FTE count is 144 FTEs. The number of people affected is approximately 240 individuals (mainly teachers and EAs).
- Will some of those funded by ARRA come back into SPPS system and will that involve bumping? Yes
- SPPS has always desired a funding formula that could be counted upon. From all appearances in the future, the dollars will be awarded on a more competitive basis. The benefit of the dollars addresses the unique needs of students. Can, under the monitoring function of the Board, this information come to the Board in a specific manner specifically on the impact on student engagement and behavior. It would be helpful if it could be identified, based on the short-term allotment of dollars awarded to district, what was the impact on student engagement and how will that be carried forward? What are the real lessons learned as to what can be done if you have X amount of dollars. What changes

have been made and what has changed around the definition of student engagement, will student achievement be defined differently when there are fewer dollars to chase? What is wanted is a way to monitor that the system is still comprehensive and moving forward cohesively, not in fits of starts and stops. How can a report be developed to help the Board monitor what changes have been institutionalized around student engagements and behavior so their achievement is better? Response: A huge challenge with ARRA and identifying and funding the initiatives was the short turnaround. SPPS cannot expect to see huge changes within a two-year period. The richest level of data will be in the area of the level of implementation, how deep was it and where was it most successful. In terms of monitoring areas of achievement, engagement and behavior what was done right was to look at efforts already underway and open for additional investment. Projects that would not take the district off course, where resources could be used to accelerate efforts around achievement, engagement and behavior. Attendance, suspension and dismissal has worked and been benefited by implementation of PSB and other efforts. SPPS has tried to weave ARRA into the way the district does business. Administration can report in more depth on what ARRA has contributed to in the way of additional resources, what it has done and what impact loss would have. However, the efforts must continue in some form or fashion because is the business or the "work" of SPPS. There will not be huge movement in areas 2 or 3 but they still need to be monitored to ensure they were/are worth doing.

- Next report – if a certain level of implementation is part of accepting the obligation of receiving the dollars, what is SPPS still doing to prepare students early to get them to graduate and is that remaining on track?
- The original concept with ARRA was to reform rather than maintain, correct? If those things funded by ARRA were done, in the end will that help establish a system that is more maintainable. Will it help deliver services better and more efficiently? Will SPPS be able to make the best of a bad situation? Response: The good news is that the Board and administration were foresighted in embedding the use of ARRA funds around the concept of accelerating where the district wanted to go, building capacity and providing support within the system. While the district is facing resource challenges, it needs to continue on the path of utilizing resources to support the SSSC plan. The District has much more information available to it now than it had previously. It is in a better place than where it started in that it has a plan, it gained information which in turn made it possible to make corrections to the plan in order to get to a better place and it has tools to address some of the hard questions facing it.
- Concern was expressed about not having the fine information on point #2. Why in October, because of what was done with ARRA funds, won't it be possible to know here is how MAP data increased, here is how MCA results changed and here is how graduation rates were impacted. Why can't the Board have that conversation? Response: Relative to questions 2 and 3, the District cannot expect to see major changes from what has been implemented over only the last year or year and a half. ARRA implementation has been over a very short time, however, there should be some changes in data points and it should be possible to define what efforts affected or did not impact those points.
- PSB was embedded in *The Rights and Responsibility Handbook*. Concern was expressed about how PSB training is being done in such a way that it penetrates whole schools when training is done for only three levels within the schools. Response: Schools were identified, especially all middle schools and have joined the state cohort. The training they get can then be replicated at other sites. SPPS has also applied for State funding to support PBIS for the next year and additional schools can be added to the State cohorts. There is an implementation timeline of 3-5 years to reach all schools.
- With regard to Special Ed, a request was made to look at what there is in terms of long-term impact and how changes are embedded so changes to the system result over time.
- ARRA funds allowed SPPS to continue and bolster what was already working and to build capacity. What does that capacity building look like? In moving forward, what will require added resources or where is capacity already built in and in moving forward where are the gaps in the context of the Strategic Plan?

- How can SPPS introduce helpful information to the community to reinforce what is being done. What from this needs to be delivered to the public so parents know the language and can reinforce it. How can parents reinforce efforts on behalf of the students? With all of the work done, what part of the training, what part of the public message can be rolled out for parents? Response: Specifically around the LLC examples, they are focused primarily on teachers. Most of SPPS communication for the public about ARRA was done at the early part of the ARRA implementation. What part of ARRA funding is specifically affecting families, the work currently being evolved into the Parent University and how parents can support academic efforts of district for their students.
- Communicating with the public is really important so this should be considered particularly around what is needed to reinforce students
- Implementation of PSB in the buildings, would that include substitute teachers receiving the training? Response: That has not yet been addressed.
- What was the total ARRA funding received? Response: \$65 million although one-half of that was money was supplanted by the State to balance the budget last year. This report is focused on funding the district had control over and which was used to support reform efforts.

MOTION: Director Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Year 2 ARRA Implementation Update with thanks. Motion seconded by Director Carroll.

Motion Passed.

C. Leadership Development Overview

SPPS needs leadership to support the teachers; leadership is needed to move achievement results. It is about what is needed to become more effective and better leaders. SPPS needs leaders who are truly effective.

The Office of Leadership Development provides learning opportunities for all leaders through coaching, mentoring, critical friends groups, Minnesota Principal's Academy participation and a year long Learning Catalyst Cohort. Objectives for 2010-12 included:

- Expanding the scope to include all leaders in the district
- Aligning and making development relevant to the specific needs of each site and program
- Rigorously assessing effectiveness to continually refine and improve supports to leaders.

A new paradigm for leadership has been established for leadership development in 2011-14 which includes:

- Authentic learning in context, learning while doing the work
- Differentiated opportunities based on strengths and needs
- Targeting individuals and teams
- Focusing and aligning within each school or department strategic plan
- Long-term sustainability
- A culture of learning based on trust, collaboration and reflective practice.

In support of the SPPS SSSC Plan Leadership Development, objectives include:

- In the area of Achievement: a focus on developing strong instructional leaders; shared leadership through building strong teams, not just individuals; skilled, active teacher leaders who play a key role in leading schools; targeted, differentiated leadership learning opportunities based on assessment of individuals' and schools' needs.
- In the area of Alignment: learning networks of leaders among schools in the same program pathways or geographic areas; clearly identified objectives and expectations for all leaders with alignment to the SPPS model for leadership and within the SPPS accountability framework; differentiation of leadership development supports across career stages to provide career-long support and development system for all leaders.

- In the area of Sustainability: networks of principals learning together and accountable to each other for improvement; partnerships with the University of Minnesota faculty and the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI), continuous feedback loop from leaders to drive program refinements and improvements and cost-effectiveness, cultivating internal expertise and targeting resources directly at schools' specific needs.

One aspect of this is entitled "**Critical Friends**" and has been established for SPPS leaders starting in 2011-12. It is based on the idea that long-term participation leads to a safe environment for learning which will provide opportunities to reflect on current issues and challenges in the work context. It will be designed and supported by the SPPS Office of Leadership Development in partnership with nationally known consultants in professional development and leadership and will reflect well-established best practices in school improvement.

The objectives after one year of participation include:

- Leaders who are empowered to lead their own learning with the skills to reflect on their own practices.
- Leaders who facilitate and participate in coaching conversations with peers and direct reports
- An increase in shared leadership in schools and programs with well-functioning leadership teams and a plan for involvement of all staff
- An increase in efficacy and professional engagement in the school or department
- An understanding of the change process and a plan for how to lead a significant upcoming change in the school and
- Increased trust among leaders with an increased willingness to engage in questioning, reflection and learning together.

Job-embedded coaching will be offered as a deliberate support for professional growth in 2011-12. This would involve topic-specific individual coaching throughout the school year and would be tailored to the needs and professional growth area(s) of each recipient. This will assist leaders in:

- Setting goals effectively, implementing new skills and assessing the impact of their actions
- Being committed to practicing the skills necessary to establish new habits of mind/behavior
- Being more fully engaged in improving professional practices
- Thinking of themselves as collaborators and partners and
- Gaining an increased ability to engage in coaching conversations with staff in an effort to build stronger relationships and promote individual and group change.

The **Learning Catalyst Cohort** provides yearlong growth and development work for school principals with their leadership teams. The work is driven by the needs and goals of each site administrator and team. After one year's participation each site should:

- Moved toward establishing a culture of learning and collaboration among all adults in the school
- Have a well-functioning leadership team and a plan for the involvement of all staff
- See an increase in teacher efficacy and professional engagement in the school
- Have an understanding of the change process and a plan for how to manage a significant upcoming change in the school
- Have a structure for professional learning for all staff that is grounded in the use of student data to guide instruction and
- See improved instructional practices throughout the school.

Staff provided impact summary charts for Traveler's-funded leadership development opportunities which showed the target audience, intended outcomes, number impacted and proposed dates for each of the development efforts being proposed for 2011-12.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Excitement was expressed about the very specific learning objectives and that they will be measurable.
- A request was made for a more specific understanding about the teacher leadership part. Response: Imagine teachers working with the principal within the school to articulate what the true condition of school is, identify top priorities and plan the movement of the school toward a goal. They would be a valuable member of a team driving planning at the school. There are other dimensions of leadership that come from who a person is rather than their position and it will involve parents and community leadership as well. It should not be defined as a stepping-stone to principal ship. SPPS needs to define how it looks at the teacher leadership role within schools and honor teachers as a valuable part of the school community.
- How will the use of this training make its way to other staff in buildings? Response: There are very limited resources so it will build outward from principals and teacher leaders. With planning, it will create a ripple effect through the momentum of principals and teacher leaders. The plan is set on a scale of three to five years from boardroom to boiler room. There a structure in place where individuals can contribute toward better service and support of the strategic plan moving it toward success.
- How does this differ from what has been done in the past? Response: Over the last 10 years, the summer leadership institutes served as a gateway to principal ship (how to manage and how to lead). This paradigm shift looks toward building a continuum of skill sets to increase individuals' ability to handle responsibility and leadership. How to build on a skill set differentiated by what point individuals are at within their career continuum.
- The program will provide coaching to principals and teacher leaders, embedded support within sites for leadership teams and working with the Federation to close the gap between the Federation and District.
- How many projects will be included at the start? Response: The program will work with 10-15 schools for the Learning Catalyst Cohort. For admin interns and principals the work will include about 60 individuals (35 schools) and the mentoring/coaching will involve 10 principals.
- How are leaders to focus on chosen? Is there a plan in place that these are the people you will work with because they will move into another role? How is the selection being made? Response: It is a combination of the above. Travelers will provide the executive mentoring for nine leaders within SPPS. These nine have been chosen because they are an investment or because they are involved with the Turnaround St. Paul Project. With the Learning Catalyst Cohort, volunteers are being sought or some may be intentionally recruited. For the mentoring, individuals were chosen because they are within their first three years of being an administrator in SPPS. Those involved in coaching are either self selected or have been encouraged. There is a wide range. Teachers in the schools are selected through how the principal is structuring their leadership teams for diverse opinion and perspective.
- The Board will expect reports back as to how this is progressing. The inclusion of families, what is the time frame and what is approach being taken? Response: Family and community are a critical part of leadership. This is moving in collaboration with Community and Family Engagement. In a limited fashion the five schools in Turnaround St. Paul are in a partnership with the Center for School Change and they are working with family and community engagement to drive innovative practices at those sites, it is collaborative effort.

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Overview of Leadership Development provided to them with thanks. Motion seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart.

Motion Passed.

D. Standing Item: Strong Schools, Strong Community Update/Program Changes

At the April board, meeting the Superintendent will bring forward detail on progress on the vision cards. She may lay out samples of what they look like with possible targets. The first round will launch in October. Staff will begin work on implementation on the strategic plan. There will be additional discussion about how to use the Promise Neighborhood construct for diversity of representation. Some of the SSSC work is internal to the district because of law, maintenance of effort, etc. so there will be limitations to public input. Varied levels of participation and input will be established. Parameters will be established for all groups to define participation, goals, limitations, etc.

The Goal 2 committee will begin work around boundary issues in order to establish those before the new Choice book is published.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Promise Neighborhoods structure was referenced, can you expand on this for greater understanding? Promise Neighborhoods has a primary Steering Committee made up of the Mayor, Superintendent, foundations and agency partners who have leveraged resources for the effort. Then there are Solution Action Groups made up of staff from some of the lead organizations and community-based organizations who do the work on the ground and some community members who are very engaged in the community and understand the community dynamics. These small committees form recommendations that go up to the Steering Committee. These Solution Action Groups meet more frequently than Steering Committee who makes final decision. This allows input, engagement, implementation recommendations and possible solutions being provided from various levels/entities with all final decisions being made by the Steering Committee.
- Work is being done on what this SPPS structure will look like, how it will build the framework and structure the work will be done within. The budget will be a major driver in implementation of the plan. The timeline will vary, as there is implementation over three years in the SSSC plan.
- As the District talks with schools about goal 1 and managed instruction, it must be thought about in terms of both short and long-term implications. Managed instruction cannot succeed without increasing teacher leadership. There is latent anxiety out there around the issue of managed instruction so communications must be sincere around leadership development.

E. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. Policy 209.00 Development, Adoption, Implementation and Monitoring of Policies
2. Procedure 209.00.1 Board Monitoring of Existing Policy
3. Policy 209.01 Regulatory System

Staff reviewed the proposed changes to the two policy items brought to the COB and reviewed the proposed procedure changes as part of the process. Action was requested for a motion bringing the two policies forward for their first reading at the April 19, 2011 Board meeting.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The question of whether the Board should approve procedures was discussed in depth. The consensus was that the policy review process provided for inclusion of a review of procedures related to individual policy and no further action was required on the issue.
- It was clarified that the Board can request review of any procedure regardless of what schedule be put forth for review of particular policies and their related procedures.

- Clarification was also made that the purpose of looking at the two policies was to clean up discrepancies in language in order to provide consistency between them and to the process.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the recommended changes to Policy 209.00 Development, Adoption, Implementation and Monitoring of Policies and Policy 209.01 Regulatory System and that the two policies be brought to the April 19, 2011 Board meeting for their first reading. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion passed

F. Work Session

1. **Board Budget Review & Justification**

Board members were provided with a brief overview of the Zero-based Budgeting process, which is being implemented for various departments for the 2011-12 school year. They were then provided with the worksheets prepared by the Assistant Clerk for review and revision prior to submission to the ZBB Review Committee and the formal establishment of their 2011-12 budget.

Board members scheduled an additional Committee of the Board meeting on April 12 at 4:30 p.m. specifically to address the Board budget.

2. **BFAC & CEAC Process**

- a. BFAC Application
- b. CEAC Application

There was discussion on use of the committees for the coming year. The Board expressed interest in interviewing the applicants for the committees in some manner during the upcoming process.

The consensus was CEAC has a charge and is moving forward on it for this year. In the coming year with the new strategic plan CEAC's focus might shift somewhat but their input with a focus on the SSSC plan and its implications/impact on requirements relative to capital expenditures will be valuable.

Board members were asked to review the two applications and come back with any changes they felt would be necessary. The Chief Business Officer was asked to prepare recommendations for the charge for BFAC in the coming year.

The subject is to be put on the agenda for the May COB meeting for further discussion.

3. **Board of Education Meeting Dates for Remainder of Calendar Year 2011**

Board members were provided with suggested dates for Board and COB meetings through January 2012.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the dates, as presented, for the COB and Board meetings for the meetings running from August 2011 through January 2012. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hardy.

Motion passed

4. **Scheduling of Board Representation at Graduation Events**

Board members were provided with a schedule of the 2011 Graduation events and asked to confirm which events they would cover. The Board discussed the various dates and agreed among themselves upon representation for all graduation events.

III. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the meeting adjourn. Motion seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

Motion passed

The meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk