

**MEETING MINUTES  
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING  
November 1, 2011**

**PRESENT:**

**Board of Education:** Jean O'Connell, Elona Street-Stewart (departed meeting at 6:55 p.m.), Anne Carroll, Kazoua Kong-Thao, John Brodrick, Keith Hardy

**Staff:** Superintendent Silva, Kathy Denman-Wilke, Mary Gilbert, Joe Munnich, Andrew Collins, Julie Schultz-Brown, Michelle Walker, Suzanne Kelly, Denise Quinlan, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Michael Baumann, Efe Agbamu Mike Kremer, Darlene Fry, Tom Delaney, Sharon Freeman, Willie Jett

**Other:** Angelique Kedem, Erica Schumacher, Karen Hallaen, Kelly Rogosheski, Mila Koumpilova, Sam Trya, Carlos S., Daarel Burnette

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**II. AGENDA**

A. Promise Neighborhood Update

The representative from the Mayor's office to Promise Neighborhoods extended her thanks for SPPS support during the Promise Neighborhood planning year and the community process involved with it. She stated she and the Director for Promise Neighborhood would provide an overview on the status of the program at this point. She stated the Promise Neighborhood is creating a new model for the St. Paul. The project is starting with the 250-block area of Frogtown/Summit University neighborhoods. The model will bring the community together to support children learning. This is a design build process to achieve system change and as things are developed that work they will be scaled out across the city. The work is aligned with the SSSC plan to make schools the heart of community and streamlining things for kids and parents. In terms of making schools the heart of the community, the plan is to build Jackson and Maxfield into hubs as full service community schools.

The Director for Promise Neighborhoods stated they were currently focusing on the grant submission for the next leg of Federal funding. There are a few core pieces Promise Neighborhoods is focusing on in the coming year and commitments made by the local foundation community that will allow various pieces to be implemented whether the grant is received or not. The first focus of the implementation work will be the 0-5 age range early childhood education. One of the key pieces for the early childhood phase is parent awareness of what is available to them and the importance of early childhood education. One piece of this is called Communities of Practice which will ensure quality programming and, in the delivery of services, that they are aligned with the work and interface with children so they are ready when they come to school for Kindergarten.

The "hub and spoke" concept is built on the gains made with the Achievement Plus model, what are called full service schools. The hub would be where families access a variety of services connected to their family's stability and needs as well as looking at the needs of children (dental, medical care [particularly asthma]).

SPROCKETS is also a piece of the effort connecting organizations providing services of some kind. It will include organizations already a part of the Promise Neighborhood initiative along with new ones who come on board in the Hub and Spoke effort. The vision for the data base phase is to evaluate, over the next five years, the work of the Promise Neighborhood. It will also include thinking through how, as a community, all systems are connected to get a good understanding of the children the program will work with. This would include large public organizations such as the City and School District, nonprofit organizations, community organizations, etc.

Over the next two months, a new advisory board drawn from the community will be established for the implementation phase. There was intentionality in having a good representation from the community as the organization is being structured to have community voices at every level of the visioning and organization of the program. It is hoped this will get buy-in from the Hmong and African American communities in the neighborhoods to ensure the efforts are working for the community and to ensure an open flow of ideas. There will be a Partners Convening on December 6 for the 72 partners who have committed contractually to providing support or services to the implementation phase of Promise Neighborhood. The convening will present a profile of what is happening in St Paul and in the implementation process. During the convening there will be a presentations on SSSC, from business-based partners working on community development, health care, social service providers and information on the hub and spoke model.

The core work group or signatory partners (the City, County and SPPS along with the Wilder Foundation) will facilitate the work, provide staff support, etc. and will ensure the work on the ground continues to move forward.

St. Paul is one of 21 districts given the initial planning grant for Promise Neighborhood. The grant, which has just been submitted, is for the implementation phase. The application was for \$5.2 million per year over several years. If St. Paul is selected, there will be a three-year commitment with the potential for an additional two-year renewal. 35 applications have been made from across the country. Application required a 100% match of \$670,000 for the first year. This has been raised in St. Paul through the generosity of fourteen different partners. The U.S. Department of Education will make four to six grants across the county of \$4 to 6 million each. The St. Paul application was aligned with Minnesota's race to the top grant. If St. Paul Promise Neighborhoods receives one of the grants it can do more sooner. However it has 72 partners committed to provide a level of services to the community and participate in the database to further the work whether the grant is received or not. The grant would also fund staff in different capacities both with the initiative navigators out in the community and in cultural organizations already in place. It would provide access to Courageous Conversations training at various levels.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- How will you provide updates and information to everyone in the networks outside SPPS in an on-going fashion? Response: There is a Promise Neighborhood newsletter that goes out monthly. This could be forwarded to various networks. Efforts to keep the involved community abreast of what happening is done through community meetings.
- The most immediate area SPPS is addressing is making a difference for all students and the schools. Nevertheless, how soon would residents begin to see some economic shift and benefit that is obvious to them? What might be expected immediately? Response: There are two parts, on one hand what is being done with the two schools and then the neighborhood which is about community development. The Communities of Practice vision and the convening on December 6 will give people an overview of what is happening in the neighborhoods including economic development. In the afternoon groups will begin conversations to get people to network to build deeper partnerships and identify gaps that might exist. Jobs and safety were within the top two or three issue areas identified by the community so the appropriate people need to be brought together to look at what an aligned and collaborative development would look like. The U.S. Department of Justice has indicated they will provide additional support directly related to

public safety for those applying for the grants. This would allow for the development of a new strategy for the community.

- Is the convening open to the public or by invitation? Response: It is by invitation to the 72 partners and will provide an opportunity to connect people to existing networks and to establish new ones.
- Within the 72 partners, are there representatives from all of the “education institutions” within the Promise Neighborhood? Response: There is a broad base of partners at different levels. A list was provided.
- Is there a marketing plan to move the work into the community organizations to take the lead? Response: It is part of structure provided through the hub and spoke model. Some work and staff will be embedded within organizations already serving the community to provide work from within
- The Wilder Survey of the neighborhoods, as you move to the implementation phase how will people in the neighborhood understand or have a sense they are in a Promise Neighborhood. What will the work do for the neighborhood? Response: The work will be felt by the schools, community and neighborhood development. The place to start is to connect the people/groups that already are there and participating to find out what they want to see happen in the community. These are a cross section of groups (university, nonprofits, faith based, business, etc.). The people on the ground will need to find a way to make visible to people in the community that the neighborhood is being lifted up. There has been one pass at canvassing the neighborhood to make Promise Neighborhood more visible. The neighborhood development and economic piece are on the table to consider who needs to be involved in the process and what needs to be done.
- Are there restrictions within the grant that the community should know about, i.e., youth employment? Literacy efforts, etc? Response: The overarching restriction is funding should not be used for service provision. It can be used for infrastructure, to align services, evaluate them, and build capacity in certain areas.
- A request was made to add Promise Neighborhood as a standing item as an update on Promise Neighborhood particularly as it directly touches Jackson, Maxfield, and the SSSC work. Response: The Vice Chair indicated they would look at a possible update from the Chief of Staff on the December 6 convening at the December or January COB.

#### B. SSSC Equity VisionCard Monitoring

The Chief Accountability Officer indicated the objective of the review of the 2011-12 Equity VisionCard was to review the VisionCard background, walk through the 2011 equity results and analysis. She indicated the report focused on AVID, PBIS and Bullying Prevention. The final objective was to take action on results.

A **VisionCard is a summary** of district-wide indicators of progress on the SSSC Strategic Plan, grouped by theme. They are clear, concise and visual where possible. The results are scaled on five levels: Intervene, Concern, Baseline, Progress and Vision. The levels are color coded from red (Intervene) to pale green (Vision).

She then noted **what had changed** in the reporting from when the Equity VisionCard was first reviewed. Additions included: GRAD (Pass on first attempt) and graduation rates. Modifications included the gifted/talented identification was adjusted to include all students in grades 1-6, discipline referrals were removed because data is only kept at some schools so it would not be representative of the entire system. PBIS information was added. AP/IB were separated (IB is kept at schools and some self-reported by students) and disproportionality ratios are provided with a new calculation model other than that used by the State.

She reviewed the desired results (percentages) for the Equity Vision Level and then proceeded to **review the data**.

- MCA reading is at the Concern level in the gap (38%) between percent proficient by race/ethnicity. Highest Caucasian, lowest African American.

- The largest gap (44%) in MCA Math is between Caucasian (high) and African American students (low); that is at the Intervene level. Gaps with other race/ethnic groups are smaller, but still large.
- The largest gap in MCA Science is 47% (Intervene level). Similar to Math but different from reading, the gaps are nearly identical for all groups. Again, Caucasian was high and African American lowest.

In the area of **GRAD** – Pass on first attempt the results showed:

- The largest gap (39%) in GRAD Reading is at Concern level, the same as MCA Reading with African American at lowest and Caucasian high.
- GRAD Writing has higher percentages of students passing on their first attempt. The largest gap (22%) is at the Baseline level between Asian American (low) and Caucasian students (high).
- Gaps in GRAD Math are similar to MCA Math, varying up to 20% between race/ethnic groups. The largest gaps (53%) is at Intervene level between Caucasian (high) and African American (low).

**Advanced Courses** show racial gaps in percentage of students completing advanced coursework that vary by over 20%. The largest gap (37%) is at Concern level between American Indian and Caucasian.

- Advanced Placement (AP) Tests scoring 3 or higher shows 49% more Caucasian students than Asian American students scored at 3 or higher on at least one AP exam; this is at Intervene level.
- International Baccalaureate (IB) tests show more Caucasian students than Asian American students scored 4 or higher at the three SPPS IB high schools. The gap (28%) is at Baseline level for percent of students with a score of four or more on at least one IB exam.

**Graduation** (NCLB Rate) in SY 2009-10, the largest gap in NCLB graduation rate was 34% (Concern level). The American Indian student group is small, so results vary greatly from year to year. Graduation – 4 Year Cohort Completion (preliminary 2011) SPPS 4-year graduation rate shows the largest gap (25%) at the Baseline level between African American and Caucasian. These numbers are not yet final for SY 2010-11.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Gifted/Talented (GT) Identification – are things being done differently beyond the traditional manner of identification? Response: There have been changes over time so yes. Currently there is an examination offered for students to take along with portfolio assessment in some cases.
- Is the focus on academic giftedness or “other” gifted areas? Response: The focus is on academic giftedness and is assessed through the Non-verbal Naglieri Test that focuses on visual spatial representation.
- Is administration working on getting consistent data on the discipline referrals? Response: It is being worked on.
- For IB is there a process in place to resolve the current inability to get complete data? Response: Yes.
- How is it determined when something is baseline or concern levels, or other level? Response: Baseline is the middle of the scale, perhaps median or mid-point might be used equally well as a definer. There is a separate scale for each measure and while the scale may be different for each level levels have specific definitions overall. On the Equity Card when gaps are discussed, there should be no gap greater than 10%. The actual percentages are Progress between 10-20%, Baseline 20-30%, Concern 30-40% and Intervene anything greater than 40%. It was noted this should be embedded in the scale for clarity.
- Where would more details behind each measure be found? Response: Currently the data is not on-line; however, the data is available if requested by the Board.
- Would it be useful if the goal were identified for each item? Response: Administration has noted the suggestion.

- Does African American include African and African American? Response: Yes. So there are English learners in the groups? Yes.
- AP/IB – there are some English learners in the mix, how many are there as that would be useful in looking at the data (percentage of population). It would help in assessing how many students of other colors are participating in the classes (real numbers or percentages).
- When you talk about proficiency on any of the items it should be clear what proficiency means and what the target is. Show what years are under discussion. Response: All data is from 2010-11 SY unless otherwise noted.
- Under Grad Writing what is the intersection with ELs? Could that be pulled out in multiple areas in future? As you look at equity and the focus is on racism the EL piece is another dimension that must be looked at under equity but it is a different issue.
- What percentage of groups are taking the classes and what percent are completing and what percentage are passing? This would help us to see the drop off. This should be a breakout in ELs and ethnic groups.
- The AP/IB courses lump together all tests regardless of subject? Yes. If it were broken out more, would it be parallel with reading and math, if it were broken out by individual subject area would the gaps be more similar to MCA, GRAD, etc.? What does the gap look like in French vs. Physics? Response: Numbers of students taking some subjects might skew the results if it was low. The gap is in course taking rate as well so that needs to be looked at. It would show who is not getting access to the courses.
- Interest is more in who is taking the course work rather than who passes because taking the courses will put them in a better position to get into college whether they pass or not or even take the test.
- Is that type of information available school by school and is it used in assessment? Yes.
- Grading across the district – is it being looked at? Response: It will be looked at in 13-14. At this time, more is being done in middle schools than in other areas.
- The GRAD tests first attempt – what happens at other takings, does the breakdown change? What is the cut off? It would be good to see a breakdown of what this looks like at other attempts. How many attempts do they get? Response: The first attempt for reading is in 10<sup>th</sup> grade. The second time is in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade when students can take it about every other month during the first week of the month. They can take it as often as they want and must attend remediation in between the test attempts. This is, and has been, tracked and there are some similar patterns and there are still gaps. It is tracked because the data is used by counselors, teachers and parents as it is so important to graduation.
- Could you do first attempt and passing? Response: The data would lend itself to a separate report toward year-end. We need to know some of ethnic issues so we can assure students are getting necessary help to be successful in taking the test.
- Students start taking the reading at 10<sup>th</sup> grade and some don't succeed. This is a 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade issue as that is where kids get off track and that needs to be addressed. Over the course of the year, it was asked that the Board get updates on back mapping of kids who are currently in trouble to see what needs to be changed in lower grades so they don't end up in trouble in upper grades. Response: The MAP testing has been added from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> grade so teachers know where kids start and where they are moving to, it assesses whether kids are making the necessary gains. There is a need for deeper interventions and more time in school for the kids to make up the losses they are experiencing. Summer school is offered as an option and is effective, however the kids need to attend and don't always do so. Some districts are requiring summer school.

**AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination)** is a 4<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade post-secondary readiness system. An AVID student can be a student who is in the academic middle, is from a historically under-served college population, is from a family living on a low income, is an English learner, receives Special Education services, receives Transitional Supports (housing, foster care) or will be the first college graduate in their family.

- In 2008 five schools offered AVID, in 2010 24 schools offered the program for the elementary group (grades 4-6). At the elementary level (4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> grade), district-wide

support services are provided to students in time management, organizational abilities and methods to use for academic success.

- Junior and Senior High student enrollment was 403 in 2005 and is now (2010) at 1,083 across grades 7-12. Individual students are invited to participate. Students are provided with informational meetings and they must sign a contract for participation. At the secondary level, it is an elective class. There are three sites still to come on board (Johnson, Linwood Monroe and Open).
- Demographics of AVID students show 56% are female and 44% male. 78% are eligible for free or reduced lunch, 30% are English Learners. 14% are Caucasian, 1% American Indian, 29% Asian American, 16% Latino and 40% African American. African American students are over-represented as the District wants to make sure they make efforts toward graduation and college participation.
- 2010-11 Math MAP Fall to Spring Growth showed a higher percentage of AVID students made typical growth by at least three percentage points in grades 8 and 9 than district-wide.
- 2010-11 Reading MAP fall to spring growth showed AVID students made typical growth by at least three percentage points more in grades 8 and 9 than district-wide.
- Advanced course completion in 2010-11 (grade 7-12) showed that of 1,083 AVID students, 898 (83%) took at least one advanced course. 873 (97%) passed at least one of the advanced courses. Courses included Language arts 97%, mathematics (96%), social studies (96%) and science (96%).
- 96% of AVID seniors graduated in 2010-11.

2011-12 AVID challenges include reaching the goal of 10% AVID enrollment at the secondary level; this goal was set in 2005. The 10% goal will require recruitment of an additional 546 students and 19 teachers. Retaining AVID trained teaching staff is also an issue.

Solutions include District AVID staff and some content coaches trained by AVID National to provide local professional development. Working with CIPD Center Coaches to blend some AVID strategies into content areas and, in partnership with EMID and MDE, to share local AVID professional development opportunities.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- What is being done to address the challenge of getting the three high schools into AVID? Response: Johnson's schedule will change in SY 12-13, it will move to seven class periods which allows kids to have more options during the day. For Linwood Monroe, as the District does AVID roll out, it has been found that it is a poor time to start a new program when a school has a leadership change. This school should come on board next year.
- On the Graduation slide 4% are not graduating on time due to GRAD testing, does this involve AVID students? Response: This is mostly in reading and involves a population of EL students who are being provided with the supports they need.
- Students who are not signing up but who are eligible, what is being done about that? Can students sign up if parents don't agree? Response: Students can self-select for AVID or be nominated. There are three populations (all male African American, Latino, and Asian) who are not participating. They are being pursued through a program called "Engaging the Missing." There are approaches in the works to get them into the program. A pamphlet has been developed aimed at that population, there is a mentoring program for those students and some technology-based pieces that are under development will be added. The Parent Academy is adding a piece on AVID so parents understand what it is.
- What is the essence of why AVID is so successful for kids who participate – what limits SPPS from expanding to any kid below proficiency? Response: AVID practices are aimed at students in the academic middle who can go either way. It meets them where they are at and moves them in a better direction. Students need to be motivated to do the work required by the program. Students need to accept responsibility and be ready for it. Students need to desire it. That is why it is being started in the 4-6 grades for elementary programs and 7-12 for secondary program.

- What is the communication with students and families and what are the expectations or commitment from the students? A letter is sent outlining their rights and responsibilities that includes an organizational method that must be maintained as part of their grade. It instills policies and procedures they would experience in post-secondary. They must maintain a C or better in core courses. They must learn etiquette and respect and how to be a representative of SPPS when in public.
- AVID as a program, what about challenging students to meet those AVID behavior principles/requirements? What about rolling out the principles if not the program to the rest of the district? Response: One of the challenges is teacher retention and getting staff trained in AVID principles. A lot of the staff is being trained in AVID strategies, the District wants to keep them in AVID but at the same time, those teachers take their experience into their other classrooms. It would be interesting to know how some of the trained teachers are integrating their experiences into their other classes. Some time ago the Board talked about getting all the program supports who provide supports for students (Indian Ed, Mission Possible, etc.) together with AVID so they understand how each provides support to students and work with them to align for a common mission and understanding, aligning the culture. This would raise expectations of students over a broad area and through a variety of means to encourage students in this effort. This would address the issue of not participating because this would get them participating in ways not yet known through exposure to expectations and incentives.
- The Office of College and Career Readiness is doing several things around the alignment piece using a software platform called Naviance to try to achieve what is being discussed. This is being offered to various other groups to align with SPPS expectations so many groups know SPPS goals and aims and can align with SPPS benchmarks.
- What are the incentives for participation in the program? Response: Currently the incentives are the career exposure trips and activities they get to do (i.e., canoeing down the Mississippi River with exposure to careers in the outdoor industry and ice fishing). There are also college and university visits (6-8 trips per year). Additionally, AVID becomes a family environment and students want those relationships. The final incentive is they are planning to go to college.
- When will AVID be in all elementary and secondary schools? Response: By the end of 2013-14.
- AVID student demographics district-wide, on this we need percentages on those eligible and who is missing.
- The Growth columns—what about achievement? Is the gap closing? Is it working? Response: Because the AVID group is in the academic middle, they will not be on the lower end of proficiency. MAP growth helps define how to move these students forward.
- Advance course completion – do the students pursue more than one course? Are they doing it more than once? Are students moving up cumulatively? Cumulative data is more valuable in this area.
- AVID course work – looking at the challenges and solutions, when an AVID course is started in 4<sup>th</sup> grade vs what happens if they start later (7<sup>th</sup> Grade)? Does course design accommodate that? Yes

**Disproportionality Ratios** are how many times more likely is a student group to experience an outcome than the group with the lowest percentage. In 2010-11, Caucasian students were twice (2.0 times) as likely as Asian American students to be suspended at least once.

Gifted and Talented Identification shows that in 2010-11 Caucasian students in grades 1-6 were over four times more likely to have been identified as G/T than African American students (46% compared to 10%). That disproportionality is at the Baseline level.

Special Education Referrals showed all race/ethnic groups are at the Progress level or above in Special Education referrals.

Absences show the largest disproportionality in Absences (11+ days absent). This is at Baseline level in Junior High. All other gaps in Absences are at Progress or Vision level. For Suspensions disproportionality is at the Intervene level between African American (the

highest percent of student suspensions) and Asian American (the lowest percent suspended).

The Chief of Accountability summarized as follows:

- Reading indicators have gaps at the Concern level.
- Math and Science indicators are at Intervene.
- GRAD Writing is at Baseline, the highest level for standardized achievement in terms of gaps.
- Gaps in advanced coursework completion and tests range from Baseline (IB testing) to Intervene (AP testing)
- Gifted/Talents identification and Special Education referrals show disproportionality at the Baseline and Progress levels, respectively
- Disproportionality in Absences (students absent 11+ days) is highest at Middle/Junior High, where it is at Baseline level. At Elementary and Senior High, absences are at Progress level or higher.
- The greatest disproportionality is in Suspension, where Elementary, Middle/Junior and Senior High are all at the Intervene level; African American students were most likely to be suspended, twice as much as American Indian students and five times as much as Caucasian students.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- On suspension rates what are the next steps? Response: The District has been monitoring suspension for some time. The data allows administration to look at not only relationship of African American students but other students of color as well. It helps to define intervention success in that an intervention method for one group may serve for other groups as well. The data is reported district-wide, at school level and at classroom level to allow for the adjustment of strategies. The focus is on student engagement and finding ways to keep students engaged at school level. Racial equity training is helping with how to address issues at school level in order to adjust responses to student behavior. Administration is asking middle and high schools to look at data for suspensions and find issue areas (transitions, timing in day, etc) and how to address them. All in all, there is a need to find a different way to address the issues and how the issues are being approached.
- The cultural proficiency training is to help in looking at policies and practices to update and make more responsible and current.
- The beginning disproportionality issues and the 2.0 which is the Board approved vision level. Response: There are concerns with the 2.0 but it does help to define and allow everyone to see the disproportion that is there.
- Most of these issues are adult behavior which should be turned around quickly. Because of the interventions that have been discussed and are moving forward or are in place it should make movement possible to bring about solutions. Response: It takes time to absorb change in practices for both adults and students.
- This behavior needs to stop before even Courageous Conversations takes place, it is urgent! There need to be ramifications for the behavior.
- There is a need to analyze student and adult behavior to define what behavior is and why staff react inappropriately to behaviors.
- It would be helpful to pull out ELs, as there may be the possibility of missing nuances that may be important.
- Does data include the ALC programs? Yes it does.
- Special Ed referrals, is there any variation by type of referral? Therefore, some unpacking may be useful or helpful.
- Suspensions how are they categorized? Response: These are suspensions for all categories in Rights & Responsibility Handbook. It might be helpful to look at suspensions by type of suspension and duration. How do the nuances intersect with this? Response: When the quarterly suspension reports are done, the data is provided by categories, grade levels and incident rates.
- On all of the dashboard items there are there deeper metrics administration uses on school/ department level to address changing higher-level metrics? Response: Yes,

that is being done. There is a need to start a conversation that compels people to look deeper into what is going on and where does the focus need to be to begin with.

- The goal discussion needs to happen but the discussion can be at a later time.
- Absences – High schools are at 2.0 – 4.0 and at Progress.
- The ultimate goal is to change behavior in the relationships between adults and students.
- Don't let the numbers affect integrity of what is happening on the ground in schools. Don't let the numbers be incentive to reduce suspensions because of quotas. Behavior needs to change at a lot of levels; goals need to be set and training put in place to address the issues.
- Everyone was reminded the data presented is for disproportionality not numbers.

### **PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports)**

Kids have a wide range of needs, academic and behavioral; some need additional supports to varying degrees. What the District does on the academic and behavioral side is to put systems put in place to help all kids regardless of where they fall. The PBIS initiative began in 2009 and will require a three to five year implementation for it to become effective district-wide. The system has three tiers of support:

- Universal Interventions (school-wide prevention including all students) made up of School PBIS Teams, utilization of discipline data, establishment of behavioral expectations and routines and a recognition that the system is in place by all (staff and students).
- Targeted Group Interventions (focused interventions for some students) utilizing screening and identification, a problem-solving team, a functional behavioral analysis, intervention options and progress monitoring.
- Intensive Individual Interventions (for individual students) which are assessment-based with intensive and durable procedures.

The PBIS teams look at discipline data regularly and use it to solve problems and implement the resolutions using evidence-based practices. Positive behavior expectations are identified for all, taught throughout the year, and re-taught as necessary. The goal for Tier 1 Implementation is 80% or higher.

Tiers 2 & 3 have 10-trained PBIS student intervention specialists for the 17 demo sites who look at adopting behavioral and academic screening and progress monitoring data systems in order to identify students needing additional behavioral assistance before serious interventions are necessary, a preventative approach. They reinforce instructional leadership in functional school-problem-solving teams and assist in developing school behavioral RTI processes. They are integral to developing an array of behavioral intervention options matched to student need.

Challenges facing PBIS include a 65% reduction in PBIS implementation support staffing to schools after ARRA funding ended and the critical need for building-level focused behavioral intervention systems to support the school success of students most often removed from instruction for discipline. Solutions were procurement of MDE approval to access State special education funds for staffing of PBIS Student Intervention Specialists (10 FTE) to 17 school sites and implementation of systematic and innovative focused behavioral intervention systems. Procurement of a Federal grant with MDE to staff select demonstration sites with PBIS Specialists and develop innovative and replicable school systems for decreasing the suspension and dismissal of students with disabilities, especially African-American students with disabilities.

Community partners involved in Tier 2 and 3 work include the University of Minnesota, the Minnesota Association for Children's Mental Health, the Minnesota Department of Education and PACER.

### **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION**

- The second solution, are there some concrete examples? Response: The District has been tracking the suspension and dismissal rates for African-American students and has

- identified a very high level of disproportionality in that group and the problem is pervasive. This is the second month of the project and efforts are directed in three areas:
- Data systems to track events when they occur and collect data around actions,
  - Communications among regular staff and special education staff to be sure everyone knows when an incident has occurred and an administrative response is about to happen; and
  - To make sure there is a functional analysis of behavior done – what happened, why it happened and what is it that will prevent the event from happening again.
- How will the work be deepened in schools, how will it be expanded to all schools and how will these approaches be embedded so they are not dependent on coaches? What about the work with St. Paul Youth Services? Response: The work began this summer and involves Youth Services work within the community. They are looking at behavior as it comes from the community into the schools and back out into the community. It looks at behavior and what purpose it serves for the kid and how environment or the daily experiences of kids can be changed so they can be more successful through modifying their behavior. This involves working, in some cases, with “survival” mentality.
  - In middle schools for an event which might involve a suspension the EIP Program is used and the student goes to Humboldt where they receive a full day of education plus some social, emotional intervention with the social work staff and resources available there. This prevents students from losing time in their educational experience. Numbers can be provided for students who took advantage of this program.
  - What is being done to get parents involved in reinforcing these behaviors? Response: Schools have PBIS teams and for Tier 1 in regular school communications the program information should be being provided to parents on how to reinforce the behaviors or when parents are in the school the program can be highlighted. For Tiers 2 & 3, home and school collaboration is critical and information is provided on how the parents/guardians can help to provide positive support.
  - Are results being gathered on behavior changes in schools using PBIS comparable to other schools? Response: Data is being collected both for PBIS and for suspensions in the schools in the program so they can utilize it to assess their progress. Comparison to other schools is more problematic because schools differ so widely in demographics, staffing, etc. Behavioral data can be compared however. This will be necessary as the program moves out into the system.
  - Suspensions for kids with disabilities – what percent is special education related? Response: 12.3% are special education related vs 5.3% that were not.

At this point, the “Taking Action on Goal 1” portion of the presentation was postponed and the discussion moved to focus on **bullying prevention and intervention**. The purpose of this portion was to inform the Board of current offerings and future needs related to bullying prevention and intervention in SPPS. Information was provided on State and School District policy along with information on the newly established Bullying Prevention and Intervention Work Group. The group is made up of representatives from PBIS, the Office of College and Career Readiness, Special Education, Out for Equity, School Social Work, Student Health and Wellness and Elementary and Secondary Counseling and Guidance. It will be expanding beyond the core group.

Prevention efforts at school level include:

- Delivery of the Steps to Respect and 2<sup>nd</sup> Steps curriculum in schools by elementary counseling and social work staff.
- Establishment of school-level positive behavioral expectations as well as setting-specific expectations and
- Active supervision in classrooms and common areas.

At the district level:

- The current middle school Health curriculum has a bullying prevention unit
- Each high school currently has a Gay/Straight Alliance (GSA) or support group

- The collaborative cross-departmental Bullying workgroup will continue to identify or develop systematic methods of prevention.

Current intervention steps at the school level include applying the system of disciplinary responses to bullying and harassment (Levels 1-5) as outlined in the *Rights and Responsibilities Handbook*; referral of patterns of bullying, harassment and/or aggressive behavior to the school's problem-solving team to review and assess the behavior and evaluation of the effectiveness of school-level responses using the district's Campus system and/or School-wide Information System (SWIS).

Plans for 2011-12 include the possibility of:

- Consistently identifying and training a designee at each building site to provide needed assistance for students, families and staff when bullying has occurred.
- In conjunction with various departments, developing and providing the needed district level training for district staff.
- Where possible working with students to develop educational and restorative emotional practices at sites that have experienced bullying/harassment, and
- Recommending a district-wide bullying reporting, monitoring and evaluation process to determine intervention refinements as needed.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Is there urgency in addressing this issue? Yes
- Where are the steps for consequences with the two levels of bullying and where are safeguards for employees? Response: The District will keep students supports in place to address student needs with support groups, etc. Work is being done with HR to redevelop a gay straight staff network and to establish safeguards. Individual experiences were provided by staff on activities relative to bullying.
- It was stressed that the District needs to provide an avenue for students so they know there is an adult they can go to for support and there needs to be the same for the adults. From an employee perspective, employees need a safe haven they can go to if they are being bullied. Response: HR will be available to talk with employee and establish the facts. Employee to employee bullying/harassment is a disciplinary issue with a variety of consequences. HR consultants are in the schools on regular basis and supports would be provided.
- The effects of bullying is as strong on friends and bystanders, is there support for them as well? Yes.
- It was noted that having students actively involved is beneficial as well; some of them have very good ideas on how to address the issue.
- Regarding Out for Equity, the District needs a larger focus such as what Out for Equity has done for students needs to be broadened for employees as well. Response: Efforts are underway to restart the employee network to provide LGBT support.
- How does the District look at normative behavior and what respect means and manifestations of that respect. How can awareness be created of what expectations are and what normal correct behavior is? Response: This goes to work being done in the district, the racial equity work, disproportionalities and PBIS. It is all those various pieces that are being worked on. Leadership has provided tools to principals and assistant principals on how to deal with the issues. Supports are being developed for families as well.
- A reference was made to policy, is that a part of the work for the team to review policy to see if changes should be made the strengthen policies? Response: It has not been discussed. Policy was discussed as a beginning for early discussions. The Board gave the group permission to review the policy and provide input to the Board if they feel changes needed to be made to it.
- It was mentioned that support was needed from Out for Equity for students whose parents "come out."
- On peer support, what is in place there? Response: Restorative justice addresses how to help students and the whole community. There is the question of what is the community responsibility and the need to restore justice. There has been a lot of work

done in other areas with Maori circles in addressing these issues. There is also the issue of what are the consequences of an action both to perpetrator and to observers. There needs to be recognition that this is scary stuff for students even if not directly involved. They need to know what their avenues are, what their responsibility is to protect their peers and friends but they need a confidential means to do this for their own protection.

Board members were asked to review the Action section of the presentation and send their questions/suggestions to administration. The presentation needs to be revised for the Board meeting and should focus on what will happen as the District moves forward. Thanks were extended to the group for a very valuable presentation and discussion.

### C. 2011 Legislative Recommendations

The SPSS legislative liaison's presentation included:

#### 1. **A Session Preview**

The 2012 legislative session will convene on January 24th. The biennial budget was adopted during the special session in July, 2011; however, a change in the November and/or February forecast will trigger the need for a supplemental budget. The forecast is due out the first week in December and has been rumored to be anywhere between \$200 million to \$1 billion short. As the state has already substantially borrowed from schools and used revenue bonds—the state cannot rely on further accounting and payment shifts to balance the budget in the event of a bad forecast.

Due to redistricting, every house and senate member is up for election and will be running in their “new” district. The redistricting bill passed by the Legislature was vetoed by the Governor and will be decided by a panel of judges.

To date, there is one constitutional amendment that will be on the ballot in the fall of 2012, the marriage amendment. It is possible that a number of other questions will be voted on this coming session, including requiring a photo I.D. to vote, 2/3 majorities to increase any taxes, or other TABOR (Taxpayer Bill of Rights) type amendments that limit the growth of government spending.

The legislature adopted many of the provisions included in last year's agenda regarding flexibility and enhancing federal medical assistance revenue. In addition, there is a \$50 increase in the formula to offset the increased borrowing expenses due to the substantial amount the state borrowed from schools.

#### 2. **State of the State on School Funding**

Prior to the special session, MDE reported:

- E-12 general fund state aid/ADM relative to FY2003 has declined by 15% adjusted for the Implicit Price Deflator (IPD) or (-5% using CPI).
- Districts statewide have relied on increasing referendum levies to make up for a portion of their funding loss. Metro referendum levies averaged \$1,307 to \$1,427 per pupil. Saint Paul's referendum is currently at \$646.
- The special education cross subsidy has grown from \$397 million to \$724 million during the same period.
- Equalized formulas have not been adjusted, this coupled with reliance on referendum to make up for flat or inadequate state funding has increased school property taxes.

#### 3. **Legislative Recommendations:**

- **Ends: High Achievement:** Learners will meet the highest district and state standards through a learning journey that is academically rich and rigorous.

The State should phase in a new redesigned funding formula, that provides districts with stable funding, including state and federal mandates, recognizes the diverse needs of students and provides adequate resources to ensure college and career readiness for all students.

*Recommit the State to its constitutional obligation to funding education.* In addition:

- Allow school boards to renew an existing referendum by a majority vote of the school board at the current level and term.
- Fund or equalize local option levies for pre-kindergarten and all day kindergarten. State funded early childhood programs should ensure that parents have access to quality school-based programs as an option.
- Allow immigrant students that are new to the State as secondary students and enroll by tenth grade to continue school until age 23 in an Area Learning Center or Alternative Learning Program.
- Expand the extended time program so district can extend the school day, week and/or year to increase learning time for students.
- Eliminate the special education cross subsidy or establish an equalized levy to cover the un-reimbursed special education costs.
- Increase weighting for new literacy formula aid to compensate more for growth.
- Reduce special education paper work and better align state and federal mandates to allow staff more time with students.
- Increase accountability for special education and regular education tuition billing. Require a non-resident district or charter school to pay a portion of the special education costs from general fund, establish a maximum that a district can bill and create an appeal process.
- Require MDE to provide districts with on-line curriculum based on state standards at no cost to schools.
- Redraft the care and treatment language to make it clear that the district that is providing the services for both regular education and special education students is eligible to bill under tuition billing for both regular education, ALC revenue and special education revenue.
- Support continued categorical and discrete bonding and installment purchase contract authorities.
- Allow schools to use their professional development revenue to implement the new principal and teacher evaluation program.

*Allow local boards to “opt out” of any new state mandate that is not adequately funded or not tied to student achievement or student safety.* The legislature often proposes new or expanded mandates without providing the necessary funding. The legislature should reexamine the existing state mandates and provide adequate revenue prior to imposing any new mandates for districts or students.

*Integration Revenue --* The current integration revenue statute is repealed after the 2012-13 school year. Base funding for the new program is \$41 million for 2014; \$68.5 million for 2015. Districts may certify the same levy as 2012 for 2013. A task force is charged with making recommendations on replacement revenue more focused on closing the achievement gap. The rule was not repealed and the special session law further stated that segregation is prohibited.

- Ensure that the state keeps its commitment as outlined in the special session law to ensure funding stability for districts between the current integration program and the new program.
- Traditional public school students must have continued access, including transportation, to high quality school choice/magnet programs and language academies under the new program.
- Promote collaboration with MDE for approval and implementation of both inter- and intra-district integration activities that also acknowledge the changing context of schools within communities.

*Recruit, Train and Enhance Effective Teachers and Leaders --* Direct MDE to develop and implement a comprehensive longitudinal data system to help personalize student instruction, enhance professional training and evaluate the effectiveness of teacher and administrator training programs.

*Early Childhood* -- Adopt a common assessment for all children at the entrance of kindergarten and foster collaboration between childhood care providers and their local school district.

*Assessments* -- The following principles should guide any proposal to modify or add new state assessments.

- Developed using research-based assessment principles and designed to measure student growth and be of direct assistance in making instructional change.
  - Aligned to a specific set of nationally adopted “power standards,”
  - Administered after students have had the opportunity and resources to master the material.
  - Tied to “shared stakes” in which the system (state and districts) is accountable for results.
  - Must not lead to unintended consequences, such as increasing high school dropouts.
  - Districts must be appropriately resourced in *technology* to support the next generation of assessments across all grade levels.
- Ends: Meaningful Connections: Learners will understand the relationship between their lives and the lives of others and the relevance of their educational experiences to their roles in society.
    - Amend the compulsory attendance law to require students to attend school until they obtain a diploma or reach the age of 18.
    - Support stackable career track programs that create "blended instruction" programs that allow ABE students to master basic and job-specific skills leading to post-secondary credentials.
    - Increase the funding, that has been frozen at \$60,000 for ten years, for adults with disabilities
  - Ends: Respectful Environment: The learning environment will be safe, nurturing, and equitable for our diverse learners.
    - Support the option for local governments to provide health insurance for domestic partners.
    - Provide a significant increase in the school safety levy.

#### 4. ESEA/NCLB Reauthorization

As Congress begins debate on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), most recently reauthorized as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the Saint Paul Public Schools will advocate for a new law embodying the following core principles:

- Establish authorization and appropriations levels for key formula programs (IDEA, Title I, Part A, Title II, and Title III) to meet sufficiently the goals of the law and to serve all eligible students. This would include embracing college and career readiness; ensuring funding is not diverted for new competitive grant opportunities at the expense of formula programs and fully funding any new initiatives.
- Reduce, eliminate and avoid new set-aside requirements to give more flexibility to meet the needs of diverse learners in the context of state and local requirements and expectations.
- Reconfigure NCLB accountability mechanisms to focus on student growth; focus improvement efforts on the most underperforming schools in a state or district; and recognize improvement.
- Retain current provisions regarding homeless children and youth with minor adjustments to better serve children and families

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Why can't test results be provided on a timely basis? Administration may want to add that if the State mandates tests Districts should have the results of those tests available to them on a timely basis (two weeks) .

- Should the number of items on the list be reduced to concentrate focus? Response: Administration can prioritize items/areas and the District can team with other organizations to strengthen positions on certain items. There has been value in the past in having a full list, it defines the District's position and having them on the agenda and talking about them can get them accomplished over time. It also defines the District position and allows the Legislative Liaison and staff to have a list of guiding principles for communication.
- A Board member commented that they liked the length and richness of the list as it defines the scope of issue important to the district.
- Are there any offensive strategies that can be put in place? Response: MDE might be looking at the literacy formula. The Governor's Finance Task Force may make recommendations; they are supposed to make recommendations on integration. The District needs to be proactive in its work to show SPPS is a good investment with comparisons both on quality and cost.
- What format would that information be in? Response: There will be FAQ sheets, basic information on the Strategic Plan and detailed information when requested or appropriate. Can the Board get copies of that information? Can talking points be created?
- Which items are absolutely key? Please define those. Administration indicated that would be provided.

**MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the 2011 Legislative Recommendations as presented. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

**Motion passed 6 in favor, 1 abstention (Hardy)**

D. Initial 2011-12 Budget Revisions

Administration indicated the first revision to the FY 2011-12 budget was in the General Fund and in the Fully-Financed Funds for Community Service and the General Fund. With the revisions the total revised revenues are \$641,714,124 (an increase of \$24,914,796) and total revised expenditures are \$667,737,980 (an increase of \$31,455,297).

General Fund revenue changes totaled \$9,725,640 and included:

- New revenue from legislation (\$2,813,900) an additional \$50 on the basic formula (presented to COB on 8/23/11)
- Addition of anticipated loss (\$4,834,221) – this was not included in the adopted budget (presented to COB on 8/23/11)
- Reduction of funds transferred to Fully Financed (\$444,814) – PBIS grants
- Enrollment changes (\$2,522,333) – enrollment on 9/23/11 exceeded projection by 407 students.

The allocation of the \$9,725,640 are as follows:

- Direct costs to SPPS for State budget shutdown (borrowing costs) - \$200,000
- Fund Balance Contingency for FY 13 - \$2,000,000
- OPEB Obligation - \$1,000,000
- Schools - \$5,636,016
- District-wide - \$889,624.

Re-appropriation of General Fund fund balances (from previous year) totaling \$6,540,501 included:

- Encumbrances (\$3,503,346) – open PO's from FY 11
- Professional Growth (\$181,636) – contractual carryover
- Site Carryover (\$1,896,156) – amount restricted for ALC.

The total increase in the General Fund totaled \$16,266,141.

Revisions to the Fully Financed Budgets were broken out as \$14,788,556 to the General Fund Fully Financed (\$14.4 is new and revised budget allocation; the remaining \$.8 million is carryover from previous year). \$400,600 was added to the Community Service Fully Financed Fund.

Changes to Expenditures were: General Fund \$16,266,141; General Fund Fully Financed \$14,788,556 and Community Service Fully Financed \$400,600.

In all the adjustments to revenue totaled \$24,914,796; expenditures totaled \$31,455,297.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- Why are expenditures going up over revenue? Response: This is because of the re-appropriation of fund balances.
- What fund balance is being referred to? Response: This is not the 5% Unreserved Undesignated Fund Balance this is the fund balance earmarked for specific purposes, i.e. ALC, outstanding contracts, etc.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the initial 2011-2012 Budget Revisions as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.**

**Motion passed.**

E. Standing Item: Policy Update

The Vice Chair stated the Policy Work Group will meet between now and the November 29 COB to develop draft language which can be reviewed at that meeting.

F. Work Session

**1. Superintendent Evaluation Timeline**

Board members were reminded the Superintendent Evaluation is scheduled for December 7 at 3:00 p.m. The Vice Chair indicated the Superintendent would provide Board members with her information by November 23. Board members will then review what she has supplied and fill out their evaluation forms and submit them for consolidation so there is only one document to review on the 7<sup>th</sup>.

It was requested that an outside tabulator be used to consolidate Board evaluations. The Vice Chair indicated this would be taken under advisement. It was also requested that the Board Legal Counsel be consulted on the rules around the evaluation process and that information be provide to all Board members.

**II. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the meeting adjourn; Ms. Kong-Thao seconded motion.**

**Motion passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Marilyn Polsfuss  
Assistant Clerk