

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
September 13, 2011**

PRESENT: Board of Education: Jean O'Connell, Elona Street-Stewart, Keith Hardy, Jeff Risberg, Anne Carroll, John Brodrick (arrived 5:19 p.m.)

Absent: Kazoua Kong-Thao

Staff: Tim Caskey, Matt Mohs, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Denise Quinlan, Suzanne Kelly, Kris Emerson, Michael Baumann, Sharon Freeman, Joe Munnich, Andrew Collins, Kathy Brown, Willie Jett, Michelle Walker, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Julie Schultz-Brown, Jackie Turner, Mike Kremer, Effie Agbamu, Pablo Matamoros, Mary Gilbert, M. Mele

Other: Mila Koumpilora, Patricia De La Torre, Veronica Pardo, Mirna Rojas, Martha Rodriguez, Patricia Perez-Knowles, Helio De La Torre, Lursa Draz, Alejandra Riaz, Sara Silva, Priscila Olvera

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. SSSC Monitoring & Reporting System

The Chief Accountability Officer (CAO) stated this was an introduction to the monitoring cycle which will be used to report key factors in the Strategic Plan. The objectives are to review the SSSC monitoring and reporting system which incorporates a continuous improvement model along with VisionCard updates to the board. Additionally, to ask the Board to adopt consistent standards for VisionCard presentation and a policy review cycle.

The monitoring system revolves around a continuous improvement models concentrating on inputs, processes and outcomes. To improve, focus needs to be on Outcomes (Achievement and Equity) and Processes (the rest of the "vision cards").

At the "strategic level", monitoring will be through District VisionCards. Under Goal 1: Achievement monitoring and reporting will incorporate Achievement, Equity and Student Data/Work. Goal 2: Alignment will be monitored through Key Performance Indicators in the areas of Partnerships, Professional Development and Leadership. Goal 3: Sustainability will involve the areas of Resources and Operational Excellence.

At the Operational Level, monitoring will be through departmental plans at school level through the SCIPs. All SPPS departments have developed a business plan with strategic goals which will be reviewed both quarterly and annually. School performance will be assessed through data digs and data reporting. Quarterly business reviews will be done through the use of the school profiles.

At the Tactical Level, (individual employee level) formative reviews and annual performance reviews and evaluations will be used to monitor and review progress.

The expectation is that data will be used throughout the year to inform and improve instruction.

Staff provided two visuals, one on the Administration Monitoring and Reporting Cycle and the second on the School/Program Monitoring and Reporting Cycle.

The Vision Cards are aligned to SSSC goals with updates provided to the Board from October–June of a given year. The reports will inform policy review, procedure development and resource application. The report out on the Vision Cards will highlight one subject per month: October (Achievement), November (Equity), December (Student Data/Work), January (Partnerships), February (Professional development), March Leadership, April (Resources), May (Operational Excellence) and June (Resources). It was noted Resources is reviewed twice as it ties in so heavily with the budgeting process happening during the same time period.

The Policy Review Cycle will be timed to align with the Vision Card cycle. Two alternatives were presented. Option A: Quarter 1 (Policies 100-300 District, Board and Superintendent); Quarter 2 (Policies 500-600 Students, Educational Programs); Quarter 3 (Policies 400 Staff) and Quarter 4 (Policies 700-900 Non-instructional, Buildings and Sites, Community Relations). Option B would identify and review key selected policies, adopt new/revised policies and develop procedures relative to them. The initial focus will be on policies directly affected by the new Strategic Plan and those involving achievement and equity.

The Board was asked to approve the timeline of VisionCard reports and to adopt policy review cycle B.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Regarding equity, specifically as a means and an end, how will this be accounted for as a means and end? Response: The SPPS focus on racial equity work informs everything that is being done. Administration is taking a racial equity lens to all of the work being done and looking not only at what happens at the outset but how the District engages in a process that supports racial equity. Courageous Conversations and the work around racial equity professional development are supporting that. There have been discussions about policies and procedures that support the work as well.
- Racial equity is essential to what is being done but is the District also looking at additional issues around other areas of equity -- resources, poverty, gender, etc. Should the Board expect to see various elements of that reported out in various ways? Yes.
- Achievement, to what extent does this go beyond test scores to the whole child notion of achievement, students becoming good and productive members of society. Response: Much of the Achievement VisionCard represents data shown before and will be test heavy. It will also include information from MAP testing, attendance and discipline in terms of equity. Other items factored in might include ratios within race or gender group issues. The same elements will be looked at, but differently. When the VisionCard for Student Data and Work is reported out such things as student engagement will be included and the VisionCard for Partnerships will include parental engagement.
- The comment was made that over time the District needs to find ways to assure it is turning out persons who do well on tests but also are developing into good citizens with the full dimensionality that involves.
- To clarify some terms, Guidance from the Superintendent, what does that mean? The Superintendent has asked each chief to identify goals for each quarter and the Superintendent and the Chief will have discussions around those goals along with the Cabinet so everyone knows the goals for the district and where the Superintendent wants to go.
- Option B starts with a process for identifying policies, how will that work? The Board has a process where there is a policy review form and any Board member can identify a policy they feel needs to be addressed; that is one part. Administration is proposing to

address policies which need immediate attention, those that might be associated with alignment to the strategic plan - attendance areas, etc.

- The Visions Cards themselves, they are reported out to show how progress is being made on each card, correct. Response: Yes, VisionCards were presented previously to Board members with the recommendation to adopt the Level 5 Vision Cards. The design is laid out with Level 1 being a particular school or area at intervention level. Level 2 represents areas of concern. Level 3 represents baseline. Levels 4 and 5 represent levels of steady progress heading toward what the vision is. The report will present each metric and where the district is at on each level including how each will be addressed.
- Work on translating technical language so that school communities are able to converse about this, how is that being handled? Over time, administration should be intentional about getting input on how this is being understood. Response: A process for this is being developed.
- Most of this reporting process will begin to happen post Action Teams, does that lead to a natural way to have people remain engaged? The issue of recognizing the significant impact of transitions for students across the district needs to be considered. Another layer could also be recognition of the whole child in transition. Therefore, talking about what families comprehend on the data and how to support their child in transition to next phase in their education needs to be addressed. The District needs to find a way to discuss how all data can be helpful in supporting students in the various natural transitions from the beginning to the end of the school year.
- Where is the “when” in the VisionCards? Where is the when for families to have a look at how schools are doing? Response: October 18, the Achievement VisionCard will present all achievement data for the district and by school. The Equity VisionCard (November) will look at achievement gaps, attendance, discipline, etc.
- The opportunity seen is as the District is measuring the strategic plan, being intentional about how that information is provided to the community. Response: There will be a communication plan for the implementation and monitoring phase of the strategic plan. The State of the District address is in January and that has been actively tied to reporting of VisionCards, so in multiple ways the reporting out of the data will reach a wide variety of groups within the community. For example, the PAC meetings will be aligned to receive the information being reported out during their meetings.
- It was suggested the District explore the “best places” to meet with families and parents within their communities, it may not always be in the school.
- Around the policy plan, concern was expressed with option B. Will there be enough staff capability to review these multiple areas within the same quarter? Should the review and recommendation process be a six-month process? Response: Both options have benefits and challenges. One of the benefits of Option B is that some of the district Action Teams are already looking at some of the policy areas so those could be brought forward with recommendations from those groups. Attendance boundaries would be the first set. The timeline could also be staggered as needed.
- The comment was made that with either option for policy review; the process could be started and revised as needed.
- School profiles, how is that being conveyed to the school community? It needs to be stressed that it is a comprehensive look at the schools but not about who is good or bad. Is this informing everything that is happening going forward? Is the District looking at statistical correlations among various data element so schools can tackle areas that are correlated? Are correlations being connected in school profiles? Response: The Superintendent wanted one way to have many different data points around schools in one place in order to follow their progress. The profiles are not designed for public consumption though some school leaders felt it would be a good way to convey information to their community and they may do this if they choose. The District is not at a point where there is a very sophisticated type of analysis is being done. The data does look at some gap analysis and school data. It does show correlations around proficiency and growth, demographic profile, student performance, staff longevity, leadership, budget expended in time. It was hoped that over time the District look seriously as causalities to

help principals to a position where they can make data and research and fact based decisions.

- Midcourse corrections – how is the District going to let public and Board know about adjustments made to improve outcomes? Response: The quarterly reviews are an internal process. The VisionCards provide opportunity to discuss data and what adjustments were made and what was problematic. The quarterly reviews are happening at all levels of organization and adjustments are being made within that process as it moves forward. Corrections are not being made in a vacuum; they are made with knowledge of what is actually happening.
- For the Wish List – is there any way there can be a VisionCard measuring our success in preparing students to graduate to post secondary programs? Response: There is some data on students who attend Minnesota universities as a starting point.
- There is an issue that families and students may not be able to distinguish between curriculum, program support and supplemental services; how will that be addressed? Also in the discussion on resources, it would be helpful if the District were able to determine what it costs for students to attend SPPS; to provide a top quality education to SPPS students. This would be beneficial in the budget process and would be helpful also for the upcoming legislative session so it would need to be couched in such a way the legislators could understand it.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve Policy Review Option B with adjustments to be made along the way as necessary. Motion seconded by Mr. Risberg.

Motion passed.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the timeline for presentation of the VisionCards with adjustments to be made along the way as necessary. Motion seconded by Mr. Hardy.

Motion passed.

B. Administrative Response to Latino Consent Decree

Purpose of the response was to inform the LCD Parent Committee of administration's response to the eight recommendations made by the parents to improve learning outcomes for Latino students and strengthen partnerships with parents.

Administration provided their response to the LCD Parent Committee following the format of the original LCD Report. The status of all responses indicated plans or actions were in place or very close to being in place.

1. **Identification/Assessment/Placement** -- Develop and implement a comprehensive communication plan that informs LCD families about their child's placement in the LCD program. Administration will:
 - Provide a list of eligible LCD students to LCD contacts at each site
 - Schools without bilingual Education Assistants (EAs) will receive assistance and support from the ELL Department and Office of Family and Community Engagement
2. **Academic Support** – Collaboration between home-school and bilingual liaisons
 - LCD Parent Advisory Committee and LCD parents will meet three times a year (October, November and March) with school and District administration, in addition to LCD EAs. These meetings would be coordinated by ELL, schools and the Office of Family and Community Engagement.

3. **Bilingual Content Support** – Schools must ensure multiple opportunities for LCD families to engage in specific school curriculum activities that lead to support education at home. They will:
 - Offer Spanish specific sessions for LCD families in areas of Math, Social Studies, Science, Reading and Writing.
 - Schools without bilingual Education Assistants (EAs) will receive assistance and support from the ELL Department and Office of Family and Community Engagement.

4. **Middle (6-8) and Secondary (9-12) Grades** – Increase parental knowledge on required and elective courses for graduation and advanced placement classes valid for post secondary education. Actions include:
 - Improving communication with parents, counselors, LCD EAs on appropriate placement of students.
 - Secondary school will implement fall planning meetings to cover high school requirements, advanced placement.
 - Providing Professional Development for all secondary counselors on the LCD Stipulation.
 - Developing and implementing strategies for LCD students to participate in advanced placement courses.
 - Adding a Spanish component to the 2012 SPPS Thinking College Early Fair.

5. **Latino Culture** – Provide the Latino students with a solid knowledge and understanding of their cultural heritage and ethnic backgrounds. Actions will be:
 - Promoting multicultural school nights in every school.
 - Holding at least one Latino Leaders in the Community event at three schools.
 - Increasing awareness of Hispanic heritage month and other Latino origin celebrations.
 - Infusing Latino Cultural studies at the secondary level.

6. **Spanish Materials** - Increase the awareness of Spanish materials distributed to schools by:
 - Informing staff and families of materials at open houses, school academic nights, parent-teacher conferences.
 - Schools without bilingual EAs receive support and assistance from the Office of Family and Community Engagement.
 - Publishing and promoting a catalog of materials to schools on parental resources.
 - Annually publishing catalog with addendums as materials are added.

7. **Parental Involvement** - Inclusion of parents of Latino students or community members on all hiring committees for bilingual teacher or LCD Education Assistant. Admin will:
 - Connect members of LCD Advisory Committee with HR.
 - Recruit parents of Latino students to advise on hiring staff.
 - Assist and educate school administrators and PTOs in the hiring process of LCD bilingual staff.

8. **Collaboration with Organizations & Community Programs** - Continue strong support from the District for the LCD Parent Advisory Committee. Administration will:
 - Continue collaboration with Latino based organizations.
 - Expand collaboration with Dr. C. Garcia to broaden access for more students.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What type of Spanish is spoken by Spanish support staff in the schools? Response: When bilingual staff is hired, there are different interviews in both English and Spanish with a written assessment. HR does not seek persons from one country or another but seeks the most qualified candidate in both Spanish and English.
- So you hire staff to speak at an academic Spanish level with materials written at the same academic Spanish level? Response: Yes, the interview and assessment is at

academic level. The individuals hired also support and work with parents as well as students. The staff comes from several different countries.

- Congratulations were provided to the LCD group on having parents and families participate in activities through the year. That high visibility is a great asset.
- Item 4.3, the training of school counselors – how does that happen and can the high visibility of family involvement help in their orientation and with the information provided to the counselors? Do they gather together so they are provided information relevant to contemporary issues? Does it raise the visibility of what students experience outside the classroom and will it affect their work within class? Response: The secondary counselors meet on a monthly basis, ELL participates in the counselor meetings which fall under Career & College Readiness. The group works closely together and they have appreciated the input from the committee asking for specific information. During PAC meetings information is presented about testing and graduation, however it is important to reach every student in every school so that is why the work is done with the counselors. Staff was reminded that the LCD Stipulation is not optional. Administration is working closely with the counselors with reminders to disseminate information in other languages. In addition, when college fairs are scheduled to ask colleges to bring Spanish-speaking staff to man booths.
- During the recent legislative session, there were debates targeting the Spanish population that may have discouraged some students from pursuing a college career. It is these types of current events that impact students so counselors need to be available to answer issues about eligibility (family status), the effect of where parents work, etc. They will need to know where to go in the community to support the students and their questions. One benefit available to the LCD is involvement with colleges who will speak to specific issues and administration is working to provide opportunities for that.
- Are the counselors linking students to support resources within the schools – Admission Possible particularly? Response: Yes, staff are trained to facilitate that process.
- Are students being directed to appropriate schools/programs and not limited to two-year programs? Response: That is a broader question for other students of color as well. This is one of the reasons administration infusing cultural proficiency and racial equity work across district. This work will impact both processes and behaviors/beliefs, work needs to be done but the District is moving in the right direction. It also raises the expectation that all students will be prepared for a four year college and it allows students to make the choice of various options of two or four year college, the military, etc.
- Can we presume the fundamental and basic direction around these issues is also going to teachers? Can we use the measure of whether the Top 10 colored students are going to two or four year institutions? Response: Yes, that is a goal to which administration can be held.
- Looking at recommendation 2, the increased involvement of parents and guardians to have more district meetings in the community, where do community members tend to congregate? Response: It is important to have a district meeting in places where parents and guardians tend to gather, this would provide more engagement. Places include churches, YMCA, family centers (rest of response not available due to equipment problems).
- Recommendation 5, the focus on Latino Heritage Month. Response: From an administrative perspective, the District has attempted to move away from such things as Black History Month in favor of a more in-depth exploration of the depth and breadth of culture throughout the curriculum, the school year and various events. The agreement is to make sure there is sufficient Latino staff persons in the schools and then to make sure in the community and with parent connections that staff see role models to engage with families and parents through the connectedness of culture and what can/has been achieved.
- Item 5.4, secondary Latino cultural studies are not only for LCD students but also for all students. Exposure to other cultures will improve the entire district. The LCD is asking that the District provide development of some of courses and support the choice of students to select the courses in junior high and high school so they graduate with knowledge of their heritage and history. Response: There has been major improvement

in the quality of the curriculum provided for all of SPPS schools. The District wants to see an increased selection by a diversity of students.

- Based on the presentation on the VisionCards and the new metrics being established, it was asked administration be sure that follow-up on responses to communities is a key part of the metrics of the ELL Department and other groups responsible for actions. Response: The VisionCard in the area of Partnerships tracks the area of engagement with various communities and will track how the District is doing with engagement efforts with communities. This is embedded in department metrics up to the Chiefs.
- If there were a scientist or medical person invited to make a presentation to a class, it would be helpful if some students from other schools were given the opportunity to join that class and engage in bilingual education so the student body has a bilingual experience and the experience of engaging with each other. This would provide the opportunity for shared experiences and broaden the understanding of the students. Response: That is an excellent idea and one the District is working toward particularly within the area of tele-presence opportunities.
- Recommendation 7, would there be any value in, along with adult participation, looking at having senior high students involved as well? Response: Parents should have a say in who is hired so they can be assured the teamwork is there. If there is a goal of involving students that may not be the best way. If the goal is to teach students how the process works and engage them in what the interview process looks like, then there may be some value. Parents need to provide more information and input on strengthening the EAs' relationships with parents. Staff Response: Parent involvement needs to be in the area of advising, giving feedback on characteristics and qualifications that the LCD would like to see in staff who deal most directly with students and families. It is something to take back to Executive Director of HR as to what that would look like.
- What part of hiring process would parent come into? Response: Once there is an opening at a particular school that is when parents would be invited to provide feedback and input before the hiring process moves forward so HR and leadership know what they should be looking for in candidates. There is no process right now for that type of input so it would have to be designed so it could work across the system.
- What is role of giving criteria? Response: The role is not yet established, recommendations need to come forward, typically parents do not serve on the hiring committees but the District is open to having parents serve on committees in an advisory role. The process would need to be worked out and administration is willing to commit to quickly establishing what the process would look like and get back to the LCD about what their role might be.
- On what basis is a student eligible for services under the Decree? Response: The metrics to identify students will be published tomorrow. Staff follows the guidelines of the Stipulation for identification. There is a language assessment and other metrics/assessments. It is generally students with a significant achievement gap, those scoring not proficient, identified as ELL, having had an assessment of their abilities in the Spanish language as well as English.
- Who does the identification? Response: The Student Placement Center identifies the students as well as the REA Department who looks at the data. A student's status is updated annually. The Stipulation serves approximately 700 – 1000 students.
- A request was made for a report on how the LCD has changed over time to get a sense of where it is going. With the services provided it should be expected that the number of children needing the services would decrease over time. Is the program closing the gap with the services provided? What are incoming numbers?
- In looking at all eight recommendations, Latino students make up about 14% of the SPPS population and based on national trends the number will increase. Latino males are ranked number two in the suspended student population and have the second poorest graduation rate from schools? Does administration feel SPPS will be in a better position to serve children so more graduate? Response: That is why the parents are here, they want more Latino students to graduate. The LCD, the ELL Department and the community communicate and support creative changes so the Latino students can achieve. The Latino community accepts its students are below grade that is why they are

working so hard. In the recommendations, the parents are not asking for more they are asking that the recommendations be implemented and accomplished. They want a timeline on every point so they know when they can expect to have the various items implemented for the students and parents. This committee represents thousands of parents who are not here and the LCD committee is obligated to satisfy and complete the needs of all Latino students in all SPPS schools. Staff Response: If the board approves the administrative response the Director of ELL and Academics will implement a timeline and share it publically to benchmark against. Everything the parents have requested SPPS has accepted and it will be done with timelines will be established for implementation.

Administration stated systems have been put in place so that things which have been stated in the response will be done, they will happen.

The Board Vice Chair extended the Board's thanks to administration and the LCD Parent Committee for the time and energy put into making sure their children are successful in school. It was suggested that since the questions were now dealing with areas better addressed by staff that the group move to another room and pursue the discussion with staff members.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Administrative Response to the Latino Consent Decree Report with the recommendation Administration support the list of items in the report and establish a timeline for implementation and that opportunities for continued discussion be provided throughout the school year as they can be scheduled.

Motion passed.

C. Initial Discussion on Pay 2012 Property Tax Levy

The Chief Business Officer stated the State sets all levy authority for schools. Schools can only levy for what is authorized by law. The Pay 2012 Levy is for school year 2012-13 and will be paid by taxpayers in May and October of 2012. Several levies have an aid penalty, which means if the District does not levy for the required amount, they will lose the correlating aid.

Changes to the levy are due to several factors:

- The State increased authorization for OPEB (Other Post Employment Benefits) for districts that sunset or limit retiree health insurance programs.
- Re-employment insurance increased due to more layoffs and extension costs.
- TRA (Teacher Retirement Association) increased due to 2010 pension legislation to address the health of their retirement fund.
- Health and Safety increases made to address environmental, air quality and safety.
- Adjustments made for new and existing debt, debt excess adjustments and refinancing.

The CBO indicated administration is proposing the following ceiling for the Payable 2012 Property Tax Levy for SPPS:

- General Fund Levy - \$83,208,823 an increase of \$7,006,283 (9.2%)
- Community Service Levy - \$3,421,684 a decrease of \$149,887 (4.2%)
- Debt Service Levy - \$39,442,069 a decrease of \$2,528,358 (6.0%)

This represents a total of \$126,072,576 (a \$4,328,038 increase over last year or 3.6%). This represents the lowest levy percentage increase in three years. The increase does not require voter approval. These figures represent staff projections as MDE is running behind time due to the State shut down. The Legislative Liaison noted that the figure might reduce further once the fiscal disparities are applied by the State.

October 7 is the deadline for school boards to certify proposed property tax levies to home county auditors. This date is a one-time only extension to accommodate the delay in MDE certifying levy limitations to school districts. MDE anticipates it will have its figures to district around September 15.

The Pay 12 levy is scheduled to be certified by the Board at the December 13, 2011 meeting following the Levy Hearing scheduled for November 29, 2011.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, for purposes of discussion, the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the 2012 Payable Property Tax Levy and the recommendation that the ceiling for the Pay 12 Levy be set at \$126,072,576. Motion seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The SPPS Legislative Liaison indicated that the approximate amount of increase for this levy figure would be a \$20 increase for the median value home in St. Paul.
- A Board member noted there is a need to clarify the charts on levy changes – to either limit the years or differentiate the referendum and the payable levy.
- Staff was instructed to get an updated version of the presentation to Board members, particularly the page on reasons for the changes, along with talking points for Board members to use.
- Health & Safety is a key levy area with flexibility on where the levy is set. This deals with critical needs in environmental, air quality and safety in the school buildings. Staff looks at projects and needs and makes sure these are funded based on specific project sets. This year's needs fall in the \$5 to \$5.5 million range. Projects include such things as fire protection, fire alarm inspections, asbestos remediation, ventilation and district-wide OSHA compliance. The legislature defines what is permitted under Health and Safety and the District needs to submit an approved plan to the State for this portion of the levy.
- Staff indicated they will provide talking points on all changes for the Board.
- TRA – this addresses the unfunded liability for teacher retirement funds. Several funds had deficiencies with not enough funds in place. There were increased contribution rates for basic members and coordinated members as well as an increase in both employee and employer share for a total of 1% for all members phased in over four years. Under Statute when a contribution increase is in place for districts, they are permitted to levy for the difference in contribution rates.
- Is it less expensive to SPPS to provide the benefit vs. rolling into the State's plan? Response: SPTRA does not wish to be rolled in at this time.
- Regarding the chart of levy changes, it might be good to go back to 2001 or at least before the referendum. This should show that the levy is lower than it used to be. Clarification was provided by the Legislative Liaison who stated this was when the State brought down GenEd levy. The GenEd Levy was a fully equalized levy across all districts, a part of the Minnesota Miracle. The districts opposed bringing down the GenEd Levy because it represented the most stable form of financing for education in Minnesota and if it went away, if there was a general downturn, financing would be all over the place. It is difficult to make comparisons year to year because of the changes which have occurred over time. What the chart is trying to show is that the trend line is down when the next year is added. This will be changed/clarified.
- Is it possible to show the percent of money coming from property taxes to support the district over time? It is not about the levy changes but the total dollars coming from property taxes to support education over time. This might help to show how the State has shifted costs to the local school districts. That's the kind of story needed, it at least needs to be looked at. The Legislative Liaison responded that that is the issue, when the GenEd Levy was eliminated (the fairest levy based on property across all districts) it ended up that the various levies have not been equalized over the past ten years. Debt service and all of the levies to adjust for property wealth have lost their power and the Districts are picking up a greater share because of State shifts to the local entities.

- A Board member commented she appreciated the fact the levy recommendation is lower than it has been but she would like to see it lower. There is a significant event coming up with the voter-approved levy in 2012. The taxes people will be paying will also be affected by the City and County as well so the District needs a stronger story to tell. Is there an opportunity to shave the amount more? Response: This figure is based on administrations calculation. To take it from 3.6 to zero, the District would have to reduce its budget by \$4.3 million in the general fund area. Administration would be adverse to reducing the debt service in any way and community service is not impactful so it would come from the general fund. It could be done but it is up to the strategy and will of the Board. Administration simply needs direction from the Board.
- The Legislative Liaison added there are some things to think about in changing the 3.6 figure. First, if Health & Safety were reduced, the projects would be jeopardized or eliminated. Secondly, the TRA obligation would still be there and the Legislature was aware this would cause an increase to levies when the action was taken. In addition, any changes will make budget decisions more difficult. Therefore, if the legislation is passed that increases the District's financial responsibility, the Legislature needs to share some of the responsibility for that. Every time the District covers up for changes made by the Legislature, they (the Legislature) are not held accountable. As far as OPEB goes, that is based on actual expenses the District incurred in the past year, so whether that is levied or not it is still an obligation which needs to be paid and, if not levied, will take money from another area of the general fund budget.
- Explain the OPEB changes in the last two years. Response: In the first year the District was allowed OPEB, the State set a cap of \$13 million and, at that point in time, there was only one bargaining unit with a contract due. Subsequently the Legislature increased the total dollar amount to school districts (each year the amount goes up) and during that time the cost of all other bargaining units was added into the figures (basically the District bucket is bigger). If SPPS does not levy the full amount, the Legislature, if they are looking for levy reductions in future years, can reduce the figure. It was noted they often do not reduce below what has already been levied. Therefore, the risk in not levying is that the opportunity may not be there in the future. Now that all bargaining units are in place, future costs should just be inflationary figures and it should flatten out in following years. The increase this year over last year is \$5.1 million (\$8.5 to \$13.6); this is from the State increasing the cap and SPPS inclusion of all bargaining units.
- When the District asks for a referendum extension on the current referendum, what would be the effect? Response: On the operating capital levy line, if the District does an extension for the same amount, that line would be relatively flat because it is enrollment based. As long as the District stayed on the same basis in other levy areas, that would remain flat as well. Because, year to year, there is a lag on the adjustments that need to occur in each levy cycle speculating on an actual percentage would be irresponsible. The Referendum is equalized revenue, it is based on enrollment. It is a dollar amount times enrollment and does have an inflationary factor included. If enrollment goes up (resident enrollment not just SPPS) that would increase the amount. The other factor tied to it is Market Value. If market value in the district goes down, the amount that comes from the referendum would decrease. If everything remained equal, nothing would change. However, those added factors need to be kept in mind as having an impact, small, but still there. SPPS enrollment has trended downward. In the years when the District plans for referendums, it does so very carefully and analyzes all of the levies carefully. Another factor is the Legislature may change some of the levies. The District cannot determine what the Legislature might do relative to the levies.

The Board Chair noted, with the process tonight, there is a motion on the table accepting the recommendation of 3.6%. There is time to reflect on changes as this action sets the ceiling. The Board could come back with a recommendation for a reduced amount in future. Administration clarified that yes, this action is to certify a ceiling and that figure is used in the Truth in Taxation notices. There is then a public hearing after which the Board can decide if it wishes to make an adjustment before the final certification in December.

CONTINUED QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- It was requested that talking points be developed outlining the benefits received from the 9% increase done last year.
- On the Debt Service amount, could the Reserve Fund be used for this? Response: There was a substantial increase in debt service last year because of debt adjustment and refinancing, these were one-time adjustments. Debt Service, by law, is required to be based on bonds sold. If there would be room for adjustment, it would come from the general fund itself.
- How will the MDE recommendation compare to this staff recommendation? Response: The \$126,072,576 is staff's estimation and should be close to MDE figures when received. The CBO noted the 3.6% figure, if set, regardless of what MDE would do, is simply a figure which will not be exceeded when the actual levy figure is set in December. If the MDE figure comes in lower, by law, the figure would be reduced to the MDE figure.

Director Hardy indicated he would abstain from the vote on the proposed levy ceiling as he did not feel it was a firm figure in the absence of the actual from MDE.

Director Carroll stated she did not believe she had put a number in her motion or if she had, she had not intended to. She restated her motion as she had intended to make it.

RESTATEMENT OF MOTION: That the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the 2012 Payable Property Tax Levy and that the ceiling for the Pay 12 Levy be based on MDE's calculation when received.

At this point, there was extensive discussion on how to frame the motion, whether to tie it to the maximum based on numbers from MDE or to the administrative recommendation of \$126,072,576. There was also discussion on various implications involved in framing the message with significant discussion on the impact of the ceiling on the taxpayers.

The CBO stated he realized that typically the action taken on this levy ceiling is based on the MDE figures, which due to various factors will not be available for a few more days, possibly longer. Staff worked up the \$126 million figure based on past experience with the usual calculations made relative to it and arrived at the recommendation that would set the ceiling of 3.6% over the previous year and meet the District's needs. He went on to say that when the Business Office receives the MDE figures it goes through extensive calculations to check the figure against SPPS figures. It is frequently necessary to go back to MDE for corrections and it can take multiple iterations to arrive at the final figure used in the recommendation to the Board. The Chief Budget Officer indicated he was extremely uncomfortable tying SPPS to the first iteration of numbers from MDE.

Following further intensive discussion Ms. Carroll moved back to her motion as originally made.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the 2012 Payable Property Tax Levy and the recommendation that the ceiling for the Pay 12 Levy be set at \$126,072,576. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

The motion passed with 4 in favor; 1 opposed (O'Connell) and 1 abstention (Hardy)

D. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. **Policy 716.00 - Advertising in the Schools**

The Policy Work Group had met for basic discussion on the policy on advertising in the school. They looked at examples of policies from other districts and were provided with a summary of areas touched by the policies which included the areas of ads, sales and properties. The Administrator of Policy, Planning and Intergovernmental Relations provided the Board with an overview of the Work Group discussion and materials.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- It was recommended that the Building Naming Policy be added to the discussion.
- If the question was asked a bit differently, SPPS has a policy on naming rights but it does not address advertising. It would be useful to see if the example districts have a policy but it does not address advertising or no policy exists. In other words, show districts that do or do not address specific areas. This would assist in reviewing how various areas are addressed.

Board members were asked to assess the SPPS Advertising Policy using the Policy Review Form and return it to the Board Secretary by September 20. They were also asked review the list of areas addressed in the example policies and note which they feel SPPS might want to look into addressing.

It was noted the next meeting of the Policy Work Group would be September 26 at 11:00 a.m.

E. Work Session

1. **Standardization of Language Regarding Schools, Buildings & Programs**

It was noted there are areas of confusion in how buildings/programs are referred to throughout the district. This needs to be addressed so that there is consistency in the application of names/locations across the system. This affects many areas (maps, website, publications, signage, school site information, actually finding a location, etc.). Is there a way to streamline the names of programs, buildings, etc. For example, can a program move to different building carrying its name along or must the building name be changed as well? It might be worthwhile to have a brief "history piece" on each building.

Support was expressed in bringing this to the Board, however, the urgency needs to be assessed in view of the fact there are a number of programs in flux as well as changes that will be made this Fall. Perhaps it would be good to gather variables (the many iterations of names for some buildings, is the name permanently in "stone" on the actual physical building, etc.) and bring recommendations to the Board.

2. **Additional Board of Education Meeting Dates Needing Action**

The following dates have been added to the Board Calendar and require official action:

- October 18, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting on Labor Negotiations (4:30 – 5:30 p.m.)
- November 15, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting on Labor Negotiations (4:30 – 5:30 p.m.)
- November 29 COB Meeting (4:30 p.m.)
- November 29 Special Board of Education Meeting – Levy Hearing (6:00 p.m.)
- December 7, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting for Superintendent Evaluation (3:00 – 5:30 p.m.)
- December 7, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting on Labor Negotiations (5:30 – 6:30 p.m.)

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the following dates as additional meetings for the Board: October 18, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting Labor Negotiations (4:30 – 5:30 p.m.); November 15, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting Labor Negotiations (4:30 – 5:30 p.m.); November 29, 2011 COB Meeting (4:30 p.m.); November 29 Special Board of Education Meeting – Levy Hearing (6:00 p.m.); December 7, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting Superintendent Evaluation (3:00 – 5:30 p.m.) and December 7, 2011 Special Closed Board of Education Meeting Labor Negotiations (5:30 – 6:30 p.m.). Motion was seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

Motion Passed

3. Meeting with CGCS Special Education Audit Group

Board members noted which meeting they would attend.

- 9/20 – 3:15 Ms. O’Connell, Ms. Street-Stewart, Ms. Kong-Thao
- 9/20 – 3:45 Ms. Carroll, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Risberg

4. EMID

Director Brodrick asked that EMID be added to the agenda of the October 4 COB.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:	Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn; motion seconded by Mr. Hardy.
----------------	--

Motion Passed

The meeting adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk