

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
December 6, 2011**

PRESENT:

Board of Education: Jean O'Connell, Elona Street-Stewart, Kazoua Kong-Thao (departed at 8:39 p.m.), Anne Carroll, Jeff Risberg, Keith Hardy, John Brodrick (arrived 5:03 p.m.)

Board Members Elect: Mary Doran, Louise Seeba

Staff: Suzanne Kelly, Michael Baumann, Sharon Freeman, Denise Quinlan, Darlene Fry, Efe Abgamu, Julie Schultz-Brown, Elizabeth Keenan, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Kathy Brown, Mary Gilbert, Tim Caskey, Marie Schrul, Michelle Walker, Joe Munnich, Matt Mohs, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Christine Osorio, Andrew Collins, Michael Thompson, Lisa Gruenewold, Mike Kremer, Doug Revsbeck, Traci Gauer, Stacey Gray-Akyea

Other: John Schutz, Merle Waters, Chris Omdahl, Raydenne Hagen, Christi Schmitt, Mila Koumpilova, Daarel Burnette, Mary Catheryn Ricker, Sarah Gering, Steve Adams

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:53 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Update on OPEB (Other Post Employment Benefits) Trust

The Chief Business Officer introduced the Controller who indicated this would be an overview of where SPPS sits with its revocable trust along with a review of the current market strategy and a brief look at other districts' practices.

Representatives from Wells Fargo provided an overview of MN Statute 471.6175 – Trust for Post Employment Benefits established in 2008. They provided a client summary of the SPPS Consolidated Portfolio. This is balanced between equities, other investments (venture capital, commodities and futures), fixed income and cash equivalents. They indicated the allocations are a function of what annual distributions might be projections of future needs and the risk tolerance of the Board.

The Trust was established April 8, 2011 with an initial investment of \$1 million which was invested in a money market account. In May, Wells Fargo began managing the fixed income portion of the trust. In June, initial equity and alternative fund investments were made early in the month along with an initial commodity investment. In August final equity and alternative investment, funds were made along with the final commodity investments. In September, the emerging market equity portion of the portfolio was rebalanced and portions of the fund were reinvested to diversify the portfolio further. In November, an additional \$1 million contribution was received; half was immediately invested in fixed income, commodity and alternative investment funds with the other half (allotted for equity purchases) invested with one-half to equities immediately and the remaining half to be invested within 30-60 days.

The Wells Fargo representatives provided their investment policy statement and a look into the U.S. economy, the international outlook, a review of the bond market with probable strategies along with a real asset review and strategy.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The reason for the 2% cash target, is that because it is being put away for use 15 to 20 years from now? Yes
- Does the State Statute provide boundaries or limits on equities? Response: It does in a roundabout way; equity is capped at 85% as a collective group. The Statute has been revised/clarified over the past year but has yet to be approved by the legislature. The SPPS allocations would be considered a moderate risk allocation.
- If this were adjusted from moderate to high risk, would that require Board action? Response: The Chief Business Officer is listed as the investment officer and has the primary responsibility for the trust; Administration would determine any changes after consultation with the Board. It was noted Wells Fargo has margins within its investment areas to allow a degree of flexibility in making investments in the short-term.
- It appears most clients funded their trusts through bonding. For SPPS what would be a reasonable yearly allocation into its trust? Response: Yes, most of the listed districts are between 80 to 100% funded through bonding. For SPPS, contributions should be as much as can be done or as much as the District is comfortable with. In actuality probably significantly more than what is being done currently.
- How many years did it take other districts to get to the 80% level? Response: This happened in the last three years following change to the law and when they did the bonding, it was instantly funded. The bonding option has closed and is no longer an option for SPPS. The District could do a referendum to bond for this in future. You need to look at how maximize the levy option to put dollars into the trust.
- When will next update occur? Response: Nothing has been scheduled at this time. Administration can share updates with the Board on a regular basis as updates are received.
- How does administration plan to close the gap over the next decades? Response: With the Pay-Go Levy Option the district has, SPPS has a very large liability reported on its books (\$409 million). The District covers its annual costs in each normal budget planning cycle and is working toward mitigating its remaining liability over time. In order to do what everyone would like to do the District would need to put more into the trust over time as economic conditions improve. As this is a revocable trust, as opposed to an irrevocable trust, it is calculated differently as it is reported out. The District is mitigating the liability but it needs to continue looking at the status of the investment and how much more the budget can tolerate with regard to the liability over time. The primary necessity is meeting the annual obligation with mitigation over time. The challenge is to monitor economic conditions and make a commitment to add to the trust as economic conditions allow.
- Can a district have both a revocable and irrevocable trust? Response: Administration will need to check law on that.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the OPEB Trust. Mr. Risberg seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

B. Auditor's Report

The Controller stated the report of the FY 11 Financial Audit and the OMBA A-133 Audit has been prepared by the firm of KPMG who was retained by Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) to perform both audits.

The representatives from KPMG presented highlights from the financial statements and their opinion for the audit conducted for the year ending June 30, 2011. They stated, in their opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the respective

financial position of the governmental activities, each major fund, the aggregate remaining fund information and the respective changes in financial position and, where applicable, cash flows thereof for the year ended June 30, 2011 in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

It was noted the District had adopted Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 54, *Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definition* as of July 1, 2010.

They stated they had also issued a report on the District's internal control over financial reporting and tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, grant agreements and other matters. Additionally they audited the District's compliance with the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133, which are applicable to major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2011. Finally, they reviewed the financial transactions of SPPS as a political subdivision of the State of Minnesota.

He then moved on to a review of the actual financial statements for the District mentioning the Management Discussion and Analysis as an area to review.

He noted on the Governmental Funds Balance Sheet the fund balance presentation has been redefined into five categories of hierarchy under GASB 54: Non-spendable or Restricted Funds (legal restrictions on the use), Committed Funds (committed by application of district policy), Assigned (resources earmarked for a particular purpose by the Chief Business Officer) and Unassigned (what is left over in general fund). This unreserved, unassigned fund balance is \$29.4 million which exceeds the Board's policy requirement of 5%.

They reviewed two items that will be reported out in the audit. The first falls under the financial reporting process itself. There were certain elements in that process that were incomplete from the District perspective. Principally the GASB 54 analysis and an accounting disclosure on a refunding. There were no errors in the accounting records but elements were there that management was not able to perform. There is limited knowledge and expertise within the department and a high demand on the time of the individuals with that knowledge; this needs to be addressed. The other matter was that some accounting entries into funds (manual journal entries) that can be done in total by one individual. This process should have a secondary review if the three steps in this process are done by one individual.

Regarding the OMB Circular A-133 report, the last element related to compliance with Federal rules and regulations related to awards made to the District. Five major clusters were selected for review: Nutrition Services, Title I, Title III, Special Education and the Educational Jobs Program. This focuses more specifically on the District's administration of the Federal award programs themselves and compliance with established rules and regulations and terms of the grant documents. There were no instances of non-compliance. Two observations on the operation of internal controls were noted in the area of the management review control, specifically budget to actual, reconciliation and financial reporting requirements. In each instance, the activity was performed but there was no evidence a review was performed. There needs to be an "evidence trail" to document the activity was actually performed.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- An Internal Auditor position has been established within SPPS, how is that working? Response: The function strengthens the control environment, it provides an unbiased look at day-to-day activities. Structurally the Auditor should report back to the Board or Superintendent not through the Finance function. The position is another tool to ensure compliance. Structurally this should be addressed to report directly to the Board or Superintendent with dotted line reporting to the other.
- What has the Internal Auditor been doing? Response: Administration can provide a schedule of audit functions that have been audited to date and the forward schedule as

well. In general, there have been nine different areas audited throughout the district. Administration will provide this schedule.

- Where do internal control measures fall under? Response: Internal control measures fall under the function of the Controller. The Internal Auditor could look at action plans to address the control measures noted and verify completion of those and look at other areas in the district. If problems are identified, the auditor will have a conversation with management for a response with proposed corrective action plans and/or changes to procedures to improve operations.
- Internal Auditors look at systems issues and resolving issues before a problem arises.
- Will the Internal Auditor report out on management responses? Response: The management response report comes from the Controller. In SPPS, the Internal Auditor advises on and follows up on corrective action plans.

MOTION: Ms. Kong-Thao moved, seconded by Mr. Brodrick, the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Audit Report as presented.

Motion Passed.

C. Report from the Special Education Advisory Committee

The Executive Director of Special Education presented the SEAC report. Both co-chairs were in attendance. It was noted SEAC was advisory to the Superintendent rather than the Board as in the past. For this reason, staff makes the report.

The Executive Director of Special Education stated the purpose of SEAC (Special Education Advisory Council) is to provide information, advice and assistance to the Board, the Superintendent and herself on issues related to special education. The Council has been in existence for 38 years. It also serves as a forum for parents and others to express their concerns and ideas regarding special education issues. The Council is mandated under Minnesota Statute 125A.24: Parent Advisory Councils.

In 2010-11, SEAC took steps to strengthen its advisory role as well as increase parent membership. During the year, it became a subgroup of the Minnesota Continuous Improvement Process: Self Review (MNCIMP:SR).

Highlights of the SEAC year include:

- An increase in parent membership and diversity of disabilities represented by 600%, 12 new parents attended meetings regularly.
- A review and re-commitment of SEAC's purpose
 - To advocate and advise
 - To assist in school district being more effective
 - To help all our learners reach their full potential
 - To help create welcoming environments
 - To influence policy and the local and broader level
 - To Inform and educate parents about special education
 - To create opportunities for parents of special needs children to connect
- Provision of food and childcare during meetings, as well as transportation (not been done in the past for SEAC meetings) has been well received and was the reason some parents were able to attend.
- A section of the CIMP was addressed at each meeting, giving parents an opportunity to give feedback.
- The Strong Schools, Strong Communities Strategic Plan, referral rates, business plan, budget overview and the State monitoring for 2011-12 school year were reviewed
- The Assistive Technology (AT) Department presented an overview of what AT is and why it is necessary as well, as how SPPS provides it.
- A presentation on the extended school year and summer school qualifications was made.

- The PACER (Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights) resource contact for 2011-12 will make presentations including two of the following (they will be presented in English, Spanish, Hmong, Somali and Karen).
 - Why it is important that parents be involved
 - How can I work effectively with the school?
 - How do we make the Individualized Education Program (IEP) fit my child?
 - How do Special Education and Regular Education work together?
- School Choice was discussed
- Information on resources such as Pacer' newsletter and available workshops, ARC, Working Family Resources and free webinars, Highland Friendship Club, Young Dance, U of M Music Therapy Clinic, Jewish Community Center and teen programs, Upstream Arts, Epilepsy Foundation, Pacer's Roberta Mann Symposium, available summer activities for children with disabilities, Camp Oz, Camp Butwin and East Metro Integration District Summer camps were provided.

SEAC goals for 2011-12 include:

- Improved communication with Special Education parent groups
- Marketing SEAC to SPED parents
- Advising the Executive Director on the CIMP (Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan)
- Making SEAC meaningful to the members so they can make informed recommendations

Topics that were taken under consideration for 2011-12 by the SEAC include:

- Strengthening the relationship of parents and case managers
- The twice exceptional programs
- Updates on the CIMP
- PACER – why it is important for parents to be involved, collaboration between regular education and special education staff

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What about parents of EBD kids? Response: SEAC has done outreach and recruitment through EBD lead staff. This has resulted in two parents of EBD kids joining SEAC. SEAC is racially and disability-diverse as well as having an age spread.
- The District needs to be sure, as it develops leadership in advisory councils or at school sites, that as many people as possible benefit from that experience. Has SEAC thought about how leadership becomes an asset to the district? RESPONSE: SEAC shares with schools through a newsletter. It is seeking Asian representation by being in touch with that community providing information and invitations to participate.
- As SEAC continues to identify families, is it focusing on early ed families? Is it looking for ways to take leadership and broaden its reach to benefit the most people? Response: SEAC has had Asian parents who have attended meetings as guests. To be a member, individuals need to commit to come to most of the meetings. Individuals are always welcome to attend as guests. As far as sharing knowledge and developing ways to broaden membership, SEAC is establishing its first Special Ed Parent Resource Group. This is a place for parents to come (parent driven) to discuss a specifically provided topic so they learn something relevant to them. This will build community in special education and share information and resources. These will be held in four languages. On leadership, SEAC is reaching out to groups, this is a constant topic of discussion. Much of the work on SEAC is taken by the co-chairs so they need to assess what is most important and how to reach out to communities but this is difficult due to lack of time. They want to be a resource to parents to direct them where to go for information or help. They want to strengthen SEAC's role through providing feedback, input and through raising questions on the work.
- The Chief of Staff added the Superintendent thinks about parent engagement from multiple perspectives. She has added the Executive Director of Special Ed to the cabinet. She is also working with Family and Community Engagement to find ways to strengthen supports for families.

- What is the gender breakdown of SEAC members? Response: one male, 11 females.
- For Goal 4 making SEAC meaningful, what does meaningful mean and how does that help with recruitment. Response: That is the advisory piece, it offers parents access to the process and provides them a place to give input on improving the process. This should help the broader community.
- In bringing the CIMP Plan to the table and getting parents to understand the process, it can give parents more of a stake in the process.
- Comment was made that the Board liked SEAC working with Family and Community Engagement. This calls out Special Ed to highlight it, it makes it more inclusive in the general community of the schools.
- Slide 16, is SEAC involved with the CGCS assessment on special education. Will SEAC include what is being offered through the equity training? Response: SEAC may have participated in the audit and will be informed of the completed report. Special Ed students are reported in all of the equity results. Accountability is looking at ways to disaggregate data to look at specific populations such as special education.
- Once that information is provided to a SEAC committee would that data add to meaningful conversations among the parents? The observation was made that Special Education students are “set aside” in the district. How do parents feel about that and in the measurement data. What is SEAC’s role in changing perceptions?
- When do recommendations go to the Superintendent and the Board? Response: This is the report for last year to both the Superintendent (a couple weeks ago) and the Board (tonight). As SEAC meets if issues or concerns are raised they can be brought by the Executive Director to the cabinet and addressed.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the SEAC report with thanks. The motions was seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion passed.

D. SSSC Monitoring: Student Data & Work

The Chief of Staff stated this is the third Vision Card presented to the Board and the first on processes that lead to improved student outcomes. She noted SPPS is one of the few districts nationally that looks at process indicators in this way.

Administration reviewed the background on the VisionCards stating there is value in having conversations about the indicators as a district because improving the processes will lead to better outcomes for students. Process data is not often compiled at the district level because:

- It is difficult to collect and explain
- It is context and grade-level specific
- It is time intensive to aggregate and generalize district-wide indicators and
- The process is not about a single point in time.

Research suggests it can take from two to four years to fully and successfully operationalize an evidence-based program, practice or effective educational innovation. Implementation occurs in stages; SPPS district-wide implementation expectations are:

- Year 1 – 15%
- Year 2 – 30%
- Year 3 – 50%
- Year 4 – 75%
- Year 5 – 90%

The Vision Level goal for all measures in this area is >90%. Measures are use of common assessments (percent of PLCs); use of data to inform instruction (percent of teachers);

delivery of district curriculum (percent of teachers); providing daily feedback to students using rubric (percent of classrooms) and student engagement (percent of classrooms).

A few changes have been made since this was originally introduced to the Board.

- The language for measures has been refined (utilization and delivery of district curriculum and provide regular feedback to students).
- Added indicators have been added for each measure (adjusted unit of analysis and determined vision levels).

The format for reporting includes the measure (as stated on the VisionCard); an indicator (the data point that reflects a piece of the measure) and source (the tool(s) used to measure the indicator). VisionCard levels are: Intervene (<30%); Concern (30-50%); Baseline (51-70%); Progress (71-90%) and Vision > 90%.

1. **Use of Common Assessments**

Indicators are:

- K-5 Literacy programming implementation (Source/sample: k-5 literacy programming observation by Literacy Coaches at 39 schools reporting back)
 - K-5 Mondo Bookshop assessments administered: 91% after Year 2.
- High School implementation of Engaging Classroom Assessments (ECA) (ECA reports from LLC Coaches at 7 schools)
 - 9-12 ECA is at 52% in Year 2 (percent of high school instructional staff implementing three or more ECAs in 2010-11).
- Databased decision making using continuous assessment elements (Learning Community Culture Indicator (LCCI) survey of 419 teachers at 12 schools).
 - Teachers using data from common assessments developed by their team to make instructional decisions (at Progress)
 - Teachers' instructional teams creating common assessments (at Progress)
 - Teacher instructional teams continuously assessing student learning to guide instruction (at progress).

2. **Use of Data to Inform Instruction**

- K-5 Literacy programming implementation (Source/sample: k-5 literacy programming observation by Literacy Coaches at 39 schools)
 - K-5 multiple data points used to plan for instruction (Mondo Bookshop Materials) is at 50% in Year 2 at Baseline
- 7-12 Professional Learning Communities with teams meeting at least twice a month is at 100% or Vision level.

Administration reviewed the six-step data team process that digs deeper into the data. High schools use the process primarily. Step 1 is to collect and chart data. Step 2 is to analyze data and prioritize needs. Step 3 is set, review and revise incremental SMART goals. Step 4 is to select common instructional strategies. Step 5 is to determine results indicators that move back to step one in a continuous, on-going process. Step 6 is to monitor and evaluate the results.

- K-12 professional learning community with the data team process functioning close to and at proficiency is at 52% in year 2 or Baseline. This is teams who have been implementing for one or more years.
- Collaborative teaming elements
 - Team collaboration on finding instructional solutions that help all students improve their learning: mean is at baseline with some implementing in Progress
 - Teams finding the most effective instructional approaches to help students master selected learning targets varies from concern to baseline with the mean being Progress.

Harding High School progress was reviewed as a case study in the process. The Principal stated it is an amalgam of collaboration -- learning and results. The process must have common formative assessments to drive PLCs. During the evolution of the process, the school shifted from what to how. He noted how important it was to build leadership capacity within the school community in order to carry the work forward..

3. **Utilization and Delivery of District Curriculum**

- K-5 implementation of mini-lesson component in Reader's Workshop is at 72% in year 3 or Progress
- Pre-Kindergarten CLASS assessment (used in 21 pre-K classrooms) with program averages reported on a 1-7 scale. Instructional is between 3-4; organizational between 6-7 and emotional slightly into seven range with the average of the three being 5.1.
- K-5 literacy student profiles and progress monitoring is at 86% in year 2 or Progress level. Elementary teachers have created individual student profiles for all of the students using Data Zone. These profiles include student stage of reading and skill development.
- Data-based decision making using continuous assessment
 - Teams that have identified common core learning standards on which they assess student learning is in the baseline to vision range with the median at Progress
 - Use of evidence of student learning to adjust instructional practice is also in the baseline to vision range with the median at Progress.

4. **Provide Regular Feedback**

- 9-12 feedback in mathematics (percent of 9-12 classrooms that are implementing error analysis component close to and at proficient levels) is at 55% in year 3 or Baseline.
- Systems of prevention and intervention that assure academic success for all students (students experiencing academic difficulty receive extra time and support) is at Baseline.

5. **Student Engagement**

- Checklist for school-wide supports (schools doing 80% or more of the items on the checklist). The checklist examines implementation of PBIS school-wide supports in the building and was completed from 27 school buildings as of 11/28.11. This measure is at 33% in year 2 or Concern.
- Senior Survey for class of 2011 (the percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that their teachers stimulated their thinking and interest in learning showed as 88% or Vision Level.

Alternative Learning was spotlighted as a demonstration of implementation in this area of student engagement. The Principal outlined various methods, means and programs used at the school in getting students engaged.

Challenges encountered in this process area included:

- Identifying indicators to measure and monitor student engagement and delivery of regular feedback
- Capturing important data with limited, inconsistent data collection tools
- Applying a racial equity lens to the measures and learning strategies
- Fine-tuning what was measured and
- The small sample sizes on some indicators.

Areas for celebration include:

- SPPS is one of the first districts in the nation to monitor and report on district-wide process data to improve student outcomes.

- Mondo Bookshop assessments being administered at 91%.
- 100% of 7-12 Professional Learning Community teams at 11 schools meeting at least twice a month to authentically answer the four questions of PLCs.
- 72% of classrooms implementing the mini-lesson component in Reader's Workshop at least 80% of the time.
- 86% of K-5 elementary teachers having created student profiles in DataZone
- 88% of students agreeing or strongly agreeing that their teachers stimulated their thinking and interest in learning
- Pre-K overall average score of 5.1 across three domains and being above average on all domains.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- On the neighborhood partnerships at Gordon Parks, what about Leonardo's Basement? Response: The school is using the community as curriculum. Leonardo's Basement is a group of engineers, builders, do-it-yourselfers working with kids (8-13 year olds). This partnership is essential to what Gordon Parks wants to be.
- Why sample schools vs. all schools? Response: Administration looked for indicators that they ultimately wanted to measure district-wide, they then looked for schools as pilots. This is a starting point in identifying what data is currently available that will eventually be seen across the district. Types of indicators may vary depending on the data needed and what schools provide a base for receiving it. Some data will measure all schools but some data may be drawn from samples, that needs to be determined over time.
- The sample schools shown are these those that responded or had the measures accessible? Response: Those populations that were included in the measure were chosen for a variety of reasons as the initial samples.
- Is there any sense of how representative this is and what concerns there might be about who is not there. Response: Not all of them are representative. The LCCI population was targeted because they were participating in a grant. Mondo K-5 is probably the most representative as a majority of elementary schools are included. In some instances, intentional mixes and/or groups were selected.
- It was asked that administration provide background on how representative the data is on the samples selected in future, as it would make it more meaningful.
- Is it possible to make the Senior Survey an exit interview to aid in development of some of the measures? Response: Administration would need to discuss this as a team in order assess this. Such things as relationships, classroom techniques, teaching strategies, etc. could be evaluated. It could provide the underpinning of achievement and equity.
- Capturing best practices – how can the District capture the Harding successes and how can they be communicated to others and how can all this be tweaked to make it work? Response: Administration is working on finding a systematic way to share with others, capturing the data is a first step. Assessment of the data is a way to capture what is happening. The District needs to align capacity with the needs of the individual buildings. This all needs to be scaled-up in an intentional way with differentiation according to needs.
- Leadership changes over time, how is the leadership piece being captured and are there on-going efforts to continue and maintain succession planning, grooming of leaders who are invested in the processes? Response: The new performance management systems call for succession planning which needs to be detailed and benchmarked within individual development plans. This is being insured and systematized throughout the various levels.
- Feedback, there needs to be feedback not only among peers but feedback with students around instruction and learning processes and checking in as goals are set. There are particular times when students need to know they have to make goals especially in preparation for their next year of learning and/or being matched with colleges that meet their needs and learning styles. Is this being addressed? Response: Administration will provide information from Office of College and Career readiness for the Board.

Assessments are given to students in a cycle. In the spring MAP, indicators are used along with MCA results to set up RTI for kids testing non-proficient or partially proficient. In elementary it seems students know how far they are from grade level, this ensures every student knows what needs to be accomplished to attain proficiency. Part of the Parent Academy training provides what and how to ask students and teachers about their scores and proficiency.

- Kudos was given to staff for the work on these metrics and the process moving forward. As the District moves forward with Beyond Diversity are there process metrics that PEG has that should/could be used to measure various areas or can they be developed before they are needed? Response: PEG has them and they can be shared. There will be targets to ensure the District moves beyond isolating race and the development of instructional strategies.
- Is consideration being given to a more robust opportunity for seniors to be given a chance on how to make the educational experience even better, how to improve their experience and how to prepare them better of the next step out into world. Response: Administrators K-12 hold monthly PLCs and they will be looking at student engagement using various measures to determine how engaged students are in their learning. They will be able to provide actual data measurements on student engagement.
- In the area of challenges, concern was expressed that based on the measures used there is not 100% of implementation – are there action steps to increase fidelity? Response: The action will be to take the data available today, look at the measures to take beyond where schools are today and provide that information to accelerate work. Administration needs to analyze what is available and what is not and how to measure that. The Superintendent is reviewing this data, she has directed staff that they will be held accountable for as close to 100% fidelity of implementation as possible. That is built into staff accountability measures.
- Student feedback, one critical question to ask is if students need extra help that they get it, what is the answer from a student perspective? That needs to be asked whenever there is another side to a question. Student feedback needs to be directly tied to assessment items.
- Another important component is to get good feedback from teachers with actual data on particular items.
- How engage is the District engaging parents and the community in supporting this work? How do we get their buy-in? Response: The process of getting information to parents is at infancy level at this time than the work done on engaging parents in the outcomes and understanding the data. The process measures is the next step in getting information to the parents.
- Why isn't reading being taught in high school? Students need to be literate. Also, too few kids are reading ethnic authors does the District understand that as it changes the environment to improve learning it will need to make specific capital investment in culturally-specific materials to a much greater extent? Response: The Common Core State Standards are pulling districts toward really diverse meaningful curriculum; really looking at what is being taught and saying that no longer can teaching be done without the use of culturally relevant materials. It is something saying "this shall be done." The District has gone from intervene to progress in this area through the AMP classes in 7th grade and EDGE classes in 9th grade. Finding teachers licensed in reading is critical to secondary level, instructional practices are key to progress not programs.
- In the area of K-5 literacy does that mean 86% of the kids have a profile or 86% of the teachers have input data into the system? Response: The profile is generated when data is put into DataZone. It is reported by the coaches that 100% of teachers have input all students.
- What is being done at Gordon Parks with hands on math? Response: A number of things are being done, much more "hands-on" math using the community as a classroom. The use of Five Easy Steps to Math and using math in context to a project. It is using math in an applied context to make it real.

- PBIS how far along is Gordon Park in this area? Response: Gordon Parks is using the concepts not the program. It is all about getting the kids doing the right things and reinforcing that.
- As best practices and common core move toward greater use of non-fiction, how will this affect the work Gordon Parks has done with literature? Response: This will just add more reading, the kids need to read more.

Thanks were extended for the report.

E. Standing Item: Policy Update -- No Report

F. Work Session

1. Levy Discussion

The Chair stated the Board would officially certify the levy at the December 13 Board meeting. The discussion centered around areas that need to be highlighted in the levy presentation at the December 13 meeting and strategies on ways to present this most appropriately.

2. Appointment to the Civil Service Commission

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the appointment of Steven Marchese to the Civil Service Commission to complete the term of service of Fred Owusu which expires on December 31, 2016. The motion was seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart.

Motion passed.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Risberg moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart.

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk