

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD
April 13, 2010**

PRESENT: Board of Education: John Brodrick, Jean O'Connell, Vally Varro, Anne Carroll, Kazoua Kong-Thao, Elona Street-Stewart

5:00 p.m. Keith Hardy joined the meeting

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Suzanne Kelly, Michelle Walker, Michael Baumann, Kris Emerson, Kathy Brown, Mandy Richie, Shirley Heitzman, Jill Cacy, Howie Padilla, Bill Larson, Traci Gauer, Yusef Mgeni, Patrick Romey Jayne Williams, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Sharon Freeman, Dana Abrams, Lisa Boehlke, Barbara DeMaster, Sadiq Mohamud, Jayne Meza, Laurie Olson, Matt Mohs, Luz Maria Serrano, Carol Olson, Mary Jensen, Susan Poiier, John Androstic, Terri Bopp, Alejandra Bosch, Dan Rodriquez

Others: Dr. Schiller, Dennis Cheesebrow, Doug Belden, Greg Patterson, Mary Turck, Paul Duncan, Kerry Dwyer, Jeff Koon, Carol Olson, Dennis Chisholm, Ron Salzberger, Mary Jensen, Carrie Dwyer, Michael Schumacher

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. AGENDA

A.. Organizational Audit Report

Dr. Robert Schiller, on behalf of the BROAD Alumni Services, conducted an organizational structure study of St. Paul Public Schools. This was done to assure the organizational structure put in place would be efficient and effective in the delivery of services aligned with district priorities and within the constraints of available resources. The objectives of the study included:

- Evaluation of the current organizational structure, its effectiveness in delivery of services, its alignment with priorities and how it matched with the superintendent's executive style and prerogatives.
- Evaluation of the district's organizational structure in comparison with the best organizational structures/practices of selected, benchmarked districts
- Identification of redundancies
- Benchmarking the reorganization to the most effective practices and organization of high performing districts of similar size and complexity nationwide
- Determining if the best people are in place to lead in the critical positions of the district
- Identification of ways to streamline the organization and assure more effective and efficient operations and support to schools
- Creation of an effective and efficient central office organizational structure to assure the district is best prepared to meet its challenges.

59 recommendations were made to the Superintendent as a result of the study.

The consultant reviewed for the Board the manner in which the baseline and benchmarks were established and the actual interview/site visit process utilized. He stressed this was an

organizational study on how best to match an organizational structure with the Superintendent's priorities and to advance the SPPS Board and Superintendent's agenda with efficiency, effectiveness and high levels of performance.

He then went on to review current conditions and challenges that included:

- A major focus by the Superintendent to assure organizational structure aligns with her goals, priorities, the strategic plan and that the structure complements the Superintendent's management style.
- To assure the right people are staffing the key positions and that they are on the same page as the Superintendent
- To assure forward progress is not curtailed

The consultant defined several critical areas for the Superintendent who needs to (1) establish a high level of visibility within the community, (2) recruit, interview and hire top quality leaders for open cabinet positions, (3) mold people into a working team which compliments and supplements the superintendent's management style, (4) lead, manage and communicate the future of SPPS and (5) lead and assure improvements in high need academic areas with a particular focus on the lowest performing schools. He stated SPPS is not overstaffed under normal conditions in comparison to the referent districts; however at this point in time, SPPS cannot afford the staffing level currently in place.

He then went on to discuss a comparison of major functions within SPPS as compared to the referent districts. The primary function lacking in SPPS is an internal audit function. SPPS does have areas serving educational equity and research and evaluation; having these functions varies among the referent districts.

He reviewed in greater detail several of the recommendations for organization restructuring that were made within the report offering recommendations of new combinations of responsibilities and alignments and a model which SPPS might emulate to send a clear message of efficiencies in the central office.

He then provided a brief report on a separate review of the SPPS communications areas BROAD had funded. The recommendation was to reorganize the district's communications organization by breaking the office of community engagement apart, creating a new office of communications, led by a director of communications and spinning off other sections of the old OCR into different units. The reason for the recommendation was that it appeared OCR efforts were hampered by the too wide focus of the current structure. Two additional findings were that the OCR is not proactive enough in telling stories of the good work of the schools and district and that the district still suffers from too little successful internal communication.

Conclusions arrived at from the study were:

- SPPS is appropriately staffed at most of the department and office levels for its size and complexity **before** consideration of the fiscal conditions facing the district.
- Fiscal conditions force SPPS administration to challenge its current level of services and staffing at the central office level in order to affect substantial savings in light of the projected need for \$27 million in cutbacks in 2010 and additional cuts of \$45-55 million in 2011 and 2012.
- Reduction of the current number of direct reports and span of control (divisions and chiefs) to the Superintendent was recommended.
- Recommendations are made to distinguish between line and staff reports/functions
- Recommendations resulted in either a two division reporting structure (Division of Academic Services and a Division of Administrative Services) or a three division structure with the school supervisors reporting directly to the Superintendent as well.
- Structure change and cutbacks would provide SPPS an organizational and staffing structure that would be trend setting for the referent districts in challenging fiscal times; send a strong

message to the St. Paul community and staff of the Superintendent's commitment to make tough decisions; right size the central office appropriate for current conditions and position the central office to be less silo-like and more oriented to cross functional teaming.

- Talented and experienced leaders for the two divisions along with strong individuals filling the middle management positions with critical, specific experience in the respective areas of assignment is essential for success and the span of control being recommended.
- Critical positions must be filled as soon as possible in the spring of 2010 and the Chief Academic Officer must be filled immediately.
- It is critical the Superintendent invest in the team training and coaching needed to assure that the cabinet staff in the critical positions are functioning at high levels within a highly accountable performance management system.
- Individuals holding the middle management positions will need to be trained into the expectations of working in tandem and to work within a strong performance management system of accountability.

In addition to the various recommendations for structuring the central office, the additional recommendation was for the elimination of 20 positions.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Appreciation was expressed for the depth of information provided and the comparability to other districts of similar size.
- Regarding the challenge of finding a chief academic officer – where do they come from? Response: For a district of SPPS' size, unless the district is willing to have very attractive financial package it will be hard to recruit candidates. There are many openings out there and competition for the best is fierce. Districts are looking for an insider with requisite kinds of experiences who can hit ground running. Additionally, with the economic situation, people are less willing to relocate further limiting the pool so districts are tending to "grow their own".
- The elimination of 20 positions – is there potential to move those to other roles? Response: The study was an organizational study and did not include an examination of that; it did not examine individuals. There are a number of experienced and qualified people in position within the district; there is a lot of talent in the district.
- For board members what should they think about in terms of long term sustainability, alignment and being visionary about where the district needs to be? Response: (1) In terms of values, it is the SCHOOLS, period. What happens everyday in the classroom and the leadership of the schools will ultimately be responsible for district performance. The Board needs to assure from a policy level that what central office does is support the schools and ensure clear, integrated messages are conveyed and that schools have what they need (within the limits of the current economic situation). (2) Establishing leaders who are responsible for leading and supervising schools is very critical. (3) With the move of the CEO from "doing" to "assuring it is done" there is a need for a new educational heartbeat with the vision to see how it all fits together, that the continuum of Pre-K through higher education is being done. Regardless of what is designed, the extent to which that person can communicate the vision of the district and assure the integration between design and execution at the schools is critical. (4) The district must dig in now and focus on the schools that need the greatest amount of attention and assistance. (5) With the fiscal realities, finding a way to sustain programs and defining the core values of the board -- what, above all else, needs to be sustained? There will be a need to look at what the trade-offs are, if something has to be cut, what is the core value? (6) Finally, there is great capacity within this Board both individually and collectively. (7) The support the Board can build around the superintendent, reinforcement and support through difficult times/decisions, that the Board to think strategically around core values and keep their eye on the ball.
- Some of the trade offs – how can the board begin to predict, what can actually be anticipated from national and state education leadership over the coming years? If the Board is to look at their core values there is also an evolving effort around national

standards. What would the trade offs be around that. If the new system is built around two strong pillars of academics and administration, will this align with what might be happening in the state in education reform? Response: (1) It is obvious all school districts will need to do more with less and will this will continue over time. (2) School districts will be the default for what is not occurring and happening with families placing a greater burden on service levels than ever before. School policy leaders will have to make decisions to redefine what can or cannot be done/offered. This will become a community issue. (3) The NCLB will become more structured between national, state, districts and schools and the assessment systems will need to become more aligned as well. (4) Performance management and evaluation of results will be the key driver over the next decade. Highly qualified teachers will be passé; “highly effective” teachers will become the new measure of performance. (5) The current situation will create a need for policy makers to rethink how education is delivered down the road. Education will not be confined by brick and mortar it will become far more self-directed, individualized and accessible 24-7. School will take on a new definition over time driven by the rapidly changing society.

- Performance evaluation, as many parts of the nation turn to an emphasis on that, St Paul has historically had good relationship between teachers and the district. Do you have suggestions on how the district and board should work through these kinds of changes and still maintain that quality relationship with the organizations that represent the various of services and professions? Response: Yes, work through these very carefully. The leaders of statewide/national organizations see where things are going, they need to be at the table as full partners in the design of change. Professionalism comes down to the point that the very best people should be leading the schools and teaching the children. Evaluation of performance is imperfect, there cannot be only a single indicator; there has to be an array of indicators both qualitative and quantitative, portfolio and hard data. Everyone needs to be at the table early on, it needs to be done in cooperation and ultimately it needs to be piloted to see if it works. SPPS has the capacity to create an environment to test out and refine a process early on so is in place when and if it becomes mandated. The district may be able to find a core group of people willing to volunteer to pilot these efforts. You need to communicate broadly, replicate successful efforts which have been developed elsewhere, it is not always necessary to build new. The Board, as the policy maker, will ultimately decide what is best for the district and the children. Not everyone will be happy but the district is about the children, not the adults.
- The elimination of 20 positions, the future looks pretty bleak, how can the Board monitor and continue to be sure the district is moving forward and is being kept lean? The accountability piece to be sure the district is on task and on track, when do you know it is time to change the structure? Response: For the accountability piece, there are some models which have been put in place at various levels which have been workable and achieved results; work toward that. Secondly, the district is hitting the wall when it comes to budget cuts (particularly for next year). If there is a need to reduce central office again the district will be hard pressed to go much deeper and then fewer people will be asked to do much more. However, it comes to a point when it is really hard to find people with the expertise in disparate areas who are able to work across those very different areas. Decisions will need to be made on how to decentralize more or look for savings in outsourcing or decide what tradeoffs must/can be made. Looking at what other states/districts have done can be beneficial.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the Study of Organizational Structure and Staffing for Saint Paul Public Schools. The motion was seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart.

Motion passed.

B. Restructuring Proposed Organization Chart

The Superintendent stated the proposed organizational changes were done to eliminate barriers to learning, align the central office to the schools for better support and to help address the current budget situation. It is the time to refocus energies and resources for future success. SPPS has made reorganizations and staffing cuts in the past but for many years, these were too few changes to staff and to practices. This organization chart will make changes in the organization, changes to titles/functions and add a few new positions to align the work to future needs. The proposed changes will better serve schools and the community, will move the district to the next level of work while being true to the vision and strategic plan.

There is a need for greater academic gains; they must be significant gains to close the achievement gap. The Superintendent stressed the importance of the Chief Academic Officer position and the change in the alignment under the Division of Administrative Services which brings together all business and financial services as well as HR. She outlined the new position of Chief of Accountability, Planning and Policy along with the realignment of various other functions under the Chief of Staff.

The Superintendent stressed that the Idea is to maximize dollars and the efficiency of staff. She complimented the staff as being professional, committed and passionate.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- There is the NGF (not funded by general funds) – there are eight positions in this area, are these permanent positions? Yes, except for the Director of Turnaround Schools which is only a one year position due to funding.
- The Office of Policy & Procedures administrator, explain this position relative to inter-governmental and public policy. Response: An area of need in the district is one having the ability to have more contact with elected officials. This position will be a mix of working on internal and external policy issues. The suggestion was made to reconsider the title so it matches better with the purpose of the office.
- Technology support and the infrastructure of academic services technology, is there a bridge between administration and academic services? Response: Technology has to be integrated, there is no other way to make it work for the district. The Director of Information Technology has a direct reporting relationship through participation as part of the Cabinet. This relationship is there because the organization has a severe need to upgrade technology both for business purposes and academic/testing purposes. Technology needs to be embedded in everything and must provide the services the district needs.
- Regarding silos, one way to tackle the issue is to work more cross functionally through fewer departments with more interrelation. How will the consolidation and integration affect student achievement sooner rather than later? Response: Two things, one big piece is parent/community engagement and family involvement. There are major things which will increase achievement: (1) the quality of the teacher, (2) the engagement of the students along with the family behind them with an understanding of the value of education. (3) The need to work to engage families in the process of learning and how to work with their own children in the home. (4) With the budget cuts there is a need to mainstream many things and is the reason the Office of Family and Community Engagement is there so all efforts are coming out of one office but with expert input from other departments. In the current budget situation, the district needs to address every way of providing support to the students, to strengthen community partnerships, to provide greater integration and alignment. The community needs to work with the schools – the parents, the city, the county agencies and many others to achieve the end of improved student achievement.
- Long-range planning this working draft/team is it set and ready to take on and increase district success over the next five years, to increase achievement and graduation rates? Response: The Superintendent stated the org chart has had many evolutions and input from many different sources. It is a summation of how to save money and provide the best structure. The reorganization saves almost a million dollars (\$944,000). This is what is needed at this time, it may change as time goes on, as needs change over time. The

district needs to do more with less. This will continue to ensure SPPS students getting a world class education. This puts the emphasis on the schools.

- Appreciation was expressed that the Board is hearing there will be improvement and that the focus is on all kids, that they must learn and be prepared for the future.
- This is a working draft, when will it become final? There will be some tweaks to the chart as that is within the superintendent's purview, the elimination and creation of positions must be brought to the board for approval on the 20th, then the chart will become final.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart move the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of the Education accept the report on the proposed organizational changes. Motion seconded by Ms. O'Connell.

Motion Passed.

C. Presentation of Preliminary Reduction Proposals for SY 2010

The budget reduction processed started several months ago. This year's approach is different from what was done in the past. The decision was made to bring forward certain parts of the budget proposal which were approved last week. This second step addresses the changes to the schools and programming. Administration is bring the best thinking provided from staff on reductions in this area, very little remains which might be considered if further reductions are needed.

The Chief Business Officer stated this was the third in a series of cultivating excellence presentations which work through the challenges of creating budget reform/reductions for FY 10-11. The projected shortfall remains at \$27,200,000. Prior reductions were made and approved in the amount of \$18,487,500 at the April 6 COB meeting. There is a need for additional cuts of \$8,712, 500. He then moved in to the specific recommendations being brought to the Board.

Centrally Administered Program/Services Reductions:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| • Central Administration Cuts identified as of 4/13/10
(Does not include reductions to ELL, Special Ed and Wellness which are included in the reductions made on 4/6/10) | \$ 1,580,000 |
| • Instructional Services (elimination of 14 coaching positions established in 08-09 with one-time only money from the State) | 1,288,000 |
| • Security (change the 24/7 monitoring service through greater Utilization of technology – eliminates FTEs) | 100,000 |
| • Instructional Services (eliminate Itinerant Instrumental Music program (not music) for grade 4-6. 10.6 FTEs involved. General music education will continue for schools) | 900,000 |
| • Instructional Services (Reduction to SY 10-11 budget as Mondo material purchases are complete) | 1,000,000 |
| • Instructional Services (eliminate all Middle School athletics) | <u>350,000</u> |
| TOTAL | 5,218,000 |

School and Program Assessment Criteria included: the size and viability of current program(s), the capacity of the building, the proximity of facilities, the condition of the building and the status whether leased or owned.

Facilities Usage – Building/Program Closure, Co-Location of Schools And Relocation of Programs:

- Closure of Program - Arlington High School
- Co-Location of Buildings:
 - o Ames to Vento
 - o Franklin to North End

- o Prosperity Heights to Hayden Heights
- o Sheridan to Highwood Hills'
- o Hazel Park to Battle Creek Middle
- Temporary Building Closures
 - o Ames
 - o Hazel Park
 - o Longfellow (announced 6/09)
 - o Prosperity Heights
 - o Wellstone
 - o Roosevelt (announced 6/09)
 - o Sheridan
 - o Franklin
- Program Relocation
 - o Washington to Arlington High School site
 - o Wellstone to Washington Site

\$3,500,000

Specifics of the various changes were outlined along with potential future usage of the facilities.

School Programming

- Staffing – shared principals in low enrollment elementary Schools

700,000

Streamlining of Transportation

- Change transportation walking distance to 2.0 miles for HS students
- ALC extended day moved to Saturdays

1,300,000

1,000,000

Operational Programs and Services

- Change temperature set points 2 degrees each season
- Operations & Maintenance (change approach to summer lawn Maintenance at some sites)
- Athletic Fields (no general fund support for maintaining fields)
- Swimming Pools (close 4 of 12 pools)
- TOTAL

400,000

35,000

150,000

200,000

3,785,000

Future Potential Opportunities

- Reconfiguration of Middle Schools
- Eliminate city wide bussing from some magnet schools; Create new boundaries for these sites
- Schools – Centrally identify class size
- TOTAL POTENTIAL FUTURE OPS

TBD

2,900,000

3,200,000

\$6,100,000

Administration noted it was bringing forward recommendations for a total of \$30,990,500 for Board consideration.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

The meeting was turned over to a Facilitator to conduct the discussion of the proposed budget reductions. He indicated questions of clarification and discussion would be on Slides 9-13 initially.

- A broad overall question, when will the district get to a place where it doesn't have to continue to make cuts over a number of years – is this happening now or will it continue for another year or longer? When will the district move to a long-term discussion on budget in a broader context? Response: Originally, that was the thought, but as work has progressed, it has become more difficult to get to the dollars. If enrollment declines continue more will need to be done, there can be no guarantee of anything in the future. The district will need to continue with cuts at this level over the next years. Administration is

trying to do this in a global way focusing on expanding grade levels in middle school, providing more support to students in each building by having more students in a school building, maximize space usage and minimize transportation. Those principles are ones the Board has expressed agreement with.

- Public questions have stated when can the district quit nickel and diming and make the cuts and get them over with? Response: The reality is some of the items being brought forward were raised last year, the district needs to make a decision and move on. Unfortunately, 85% of the dollars rest in people resources. Ultimately, the Board needs to make the decision on how the cuts progress – bit by bit or major reductions.
- Slide 4 centrally administered programs and services – the 8 FTE reductions to date, \$944,000 with the note that that is part of a total reduction of \$1,580,000. What is the connection between slide 4 and the org chart? Response: The eight FTEs (\$944,000) are changes reflected in the org chart. The other reductions in central administration were done previously.
- In going through co-location/closing, etc. does this anticipate that part of the structural deficit will be fixed longer term and potentially the deficits in future years may be slightly less? Yes.

The discussion then moved specifically to Slides 9-13:

- How many kids at Arlington for the junior and senior year will have to choose new schools and, beyond on-time enrollment, how will administration work to make the transitions as successful as possible for the kids? How will they be kept in SPPS and how will they continue their focus and work in the BioSmart program and what will happen to staff? Response: There are 190 students in 11th grade; 210 in 12th grade. Continuation of the BioSmart focus – how many classes are related to BioSmart? There are more BioSmart classes in 9th and 10th grade because the program has been at that level for a longer period. In the higher grades, students are taking classes they need to graduate or extra reading and math classes. There is not an extensive number of BioSmart classes. The district will facilitate the transition for kids, every student will be given information tomorrow and families will receive a letter showing them what choices are available. There will be meetings scheduled for parents and students to discuss the change. The Placement Center will assist in every way possible in placement of the students. There will still be 9th and 10th grade BioSmart. The district has been working with the Teacher's Union addressing the extra hour Washington has. It is hoped the BioSmart staff will remain even with the extra hour of school time.
- The BioSmart program has a large amount of resources invested in it, is it correct that there will be no 11th and 12th levels of BioSmart? Response: There has been an investment of \$6 million in BioSmart. The classes for SY 10-11 will be through 10th grade. In SY 11-12 11th grade will be added with the 12th grade the year after that. It will take an additional three years to grow the program out at the Arlington site. Washington Middle School has many applicants for their program; moving to the Arlington site will allow more spaces for interested students. Eventually the BioSmart program at Arlington will grow to a 7-12 articulation.
- With Arlington, having about 400 students looking for another secondary school option and teachers from Arlington who will be moving, what is the time table on how families will find out what school their student will end up in and what is being done about the teachers? Response: As soon as information can be given to the students and their application is processed they will know where they will go. The Placement Center will be giving each current 10th and 11th grade student an application. Arlington staff will help ensure the applications are back on time. The aps will be collected, entered into the data base and processed as on time applications. The ELL level 1 and 2 students would be handled separately to match students and services so they get the support they need to be successful in their transition. In regard to staff, administration will need to know how many students will be coming in to the 9th grade (Washington). Then the number of 10th grade students needs to be assessed in order to have a better sense of how many teachers will be needed. Also, there is a need to work with Washington 8th graders to see how many are

willing stay with the group so there could potentially be more 9th graders. Once the number of students is known, then the number of teachers needed can be determined.

- What is the current thinking about how to resolve the differences in focus in locations? Will the schools co-located continue with their current focus? Response: The hope for the coming year is that the schools being co-located will continue with their current focus. Administration will work with the other school to continue its focus for this year. For SY 11-12 work will be done to find ways to incorporate pieces of certain programs into schools' focus. That will be the responsibility of the two principals and staff. It is believed it will be less disruptive to bring the students as a cohort (the same teachers and friends) they are simply located in a different building. The district needs to begin to think about the future SY 11-12 and how can the two schools be integrated into one in order to share services and offer richer options for students in services, classes, etc.
- For clarification, it is expected that within a year's time, co-located programs will begin to collaborate and the quality of services will go up because of shared budgets to expand core pieces? Yes, there will be new innovation in terms of program focus, etc. This will provide the opportunity to look at becoming more cohesive while still maintaining some independence.
- The trifecta of schools on White Bear Avenue between Maryland and Minnehaha, was there no possibility of keeping one of the three schools as host and co-locating another program in that building? Response: All the buildings are small and only hold a little over 300 students each – even if numbers reached capacity they would still be small schools and it would be expensive to open the doors. Why instead of collocating couldn't they go to Hazel Park? Hazel Park was built as a middle school so there would be a need to investment in modifications. Additionally it has much greater capacity than the number of students being co-located. There is also discussion about utilizing Hazel Park to articulate the Montessori program into a middle school program.
- Going back to Arlington – What about kids who chose other schools for this coming year who might now want to go to Arlington – is that option precluded? That would not be precluded, in fact we hope that might happen as students see the opportunity open up. Secondary students can change schools up to the end of July. Will all families be informed of this opportunity? All current secondary families who have already enrolled? That is something that could be on the table, this may be an inviting offer not available previously.
- Arlington has no attendance area – if it is taken away as a high school then all the current Arlington kids drop back into their residential attendance area as their first choice? Yes, if that is the first choice they make. When will kids who registered on time be notified of their school? Within the next week. How will the Arlington kids get everything done within the next few days, how do they end up in the same queue? What would be done is the applications would be collected, a window of time for application would be defined, and applications would be entered for their choice as an on time application.
- In co-location, Creative Arts moving into Wellstone which is set up as an elementary, what are the costs associated with co-locating/transferring programs? Response: The Creative Arts Program is small with very specific needs. There will be a requirement for some investment – at this point, no calculations have been done, further options need to be explored for this program. For the first years, as the upper floors were for older kids, these could be utilized and as enrollment increases modifications would need to be made to the building's lower levels. The various possibilities need to be explored. Administration and the Board have talked about saving, but at the same time what will it take to get where we need to go?
- Will there be costs associated with co-locating? There will be both operating and capital costs – estimates have not been done at this point as the information has been embargoed to this point. It would be mostly contracting to pack and move so the moves could be done in a timely manner. District staff (teachers, etc.) will not be allowed to move any district equipment/materials, only their own personal items, for liability reasons.
- Creative Arts to Wellstone – what about student parking? Response: There is no parking on University right now and students are still getting there. The idea is the district needs to

find a place to expand for a 7-12 creative arts program. Wellstone was a suggestion; it may not be the answer; administration is still exploring options. More students will be captured from other places with the expansion of an arts school, it will be appealing to many people.

- As we look at the programs that are co-locating – many of the schools have pre-k programs and are going into schools that do not. Is it correct to assume that all of these buildings with co-located programs will now have pre-k programs if they did not have them previously? The funding for the pre-K program is very targeted to so many people and so many buildings but yes, all sites will have one.
- The designation for future usage TBD – what are administration's initial thoughts around use of the buildings which are being closed? One of the things the Board talked about as adjustments were discussed in terms of cuts was the possibility of generating revenue from the closed buildings through leasing to charters, etc. Response: A couple things, the past year the district has been offering Longfellow and Roosevelt for use (community colleges, etc.) the primary issue seems to be parking. The district is looking at other organizations with the next conversation being with non-profits or charters who might be willing to lease space. The reality is as much as the district can collaborate with the community, the city, the county instead of renting space from others they might rent the space from SPPS this would help with some of the costs. The next conversation would be if the district is willing to lease (maybe sell) to charter schools. If it is a way to generate dollars, it needs to be looked at. The Board makes those decisions or provides those directives, administration will abide by the Board's directives.
- Regarding the articulation mentioned between Adams and Highland, perhaps this should be looked at as a possibility sooner rather than later. Response: The reason it is not listed is the discussion has only begun. Administration has talked to the principals and received a positive response, parents are interested in reducing the overcrowding in those buildings. The next steps will be meeting with those schools and the 6th grade parents to see if they would be interested in making the decision this year or when.
- Back to Creative Arts, if Creative Arts is now one of the alternative programs, are you suggesting combining ALC with non-ALC in order to get capacity over time? Yes
- Slide 9, shows a \$3.5 million savings but costs have not been identified so will the savings be less? Slide 12 shows specific savings from Arlington which are included in the \$3.5 million. So at least 1/3 of the money is from the Arlington closing and has there been (or not) a cost estimate as the savings were created? Response: For the co-location, there would not be any major facility changes. There will be some cost in moving and packing. For the Washington transforming to Wellstone administration will need to look at the numbers. The renovations for this were not calculated into the savings figure.
- Expenses – administration has built models that do estimates based on historical information and the cost sheets based on those historical models for the expenses for moving. These are best estimates as there are many variables in that. Closures and co-locations were factored in. Slide 12 shows, as a subset of the \$3.5 million, the parts of the program which represent savings which will occur with the closing of the Arlington program. On balance all of the closures and co-locations were modeled with conservative estimates, there could be more savings or there could be less savings depending upon circumstances at the time of implementation.
- If you only focus on how much it will cost in moving from A to B and enrollment continues to decline what is happening is the district is offering a lesser program for students. With more students on site, the district can provide a stronger program for students. Moving is a one time cost but there are other gains directly for the students and that is what needs to be focused on.
- The upgrades at Washington, there was a specific grant to update the technology center? Yes. Does the technology center move with Washington? Response: It is a mix. Arlington has plenty of technology at that location but the district will need to know how many students move to the program to be sure it is adequate for the numbers. Both schools are well equipped with technology. The gain in moving an elementary school is those students will have more technology than at their current building but it is also a way to feed the

BioSmart program by moving the program back down into elementary. The grant was for a BioSmart Program not for technology.

- Arlington has a thriving ROTC program – will the program be offered for Washington students or will it transfer to another location? The program starts with 9th grade so it will be offered.
- The suggested change to Highland for the 6-8 Spanish immersion – can there be a middle school? There is one we are just bringing 6th graders into the articulation.
- If Washington is moved to the Arlington site and next year it will be 7-10, then the next two grades will be added over the next two years. Then the district will be back to the same number of high schools it has now? Yes and if Creative Arts is added it would be another high school option which is important because the district is overcrowded in the high schools. This will allow an additional space for the students who desire creative arts and also another specific program at Washington. These will be specialty programs rather than comprehensive.
- The impact on neighborhoods and community associations around the school must be included in the communication and engagement process which needs to be at the highest level of competency. For that purpose, alone filling the Office of Family, Community and Engagement ASAP is important.
- The Board understands there may be some bumps along the way but whatever can be done to have that office for support through the transitions is vital. Response, The hope is after the Board meeting and approval of the changes the positions will be posted.
- Within that office in of the areas around community partnerships. There are a number of public partners who have been working with SPPS in goal areas but there are other public entities (parks and rec, libraries) which might find a different impact from these changes. There is a need to develop a new policy to support public partnerships in ways that have not been done previously. This needs to be considered by the Board as a future issue for consideration so that we finish the year with a complete review of current policies while remaining open up new possibilities..
- What can be shared with the Board on limitations of building use, management, zoning, etc. Please provide information to the Board on any future use, limitations, etc. so the Board has at least a basic knowledge on building use potentials. In other words, constraints on buildings which would become open. This is to equip the Board with some basic knowledge in case questions arise.
- On the Community engagement piece, while the position is being posted there is still a strong Office of Community Engagement through June 30 which will do the work as the process proceeds. There is a plan being put in place.
- What about kids in co-locating schools or moving schools – what if they want to be in a different school?. Response: What will be done is those students will be treated as students who want to make a change. There will be a better sense when staff starts meeting with the groups. As always, the Placement Center will work on a student by student basis.
- Here is the challenge, you do assignments within a week, will there be sufficient room to accommodate not only all the Arlington kids but any kids from these 10 schools who might want to move? Won't there be some kids who might fall into the not on-time registration? Please be sure to watch for not on time applications and be sure everyone is treated fairly.
- On building co-locations what is the message on attendance areas and on transportation? What happens to the attendance area and what happens with transportation? Response: It will not affect attendance area as this is temporary, it is being looked at year by year. The district is not making permanent changes in attendance areas at this time. Transportation will be based on enrollments received by the Placement Center and changes occur every year in costs and routes. There will probably be some tremendous changes in start times. Costs can't be calculated until Transportation has the numbers. There will be some efficiencies built in by having more children at fewer locations.
- Will Operations/Transportation have a conversation with families as each site has its own culture on how things work and the families base their of life on timing around schools. Will

this be taken into consideration? Response. There will be many changes but the information is not going to be available immediately. The current circumstances are forcing these changes on the District. If the District wants to continue being fiscally responsible while impacting students as little as possible these decisions need to be made. Everyone needs to work together on these tough decisions, every school district needs to make these very, very difficult decisions. The District has to be realistic on what it can promise and what it can offer. The program the students will get by co-locating schools will be a better program as there will be more supports for the students.

- How will this be communicated and how can we help parents and students be comfortable with the new buildings? When Farnsworth and Cleveland went K-8, they held open houses so families could see the new facilities. The Board encouraged administration to take advantage of the energy of high school students and ask them to form welcome committees at Arlington for the new students coming in.
- Community partnerships/community schools – this should be an item for future Board discussion along with wrap around services, community investment, bring in partners to offer services to students and families, etc.

The facilitator stated that this presentation of proposed cuts will set Board and administration up for a clearer understanding of the cuts and allow for further public/staff engagement to find areas of concurrence or weakness in the specific proposals.

- Slide 14 – transportation changes, explain the ALC extended day change to Saturdays and what is the impact piece of Creative Arts and Gordon Parks? Response: Instead of after school programming twice a week it would be changed to Saturday programming (30 days of instruction). Students would be less tired, they would be provided with breakfast and lunch and a very exciting learning opportunity. There would be transportation paid for out of ALC. There is some risk that some families will not like Saturday programming, however, this will provide additional time for learning with an intensive focus on instruction and academics particularly in specific areas of deficiency. Additionally the District will work with the City to bridge to the rec centers and more extended learning time. This would provide a much more stable schedule of extended time learning for the students (Mon-Sat.).
- Slide 14 – for both items – neither seems realistic for SY 10-11 in terms of the magnitude of the change. Response: When talk about changing transportation you will need to look at all who are attending high school to know who are under the two miles limit and transportation will not be provided for them. The unintended results will be students moving to a school that is over two miles away. The Director of Transportation was very emphatic that this would happen so it may not really be a savings. It was put into the proposals as a possibility for consideration. For Saturday school, currently the after school program starts in October so it will be necessary to work with staff and parents to promote the Saturday opportunities. There would be a saving on staff because of the number of people required to run the after school programs; Saturday is a better return on investment. The idea did not start because of the savings but as a way to offer additional school time on task. One of the advantages of the way it is done now is there is no transition, there is the same staff, there is clarity of curriculum alignment vs putting a number of students together in possibly different sites. The reality is it is difficult to find teachers to do the after school programs, the kids don't absorb everything they could as they are tired; there are trade-offs. The district should be able to know after the first week in September the specific areas in which students are not performing; the programming will be worked differently by focusing on the specific need, not grade level, but need.
- The proposal to eliminate middle school athletics. What are the number of students impacted by this? How many hours of extended day will those students lose? How realistic is it for the District to expect the City and Parks and Recreation to pick this up since they are also under serious financial constraints?
- Slide 18 – provide details on the pool closing; we are not closing any high school swimming pools, right? Response: The originally proposal closed 10 of 12 pools. What are the implications and savings in keeping the high school pools open? Response: Originally it was proposed to close 10 of the 12. If the high school pools are kept open the district can

still have some savings, approximately \$200,000. There may be a need to find other ways to maintain the pools. This may change again next year and we may need to close the rest. The four pools which will be closed are Wellstone, Cherokee, Murray, the Arlington lap pool. The programming impact in elementary schools is the need to have one or more physical ed teachers who are fully certified so swimming will not longer be offered as a physical education activity. In the middle school it will simply not be available as a physical education credit.

- Slide 6 – what does the cut to music mean? Currently every elementary school has .2 FTE instrumental music teachers. This serves 5th and 6th and in some schools 4th. By cutting there will not be instrumental music programs in elementary schools. The general music program will continue. These are centrally funded dollars and were originally cut in '09 but was reinstated in part.
- Why doesn't this trash band and orchestra in the secondary schools where the students come from families who can't afford private lessons? Response: SPPS is one of only a few districts that offers instrumental music in elementary. Administration was tasked to make budget cuts which are not from the original dollars that go to buildings. This is from centrally funded dollars. When the partial cut was done last year with schools having the option to pick it up, not many did it. This year schools will be focusing on using current dollars to staff schools, as they have already been cut by \$10 million for this year the chances to pick it up is even less than last year.
- Administration was requested to provide information on the impact of the music cut as follows: How many schools took the option to fund instrumental music after the cut was reinstated last year? Provide clarity on the impact on opportunities for kids to participate in secondary musical opportunities and how this might damage the programs. How many kids in secondary band or orchestra got start in elementary programs? Percentage and demographics would be helpful also.
- These cuts to music might be an opportunity to pull in community partners (McNally Smith, Walker West, Ordway) and there may be other possible solutions to consider as well.
- The request was made for administration to provide the same information about middle school athletics as was asked about the 4-6 music. The District can't commit the City at all as at this point, the conversations are just beginning..
- Lawn maintenance - citations – again there is a need to have a conversation with the City about maximizing services. What would the citation be? How will this play out?
- Slide 5 – Security – Is this \$100,000 eliminating personnel, using locks and cameras, etc.? This is not security for students, security for buildings? Response: This is primarily for mechanical failures – this monitoring will rely more on technology and less on the number of people at monitoring stations. It is 2 FTEs.
- Slide 13 - Shared principals. Clarification was made that in some schools which share facilities, they are separate schools and have 2 different principals. This would be changed to having one site principal for two schools. There are also some small schools in relatively close proximity that could share a principal between the two buildings. This would not be done with the co-locating schools in 2010.
- Middle school athletics – Apple Valley is turning this over to neighborhood athletic associations (football, baseball, etc.) and have increased fees. Administration was reminded the Board had instructed them not to ignore fee increases so they need to look at those possibilities
- Slide 22 – Why is administration aiming at \$4 million in cuts over the projected shortfall? Response: Administration is not aiming for more but providing more choices and putting more dollars on the table to allow other choices which have less impact on direct services to students.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education receive the report for the purpose of moving forward with public and staff engagement around the array of options with the addition of the specific information requested. Motion seconded by Mr. Hardy.

Motion passed.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Superintendent asked the Board if there is any specific thing that most Board members feel should not be included in the proposal at this time? Is there anything the Board wants removed from the proposal at this point? Administration needs to focus on what truly needs to be done without spending time on items which will be pulled out in the near future.
- The two mile issue might be too disruptive for this year and may be better considered at a future time.
- Music, perhaps take off the table or find other ways to offer instruction.
- The comment was made that a board member wanted to hear from stakeholders about ways to do this, let the community provide input and feedback on impacts and how this might be done better. There may be other new ideas out there.
- The Board should hear from the public there should be a balanced hearing on the issue and the information requested would also be beneficial in making a decision.
- A Board member reiterated that this is a time when SPPS can no longer do business in same manner as has been done and the decision is to bring the kind of decisions/closures needed to address eliminating the achievement gap. This is not a judgment call on the value of one thing over another but if the district is already reduced to providing something only one day a week, perhaps the district is not best suited to provide that service and would be better off exploring with due diligence other opportunities and options out there so as not to do more harm. She would not support taking anything off the table but challenged the public to look at options and come back with alternative solutions and what else may be possible.
- The statement was made the Board recognized going into this process that it was essential the Board be very clear about information the Board wanted from administration. In some of last year's discussion the Board focused in on one subject in the proposal and spent a great deal of time on that. If the Board is asking staff to do surveys around student instruction the Board must be very clear about what it is looking for and that the information being asked for is valid. It appears it would be more valuable for staff to spend its time on aspects of core academics. Let's determine specifically what is being asked and how to be confident it is valid information but there should be no additional rounds on the same subject once the information is provided..
- Clarification on request – the concept of elementary instrumental music instruction and middle school athletics is to provide a comprehensive contemporary curriculum that appeals to kids and families from different angles. If there are alternative ways of getting these services then that is the route to pursue first and foremost. If the instrumental music instruction so disabled at this point as not to be worth saving at this level of instruction the district shouldn't be working on the margin. What needs to be verified is that this is a critically important feeder for kids in poverty to go on to legitimate music opportunities in Grades 7-12. If only kids who can afford private lessons are the ones who have historically used this program then it becomes a different issue. What is the connection between a full program, regardless of how it is delivered, between elementary and secondary? This is not about the things on the margin, it is about the core understanding of how this is connected to students wanting to be in the school district, enrolling in particular schools and pursuing and education in SPPS. The same for athletics.
- The question was asked if the Board was concerned about the time sensitivity dilemmas of the proposals on co-locating, closing and moving schools. How soon does the Board need to move on certain aspects of this prior to June 15? Response: The proposals on co-locating, closing and moving schools is something that needs to move forward as people

are being notified of the proposed changes and students need to apply for schools for next year; it is very time sensitive. The implications of this on schools is large. The impact on families is great if the Board doesn't act on these aspects soon. If these changes are made the district has to work with people – each change affects SPPS staff, students and families, their lives and the community. The major changes being asked for are the co-location of schools, the closing of schools and programs.

- In looking at slide 21 (the summary) it seems the center of the constellation is the \$3.5 utilized for changes under facility usage and say the successful reductions are contingent upon the ability of the district to make those proposed changes of \$3.5 million. The commitment of these dollars is what the Board needs to do, it is the next step. What we need from the community is, given the changes, how can they be successfully accomplished rather than exploring other alternatives. The Board can say with integrity the \$3.5 million can be acted upon now.
- The Board owes the community a decision as early as next week's board meeting on the direction for the schools saying the Board agrees on the closing, co-locations as well as the parts of the other buckets that go along with those actions so these are approved by default as well.
- As a governance issue what is in this proposal is primarily within the purview of administration but clarification was requested on the Board's governance areas. The Board areas are grade reconfigurations (Washington), the school building/program closures (Arlington program) and the title changes within the org chart (\$944,000). The co-locations are not a change in program or grade so do not fall to the Board.
- Principal sharing? Does not require specific board action as it is required to have a principal assigned to a school.
- These are decisions which must occur in some way, shape or form what is needed from the community is to take this proposal to them to seek input on impacts and implications not foreseen; how best to minimize damage and mitigate harm. So this needs to be framed for community engagement properly before moving forward.

There was an in-depth discussion on the particular pieces the Board might need to move on at this meeting and the urgency of moving forward on various pieces of the proposal. The question was asked what additional information was needed if a meeting was held prior to the Board meeting on April 20?

- About the co-locations – a proper, written restatement of the summary presentation made by the Chief Business Officer about the schools chosen to move in the directions proposed with more clearly stated reasons for why the schools are being moved in these directions. This would be needed by no later than the 4:00 p.m. the day of the proposed meeting.
- There is urgency to move forward from the proposed COB meeting on some or all of these issues. It is essential that schools and families have the time to process these changes in order to make them successful so there is urgency in moving forward.
- Concern was expressed that there is a need to have community engagement on this matter.
- The District needs to clearly identify the nature of the community engagement that is relevant and appropriate to the decision. These recommendations have come from community input, research, analysis, Board guidance and the best thinking of administration. What is being sought is perceptions, belief and experiences around impacts and implications of the changes so the implementation can be managed best for the students, families and staff.
- The meeting should be administration presenting their arguments, in their fullness, around the \$944,000, the \$3.5 million and the \$700,000; the three most time sensitive pieces within the proposal.
- The Superintendent stated the following were inter-related and time sensitive: Co-location of schools, centrally administered programs and services, school programming (sharing principals) and the transportation (2 miles limit).

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education schedule a Committee of the Board meeting for Tuesday, April 20 at 4:00 p.m. with the intent of determining how to move forward on the budget categories within the proposal with specific focus on facility usage and relevant budget updates related to that. Motion seconded by Ms. O'Connell.

Motion Passed.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Ms. Varro.

Motion Passed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk