

MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
March 23, 2010

PRESENT: Board of Education: John Brodrick, Elona Street-Stewart, Kazoua Kong-Thao, Anne Carroll, Vallay Varro, Keith Hardy
Jean O'Connell – joined the meeting at 4:53 p.m.

Staff: Suzanne Kelly, Superintendent Silva, Luz Maria Serrano, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Christine Wroblewski, Michael Baumann, Denise Quinlan, Howie Padilla, Tracy Gauer, Kris Emerson, Bill Larson, Jill Cacy, Barbara DeMaster, Shirley Heitzman, Michael Thompson, Eliza Tocher, Billie McQuillan, Jan Magrane, Kathy Brown, Doug Surgenor

Other: Mary Kathryn Ricker, Kathy Korum, Jeff Koon, Doug Belden, Greg Patterson

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:43 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Preview of 2010 Summer School Alternative Learning Programs

ALC Summer Session 2010 will provide programs and classes to increase proficiency and credit recovery for graduation. These sites will include 15 elementary schools (in 2009 there were 28), three grade K-8 schools (2009 = 1), 1 grade 7-12 school (2009-0), 3 middle schools (2009-6) 7 high schools (same in 09) and four other sites for special education, BTT, JDC and residential.

As was done last year there will be a three week session of 96 hours (6 hours/day) starting June 28 ending July 20. High school students will be able to earn up to six quarter credits. An additional three week high school credit recovery session will be held at Gordon Parks with another six quarter credits possible. This will run July 26 through August 13. Students attending both sessions can earn up to 12 quarter credits.

Enrollment in summer session has been trending upward; in 2008 it was 12,908; in 2009 13,925 a 7.3% increase, with the greatest portion of that in secondary programs. 2010 is projected at 14,000. Secondary eligibility criteria include being under age 21, low achievement results, not having passed the GRAD tests or are credit deficient.

The program supports student learning at the elementary level with academics in math and reading; at the middle school with academics in math, reading and writing and at the high school level with credit recovery for up to six quarter credits and test prep for the MCA GRAD testing with the test being offered at the end of the summer session.

Success will be measured by looking at the following:

- Stability of attendance in the three week session (fewer absences and increased enrollment)
- More students making up credits
- More students taking the GRAD Test Prep classes and re-testing at the end of summer
- High rates of passing on the GRAD tests

- Lower costs in transportation; nutrition services and staff

Classes have been combined in specific schools to lower costs, maximize space and provide the facilities department time for cleaning and renovating.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- At the end of summer, how will parents be given an update on how the student's participation looked? Is there a notice summarizing participation, credit recovery, etc.? Response: At this point letters have been sent to all homes where student are eligible for summer session and registration has been started in conjunction with conferences. Prior to the start of the summer session, every student and family will be called to remind them of the start date and report cards will be provided at the end of the session.
- Can notification be sent by e-mail? Response: This is not currently being done but could be explored; perhaps that information could be gathered when students register.
- In the area of secondary eligibility, which area has the highest number of students? Response: Credit deficient is the primary reason; most come to summer school to make up credits they have failed, the second is for GRAD test remediation. Most students need to make up required credits but some come for the option to take other credits that they might be interested in but could not fit into their schedule. This can also be done at evening school.
- How does the district address the concern about sending students to a different school from the one they normally attend? Response: How summer school has been offered in the past was reviewed. In the last few years, the District has cut down on the number of buildings used and moved students into other buildings. Efforts are made to move the students as a group so they are with familiar faces and teachers. There will continue to be more of this combining due to the economic situation.
- How is it a success when it is necessary to have greater enrollment in summer school? Response: Ideally, all of the students would be achieving to grade level or better. The reality is many kids need summer school in order to graduate on time. This provides the opportunity to make up credits to graduate within four years. Summer school, after school and evening school give students the opportunity to have many ways to meet credit needs to graduate. SPPS also serves charter school students who are provided the opportunity to attend summer session as well.
- What is the gap between those eligible and those who attend? Response: 14,000 letters are sent out inviting students to attend. You have heard to numbers who have attended in the last two years but it is pretty close to most attending.
- What are the expectations for the percentage of students who are taking one or both sessions to make up all their credit or pass the GRAD? Response: The curriculum is very focused because of the short time period. There is an 80% attendance rule; students can only miss 3 days. A lot of teacher training takes place before summer school starts so teachers understand the curriculum and the expectations for summer school.
- At high school level, how is this staffed? Response: high school counselors are currently in the process of completing credit forms to find what each student is missing. Additional confirmations are also coming back from registrations so teacher numbers can be better estimated. Previous year data on staffing is also utilized. There is usually a need to hire some last minute instructional staff and this has been accomplished very smoothly in the past. Because of the change in the session length and timing, teachers have been more willing to participate in summer school.
- Does the District track how many students don't return to a following summer school session? Response: Each high school tracks student's credits to keep them on course. There has been no cumulative reporting of this. Each school does this to keep their individual students on track.
- Would it be hard to get an aggregate report? When high school students come to summer school, they are missing many credits so they are constantly falling behind. There has been no sense of urgency among the students in the past but with GRAD the students are now beginning to see that they will indeed not graduate without their needed

credits and having passed the GRAD test. The prevention piece needs to be brought to light for students and families at a much earlier time in school. If summer school attendees were looked at, it would probably be the case that most of them, at least those serious about graduating, have attended summer school for the past two years because they are so far behind. Summer school should be seen as an opportunity to get back on track to graduate.

Thanks were extended for the report.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on summer school.

Motion passed.

B. Legislative Update

The Legislative Liaison stated the House and Senate passed the first round of budget reductions, which included budget cuts for all agencies except Health and Human Services and K-12. It has now moved into conference. The local government aid cuts were roughly half of the Governor's recommendations.

The E-12 and HHS bill mark ups have been delayed pending more information on the federal action on FMAP extension and the recently passed health care reform and reconciliation bill. In addition, legislators have been advised to wait for the ruling prior to enacting legislation that puts the Governor's unallotments into statute. If the Supreme Court rules against the Governor, the legislature would have to act on balancing the budget retroactively to July 1, 2009. Bills have been introduced in the House and Senate to codify the revenue recognition shift as well as the payment delays from 90/10 to 73/27.

The Grad Assessment bill establishes the new high school assessment system and is largely based on the ACCESS report. The bill as introduced, included additional provisions from the Commissioner including moving toward phase II which includes test development of the chemistry, physics and geometry end of course exam, as well as a penalty for high schools that are determined to be highly misaligned, which means that the course grades do not match up with the proficiency levels on the end of course exams for math and science. The penalty requires a district to pay for one remediation course at a state higher education institution. The Senate added an amendment that would require interim benchmark assessments for math.

The House also acted on the bill and it will be heard again in the Finance division. The House bill was amended to require interim benchmark assessments and item banks for all three areas, details how the cuts score can be determined for language arts and prohibits the commissioner from moving forward on the phase II tests without legislative authority. The bill removes the financial penalty for highly misaligned schools, but adds a provision that weights the end of course exam at 50% of the grade in that course area, rather than 25%.

The MDE policy bill includes the SPPS amendment that adds government run after school programs as an eligible provider for school transportation. Also included in the bill is a clarification on OPEB, which requires districts to do field testing if asked by MDE, eliminates the requirement that districts annually certify that we spend at least the same on support staff or have no less FTE's for the category (counselors, social workers, nurses, psychologist) than the previous year. It also creates an early learning and care system, and cleans up the school readiness and screening statute and clarifies that general community education revenue can be used for learning readiness programs.

The Conciliation Conference-Special Education action cleans up special education language adopted last year, the SPPS amendment to allow for more time (two business days) for offering a conciliation conference was adopted.

The Integration Study Task Force bill creates an advisory task force to make recommendations regarding the current integration rule and uses of integration revenue. It outlines the data that must be examined when developing the recommendations.

The MA billing for Special Ed bill requires DHS to clarify whether districts must continue to bill third party payers prior to billing MA for medically related services provided as part of a student's IEP. It also requires the commissioner of DHS to include a provision for families to consent to the data sharing on any newly developed enrollment form.

In the area of Alternative Teacher Licensing there are two bills moving through the legislature. The Mariani bill is very similar to last year's bill, and is modeled off of the Teach for America and Teaching Fellows programs. The Slocum bill was referred to the K-12 Finance Division, since it requires Board of Teaching rulemaking and would necessitate a fiscal note. This bill takes a broader approach of requiring the Board of Teaching to adopt rules on alternative teacher preparation and licensure, and to hold alternative preparation programs and candidates to the same accountability standards as all other programs.

The Physical Education Standards bill adds physical education as a standard requirement requires posting of the wellness policy on the web sites and requires the development of recess guidelines for school districts.

The Efficiency Plus Task Force bill represents the work that was done over the interim in response to the shared services bill, which was controversial last year. The task force is developed to facilitate greater efficiency and reduce education costs through collaboration and cooperation across school districts and government agencies while maintaining or improving the learning results for students.

Service to Students in Other States bill clarifies that schools are not required to serve regular education students in a residential or care and treatment facility without a tuition agreement.

MDE has agreed to offer districts the option of allowing seniors to retake the 10th grade MCA-II's, which has the grad embedded in it, this spring using pencil and paper. The cost to districts will be roughly \$7 per student.

The compulsory attendance bill was heard in the Senate and referred to the finance committee. The author indicated that he felt positive about this being included in the final bill with a delayed effective date to address the fiscal note. This should make it clear to 9th graders that they will be expected to stay in school until they receive their diploma or reach the age of 18.

Various Levy Bills were heard and include bills to expand uses of Health and Safety Revenue, additional levy authority for career and technical aid, authorization for school board to renew both capitol and referendum levies by board action and levy for TRA increases included in the pension bill. All these will be considered as part of the omnibus bill and will depend on the levy target set by the divisions. Due to the revenue recognition shift, any increase in levy actually saves the state money.

Other issues still moving include two different pension bills moving through the process. Both include increases in the St. Paul Teacher Pension fund. Senator Pappas has agreed and the pension board is supporting the districts' request to reduce the contribution rates from 2% to 1% for employers and employees and phase the increases

in over four years. The EdMN Statewide Insurance Bill that was considered last year and which has been brought forward again is being reviewed in committee.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- The alternative teacher licensing bill, what is the rationale? Response: The bill is an initiative by Teach for America and is supported by the Dept of Education, the Chamber of Commerce and the Minnesota Business Partnership and some school districts. The program is offered as an alternative to having a pool of applicants. The Department of Ed is pushing it because they consider it an important component of the Race to the Top application. The Teach for America requires that a district take all candidates to fill all license areas. The New Teacher Program allows districts to limit license areas where alternative licensing is used.
- Is there mandatory participation? There is none, it is an option on the part of districts.

Thanks were extended to the Legislative Liaison for the report

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report with thanks. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion passed.

C. LLC Report

The presentation provided results that have been garnered from the Leadership and Learning Center audit work. The audit provided a view of where district academic programs are. There were 15 initiatives analyzed. It brought out which initiatives provided the best return on investment and provided the desired student achievement results.

The initiatives implementation audit resulted in two overall findings:

- All audited initiatives had some positive impact on student achievement
- Five initiatives showed the greatest positive impact on student achievement

The big issues found by the audit were a lack of consistent, deep implementation and the overall number of academic initiatives within the district.

What should be looked for, according to the LLC, is a level 4 implementation where the most effectiveness is achieved from the program; in other words, doing the whole thing full out. This means the user fully employs the practices in the initiative as standard operating procedure, re-evaluates the quality of use of the initiative, seeks major modifications, examines new developments in the field and explores new goals for self and the system.

Five initiatives showed the strongest correlations to student learning. These were:

- Professional Learning Communities
- Content-focused Coaching
- Elementary Language Skills Block
- EverydayMath and
- Writer's Workshop

Other initiatives audited included:

- Reader's Workshop
- Full Option Science System
- APALS assessment
- AVID: Elementary and Secondary
- 7-12 Science
- Edge Reading
- AMP Reading
- Holt Math

- Read 180
- Disciplinary Literacy

Overall findings stated that effective practices are more important than programs; implementation has a nonlinear relationship to results; focus should be on deep implementation with fidelity; a smaller number of initiatives; and that an SPPS decision making process is needed to eliminate or retain initiatives and prevent adding of new initiatives.

An Audit Project Team was assigned to develop a decision-making framework that would move the district toward full implementation of fewer initiatives. They created a “Fate Determination Process” and came up with preliminary recommendations for administration.

Potential outcomes from the team’s work include the realization that language is important so firm definitions of what is meant by each specific statement used in the determination process were developed. The five areas developed were:

- Retain and fully implement (active promotion of an initiative where appropriate according to a prudent implementation plan)
- Retain, refine metrics and evaluate (continue academic achievement at the schools using it and expand to additional schools after metrics have been refined)
- Retain and maintain (continue using the academic initiative where it is in place but with no further expansion of its use)
- Retain and scale back (continue the academic initiative at the schools using it and effective practices may continue to be used but with no further training or materials being acquired.
- Eliminate (stop using the academic initiative and its materials as quickly as possible).

The “Fate Determination Process” answers essential questions about an initiative.

- Is the academic initiative a critical curriculum priority? One that moves SPPS toward achievement of its academic goals.
- Is the academic initiative demonstrably effective? (As measured by clearly defined metrics.)
- Is the academic initiative fully implemented? (At 3.8 or above, stabilized or enhanced use?)
- Does the academic initiative have broad internal support/readiness? (Is there readiness among the people employing the academic initiative?)
- Other questions addressed include:
 - o Is it redundant?
 - o Is it better than alternative?
 - o Is it attractive/adaptable, can it be integrated/aligned?
 - o Is it cost effective?
 - o Is there a legitimate non-academic reason to have it?

A sample flow chart of the process was provided.

Initiatives that were recommended for retention and full implementation were:

- Elementary: Language Skills Block, Everyday Math, Writer’s Workshop, Reader’s Workshop [with clarified expectations] and Full Option Science System (FOSS) [with clarified expectations].
- Secondary: AVID 7-12, 7-12 Science, Accelerating to Maximum Potential (AMP) [with clarified expectations], Edge [with clarified expectations] and Holt Math [with integration of Five Easy Steps practices].
- K-12: Professional Learning Communities

Initiatives to retain, refine metrics and re-evaluate were K-12 Content-Focused Coaching.

The initiatives to retain and maintain was Elementary – AVID K-6

Initiatives to be eliminated were:

- Elementary – Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)
- Secondary: Disciplinary Literacy and Read 180 Grades 9-10 (expectations need to be clarified for use in Special Education and ELL).

The District's commitment is to focus to achieve better results by taking solid steps toward fewer initiatives and by focusing on providing clear accountability. This should allow administrators and teachers to better focus on core practices with the outcome of students learning more overall.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Mondo – given the elimination of PALS, is Mondo considered part of Reader's Workshop? Reader's Workshop is the framework and Mondo is the material (books, lessons, assessments, etc.).
- What is the process for continuing intensive evaluation over time to look at those initiatives that weren't audited? Response: The level of implementation is key. The "silver bullet" is the best teaching in front of the student. Teachers need to have the tools, the training and students in reasonable numbers. Research shows if these are present and implemented with fidelity students will move toward meeting the standards. The issue is how to measure implementation with full fidelity and full effectiveness. The system needs to be a bit more prescriptive of what is expected of the teacher. SPSS has historically left it up to the site to decide. Now, in the current situation, the expectation of the teachers is that they will do XYZ and the teacher decides how to do it but the end results is improvement in the learning of the students. The District needs to continue to help teachers grow. By reducing initiatives and focusing on what needs to be done and investing in fewer initiatives there should be results/changes. The District needs to be sure kids are making gains relative to where they started. The District also needs to work in conjunction with families and communities to reach this end. The District needs to be more clear, more prescriptive while leaving space for individual creativity and it needs to provide the necessary resources.
- Is there reason to believe that if these are fully implement that they will meet the needs of students such that the Board can anticipate not having an major new initiatives coming up and if new initiatives are brought forth, what process would be used to evaluate the new?
- It is helpful that the decisions are broken down between elementary and secondary as what is being looked for is the concentration in the earlier years to be sure that what is being done in the secondary years the mark was hit early. How will the District be able to recognize that with what is being retained and implemented by the District in the elementary years will in the secondary years deliver the desired results? Response: It is difficult to determine where to focus the most. It is research proven that the early years are important but funding is not being provided for the earliest years. At the same time, it is the District's moral responsibility to continue to educate kids in the higher grade levels to get them to graduate. Through the evaluation process there is an emphasis on the secondary level in reading instruction. Middle grade literacy is the biggest issue in the U.S. today; reading is not taught after the 5th grade. The District decided there needed to be interventions for students not reading at grade level. It was determined those skills need to be developed as soon as they can be especially when they get to the 6th and 7th grade level; that is why AMP and EDGE are being added to get the students to proficiency. Students must learn how to learn, how to read and be provided strategies to be successful readers early on if they don't get these they won't be successful when they get to the higher grades. The balance between these is the challenge because neither can be given up. AVID is being focused on in middle and high school because the implementation has been successful but needs to go deeper and further. The District will look at the other areas over time. The District is looking at enlarging the 4 year old program which can be replicated and expanded and those children will be much better

prepared when they reach 7th grade but the District can't forget about the kids who will not be able to graduate.

- As improvements come through more focus on these areas of instruction will that see improvements in the classroom? Response: Yes, LLC brought awareness of the 90-90-90 research on schools that are having great success with their students. They did this process of narrowing and implementation of practices to allow students to learn more. The standard operating procedure changed because they are learning more within a context that makes sense. Stability of leadership in buildings and stability within initiatives over time are key to achieving success.
- Teachers need to make a difference in the life of the kids; they are the most important part of the educational system. There is a need to enhance the perceived importance of teaching as a profession.

Thanks were extended for the presentation.

MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the LLC Report.

The motion passed

D. Standing Item: Budget Update

The Superintendent indicated this presentation would begin the conversation on budget cuts for 2010-11 and beyond. The Chief Business Officer stated one of the greatest challenges for FY 11 is resourcing financially a future for SPPS that is different from that of the past. The Superintendent tasked staff to stay positive and seize the day with challenges that lie ahead with regard to the budget in the face of economic adversity and to do so relentlessly to find the best outcomes for students. The title of this presentation is "Cultivating Excellence" toward more high-quality schools, preparing all students for the challenges of the future. This is the intersection and alignment of two key areas:

- Academics – high-quality programs providing educational excellence to all, and
- Operations – the responsible management of fiscal and capital resources

The guiding principles and priorities included:

- Expanding excellence
- Increasing access
- Ensuring equity
- Addressing the needs of all SPPS students and families

Stronger schools for families and communities will result from new grade level configurations with attention to middle grade improvements; preK-12 alignment of programming (Montessori, environmental, BioSmart, language immersion, etc); innovation and enrichment as a priority and the goal of graduation and post-secondary preparedness for all.

The driving factors in the process are closing the academic achievement gaps, offering more enrichment, addressing declines in enrollment, recognizing and dealing with the economic realities, following best practices and, the interests and priorities of families.

The Academic achievement gap is reflected in the following:

- A persistent achievement and access gap across student groups
- Inconsistent application of core programming across SPPS schools
- The need to improve services for all students
- The drop out rate must be overcome to ensure graduation for all
- The fact that not all magnet schools are magnetic.

The District must create schools of engagement and innovation.

Enrollment decline is due to a school-age population decline and lower enrollments contribute to reduced revenues. There of 41 elementary schools 27 are under capacity (66%); of 7 middle schools 4 are under capacity (57%) and of the 7 high schools 2 are under capacity (28%). The declining school-age population and lower enrollment contribute to the reduction in revenue or market-share.

The economic realities facing the District are increasing costs for employee salaries and benefits; increasing operational costs (transportation, utilities, supplies, etc.), decreasing state and federal funding and declining grant revenue.

Families expect SPPS to provide students:

- A high-quality education at every school
- Greater opportunity for new and expanded education programs
- New educational innovations
- Extended time for learning
- Seamless education with fewer transitions
- Equitable distribution of programs and services
- Alternative education options and safety nets for off-track students
- Arts, music, athletic and enrichment programs.

The guiding change document, agreed to between the Board and administration, provided guidance in the process of finding opportunities in establishing the budget.

Some potential opportunities to strengthen school programs will come from a focus shift from school buildings (where instruction is delivered) to school community (the type and quality of the programs). Potential changes to programs include such things as: expanded programs (grade reconfiguration, single or dual campuses); relocation/co-location of programs (combine two or more school communities into one) and discontinuation of programs (removing them from the District's portfolio including buildings).

To maximize facility opportunities options include: reprogramming the facility (change programs located at the site); closing the facility (vacate the site, potentially for later use); relocating and/or co-locating programs with space constraints and identifying sites for expansion or new programming (to meet academic priorities).

This would lead to the ability to streamline transportation by modifying some magnet school transportation boundaries to better match with current student attendance patterns.

There are potential opportunities for centrally administered programs and services by reorganizing centrally administered departments and programs/services; eliminating additional positions and housing fewer staff centrally; adjusting professional development delivery and alignment with curriculum, adjusting service delivery from centrally funded programs/departments and reducing out-of-state travel not bound by contractual provisions.

The opportunities for schools and academic programs will result in implementation of consistent core programming for all SPPS schools (including extra-curricular, enrichment and specialty programs); grade reconfiguration; school budgets which reflect enrollment and revenue declines; co-located schools and programs and reconsideration of site usage.

Infrastructure maintenance costs will be contained through building energy management including temperature set points; alteration of seasonal grounds maintenance; reduction of supply inventories and closure of 10 of 12 aquatic facilities.

Savings in labor costs will be reached through offering the opportunity for voluntary early separation and engagement of employee groups in discussions about other contractually covered items.

The sum of these changes would result in a budget reduction of \$33,050,000.

Future opportunities for savings include centrally identified class size, time and labor automation, remove current pay with all employees going to a two-week lag. Opportunities for future revenue generation included such things as assessment of the fee structures, evaluation of the permit process and pursuit of additional grant resources.

The Chief Business Officer reviewed the timeline for additional communication and community engagement opportunities which have been scheduled over the next couple months.

The Board then moved into a facilitated discussion on the presentation with the principal of Teamworks International acting as facilitator.

The Facilitator provided an outline of process, suggesting first addressing only questions of clarification on the presentation looking at (1) Slides 1-11 as Context, (2) Slides 12-18 as Opportunities and Slides 19-21 as Summary. He stated then there could be more in-depth discussion on the opportunities. He noted the budget discussion does not stand solely in FY 11 but should be considered in the long-term over the next few years.

CLARIFICATION - CONTEXT

- Slide 7 - Excess capacity – The percentages, are these figures excess capacity or actual capacity of buildings? The figures were taken from the Facilities Condition and Educational Adequacy Assessment. The figures state that 66% are under capacity, 57% are under capacity and 28% are under capacity. The bricks and mortar footprint would show more building space than there are students to fill it or than the District can financially afford. The title should say Percent of Total Enrollment To Total Building Capacity. 66% of elementary space is utilized with an excess of space of 34%. This needs to be clarified before it is used for any other presentation, perhaps a footnote explaining methodology.

CLARIFICATION - OPPORTUNITIES

- Slide 13 – the qualifier “with space constraints?” It should be “within” space constraints. This could also be looked at as where there is a very popular program within a building which can take no more enrollees in the building. Perhaps this should be broken into two items.
- Slide 15, bullet 2 – eliminate additional positions and house fewer staff centrally – are we talking about reducing the number of centrally funded staff or locating them in other places? Both
- Is there a purposeful repeat between Slides 12 and 13 -- Relocate-co-locate schools and programs – the figure was not added twice, the statement was put there twice to be sure it was considered under both options, it was not calculated into the total twice. It is two different purposes? Actually three different purposes. Was the question about double counting or consistent use of language? Double counting.
- Slide 15 - adjust service delivery – is that people who do the service and the way service is delivered to buildings? Both
- Slide 17 – Should “Manage building set point” be broadened to the whole area of “building energy management?” As this goes forward putting this within the context of what is already being done.

CLARIFICATION SLIDES 19-21

- Slide 20 - Explain the two week lag. Some of the district workforce gets paid current; they work a week they get paid for that week immediately. Other staff have a two-week lag (they work two weeks and are paid for those two weeks two weeks later), this is customary practice in business. It is a cash flow issue which is all about timing and provides indirect savings on interest on short term borrowings.

- Slide 20 - Time and labor automation, what is this? All staff are currently on paper timecards which are entered manually. The District needs to re-look at technology to make this more efficient.

OPEN DISCUSSION ON OPPORTUNITIES (Slides 12-18)

The facilitator offered two guidelines (1) answer the questions asked, not the ones not asked and (2) check back to be sure what is being asked.

- The Academic Audit was a commitment for the future to things which make a difference for students -- Slide 12 matches this. This is now reflected in the total environment being provided so there is congruity. This is making the culture shift to focus on things which benefit students and provides permission to make changes in other things that don't.
- There is a clear alignment with the Guiding Principles – this is helpful.
- Slide 14 – under what principles or values would this option be pursued? What Guiding Principle would underlie decisions made in this? Redesign transportation. On many of the other opportunities there is clear alignment with academic achievement, access, etc. This doesn't seem to connect with the Principles in the same way. This could be an *expo facto* thing that could be a symptom of not having fidelity of implementation, etc. It feels like it violates some of the Guiding Principles.

Facilitator: Hearing two things: What might be some practical implications of this? Is this avoiding other issues that are centrally located to the values and things the Board developed and the Guiding Change?

Superintendent: This is looking at ways to reduce expenditures, ways to change transportation. Magnets are supposed to draw kids from all over the city. Currently, some draw very heavily from one area of the city so there is a need to find ways to reduce the busing. There is a need to look at current attendance patterns against historic patterns and adjust accordingly.

The comment was made that this contradicts some of the issues around equity and this questions can't be asked without considering the corollary of which schools without busing would become attractive if they had city-wide busing and what is broken about the programming at these schools that is not attracting kids from all over. The equity piece and access and opportunities is where the discussion needs to begin. Response: when you say what is broken in a school, many of the magnet schools are not broken, they are good schools but they fill right away with kids closer to the area because the parents like the areas, like the school. That is a different issue, that's saying which schools have enough kids in the current attendance areas who choose it to fill it. That's about current demographics versus past demographics. If it were framed on that basis and what to do with the busing system to avoid in future the situation the district is in now, that would be a much sounder way to approach this.

Facilitator what is being asked is that a consideration to make comments about transport as a whole and to balance savings from efficiencies in busing against issues of access and equity. No, the access and equity questions come first as well as attendance area and number of kids choosing certain schools so they fill up. This is the real issue; that these schools are filling up versus schools where there aren't kids because they simply are not there demographically.

- Slide 14 might be another place to add the relocate and co-locate programs statement.
- Is taking a look at high school starting later in the day being considered anywhere in this? If all these other things are being considered wouldn't this be the point to look at this as well? Response: it is not part of the presentation at this point. Some scenarios are being run on this by the Transportation Dept. It is not a simple issue as with transportation everything is so interconnected. If the discussion is on large changes,

let's put as much into the change process at one time as can be and get over the "agony of change" as quickly as possible.

- Has there been an exploration into a greater reliance on mass transit for high school students? No, St. Paul's public transport is not set up to provide an easy means for students to get to school on time. In many cases it would require the student to ride 2 or 3 different buses to reach their school which is unacceptable in terms of timeliness and attendance.
- Slide 14 this should also look at the changing student attendance pattern and how it impacts neighborhood schools if magnet boundaries change.
- Have there been conversations about exploring a four day week and Saturday school? Response: This was not costed as there was a sense that the Board did not seem interested in this. Administration would not strongly recommend it as a budget cut until the last possible moment. Students need as much stability in life as possible and a four day week might impact this as well as place a burden on families relative to daycare, etc. There are a couple districts doing this in the state so figures could be extrapolated from those. Saturday school is a possibility or to see if the use of extended time to add more instruction during the day or on Saturday. This is also a transportation issue. Neither of these are in the current recommendations.
- If all of the potential opportunities related to facility use were bundled around attendance and options at the school site, address consideration of program alignment relative to opportunities for families to have an opportunity for articulation through the system. The bottom line is whatever is done; it cannot just be for budget cuts it has to be for the welfare of the students and the best system for SPPS. Changes which are made need to insure school and programming continue all the way through the student's educational life with SPPS. If groups of students are taken into the transition it doesn't save any money, there still need to be two buildings open. If a change is made the program/site is taken and moved to another place in its entirety. More than anything the District needs to be very sensitive and realistic about what every student in SPPS should receive in their education – the totality of what every student receives regardless of what building they attend school at. Equity is not currently being provided and it's not about being poor or where you live, it depends on the resources each school allocates. It might be helpful as the budget recommendations are put together, as changes are begun around facilities and transportation to demonstrate how the academic equity and articulation are being met/addressed – "this" results in "what".
- It has to be an asset model of excellence.
- How to attract teachers to the most needy schools needs to be addressed as well.
- The review should not be limited only to reductions, there needs to be a look at revenue generation as well. Things like fee generation/adaptation, the permitting processes and other possibilities in other areas.
- The key to adding revenue is creating stronger programming, if families know what they are going to get, what the articulation is they will send their child to SPPS.
- Other things to consider is consolidation/sharing of services among various entities.
- Slides 12 and 13 use of language. Why are the potential savings so different? Slide 12 is looking at program changes, staffing adjustments dealing with programs and consolidation or combination of schools. Slide 13 looks only at facilities, building capacity. the alignment of enrollment, their potential closure. It might be beneficial to use examples from the past to help define the differences between these two areas.
- Back to revenue generation, there is talk of market share and about marketing the schools, that every student in the district will have access to XXXX. Also, as buildings become available think about leasing buildings rather than letting them sit empty.
- Related to that, think about ways to engage parks and rec where possible or other entities that use space for dedicated purposes for young people, consider leasing a portion of the building even, consider portions which might be attractive (gym, aquatic facilities) other entities/organizations might use so the facilities are being used as an asset to the whole community.
- As the District moves to looking at space utilization for SPPS and others that area needs to become a professionalized operation. The notion of how it moves the strategic

plan forward, how this relates and might be modified for strategic partners/non-profits; perhaps through different fee structures, etc. We don't want to make money on the backs of the City of St. Paul or strategic partners/non-profit partners.

- Because of the challenge this is a good time to explore new ways of collaborating with communities, families, etc.
- There will be an impact on the type of staff to match programs and articulation; so need to look at establishing excellence across the city and all SPPS buildings. There needs to be a discussion around combining traditional streams of employees (technology and instructional) and moving those closer because of issues around technology. If programs are to be temporarily housed to be moved on at some point, there needs to be a discussion around investments in that building, especially around technology, and how to make it mobile/flexible to optimize technology opportunities for use across multiple potential uses/users as programs evolve.
- The facilitator asked that each Board member offer a word about the work of the evening. Comments included:
 - o Reflection, possibilities
 - o Re-invention, taking advantage of a crisis
 - o Talking about transition over time, success of implementation
 - o Justice
 - o What would administration like from the Board about next steps leading to final decisions? Response: The document tonight is a macro look, administration would like direction about what routes to continue exploring in order to maximize preparation time of more specifics/details.
 - o When specificity within areas is reached, show the interconnectedness of the budget changes
 - o Specificity, the total package
- Administration was asked to add a slide on income potentials

E. Standing Item: School & Program Changes -- No report

F. Standing Item: Policy Update -- No report

G. Work Session

1. Graduation Scheduling
Board members selected and confirmed the graduations they would be covering.
2. Cultural Proficiency Session
The third training session was moved to April 6 at 5:30 p.m. following a one hour COB meeting.
3. Broad Foundation
The Board will meet with Tom Payzant to discuss various models for superintendent evaluation on April 8 from 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
4. Budget Forums
Community sessions on the proposed budget reductions for FY 11 have been scheduled for May 10 and May 26. Further details will be forthcoming.
5. Board Listening Session
It was established that Ms. Varro, Mr. Brodrick, Ms. Street-Stewart and possibly Ms. Kong-Thao would represent the Board at this session.

Discussion was held on further promotion of these sessions.
6. Elected Officials
Board members were assigned to specific individuals to contact regarding the District's legislative agenda.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the meeting adjourn; seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion Passed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk