

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
August 23, 2011**

PRESENT:

Board: Jeff Risberg, Jean O’Connell, Anne Carroll, Kazoua Kong-Thao (departed at 7:06 p.m.), Keith Hardy, Elona Street-Stewart, John Brodrick (arrived at 6:02 p.m.)

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Michael Baumann, Kathy Brown, Michelle Walker, Julie Schultz-Brown, Jaber Alsididqui, Marie Schrul, Matt Mohs, Andrew Collins, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Willie Jett, Sharon Freeman, Jackie Turner, Joe Munnich, Mike Kremer,

Others: Sarah Gering, Mila Koumploa

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:37 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Impact of State Legislation on SPPS FY 12 Budget

The Chief Business Officer provided a recap of the State Legislature Education Budget Settlement and how it affects SPPS. He then went on to provide a comparison of major revenues under current law and the legislative bills.

<u>State Aid Categories</u>	<u>Current Law*</u>	<u>Special Session Bills*</u>
Basic Revenue	\$218.0	\$220.2
Comp Ed	63.9	64.5
Integration	18.9	18.9
Proficiency Aid	0	0
Growth Aid	0	0
Integration Transportation	.7	.7
Career & Technical Levy	.7	.7
Special Ed	<u>50.3</u>	<u>50.3</u>
Total	\$352.5	\$355.3
Difference		\$2.8

* in millions

The State has made a budget shift from 70/30 payment to 60/40 payment which adversely affects SPPS cash flow. Staff is monitoring the cash flow bi-weekly. The shift will probably necessitate additional mid-year borrowing by the District.

He went on to outline how administration recommends the additional \$2.8 million (general fund dollars) be distributed.

Additional Revenue from Legislature	\$2,813,900
Add Revenue Held Back for Anticipated Loss	<u>4,834,221</u>
Sub Total	\$7,648,121
Direct Cost to SPPS for State Budget Shutdown (borrowing costs)	(200,000)
Fund Balance Contingency for FY 13	(2,000,000)

OPEB Obligation	(1,000,000)
Total Available	\$4,448,121

As stated in the initial budget presentation, any additional funds obtained from final action on the State budget would be split 70% to schools, 20% district-wide and 10% for school service supports. The actual amounts delegated to each area are:

Schools	70%	\$3,113,685
District-wide	20%	889,624
School Service Support	10%	444,812
Total	100%	4,448,121

From the \$3,113,685 Elementary Schools will receive \$1,500,283; Secondary (high schools/middle schools) will receive \$1,351,912 and other sites (AGAPE, BTT, JDC, etc.) will receive \$261,488.

The district-wide distribution of \$889,624 is divided between Program Support, Information Technology Support and opening all pools within SPPS schools.

The \$444,812 for school service support is divided among several areas with Positive Behavior Intervention Support being the largest.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- The Board's directive is to keep the fund balance over 5% where will this put us? Response: Around 5.4% to 5.5% that will provide flexibility for administration and the Board next year.
- Why the distribution to high schools and middle schools immediately? Response: There are fewer schools and bigger amounts for them. This will allow them to hire additional staff members before school starts. The elementary schools will receive between \$10,000-12,000 and this can be used to plug holes.
- Is the high school distribution only to traditional high schools or does it include alternative high schools? Response: It is the traditional sites – Open falls under the traditional; Creative Arts falls under ALC.
- What is the potential for borrowing needs now with these added funds? Response: The District will still need to borrow because of the 60/40 shift.
- What will be the total interest expense expected in the budget at the end of all of the borrowings? Response: For the amount already borrowed of \$55.7 million due to the State aid shifts in previous years, the total net cost has been \$274,000. This is prorated over two fiscal years because of the timing of the borrowings. If the District borrowed a similar amount this would be the approximate cost, though that will be variable depending on amount borrowed and rates available.
- For the elementary schools what is the basis for the division between the traditional and non-traditional? The ALC dollars are a different fund from the general fund. What is the rationale behind the split? Response: The funding for ALC is comp ed only. The rest of the breakdown is based on the funding formula based on projected enrollment. \$261,488 is general fund and comp ed combined for 15 programs.
- Is the distribution for high schools the same? Response: No, they are divided out for purposes of clarity.
- The 15 sites in "other sites" category, assuming equal distribution, this is less than \$20,000 per site. Response: Yes, for example, AGAPE has enrollment at 113 they will receive \$9,520. There is only one over \$20,000, an early education site with enrollment at 688; they will receive \$38,603. The rest are all under \$20,000 based on their enrollment.
- To address the second percentage (20%) for supporting schools will they be reflecting the district-wide strategic plan? The money is not a very large amount. How will the District be able, with the dollars available, to fit the communication plan on the use of extra dollars to support schools. How will this be messaged to the school community that the District is supporting schools first and foremost. Response: As an example, the

plan is to have the best schools in every corner of city. The opening of the pools provides exposure for the students through phy ed. It also provides for community building in that community ed can now provide classes they could not before and the community can now use the pools as well. The pools will also enhance middle school for the students by connecting the students to the schools by offering something, which is unique that they cannot get at other schools. IT has expanded its capacity within schools; they are addressing communication issues and providing opportunities to elevate the usage of technology as a tool within SPPS. Another key area is the District's business intelligence efforts toward tracking and reporting data and building internal expertise to sustain this capacity and capability while building flexibility into the system. Infrastructure support is being built to sustain the system. Program supports district-wide have been funded but the District needs be able to sustain and improve where it can within areas identified by administration.

- We know the State budget for education put schools on the edge so they must rationalize decisions made on use of money. It is good to hear SPPS has agreed upon areas of priority where impact will be gained through the use of funds, even small amounts, to maximize capabilities. The message is not that the District has more money but that it is employing a fiscally conservative way of looking at the potentialities facing SPPS. It is good that SPPS can justify what was done through good planning and the evaluation of possibilities without penalizing students.
- What is the program support referenced here, the district-wide. Response: The amount is \$24,940. Some programs within this are Business & Financial Affairs, Family & Community Engagement, the Print, Copy, Mail Center, MIS, Technology Infrastructure, etc.
- How many pools are there in the district? Response: 10 or 11 pools.
- How will the District message the District-wide support items? Response: It is important to give as much communication to the public and staff on what going on in the District. The enrollment campaign is integrated with the website update and will roll out around September 15. It is called "One thing I love about St. Paul".
- Thanks were extended to staff for finding the \$1 million to fund the OPEB trust.

MOTION:	Director Hardy moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, acceptance of the report/update.
----------------	--

Motion passed.

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

Administration will provide a full report at the September 13 COB on the proposal for monitoring of the SSSC plan with monthly reports to the Board on the various areas. The Action Teams will continue to meet through December. Administration is looking to schedule updates for the Board in October and November. In January, administration will bring forward all recommendations from the various action teams. The District has been working with support from the St. Paul Public Schools Foundation and the Greater Twin Cities United Way to support the action teams and is looking forward to recognizing their support and the efforts of the action teams in bringing forward their recommendations.

DISCUSSION/QUESTIONS:

- The change in name of "managed instruction" to "aligned learning". Why was the decision made? Response: Managed instruction is part of the theory SPPS is using within the strategic plan. The public, however, does not understand the concept and it is difficult to explain. Aligned instruction was recommended because it explains what is being done and allows the public to understand the plan better. It aligns everything being done across the schools, grades, etc.
- Does the name change mean any change in what is being done? Response: No

- Is part of name change related to some of the discomfort/push back with people misunderstanding what was meant? Response: Yes, the new language should clarify what is meant.
- Will the September update include what is happening with the four site-specific action teams? Response: The September 13 update will focus on monitoring and reporting of the strategic plan. The October update will be on the action teams and there would be more information on site work at that time.
- The funder celebration, what provision will be put in place between now and then to bump up the level of horizontal sharing? Response: There was some success in the joint meetings between the Achievement Gap and Integration groups. This provided an opportunity to share information across teams with members of all groups present together to understand some of the pieces. As the work has progressed, it has been found that some pieces may be more relevant to other teams or there might be differing suggestions around similar topics. Administration has been doing check-ins with the staff co-chairs of the teams asking them to bring forth some of themes emerging in order to find areas where overlaps in committee work might be occurring in order to avoid conflicting recommendations.
- Will summaries be available to the public in some manner? Response: It is administration's intent to have a structure for teams to present their recommendations.

Thanks were extended for the work being done and the update on the process.

C. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. **Presentation of Minor Revisions to *The Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook***

The Administrator of Policy, Planning and Intergovernmental Relations indicated the *Rights and Responsibilities Handbook* would be sent to the families soon. A reprint is being done and minor changes to update it are being proposed including the new SSSC goals, a new Superintendent's letter introducing the Handbook and an updated listing of Board members.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- A Board member noted the Board needs to think about what happens to the Board's long-range goals when a new strategic plan is adopted with its own goals. A work session was recommended to discuss what the Board will do with its goals, how do they evolve.
- As the District finds a variety of formats for information and the translations into other languages, what are the core standards around translations? Has the District had the opportunity to hear from speakers of other languages about what areas are most difficult to translate relative to the expectations in other cultures? It would be helpful to find a way for people to comment on areas more difficult to translate and why. Response: The cabinet had excellent discussion in this area around the issue of understanding not only for families who speak another language but the format of the book is not inviting. The question was raised as to how to improve the product and the understanding of it. Students are expected to follow the directives and families to understand handbook. Issues raised included: (1) how to meaningfully engage parents in what it means and what behavior is defined with consequences. (2) are there differences in application of policy across the district? Cabinet members were charged to revisit and think about ways to engage parents in this in order to expand their understanding of the *Handbook*. It was suggested the Parent University might be a starting place to engage around discipline issues and encourage parents to become advocates for their children.
- There are parent support groups in place, do those have some key people to carry the messages across the district. There might also be partners who can help get the message out.

- With that conversation, there should be expanded discussion on bullying and what is being done to address it.
- The power of audio/video and the interactive potential to display acceptable and unacceptable behaviors to provide clarity on what is meant should be considered.
- When will the revised version go out to families? Response: The first week of school.

The question was raised as to when the Advertising Policy will be addressed. Initial information will be provided for the September 13 COB. The work group will meet after school starts.

D. Work Session

1. **Schedule Board Meeting Dates through August 2012**

The proposed dates were:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| ▪ February 21 | Board of Education Meeting (Ex Team) |
| ▪ March 6 | COB Meeting |
| ▪ March 20 | Board of Education Meeting (Ex Team) |
| ▪ April 3 | COB Meeting |
| ▪ April 17 | Board of Education Meeting (Ex Team) |
| ▪ May 1 | COB Meeting |
| ▪ May 15 | Board of Education Meeting (Ex Team) |
| ▪ June 5 | Special Board of Education Meeting on Non-Renewals |
| ▪ June 12 | COB Meeting |
| ▪ June 19 | Board of Education Meeting (Ex Team) |
| ▪ July 17 | COB Meeting |
| ▪ July 17 | Board of Education Meeting (Ex Team) |
| ▪ August 7 | COB Meeting |
| ▪ August 21 | Board of Education Meeting (Ex Team) |

It was noted that August 7 is National Night Out. The meeting date was changed to July 31 2012. The Board requested they be provided with a revised list of dates.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved approval of the dates with the one adjustment noted. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion passed (Mr. Risberg abstained.)

2. **Appointments to CEAC**

It was noted 11 applications had been received. Five of them had served on previous CEAC:

Discussion occurred relative to information being provided by staff on participation, issues involved in some of the applications and concerns about the strategic plan and priorities relative to applicant experience.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the reappointment of the five individuals who had previously served on CEAC. (John Decker, Edward Driscoll, Amy Filice, Phillip Peterson and Richard Streeper). The motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.

It was requested that Jemal Bedaso be included in the motion as he was also a reappointment. The maker and seconder agreed to the addition.

REVISED MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the appointment to CEAC of the six individuals who were reapplying (Jemal Bedaso, John Decker, Edward Driscoll, Amy Filice, Phillip Peterson and Richard Streeper). The motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion passed.

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved, seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao, approval of the appointment of Jennifer Ampulski.

The Chair recommended the process be to review all individuals and then move appointments as a group.

Director Hardy withdrew his motion.

In-depth discussion ensued relative to the remaining applicants.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the appointment of Jennifer Ampulski and Michael Roehr to the 2011-12 Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion passed.

The consensus following additional discussion was to decline to make any additional appointments to CEAC at this time and to reopen the application process for additional applications with an emphasis on expertise and diversity.

Staff was instructed to repost the application process to the website and to notify all applicants of the actions taken noting that the application process has been reopened with a deadline for new applications of September 27. New applications would be considered at the October COB with final approval at the October Board meeting. It was noted the Board would approve the seating on CEAC of new October appointees if CEAC's first meeting should occur prior to the October Board meeting. Staff was specifically instructed to get the information to the parent advisory groups.

Administration was encouraged to pursue student applicants for CEAC. It was suggested that those involved in Project Lead the Way, OWL, students connected with engineering, CAD training, etc. might be good candidates. A "team" of students was suggested in order to maximize participation and comfort levels. It was felt this would be a good opportunity to build leadership skills.

A student advisory group for the Board was mentioned in passing to gain student input on specific topics. Perhaps this could be tried with a pilot session in the spring around Board goals.

Ms Carroll moved the Board clear the remaining applicant pool and the application process is reopened with particular emphasis on having members reflect the diversity of the community and with a focus on experience or expertise relative to the purpose of the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee. The motion was not seconded and died.

The COB Chair reiterated the directives on the revised CEAC process:

- The deadline will be extended with particular emphasis on having members reflect the diversity of the community and with a focus on experience or expertise relative to the purpose of the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee.
- Eight applicants have been approved with final approval at the September BOE
- Deadline is extended to September 27 with applicants to be considered at the October COB and approved at the October BOE.
- Approved applicants will be seated at the first CEAC meeting in October if that occurs prior to the October BOE.

3. Announcements

- The October 6 PEG training has been moved to October 17 from 6:00-8:30 p.m. The November 15 PEG date will need to be rescheduled due to conflict with a Board meeting. Final PEG dates are: October 17, November TBD, January 5, March 12 and May 8. No food will be provided for the meetings.
- It was noted no food would be provided for the Diversity Training later in the week.

III. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk