

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
October 4, 2011**

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

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Suzanne Kelly, Michael Baumann, Michelle Walker, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Ivar Nelson, Andrew Collins, Willie Jett, Julie Schulz-Brown, Tim Caskey, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Liz Keenan, Tracy Gauer, Sharon Freeman, Christine Osorio, Michelle Bierman, Kristine Halling, Matt Mohs, Joe Munnich, Denise Quinlan, Toya Stewart-Downey, Patty Hanley, Jackie Turner, Sara Guyette, Kathy Denman-Wilkie

Others: J. Robicheau, Jeanette Gudgel, Denise Dzik, Geri Cook, Nate White, Mary Hess, Eric Celeste, Bev Danielson Sellie, Mila Koumpilova, Kathy Griebel, Daarel Burnette, Felicia Widi, Angie Thornhill, David Cournoyer, Nicole Martin-Rogers, Julie Donovan, Alicia Zetah, Janet Pinney, Diana Johnson, Naomi Sky Berglund, Donna Stein, John Albers, Ed Driscoll, Phillip Peterson

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Final 2010-2011 Budget Revisions

The Chief Budget Analyst provided an overview of the final revisions that were made to the 2010-11 budget. He indicated the current revisions are in the fully financed funds (grant adjustments) for Community Service and the General Fund. With those revisions, the total revenue for FY 11 was \$656,752,734 and the total expenditures were \$656,106,142. A copy of the revision sheet is attached (Attachment A).

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Are there any large grants in this figure? Response: These are adjustments on current grants of which there are approximately 230 within the fully financed budgets.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Brodrick, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the final 2010-11 budget revisions as presented.

Motion Passed.

B. Budget Guidelines for FY 2013

The Chief Business Officer (CBO) indicated the format for the Guidelines had been revised to reflect the three key areas involved in development of the budget: preparing the calculations, creating the budget and compiling and presenting the budget. He also noted that the term “unassigned” is a change in terminology due to changes called for under GASB rules.

The CBO then reviewed the FY 2013 Budget Guidelines (Attachment B) which included:

1. The philosophy it was supporting (SSSC Plan)
2. How the budget calculations would be prepared in the areas of revenue projection, inflation, enrollment, average salary and benefits calculation data and fund balances.
3. Creating the budget for schools and non-school programs
4. Compilation and presentation of the FY 13 budget

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Please define assigned and unassigned. Response: The fund balance is equity on the balance sheet. It used to be called reserve; it is now called restricted, committed, assigned or unassigned. Those are the levels of restriction on the money available. Restricted, usually restricted by law, is money that must be used for a defined purpose. Committed are funds that have been committed by Board action. Assigned funds do not require board authorization for the money to be set aside (i.e., school carryover). Unassigned (formerly undesignated, unreserved) funds are the funds maintained under Board policy at 5%.
- The class size range, what standard is used? What has been done to determine what ranges will be for high school, middle and elementary? Response: In FY 13, a “by grade” assessment will be done for the high school, middle and elementary component. What was utilized for FY 12 has been published in the SSSC Plan (PreK – 20 or less; K-3 22-28; 4-8 25-30; 7-8 29-35* and 9-12 30-39* [*for core classes only]). These may be changed after the analysis for next year is complete. When the SSSC Plan was done, class size ranges were made very clear. On a positive note, this is the first year in which SPPS has had an enrollment increase in over 10 years. If that trend continues, SPPS will look at reevaluating class sizes. In response to the question, SPPS follows the standard established in SSSC Plan. If enrollment increases, the District will work toward diminishing the number of students in the classrooms.
- Zero based budgeting, what is the thinking beyond next fiscal year? Response: Zero-based budgeting will continue through all administrative levels particularly in those areas with new directors and those who were not involved last year.
- The comment was made that one opportunity zero based budgeting gives, as the District moves forward, is the deep rethinking within departments about structure, commitments, etc. Is there any thought about going beyond centrally administrated funds? Response: Yes, as administration assesses what areas would be appropriate.
- In looking ahead to budget season, a question was raised about the general understanding around funds available to schools and how dollars are applied to programs, staffing, etc. As administration, looks at describing the compiling and presenting “resources allocated to schools” hope was expressed that (1) the format would be such that comparisons will be the same (apples to apples). This would help people interpret the information they have. (2) Around the disparities across the district (Special Ed services, etc) is there a way to format that so people understand why a particular school has other resources that are based on actual student population. Response: The new website has been launched and that would be a good place to put this information. Parents and community members need to become more familiar with how schools are funded and how different funds are allocated due to children’s needs. Administration stated it was looking forward to providing more information to the public in this area.
- Under “prepare budget calculations”, why are average salary and benefits used rather than actual? Response: Averages are used for the school budgets for simplicity and to make the budgeting process more user-friendly for schools. It allows them to focus on staffing needs without becoming bogged down in determining each individual salary amount for each staff person needed. The program and department budgets use actual salaries.

- Under “compile & present other resources allocated”, does this include specific donations to individual schools; funds raised the PTA/PTOs, etc.? Response: This does include fully financed and grants. Other resources is usually above and beyond what school receives over the average budget such things as light, heat, custodians, ELL, Special Ed, etc.
- Therefore, if schools do a particularly good job in fund raising that is extra money for their budget. Response: Yes.
- Where does the tax levy fit in? Response: That falls under the “revenue projection” and falls under current law.
- The inflation calculator or 2%, if there are contracts the District will use the ongoing contractual figures, but does the 2% include health care? Response: The 2% would not include health care; that is based on contract. It usually includes such things as supplies and those kind of line items.
- If there is no contract, what will be used in the following years? Response: Based on practice what exists is required to be carried forward.

MOTION: Ms Street-Stewart moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the FY 2013 Budget Guidelines as presented.

Motion Passed.

REQUEST: It was requested that the Board have a discussion on fund balance at a future meeting.

C. Update on District Action Teams

The Chief Accountability Officer provided a brief update on the District Action Teams (DATs) indicating the DATs continue to meet regularly and are moving along productively. All are past the norming stage and in the early stages of drafting or moving toward drafting recommendations. Several teams have broken into sub-committees to provide recommendations on pieces of the work. The final recommendations are due by December 19. Administration continues to meet with district co-chairs for check-in updates on work and to look for overlaps, redundancies or inconsistencies in the development of recommendations. Updates for each DAT are being provided on the Accountability website.

The Site Action Teams (SATs) are looking at areas specific to site changes that are being undertaken this year. The Board had asked how schools are approaching changes and what types of support they looking for. A “timeline” was provided for the 2011-12 school year outlining what is being undertaken as the various sites.

Each group has an overall strategy for communication with families. All are using Connect Ed for periodic updates on meetings and announcements and using personal connection via family dinners, meetings, etc. to communicate about more in-depth detail on the changes. Community involvement is advanced through attendance at community meetings, invitations for community members to participate in certain aspects of the changes, etc.

The timeline was broken into three major areas with one additional sub-area: adding programs or grades, relocations and full-service schools. The sub-area is those schools going through multiple changes (moving sites and changes in grade levels as an example). Some things happening within these areas include:

- Staff development of teams to address/coordinate changes
- Identification of needs to adapt how services are provided within a new space
- Community building around the schools
- Communicating changes in transportation for the full service schools
- Logistics around more students
- Logistics around extended day offerings

Overall transitions have been smooth and issues raised are being addressed. There is an on-going need to communicate the changes and the benefits of the changes. The District needs to be sure everyone is aware of what is happening, why and how it fits with the SSSC Plan

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- There has been some non-attendance for some of the DATs, what is the process to add applicants in? Response: In some cases if a participant misses three or more meetings, the chair will reach out to see why the meetings were missed. For other DATs, additional participants were asked to join for their expertise. For the most part, however, at this time no additional people are being added to the process because of the difficulty of bringing them up-to-date on knowledge bases and the process. Co-chairs are all satisfied with the size of their groups.
- It has been heard that site-specific committees are lacking clarity on what their role is as site council members, PTO members vs. district expectations, what is being done? Response: Administration is providing support to meet the concerns expressed to try to move the processes forward.

D. East Metro Integration District (EMID)

The Superintendent indicated that this presentation was an informational update for the Board. She reminded everyone that EMID is a separate entity from SPPS and has its own Board to guide its future.

Dr. Robicheau, Superintendent for EMID, provided a brief history of EMID, a review of changes to EMID and its use of integration revenue. He outlined the issues surrounding the funding of programs and services within EMID. He noted future legislation will also have a bearing on the re-purposing of integration revenue which will impact EMID.

He also reviewed the strategic planning process and the timeline for the process.

He indicated his report would cover recommendations concerning the future of EMID and the possible utilization of Harambee and Crosswinds buildings. Three options have been considered at this point:

1. Strengthen the schools under the current structure to become models of integration and high student achievement. (May require additional time and investment).
2. Transfer governance of the schools to a different operator with a refocus of EMID's overall purpose and core competencies away from operating the schools.
3. Merge students back into home district schools (another way of reprioritizing EMID's focus).

The options concerning the outreach programs showed there is an opportunity to shift from mostly direct services to a focus on strengthening and coordinating member district programs. The potential for EMID to serve as a coordinator of member district programming by leveraging current offerings to increase overall participation without dramatically increasing costs and that of EMID becoming a technical assistant to member districts by delivering its knowledge base of best practices to strengthen and develop member district programs.

He indicated 400 students from St. Paul attend Harambee (185) and Crosswinds (215) which represents approximately 45% of the total enrollments (880) in the two schools. St. Paul is currently or will be participating in shared services supported by integration dollars in the areas of AVID, curriculum mapping/planning, principal networks, innovation and on-line learning.

He closed his presentation by again outlining the issues facing the EMID Board:

- How to address the future of the two magnet schools
- How to be proactive given the political environment surrounding the use of integration revenue, and
- How to address the educational needs of the 10 district collaborative.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Are other integration districts facing similar situations? Response: There are a couple of differences with the other two districts: the first has magnet schools within the individual districts. The other has two schools supported by levy and foundation dollars not integration dollars. Both are involved in the discussion on integration dollars but EMID is the most heavily impacted by integration dollar issues.
- What is the timeline for the EMID decision? Response: A white paper is being formulated that will be considered in a work session on October 12 followed by a Board meeting October 19 where the Board will consider again the options out there. If the Board recommends discontinuance of the schools, there will be a public hearing between the October and November Board meetings and at the November Board meeting, the Board will make a final decision on what will be done. The direction will be known in October.
- What was the trigger for the discussion on this issue? Response: Discussion began in July with the new Superintendent coming on board. There had been discussions previously around what EMID should look like, its vision and mission. Comprehensive discussions begin after the data from the strategic plan study became available.
- Have you planned out funding and what will happen when you lose integration funding? How were the three options formed, who was involved? Response: Under current legislation, integration dollars are available through next year and an additional amount has been appropriated; this is under consideration in the legislature and may or may not actually be there. The District Management Council who was hired to do the strategic plan offered the three options. There was also input from parents, staff, board members, superintendents and other stakeholders. Once the three options were identified, discussions have occurred with the Board, Superintendents, the community and with stakeholders. Those discussions started in January 2011.
- Is there currently an ongoing discussion on integration best practices and the student achievement gap? Response: There has been no extensive discussion, policy vs. implementation has been looked at and how to address the achievement gap. EMID is looking at what the future will be and how to address it based on type of funding available. Integration is a statewide issue. The discussion needs to be around how to collaborate with other integration districts and school districts to provide opportunities for students. There is a regional opportunity to provide program options for member districts and with other districts to address these issues.
- What are the demographics of the EMID schools? Response: About 50% students of color. What the demographics of the member districts are can be addressed in further information. There are 10 districts with approximately 120,000 students of which 880 attend the EMID schools.
- What is the student achievement at the two schools? Response: Neither school meets AYP but do meet requirements in attendance (number of students taking the tests). MAP tests are showing significant improvement in achievement of students at the sites. The kids are doing very well in demonstrated project learning.
- From SPPS are monies being passed through to EMID? Response: There are two integration revenues SPPS does not contribute integration dollars to EMID. The students do get integration dollars but it is not through SPPS; it is revenue that follows the students to EMID. There are 400 students who attend EMID who live in St. Paul; there is no way of knowing what school they came from (charter, church, public).
- If the EMID Board were to decide there was a need to close the schools at the end of 2011-12 school year, is that what is pushing the talk? If they decided they did not have to do that, the urgency becomes less. Response: Yes.
- Request for SPPS staff – depending on how the EMID proceeds it may be useful to see some student performance data on the St. Paul students and the EMID population as a whole. St. Paul has the data and it can be supplied by the Superintendent.

- Is there a risk involved if the schools closed, could this affect integration funding that comes to St. Paul and how does that play out with literacy funding? Response: If the decision is to close the schools that does not disband EMID. EMID will continue to provide outreach, shared services and will influence students in that manner. EMID is not just the two schools. Other EMID services will still be available to SPPS as part of the consortium.
- The literacy funding formula, will that be the same as integration funding, separate, what? Response: The original discussion held before current legislation passed was that the current integration dollars would be subsumed by early literacy funding which would directly address the achievement gap.
- If the decision is made to close either school, will there be a equitable process for families? Response: 84% of the monies follow the students (which includes integration and foundation dollars). The Board is committed to having an open process and to seek input from stakeholders as they deliberate on the direction to go and what is best for students.
- What is the Board hearing from stakeholders who are not using EMID schools? Response: Each of the 10 districts is represented by one person on the EMID Board. What needs to be considered is what the new EMID looks like and how students are impacted not only within EMID but also across the collaborative districts. EMID is engaged in outreach through their Office of Equity and Integration and districts have integration specialists. There is a network looking at the needs in member districts and how that can be addressed through the consortium.

Thanks were extended for the complex work done by the EMID Superintendent and the ten Superintendent group.

E. American Indian Parent Committee Resolution of Concurrence

The Resolution and Recommendations of the Parent Committee of the SPPS American Indian Education Program is required as part of the Minnesota American Indian Education Act of 1988 (Statute 126.51, § 1a). The resolution allows the Board to view the district from a parent perspective and assists in monitoring/creating District policies. The committee then reviewed their recommendations and requests.

1. **American Indian Studies**

The group stated they were pleased with the expansion of the American Indian Magnet School (AIMS) from Pre-K-6 to PreK-8. They then outlined some areas of concern:

- School Name – the District was asked to make the commitment to retain the name of the American Indian Magnet School.
 - Administration stated that in the 11-12 school year there are still an Indian Magnet and the World Cultures Magnet school sharing a facility. The programs are co-located but are two separate schools. In SY 12-13, World Cultures is discontinued with the American Indian Magnet becoming the only school at that site. World Culture students will be given the option to enroll in the American Indian Magnet school and will have preference for that school.
- The District was asked to work with the St. Paul Federation of Teachers (SPFT) to create a specialty status for staffing positions within the American Indian Studies program which would include, in addition to a Teaching License, an Eminence Credential of American Indian Language and Culture, or its equivalent.
 - The Parent Committee stressed the need for cultural competency in their teachers and the value of someone who understands the cultural background and the life and norms of the community. They also stressed the time involved in bringing new teachers up to speed on culture and background. They stressed the need for a minimum level of competency for their teachers. Administration stated they were currently in negotiations with the Federation and that discussion

around certain licensures is part of that discussion in working out qualification, rights, etc. They indicated the negotiations are an open meeting and public and teachers can observe the negotiations that are held on Thursdays from 5-7 p.m. at the Federation headquarters.

- Administration went on to say that, as a district, when a position is posted certain requirements can be stipulated within the posting. When HR is looking at requirements for a particular position, it can amend those requirements to look for a specific individual. They asked the Parent Committee to assist in defining those requirements.
- AIMS Principal Vacancy – the group asked to work with the District to create a list of essential criteria for the next principal and to be involved in the recruitment, interviewing and hiring process.
 - The Parent Committee acknowledged the process for hiring principals had changed from their being a partner in the hiring process. They asked for clarification on what the groups' role is in the process now. Administration indicated hiring used to be a site based decision with input into hiring of applicants and recommendations to the Superintendent. In the last three years, the Superintendent now recommends principals to sites.
 - HR indicated that one of their reasons for meeting with the Parent Group was to receive input on principal requirements and what they should be looking for, what the criteria would be. They outlined the efforts that are underway to find a principal for the American Indian Magnet and the difficulties being encountered. The Parent Group asked how they could help and where they could disseminate information to assist in the process.
- The Parent Committee recommended the American Indian Studies Program remain intact and that city-wide busing remain a priority for both AIMS and American Indian Studies at Harding Senior High.
 - The Parent Committee stressed the importance of busing to them. Administration responded busing for AIM is part of the SSSC Plan. They stated all busing is paid out of integration funding and if integration funding is lost, then the entire matter of busing in St. .Paul will need to be revisited. .

2. Follow Up On Previous Administrative Agreements

Committee members indicated they recognized the District is in transition and understand some of the specific programs in previous agreements may have changed due to the adoption of the SSSC strategic plan, the State shutdown and the budget crisis. With this in mind, they made requests in six areas addressed in previous Resolutions.

- In the area of Attendance, that there be a continuation and monitoring of the Attendance/GPA letter; that an update be provided on the District's work surrounding attendance and TIP/FTIP goals, especially pertaining to American Indian students and how the SSSC and the State budget issues impact this.
- Under Academic Achievement that a status update be provided on the implementation of Response to Intervention; that details be provided on the District's efforts in professional learning around cultural proficiency as it relates to instruction and details on how the SSSC and State budget crisis impact this issue.
- In the area of Student Suspensions they asked for a status update on the Positive School-wide Behavior Model (PSBM); details on the District's efforts around cultural proficiency and how this relates to the reduction of student suspensions and details on how the SSSC and State budget crisis impact this issue.
- Under the Inclusion of American Indian History, Language, People and Culture into District Curriculum they asked for a status update on the development of the social studies common end-of-course assessments; a status update on the work of the Multicultural Center Outreach Coordinator and for a copy of one of the learning kits that goes out to the classrooms. They also asked for details on the District's efforts

around cultural proficiency specifically as it relates to the inclusion of American Indian curriculum and details on how the SSSC and State budget crisis impact this issue.

- In the Special Education area they asked for a status update on the efforts of the Department of Special Education to address Parent Committee concerns; details on the District's efforts around cultural proficiency specifically as it relates to the inclusion of American Indian curriculum and details on how the SSSC and State budget crisis impact this issue.
- In the area of Building Deeper Relationships through Inclusion, the committee asked for continued inclusion of the American Indian community on the DPAC. They indicated they would like to see expansion of the Parent Academy to AIMS during the 2011-12 school year. They asked the District to consider moving Indian Education from the Division of Academic Services to the Department of Family Engagement and Community Partnerships, given that the majority of the services provided by Indian Education are supplementary. They also asked for details on how the SSSC and State budget crisis would affect this.
 - The Parent Committee spoke of the value of their being part of the District Parent Advisory Council and its value in providing a voice for parents and community members. They felt it was a partnership allowing them to become stronger advocates for all kids because of the broad range of perspective at the meetings.
 - The group stressed their desire to have a Parent Academy at the American Indian Magnet. Administration indicated they had modified a budget to offer a Parent Academy at AIM, potentially in the spring. They stated the curriculum needed to be modified to make it culturally relevant and that they would work with the parent group to assure cultural relevancy.
 - There was extensive discussion around the idea of moving the program to the Community and Family Engagement area from Academics. The group was reminded that academic achievement and the quality of education for Indian students is a core charge the parent committee under law. They were advised to give this recommendation additional consideration.
 - The question was asked about how many times the various "follow-up items" had appeared in the Resolution of Concurrence. Administration was asked to review this in order to see how well and how quickly the District is responding to some of these issues. It was suggested the Parent Committee should ask for more urgency in addressing these requests in order to increase graduation rates for American Indian students. This led to additional in-depth discussion and a review of the cultural proficiency training being done at SPPS. It also led to a discussion of parent involvement and the need to educate the parents through outreach.

Thanks were extended to the Parent Committee for their diligence, involvement and recommendations.

MOTION: Ms Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Indian Education Act Resolution of Concurrent 2010-2011 as submitted by the Parent Committee of the SPPS Indian Education Program pending the Administrative Response.

Motion passed.

F. Recommendations from the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC) on Capital Bonding Projects

CEAC is a Board of Education appointed committee that advises the Board on expenditures of capital bond funds; including building acquisition, construction and remodeling. It is allowed up to 21 members who serve a one-year term with a limit of up to three consecutive terms. The staff liaison is the Facilities Director.

The 2010-11 CEAC had 11 members (three were returning members). The group met 11 times beginning in November 2010. The committee:

- Helped define project selection criteria
- Surveyed building administrators
- Reviewed the communication process and looked for better ways to engage the sites/programs in the capital bond process and
- Reviewed the applications for projects submitted by the sites/programs.

During the months of July and August, CEAC and the Academic Operations Committee (AOC) ran parallel paths to make a recommendation of projects.

The CEAC Chair then reviewed committee highlights and provided the recommendations from the committee.

Highlights:

- Conducted a survey of building administrators for feedback on the previous year's process
- Refined the criteria for the selection of capital bonding projects
- Made recommendations to staff on capital bonding communications issued to programs/sites
- Attended public meetings and reviewed information on the SSSC Strategic Plan
- Reviewed and discussed all proposals (ranked projects and single proposals) submitted by programs/sites
- Prepared project recommendations to the Board for the 2012 capital bonds.

Criteria developed to assist the committee in determining which projects to forward to the Board were given to the sites/programs as part of the capital bonding application. Project costs were not given to programs/sites as part of the application process. This allowed sites to prioritize projects based on overall needs and not costs.

Projects which were favored met one or more of the following criteria:

- Those that aligned with and supported the goals of the strategic plan
- Those identified on the FCA/EAA list of capital improvements
- Those that aligned with unique site-identified priorities
- Those that resulted in long-term efficiencies and/or reductions in energy and/or operating costs
- Those that had an impact on daily use
- Those that positively impacted the greatest number of students
- Those that had a discernable total cost of ownership and a superior return on investment.

Projects that took less priority were those that resulted in building additions/increased square footage, those that focused on athletic or staff-only needs and those that resulted in increased energy/operating costs.

The allocation recommended by the committee was:

• Site requested single proposals & ranked improvement projects	\$4,432,700
• Infrastructure upgrades to support the Technology Integration Plan	3,162,300
• Strategic plan implementation	2,600,000
• Security infrastructure upgrades	1,000,000
• Energy efficiency improvements	805,000
• Miscellaneous projects	600,000
• Project management (salaries)	900,000
• Contingency @ 10%	<u>1,500,000</u>
Total	\$15,000,000

Site requested single proposals and ranked improvement projects (\$4,432,700) included such things as:

- 19 single project proposals for \$2,141,000 the largest of which was the installation of an elevator at Randolph Heights (\$420,000). The median project costs was \$72,000.
- 62 ranked improvement projects (\$2,291,700) which included:
 - Acoustical improvements (\$270,000)
 - Auditorium improvements (\$257,000)
 - Classroom interactive white boards (\$195,000)
 - Classroom marker and tack boards (\$408,000)
 - Electrical and lighting improvements (\$565,000)
 - Safety and security improvements (\$350,000)

Infrastructure upgrades to support the Technology Integration Plan included a 4-year, \$12 million total, district-wide implementation for schools along with infrastructure to support independent learning and individual devices.

The strategic plan implementation included construction and remodeling costs for Roosevelt, Hazel Park Academy and Johnson Senior High, exterior signage changes and large program moves.

Security infrastructure upgrades includes a one year, one-time, district-wide implementation that unifies the security and card access system at all sites.

Energy efficiency improvements included pool covers for eight schools and conversion from T12 to T8 florescent lighting encouraged through a U.S. government phase-out with 50% back in rebates for projects completed by March, 2012.

Miscellaneous projects involved planning and installation of equipment purchased by Nutrition Services and resources to provide for efficient responses to small program changes, emergencies and unplanned items.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Regarding the Randolph Heights elevator, are there other projects where increasing accessibility is critical, shouldn't those be priorities as well? Response: Administration indicated this was the only pure accessibility project presented. They indicated there were also alternative bond funds available to address other smaller accessibility projects.
- It appears there are no major projects that align with SSSC plan, is that correct? Response: The CEAC Chair indicated they had looked at a range of needs and necessities and felt they had provided equity across district. There had been large projects that served a small population of students but it was felt these did not meet the criteria and also there were so many needs to be met that it was felt the monies could be used more wisely over a larger group of projects. The big project could be considered the IT work.
- Will there be one major project each year? Response: There was nothing that appeared to be an unavoidable priority.
- There is the standard 10% contingency but also other contingencies built into individual projects. Why and what happens to those contingency funds if not used? What is the plan for those excess funds? Response: The 10% contingency is always there to maintain the District's good standing in bond ratings. When projects are estimated, the estimate is usually 18 months out so funds are put into contingency to cover cost increases. Additionally, when project estimates are done there may not be knowledge of the full scope that might come into play so the contingency also allows for unforeseen issues. Contingency reserves range from 5% to 20% depending on the building and what is involved.
- What is done with excess funds at the end of a project, if there are any? Response: The monies stay in the capital bond project fund and are used for other projects.
- What happened to the multi-year process? Response: Facilities is working toward taking the process out to two years next year, then out three years and eventually to five years.

- Was there equity across various buildings and services, how has the process reached out to all sites? Response: CEAC made a concerted effort to involve all sites in the process through the initial survey, materials provided and follow-up. In addition to making project coordinators available on an as needed basis for sites, two meetings were held for building administrators to walk them through the process and assist with any questions or concerns they might have. Flexibility was required this year as there were also sites that needed to be reopened.
- How many buildings participated in the process? Response: Most of the buildings.
- Energy efficiency projects, those will be money back to the District, correct? Response: Yes, if they are complete by March, \$170,000 in rebates will go back into the general fund plus savings through energy efficiencies.
- What about other energy saving projects? Response: The department is currently doing a master plan for energy improvements.
- The Strategic Plan projects, specifically related to changes needed in buildings for the SSSC plan, what is happening? Response: Facilities has aligned building changes, recommissionings, furniture changes etc. directly related to the Strategic Plan.
- The District is aligning a number of things, the strategic plan, facility management, to support the goals of the plan. How is it ensuring that buildings will be prepared for increased traffic, after hours usage, etc. As leadership in the schools, evolve who keeps the history of the building and is there a plan in place to address higher traffic, greater needs and usage? Response: The work CEAC has done to align with the Strategic Plan is excellent. Facilities Management is working to align other funding sources (health and safety, alternative bonds) to address other areas such as windows, roof and floor replacements, etc. As schools evolve, there is an effort to balance between a multi-year process and a single year process. Principals are looking at usage of their buildings very differently from a few years ago; they are seeing they are there to serve the community.
- Who maintains the history of the building – why it is used in a particular manner now, what repairs are done, what is equipment usage, usage of rooms, etc. As the District makes improvements, the history should be there so the occupants can appreciate the efforts made to maximize the use of the buildings.
- This current process is built around a study of what is needed in the buildings. Therefore, when they discuss the ranked projects that is the base from which the process starts. The single proposals on top of that add to equity and there is a need to keep reminding everyone about the equity piece built into the process. Is this recommendation presented as a joint CEAC/AOC proposal or are there different priorities? When CEAC looked at AOC and their alignment with CEAC, were the recommendations very similar or were there some differences? Response: They were very aligned and Administration is ready to go forward with these recommendations.
- The Project Management Salary, has that always been part of this? Response: Yes, it has been part of the project lists. It does not represent new staff, it is existing staff (planning staff, accounting staff, etc.) needed to carry projects forward

The Board recognized the work of the CEAC group and complimented the diversity of the committee.

CONTINUATION OF QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The committee members were asked if they had any recommendations as the Board finalizes their appointment work. What made this committee work so well? Response: The range of life experiences, the requirement that the person be committed to the success of SPPS, a commitment to attend the meetings and a commitment to carry their expertise into following years. The structure was perfect and the CEAC recommended the Board favorably consider all reapplications.
- The question was asked about student participation in the group. CEAC responded the benefit for the student would be exposure to internal working of the school system.
- What was average attendance at given meeting? Response: 8-9
- Why is the Direct Digital Control project not on the list? Response: It is not off the list, just sidelined temporarily. Due to other commitments, the projects got behind and since

they cannot be done during cold weather season, the decision was made to take them off the agenda and bring them back after completion of the projects now in line.

MOTION: Ms Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hardy, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the Recommendations from the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee on Capital Bonding Projects as presented.

Motion Passed.

G. Standing Item: Policy Update

The Office of Policy, Planning and Intergovernmental Relations Administrator provided a brief report on the work group meeting which occurred on September 26. The group is moving forward and staff will provide draft language at the next work group meeting.

The Chair noted the final reading the Dangerous Weapons Policy at the next Board meeting.

H. Work Session

1. **CEAC Appointments**

Two applications were submitted to the Board for consideration.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend to the Board of Education that the minutes reflect the final list of appointments to the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion Passed.

The appointments to the 2011-12 Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee are:

- Jennifer Ampulski
- Jemal Bedaso,
- John Decker
- Edward Driscoll
- Amy Filice
- Phillip Peterson
- Michael Roehr
- Richard Streeper
- Zachary Wilson

2. **Board Listening Sessions**

Dates and locations for previous listening sessions were provided to Board members who were asked to provide a recommendation for dates for the 11-12 Listening Sessions along with preferred locations. Following some discussion, the following motion was made:

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved, seconded by Mr. Risberg, that the Chair initiate a meeting with the District Parent Advisory Committee and use that meeting to get input on how to make the listening sessions better attended, along with suggestions for dates and locations.

Motion Passed.

III. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion Passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk

**SAINT PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS
FINAL BUDGET REVISIONS
FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011**

	Adopted Budget	Previous Revisions	Current/Final Revision	Revised Budget
<u>Revenue</u>				
General Fund	\$455,358,457	\$6,617,385	\$0	\$461,975,842
General Fully-Financed	57,627,905	19,116,076	3,880,704	80,624,685
Food Service	22,900,000	\$0	\$0	22,900,000
Community Service	18,933,617	469,068	\$0	19,402,685
Community Service Fully-Financed	2,814,563	3,189,435	87,562	6,091,560
Building Construction	26,015,000	\$0	\$0	26,015,000
Debt Service	<u>39,742,962</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>39,742,962</u>
	<u>\$623,392,504</u>	<u>\$29,391,964</u>	<u>\$3,968,266</u>	<u>\$656,752,734</u>
<u>Expenditures</u>				
General Fund	\$455,858,457	\$5,527,537	\$0	\$461,385,994
General Fully-Financed	57,627,905	19,116,076	3,880,704	80,624,685
Food Service	22,749,700	\$0	\$0	22,749,700
Community Service	19,433,617	496,539	\$0	19,930,156
Community Service Fully-Financed	2,814,563	3,189,435	87,562	6,091,560
Building Construction	26,000,000	\$0	\$0	26,000,000
Debt Service	<u>39,324,047</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>39,324,047</u>
	<u>\$623,808,289</u>	<u>\$28,329,587</u>	<u>\$3,968,266</u>	<u>\$656,106,142</u>

Budget Guideline for 2012-2013 Budget

Philosophy:

The proposed budget will reflect the District's Vision 2014 Strong Schools Strong Communities (SSSC) as adopted by the Board of Education (BOE).

Preparing budget calculations:

Revenue Projection. Revenue will be calculated using current law.

Inflation. The Budget Office and the Office of Human Relations will project salary and fringe benefits using actual salary and benefit amounts if labor contracts have been negotiated and all non-personnel budget items will reflect no more than two percent (2%) inflation except for items related to contractual commitments.

Enrollment. The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (REA) and the Budget Office will prepare overall enrollment projections.

Average Salary and Benefits Calculation Data. A table detailing the average salary and benefits will be provided for budget preparations.

Fund Balance. The budget should maintain an unassigned fund balance of five percent (5%) of the general fund expenditures in accordance with the BOE policy.

Creating the budget

Schools:

- Continuation of refined blended Site-Based and Centralized funding method will be used for schools in FY13.
- Class size range will determine teacher FTEs.
- Office staffing (Principal, AP, clerk) and other staffing determined by enrollment and type of school.
- Intervention staff determined by enrollment and differentiation.

Non school programs:

- Non-school programs will be reported into three (3) categories: School Service Support, District-wide Support, and Central Administration.
- Zero-based budgeting will be utilized.

Compiling and Presenting the FY13 Budget

Presentation format. Summary information will be presented for schools and programs in the preliminary budget document. Each summary page will include an analysis of the changes to the current year budget that are impacting the schools and programs

Fully Financed Budgets. Fully Financed budgets with anticipated revenues and expenditures over \$500,000 for the 2012-13 school year will be included in the adopted budget.

Other Resources Allocated to Schools. The adopted budget document will include a school by school detail of resources allocated to schools such as grants, special education, operations, and student activities, to name a few.

The Adopted Budget. Administration will present a balanced budget to the BOE. The budget for 2012-13 is expected to be approved by the Board of Education by June 30, 2012. The adopted budget will be published on the Budget Office website (businessoffice.spps.org).