

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD (COB)
February 24, 2009**

PRESENT: Board of Education: Elona Street-Stewart, Kazoua Kong-Thao, John Brodrick, Tom Goldstein, Keith Hardy, Tom Conlon, Anne Carroll

Ms. Kong-Thao left the meeting at 6:15
Mr. Conlon left the meeting at 6:30

Staff: Supt. Carstarphen, Michael Thompson, Mike Sodomka, Carl Jones, Sue Gutbrod, Kate Flynn, Denise Quinlan, Rebekah Doyle, Michael Baumann, Tyrone Terrill, Judy Neece, Eliza Tocher, Nancy Flynn, Steve Shellenberg, Andrew McGinley, Robert Huntley, Henry Jerome, Rich Valerga, Darren Yerama, Matt Mohs, Jill Cacy, Michelle Walker, Patrick Romey, Nancy Stachel, Yusef Mgeni, J. Eng, J.Meza, Dolores Henderson, Stacey Gray Akyea, Jeanne Freidlund, Nancy Cameron, Eileen Cardwell, Teresa Rogers, Traci Gauer, Ann Hoxie, Teresa Caccarelli, Ruth Paisley, March Doud, Jim Gebeke, Janet Yannarely, Jim Langevin, Jackie Felt, Lynn Gallandat, Kristin Keller, Sharon Freeman, Adrian Pendelton, Belinda Green, Hitesh Haria, Kris Emerson, Lisa Severson, Christine Wroblewski, Jeremiah Ellis, Joe Raasch, Suzanne Kelly, Valeria Silva, Patrick Kennelly, Dennis Hale, Kevin Umidon, Jeff Lalla

Other: Margaret Parsons, Steve Albertson, David Nystrom, Kevin Huepenbecker, John Krenik, Keng Chang, Cricket James, Stan Gardner, John Heiderscheidt, Al Oertwig, Andy Mosca, Joelle Zieren, Bob Goerne, Bob Boyd, Emily Johns, Doug Belden

I. CALL TO ORDER

The COB Chair, Ms. Street-Stewart, called the meeting to order at 4:41 p.m.

II. AGENDA

The Superintendent introduced the agenda stating the information provided in these assessments will help guide recommendations and decisions on facilities for many years to come. The summary report includes key findings and building capacity information. The first part of the report with the data was presented by Margaret Parson a principal of the Cunningham Group. The Chief Operations Officer concluded the report by outlining how SPPS will utilize the comprehensive data to further facility planning efforts, inform the capital bond process and the Large Scale System Change (LSSC) process. The data in these assessments is the most current data on school building capacity and is not presented in same way that capacity data was shared in September, 2008 in the LSSC discussion which was data gathered in 2001.

1. Report on Findings of the Facilities Assessment and Educational Adequacy Assessment

Margaret Parsons, a principal of The Cunningham Group, was called upon to present the results of the St. Paul Public Schools' (SPPS) Facilities Condition and Educational Adequacy Assessment. She began by describing the four components of the assessment: educational adequacy, facility condition and future capital costs (the other component, student enrollment data is a District-provided data piece). The process is about data gathering. The review presented was an overview of the district as a whole.

The assessment objectives were to provide an accurate view of facilities at a given point in time and to:

- Assess the educational adequacy of all instructional spaces district-wide
- Identify current building conditions and educational adequacy deficiencies district-wide
- Understand the future life-cycle capital renewal requirements for the district's existing facility portfolio.
- Provide data necessary to maintain all facilities in a safe and secure manner.

She then provided a brief history of the process which included descriptions of:

- The project kickoff
- Establishment of the educational adequacy guidelines to establish what was important to look at
- Orientation sessions for principals which defined the process and what the process would involve
- Assessment and data collection by two teams (Educational Adequacy Assessment Team and the Facilities Conditions Assessment Team)
- Data entry – entered into the M.A.P.P.S.™ software system
- District review of data gathered
- Final report

She noted all of the data collected is housed in the M.A.P.P.S™ assessment database and will be maintained by the district Facility Planning staff.

She then went on to present key findings of the assessments noting the deficiencies identified in the assessments can be combined with district enrollment projections to provide an overall Facilities Master Plan that can be the basis for a district-wide capital improvement funding strategy. Key findings from the assessments included:

- The SPPS facility portfolio includes over 7.3 million square feet of space spread over 468 acres (3.1 million square feet in elementary space, 1.0 million square feet in middle schools, 1.9 million square feet in high schools, .9 million square feet in other educational configurations and .4 million square feet in administrative support. The total replacement cost for all district facilities is \$2.1 billion.
- There are 79 permanent buildings with ages (based on original construction data) ranging between 1890 and 2007. Only 9% of the buildings were built in the last 25 years; 51% were constructed between 1953 and 1982 and 40% were constructed prior to 1953.
- 17,250 square feet of space is contained in portable classroom buildings (22) which total less than 1% of the total portfolio (this is low compared to other urban districts across the country).
- Current facility condition costs, including general conditions and educational adequacy deficiencies total \$317.7 million. Of that total \$208.9 million are related to the general condition of the site and buildings; \$108.8 million are related to educational adequacy deficiencies that contribute to functional equity district-wide. There are additional Life Cycle renewal costs of \$60.2 million to correct deficiencies over the next five years.
- The identified costs include "soft costs" which are costs that must be added to construction dollars these include general contractor overhead and markup, adjustments to local labor and material markets, professional design fees, administrative testing, permitting and legal fees, as well as escalation and contingencies. Total cost, including the soft costs, is used for the purpose of planning and budgeting.

- The assessment also collected information regarding site and building systems. These systems each have a projected life expectancy, at which point they may no longer be serviceable. When this occurs, an investment for replacement is generally required. The assessment forecasts that over the next five years, \$60.2 million, stated in unescalated dollars, will be required for life cycle renewal.
- The Facility Condition Index (FCI) is a recognized industry standard that provides a general indicator of a building's health. The district-wide FCI for SPPS is 15.1%, a figure that is low when compared to other similar districts.

Ms. Parsons indicated data could be looked at in multiple forms and iterations. She then moved on to define the priorities which had been assigned to deficiencies established:

- Priority 1: Mission Critical Concerns (Current) - things which directly affect the school's ability to remain open or deliver the educational curriculum.
- Priority 2: Indirect Impact to Education Missions (1 Year) – Items which, if not addressed in the near future, may progress to Priority 1 items.
- Priority 3: Short Term Conditions (2-3 Years) – these are items necessary to the mission of the school but may not require immediate attention.
- Priority 4: Long Term Requirements (3-5 Years) – Items or systems which are likely to require attention within the next five years or would be considered an enhancement to the instructional environment.
- Priority 5: Enhancements – these are aesthetic deficiencies or considered enhancements.

She also defined school improvement categories:

- Functional deficiency – a system which has failed before its expected life
- Educational adequacy – deficiency based on accommodating one of eight educational adequacy categories
- Deferred Maintenance – planned work which corrects deficiencies which have been postponed beyond the regular life expectancy of the system
- Life Cycle Renewal – deficiency that has reached or exceeded its serviceable life and requires replacement.

She then moved on to discuss educational adequacy which she defined as the degree to which a school's facilities can adequately support the instructional mission, methods and purpose. Education adequacy was reviewed in eight areas:

- Capacity – ability of core facilities to meet needs of the student population
- Support for programs – special spaces or classrooms that support specific curriculum offerings
- Technology – presence of infrastructure, equipment, etc. within classroom and laboratory settings.
- Supervision and security – extent to which physical configurations help or hinder building operation including both passive and physical security
- Instructional aids – presence of necessary equipment within teaching spaces
- Physical characteristics – primarily size and shape of individual teaching spaces
- Learning environment – degree to which learning areas are comfortable, controllable, etc.
- Relationship of spaces – proximity of instructional spaces to support areas like libraries, restrooms, dining, recreation.

Life cycle renewal looks into the future to understand what might become needs over the next five years.

The last area she touched on was capacity. Fixed capacity was defined as the sum of permanent classroom space in a school building (the bones), whether it is used for student instruction or not, multiplied by the utilization rate for the school building. Functional capacity was defined as the sum of student stations for all classrooms that are used for instructional purposes, multiplied by the school type utilization factor. Fixed capacity is always greater than

functional capacity. Functional capacity is the most accurate measure of how school space is currently utilized. It was found SPSS has a deficit in space at the high school level.

The Chief Operations Officer extended his thanks to everyone involved in the collaborative, district-wide assessment process. He reiterated the objectives of the assessment were to

- Assess the educational adequacy for all instructional space district-wide;
- Identify current building conditions and educational adequacy deficiencies district-wide
- Provide data necessary to maintain all facilities in a safe and secure manner
- Understand future life-cycle capital renewal requirements for the district's existing facility portfolio.

He reviewed the data gathering process and the planning process which the District will utilize to inform future decisions. He then reviewed the district funding mechanisms (alternative bonds, capital bonds and the Health and Safety Levy) noting these funds are limited which necessitates prioritization in allocations.

He then went on to discuss data utilization (a facilities master plan, an informed capital bonding process and informing the Large Scale System Change discussion/decision process) and stressed the value of data-driven recommendations.

He indicated facilities master planning will involve analyzing the data to determine the most efficient and effective way to invest facilities dollars in the approximately \$377.9 million in potential project costs. The district funding mechanisms will allow for fully funding the Priority 1 and 2 projects; however analysis is needed on how to address the rest of the items in the most efficient manner.

The fixed capacity data shows the district has capacity for approximately 4, 000 more students. The assessment shows most buildings are in really good condition; there are no quick "close the building" decisions based on the data in the assessments. Facility condition will be one part of the rightsizing and consolidation criteria that will be used to make LSSC recommendations; other areas will include: educational value/academic performance; school/district funding and enrollment/trends.

The COO indicated building condition reports will be sent to all principals on February 25. They will include: building history, facility condition costs, future life cycle cost and the FCI; current deficiencies listed by category and priority; future life cycle renewal projections by system and a summary of deficiencies by category and dollar amount.

He finished by saying the assessment is a "snapshot in time" and that the data needs to be kept accurate and up-to-date. He noted some items may already have changed (programs moved, deficiency correction scheduled/resolved). Administration is looking forward to data-driven recommendations in developing the Facilities Master Plans, capital bond projects and LSSC.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Superintendent noted two items: (1) District buildings are in really good shape when compared against other urban districts across the country. (2) Specific recommendations are not being provided in this report. The purpose of this report was to provide a summary of the data gathered. This data will be utilized in the development of a new capital bonding process due to wrap-up in June 2009; recommendations in the LSSC process and in developing a Facilities Master Plan which should be ready in December 2009.
- Are the dollars amounts in the estimates based on an industry-wide average or what was the source? Response, the costs are based on an industry index which is adjusted to local areas, there are also soft costs factored into the number.
- Will the Principals share the individual school report information with staff and will there be explanations/clarifications provided? The Superintendent indicated there is a

communication roll-out plan in place for sending out these reports. Administrators have been given benchmarks about the assessment as it has progressed. The Chief Community Relations Officer indicated the report provided tonight is being sent to all staff and stakeholders. The school reports will go out on the 25th and information will be shared with staff. It is about informing people of where the district is and to provide guidance in years to come.

- What is CEAC's function now? The report information has been provided to them and they will look at it in-depth. They will utilize the data in planning capital bonding processes as their planning goes forward. CEAC and CBFAC were brought together for presentations on both the enrollment and budget discussions and also the State Demographer presentation.
- Does the report address leased space? The assessments were done only on District owned facilities, no leased space.
- Life cycle costs, how is it related to regular routine maintenance which is done on the buildings? Life cycle cost is used to forecast what needs to be repaired out into the future.
- Clarification was sought on the deficiency relative to high schools. Capacity numbers (both fixed and functional) indicate too little space at high schools for numbers served. There are some buildings that are more deficient and some that have space but the overall total shows a deficiency.
- How does the report deal with current space use vs best utilization? Each space was looked at as it is currently being used. Two numbers are generated: fixed capacity (actual count/measure of each space in a building) and functional capacity (how the space is used currently). The data can be drawn on those two lines. How can data be used to help inform best utilization or getting the greatest value from the space utilization? It depends upon the program put into the building and, of course the actual capacity of the building. So in future planning the numbers will help inform what can or cannot be done with a building.
- Was time spent thinking about student movement within buildings relative to crowding situations, bottlenecks, etc.? The educational adequacy assessment looked at the security piece relative to the location of office, arrival points at sites, traffic separation, etc.. There is nothing about new construction or additions in the assessment because overall there is a surplus of space. As the District goes through the planning process it can look at how to use buildings to address the traffic flow pieces by looking at various models.
- The educational adequacy categories, the eight parameters, were they based on criteria established by the district or national criteria? As a part of the process the assessment teams met with SPPS representatives and discussed the categories (which are system Magellan has developed through doing these types of assessments) relative to SPPS and the results of those discussions were used to establish the guidelines. Moving forward the eight criteria are locked in the database but additional criteria can be added as a separate line item.
- Keeping the data up-to-date, how often would it be done, does the system reflect changes as they are made? This data must be input by Facilities Planning staff. A process is being developed for this updating to the planning tool. The District will continue to use a work order system for routine, day-to-day work.
- Was there student feedback in the study? No students were involved in the project; it was an objective facility assessment study. The Superintendent has discussed the study with various students groups within the district.
- Was green space considered? No, it was about data collection on the bricks and mortar.
- The portable classrooms (22 in total) what was their state? The classrooms are permanently set on sites, most are 20-25 years old, generally they are large enough for the number of students using them but many have deficiencies.

MOTION: Mr. Conlon moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the complete *Report on Findings of the Facilities Assessment and Educational Adequacy Assessment*. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion Passed

2. Preview of 2009 Summer School Plans

The ALC summer session 2009 will provide programs and classes to increase proficiency and credit recovery for graduation. The program will support student learning at elementary levels in both academics and enrichment; in middle school credit recovery, academics and enrichment and in high school credit recovery and test prep for the MCA GRAD testing. Middle and high school will have a credit recovery possibility of 3 credits. An additional 3-week high school session is being held at Gordon Parks for another 3 credits, so students attending both sessions could earn up to 6 credits.

The site recommendation is to have 28 elementary, 6 middle schools and 7 high schools open for summer school. Summer school will be 5 days a week, 6 hours per day for 3 weeks for a total of 96.5 instructional hours (the same as in 2008). There will be opportunity for remediation plus enrichment due to the extended time. Projected enrollment is for 12,000 students.

Proposed dates are:

- June 22 – July 14, 2009 – Regular Ed (full days at 41 sites)
- June 22 – July 24, 2009 – Special Ed (half days at 9 sites)
- June 22 – July 17, 2009 – Ontrack (full days at 1 site)
- July 20 – August 17, 2009 – High School (full days at 1 site)

Benefits will include additional time for enrichment opportunities, there will be longer days but fewer weeks allowing families to better plan their summer schedules and families will have more access to summer instruction and enrichment through the summer sessions and Community Education.

Community Education is planning Education Camps beginning July 18 at 4 sites in collaboration with the City of St. Paul. There will be three weeks of camps families can sign up for so, in total, there will be six to eight weeks of instruction or learning opportunities for the students.

Teachers will teach the same number of hours and compensation will be the same as the previous year but with two fewer weeks in total. Academic outcomes are to increase the number of students passing the BST and GRAD, improve test scores, improve credit completion and improved reading levels.

Assessment opportunities are being looked at on entering and leaving (PALS K-2, MAP 3-8, and progress monitoring [RTI]). The cost would be approximately \$250,000-300,000. Options are still being explored with decisions to be made in the next few weeks.

Cost savings will be made in transportation due to the reduced number weeks and is estimated to be approximately \$200,000. Savings will also be made in facilities with reduced utility costs (\$50,000), fewer sites open and an additional two weeks available for maintenance and cleaning.

A daily breakfast and lunch will be provided with a pilot program for breakfast in the classroom. The food piece is critical because it supports students academically and data shows test scores improve with regular meals.

Next steps include staffing the summer session, scheduling transportation, communicating with families at spring conferences and completing the application process by April 10, 2009.

The Superintendent stated she had asked the academic office to start tracking every summer school session in order to establish a baseline of information. The District is working to get the right design with the right outcomes for students in achieving credit recovery and improvement

of test scores with added opportunities for enrichment. Other benefits of this new design include anticipated cost savings, earlier decision making for families which will allow them to better make summer plans and with the earlier commitment to attend will ensure kids know they need to do credit recovery.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Will there be transport to Gordon Parks? Students currently don't have transportation to Gordon Parks, summer attendees would need to provide their own.
- Are the hours of operation the same for all schools? It is being proposed starting high school and middle school at 9:00 a.m. Younger students starting at 7:45 and 8:15 a.m.
- Projected enrollment numbers are a 900 decrease from last year. It is hoped more students will complete the entire course because of the added enrichment and the fewer number of weeks. The enrichment part is embedded into the math, reading, languages and social studies, it can't be done separate from academic instruction.
- Demographically what is the student population for summer school? Students on free and reduced lunches, those with credit deficits, not meeting standards, second language learners, homeless; there are a high number of students of color who attend summer school
- The length of the student day, does it vary? Length of day is dependent (in middle and high school) on the number of credits needing to be recovered.
- Are teachers paid on an hourly basis, yes.
- What ages for enrichment? All ages.
- By reducing the number of weeks of summer school will there be an impact on the knowledge retained by the students? No, offering the remediation piece is to make sure the students get their credits. The opportunity for enrichment allows for access to continuous instruction. Given SPPS's typical population for summer school, it is more about creating a structure that brings a little more year around approach for exposure to instructional time. One of the reasons for the push on assessment and data collection is to track and better understand if instruction is helping and see if, how, when extra time achieves successes.
- The Chief Academic Officer stated there will also be opportunities for on-line credits available for students. This is being piloted to see how it works.

MOTION: Mr. Conlon moved the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education approve the proposed revisions to the 2009-2010 calendar. Motion seconded by Mr. Goldstein.

Motion passed. (6 in favor)

3. Standing Item: School and Program Changes Update -- No report.
4. Standing Item: Policy Update -- No report.
5. Work Session
 - **Board Representation on Outside Committees**
Assignments were communicated. Mr. Hardy and Mr. Goldstein are to check their calendars and let the chair know which will be the representative for AMSD.
 - **Graduation Scheduling**
Assignments were made for those still in attendance. Ms. Kong-Thao and Mr. Conlon are to be contacted for their preferences.
 - **Discussion on Board Development Contract**
Next steps were discussed in identifying resources and contract development. It was suggested representatives from administration, the business office, legal and a Board

representative (Mr. Goldstein) be available as contacts/resources as the process moves forward.

- **Committees Advisory to the Board**

The Chair indicated reports from the Latino Consent Decree and Indian Education will be presented in May. Special Education is still to be scheduled.

- **Additional COB Meeting Date**

An additional COB has been scheduled for April 7, 2009 at 4:30 p.m.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:	Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Brodrick, that the meeting adjourn.
----------------	---

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk