

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD
April 7, 2009**

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

Tom Conlon joined the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Staff: Superintendent Carstarphen, Suzanne Kelly, Kate Wilcox-Harris, Joe Raasch, Cecilia Dodge, Matt Mohs, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Michelle Walker, Christine Wroblewski, Hitesh Haria, Jeremiah Ellis, Sheri Stombagh, Anita McLaughlin, Kevin Umidon, Dave Perry, Jeremiah Ellis, Susan Leek, Shirley Heitzman, Kathy Denman-Wilke

Other: Jeff Koon, Emily Johns, Doug Belden, Kevin Schultz, Andy Mosca, Patricia Welch, Felicia Widi, Stephanie Schroeder, Mary Cathryn Ricker

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:40 p.m.

II. AGENDA

1. Federal Stimulus Package Update & Recommendations

The Superintendent opened the presentation by reviewing the history leading up to the current report on the opportunities of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA). The plan for the ARRA stimulus package combined with the Large Scale System Change (LSSC) recommendations to be presented in May is the culmination of the last three years of study, data gathering, planning, design and implementation. This work has evolved and been built up and out from a foundation of intensive study and review. In 2006-07 three planning areas set the district up for improvements: the referendum, the Strategic Plan and Implementation Guide and a study and results of educational resource strategies where the district looked at professional development, special education, behavior and accountability data around students. In addition there were other studies that contributed to the planning such as the communications audit and a series of community conversations.

In 2007-08, the district revised the *Policy Manual*, the inclusiveness study was implemented, the Human Resource audit and transformation of that department, a shared accountability framework was developed, the first comprehensive Annual Report and State of the District was delivered, and the first comprehensive parent survey was conducted. In 2008-09 the school year was launched with the case for change, engagement and development (LSSC), the community engagement plan was developed and implemented, organizational values were established, the Facilities Condition and Educational Adequacy Assessment was conducted, the second round of school and programs changes were put into effect and a synthesis of all the plans and improvements leading to SY 2009-10 and what is the beginning of 2010-11. The plan for implementation of LSSC, the implementation of ARRA, the next stage for engagement for LSSC and the transition in leadership are currently being discussed. The District is at a point to be in a better position than most districts in the country due to the reform efforts already underway in the district.

The Chief Accountability Officer was asked to provide the overview of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA). She stated this represents an unprecedented investment in Education. Public education will be reshaped for the next 30 years within the next 5 years by what is being done at state and district levels as a result of the stimulus

package. The funds must be used for reform, not to maintain the status quo. The guiding principles of ARRA are:

- Spend quickly to save and create jobs
- Ensure transparency and accountability
- Thoughtful investment of the one-time funds
- Advance effective reform.

She noted the first and fourth principle may be at odds with one another over the life of the funds.

She then went on to state recipients of funding must advance effective reforms in the areas of:

- **College and career-ready standards** and high quality, valid and reliable assessments for all students including ELLs and students with disabilities.
- **Pre-K to higher education data systems** which meet the 10 principles in the America Competes Act
- **Teacher effectiveness** and equitable distribution (placement) of effective teachers
- Intensive support and effective **interventions for lowest-performing schools**

There are four major sources of ARRA funding for K-12 education:

- State fiscal stabilization funds, \$667 million for Minnesota, an amount to be determined for St. Paul Public Schools (SPPS) which supplants state general fund monies; additional information will be provided as it becomes available.
- Title I, Part A, \$94 million for Minnesota, \$18 million for SPPS over two years
- IDEA, Part B, \$190 million for Minnesota, \$11 million for SPPS, and
- School construction, \$22 billion nationally, \$30-32 million for SPPS bond authority (tax credit structure) – translates to \$17 million of interest saved.

Other revenue sources within ARRA funding are: several other grants SPPS may be able to access; some are only available to states; others to school districts through competitive grants. It is unclear how much, if any, of these funds will be available to the District.

The State Fiscal Stabilization Fund is the largest source of funding for education (\$820 million to Minnesota, \$667 million of this dedicated to K-12 and higher education). There is, however, no real budget relief for SPPS.

Title I, Part A funds are estimated at \$18 million for SPPS for use between SY 2009-10 and SY 2010-11. All Title I requirements apply though the U.S. Department of Education (USED) may consider some waivers around AYP sanctions; the supplement not supplant requirement is not subject to waivers. Title I have significant limits on use of funds for district-wide activities in that only Title I schools can benefit. Professional development related to district AYP improvement is the only major exception.

IDEA, Part B (Special Education) funding is estimated at \$11 million to SPPS for use in SY 2009-10 and SY 2010-11. IDEA allows up to 15% of total funds (approximately \$3 million) to be used for Early Intervention Services [EIS] (the state may order districts to reserve these funds to address over-identification). Under certain circumstances, a district may reduce the level of State and local expenditures by up to 50% of the increase, as long as the district uses the freed up funds for activities authorized by NCLB (\$5.5 million using current estimates). The 15% and the reduction in expenditures are inter-related and not conjunctive; if a district is ordered to do EIS, the district cannot use the flexibility granted under reduction in expenditures, according to USED.

School construction represents a tax credit to subsidize interest for school construction and renovations (approximately \$30-32 million total over the next two years). Basically, SPPS issues the bonds for an eligible project (the district must cover the principal); the U.S. Treasury provides a tax credit to the holder in the amount of the interest that the district would have normally paid (\$17 million in interest savings to St. Paul taxpayers). SPPS is eligible for

subsidies directly from USED, rather than through the State of Minnesota. The District must use existing bonding authority for issuance of bonds.

USED has \$5 billion available to award competitively to states and districts for advancing reform. This will be a "race to the top" with \$4.35 billion awarded by the spring of 2010 to states demonstrating the most progress toward the outlined priorities. \$650 million has been designated by USED for investing in what works and innovation. This will be awarded through competitive grants to district and partners they work with that have made significant gains in closing the achievement gap and which will be models of best practices.

The timeline for entitlement programs has over 50% of the formula funds arriving within the next 30 days (SFSF-67%; Title I, Part A-50% and IDEA, Part B-50%). The remaining formula driven funds will arrive not later than September 30, 2009. Distribution by the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) is still to be determined (many funds are likely to start July 1, 2009).

The competitive grants will follow many different timelines with many grants to districts available within the next 12 months from MDE or USED. MDE will administer over \$30 million in Title I school improvement grants within the next two years. USED will offer competitive grants to districts as well through the "Teacher Incentive Fund" and "Investing in What Works and Innovation".

Additional Federal guidance has been provided in two areas:

- Transparency and Accountability
 - All funds must be tracked separately with a description of fund use; quarterly reports on both financial information and program outcomes/results; estimated numbers of jobs created/saved. Subcontracts and sub-grants must comply with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act.
 - There will probably be many requests for information on the use of the funds and districts must be willing to stand by the uses.
 - Opponents to ARRA have targeted education funding for oversight; urban districts will be on the front lines of these requests.
- Accountability and Risk Management, the root cause of most failures in this area is lack of effective design or implementation of proper internal controls. Potential problems with these funds have been projected to be:
 - Unallowable personnel costs
 - Unallowable expenditure of funds or unreasonable expenditure of funds
 - Inadequate contracts, lack of oversight or approval
 - Poor internal controls over expenditures (purchase cards, gift cards)
 - Incomplete, inaccurate, untimely personnel activity reporting.

SPPS will have to provide intensive oversight of these funds.

District planning assumptions for the stimulus package recognize that this is two year money. The money will be used in a way to leverage for sustainable long-term district-wide change. Well designed, research-based systems will be implemented that maximize resources. There will be increased fidelity of implementation through alignment with existing efforts and a project management approach will be used to set and meet clear benchmarks and timelines.

The Chief Accountability Officer then went on to discuss the District's proposed Federal Stimulus Initiatives and the on-going engagement process. Four areas will be focused on:

- **College and Career Readiness** – SPPS will use stimulus funding to advance the following effective reforms:
 - Implement a *comprehensive audit of Pre-K to 12 curriculum* to increase the rigor of academic courses and identify the efficacy of current interventions
 - Identify and implement *consistent assessment tools* (benchmark, end of course exams, progress monitoring) to continuously measure student performance and provide timely information about progress before the school year ends.

- Implement *specific elementary and secondary reform efforts* to ensure alignment within and across schools and support seamless transitions for students

Elementary reform efforts will ensure fidelity of implementation of research-based reading curriculum through job-embedded professional development; enhancement of the current coaching model to increase direct support to schools for instructional improvement and systematic tiered interventions for literacy, math and behavior.

SPPS will use stimulus funding to advance the following secondary reform efforts: a two year instructional coaching surge to provide intense support and accountability for tiered interventions in literacy, math and behavior; accelerated development and consistent implementation of district curriculum in literacy and math and identification and implementation of research-based content literacy reform (e.g., READ 180, AMP Reading, EDGE Reading, Disciplinary Literacy, Content Literacy Continuum); limiting the range of options to those that have proven efficacy.

- **Student Interventions** – stimulus funding will be used to advance the following interventions for low-performing and struggling students:
 - Develop and implement a Response to Intervention (RTI) model that matches instruction to student needs and provides different levels of support as needed (tiered intervention).
 - Develop and implement a Positive Behavioral Intervention System (PBIS) to decrease office referrals and suspensions and improve attendance, school climate and behaviors.
 - Integrate cultural proficiency into district practices, to address factors that contribute to achievement gaps, including disproportionate referral and identification of children of color to special education.
- **School Interventions** – it is known that schools not meeting district and state expectations for two or more years will have less autonomy. Intensive guidance and support may require:
 - Targeted Title I allocations to support reform initiatives through professional development, materials and technology.
 - Approved program changes to revitalize academic offerings, outcomes and enrollment; such things as dual language/immersion, STEM, AVID expansion.
 - Redesigned academic school day and school year and effective use of out of school time through on-going reform of summer school, piloting the “ideal day” and creative/effective use of best practices and programs already known/piloted.
- **Teacher Effectiveness** -- SPPS will use stimulus funds to advance the following effective reforms:
 - Develop and implement a monitored structure for teacher placement
 - Realign staff resources and program models to improve support to teachers in the IEP process
 - Enhance professional development to expand current collaboration between general education, special education and school leaders.

SPPS will also apply for “Investing in What Works” and “Innovation” grants that could be used to offer incentives to schools and teachers with demonstrated success.

- **Education Data Systems** – the District has a lot of data, however, it doesn’t have the systems to get it pushed out in the most effective and efficient way to everyone who needs it. The stimulus fund effort will be toward putting systems in place to:
 - Better track and evaluate student performance
 - Monitor and reform curriculum and instructional practices
 - Review and redesign staff development efforts
 - Reduce the paperwork burden on teachers

- Improve compliance and better manage special education staff.

The Chief Accountability Officer stated those were the proposed ways to utilize approximately \$29 million in Title I and IDEA combined. Administration is still working on all of the details. For Title I an estimated \$8 million will go directly to Title I schools and will be heavily monitored. Some will go secondary reform efforts (estimates are \$4 million to accomplish some of the secondary reforms be proposed with \$3 million for elementary). There are set-asides for Title I for non-public schools, parent involvement and district improvement through AYP. IDEA will have an estimated \$11 million of which \$3 million will go toward early intervention services (assessment and data systems, RIT, PBIS) and \$8 million to special education reform (general education/special education collaboration, improved IDEA compliance and assistive technology).

One of the primary directives is to create or save jobs. The stimulus monies will not offset or impact the needed \$25 million reductions the District must make. In order to do the stimulus work, it may be necessary to create new, short-term positions to get the work underway. Administration estimates that several positions may be redesigned or newly created for the next two years (up to 50 FTEs for Title I and up to 30 FTEs for IDEA). Staff impacted by recent budget cuts may qualify for these new positions and may participate in the application process for them.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- Distribution timeline (Slide 35) – how do the various funding streams align? Slide 35 refers only to Title I, IDEA dollars. When college readiness is discussed there will be efforts funded from Title I and several from IDEA and if any new money comes from the State fiscal stabilization it will be funded through that as well as some parts through competitive funding if it becomes available.. Title I and IDEA have very strict guidelines as to how much money can be used for school and student specific areas and district-wide. As more information becomes available more definition will be provided on how other funding lines will be used.
- How will staff resources and program models be realigned to improve support to teachers in the IEP process? There are ways the District can deploy special ed teachers and support staff and even the coaching support staff for students to better support teachers in the identification process, working through all the steps once a student is identified and in the way they work with other teachers, the principal and parents. If the model is implemented, how will it be assessed? The District will assess along the way and in two years the District will have to account for the dollars and the process with the Federal government as to whether it has made a difference. It is therefore important to continue to assess along the way and continue to tweak the process to provide the best support. The IEP process is not going away and the District needs to get better at doing the IEP process and what it does to support that process.
- The “Invest in what works” and “innovation” grants that can be used to offer incentives, how is this different from other incentive grants? This does not have to be mutually exclusive, if the District applies for Q-Comp from the State and then uses it as its incentive program, the District can say this is what it is currently doing and if funds came from “Investing in what works” the program could be accelerated. It is up to the District to design what it thinks will be eligible for support from these programs. The notion is that incentives should be offered in some way and the District needs to develop what that will look like and then it can access either State level dollars or “investing in what works” stimulus funds. Guidelines have not been established yet but will be laid out.
- On slide 33 –Realign staff resources and enhancing professional development – why can’t the district do that now and if it can’t be done now, how will the money make the difference to enable it? It is not a matter of not being able to do now, professional development costs money and the district currently has only a very small fund from which to draw for development. The stimulus funds will allow the district to do more, maximize the impact and target specific programs. It will drive development into more areas. Most current development is special ed and general ed development. It is being suggested there be

more collaboration between those areas and spread it further across the district. Professional development is a best practice; it also combines with having the coaches work with general ed and special ed teachers to do collaboration. The stimulus funds will take a pilot program (a best practices which is critical for special ed reform) and scale it up.

- A request was made to have slide 31 provided in a larger version.
- Title 1, Part A does this provide funding only to schools with a certain percentage of Title I students or for all schools that have any number of Title I students? This is all Title I schools but there may be a tiered approach in rolling this out. There are five stages in NCLB so as schools get closer to restructuring; the school may get more emphasis than those at the beginning stages of NCLB. Once a school is designated as Title I it is eligible for the funds. A Title I school is defined as a school with a concentration of free and reduced lunch at 75% or greater (both elementary and secondary). To target services to the lower grade levels, the elementary threshold is expanded down to 40% for reduced lunch. About 2/3 of the schools in the district are designated Title I.
- ARRA design doesn't support systemic reform. The question of using the funds for all schools, since most if not all have at least some students in poverty was raised with USED; they said NO. Funding, where it is an appropriate use, will be designated to the schools; for those not appropriate for a funding stream, external partners will be sought to fill in gaps to provide the concept to every school even if it is not a Title I school. This money is not targeted for systemic reform it is targeted for special ed and Title I and those schools with those demographics.
- The money is dedicated for 2 years; does the money literally cut off at end of two years? Some of the dollars will have tails attached, has that been clearly defined? Are there dollars within ARRA funds that allow for a system to be dismantled? You can't supplant or sustain but can a district dismantle? ARRA is hopeful that that would happen that this is the driver to drive out stuff that doesn't work and, if a district wants to continue, it must show immediate jumps in graduation rates, show immediate reductions in suspensions and expulsions; they want to see it in one year. The idea should be that anything that was being done previously that wasn't working should be eliminated which will then free up resources for other uses.
- The expectation is that the dollars must be spent by 9/30/2011; that is when the monies must be accounted for.
- Will any of the money be used for assistance to probationary and struggling teachers? The first challenge is that the dollars are very targeted to Title I schools and special education. The District is looking at (whether through stimulus dollars or partnerships) how its efforts can be retooled using better data systems, using more ongoing monitoring efforts to be able to do exactly what is articulated. It is not clear whether the dollars can be used directly for that process but the dollars can be used to do the curriculum, create the system, etc. In the next year or two, will struggling teachers' need for individual attention be addressed? What can be shown within that time period is there will be a consistent standard on how to identify those who are struggling or need help because the data systems will consistently measure the students and teacher performance. The tools will be there, it still needs to be determined what funding is available to do professional development or implementation.
- Slide 22, the engagement process. The proposals presented appear to be pretty firm. What is the District asking of the community in its engagement process? Comment on the proposals? To come up with completely new ideas? The restrictions on these funds are so firm and so complicated, strategically how is the District approaching this and what kind of input is being sought? Everyone is encouraged to do the survey, including the Board. As a school system, the stimulus money doesn't change the direction SPPS is moving. SPPS put forward the proposals presented in this report. The public is asked to comment on that and offer other thinking if they don't approve the process. Input must fall within the four reform areas identified in the ARRA. The criteria/guidance has been given to districts, SPPS has put resources in place leading up to it; now uses have to align against it; it must be monitored and show outcomes to be reported out. Districts have to get it right or there won't be any more coming; it must align with best practices, be research based and move the organization forward.

- Regarding the coaching model and the coaching surge, will those roles be filled with internal people already on staff or is the District looking to bring in outside people? The district has a coaching model where schools have coaches onsite. This is increasing capacity for central administration to support clusters of schools so this would be new coaches to be brought on board to work with clusters of schools. They would be working with the on-site coaches, the school leadership and teachers in schools around the new reform models. The positions will be posted and applications will be accepted both from outside or current employees. HR practices will apply, the positions must be posted. The Superintendent clarified (1) the positions are for two years and (2) employees who have been laid off may apply for the posted positions however the best qualified candidates will be hired (no guarantees of any kind are being offered).
- Regarding the surge, is it intended to get a base level of preparedness so the on-going doesn't have to be surged again? Reply: Yes.
- Regarding the coaching being done – will the model change? Currently it is job embedded development, will it be done in cohorts? Are the new coaches dedicated or will they have other responsibilities as well? The coaches are full time positions, coaching is what they do full time. Coaching is about professional development not evaluation. They are typically teachers who are closer to “master” teachers who really understand the model.
- The engagement process, the advisory panels, who is on those panels? The Title I advisory panel is a mix of external stakeholders including parents and community members and Title I administrative staff including some from building level. The composition is defined in law.
- The District will have to deal with two levels of challenges to the final recommendations the Board will approve in June: (1) what is all this and how will it make a difference to student achievement? (2) there will be internal and community-based challenges about why other ideas were not selected. The request was made that it would be useful to have a way to explain how/why choices were made particularly relative to “tails” and what drops off, is it picked up by other funding, clarification on how it all fits together.
- Relative to racial ethnic students and students in poverty, the combination of interventions for lowest performing schools and teacher effectiveness raises the question of more teacher time per student per day and the idea that it needs to be effective time. How will the issue around awareness of which students are not participating in the classroom be addressed? How will there be more teacher contact when students aren't initiating it? What supports/means will be put in place to deal with non-participatory students? The best solutions need to be right in the classroom to assure those students are recognized. The District's efforts around cultural proficiency is not that it will be done as a stand alone project, it will be incorporated into all practices and there needs to be a two part focus on (1) the instructional side – how are practices changed in schools to get at these issues. It is what are the things done in day-to-day practices that may lead to ignoring a certain set of students or having differing sets of expectations of students; and (2) the customer service side, what are non-school based staff doing, how is the phone answered, etc. The first piece to address this is cultural proficiency. The second piece is around effective ways of creating more teacher contact with students and specific tiered interventions for students; a distinctive intervention plan. The tiered interventions are about changing the effectiveness of the extra time provided to students.
- The comment was made it is important not to define cultural proficiency narrowly, not just responding to individual groups who press issues. It is hoped that the stimulus funds will be used to move toward the true notion of an individualized education plan to meet the needs of each child; to do this as a fundamental belief system across the entire spectrum of diversity.
- A request was made for a fuller description of how intervention will actually reach the invisible student population. Please expand Slide 27, 28 and 29 to explain what the district is proposing to address the low graduation rates; how will the funding benefit this area? The graduation rates for students of color are a major problem and this needs to be addressed in real time.
- Slide 30, the Positive Behavioral Intervention System (PBIS) item – how will funding improve behaviors? PBIS is a model/strategy to address behavior. There is a Key Power

Action Item to restructure/implement a new behavior management system. PBIS will assist in establishing a consistent way of looking at behavior across the district and understanding what are those indicators, signs and corrective actions which can be taken before the problem move as far as referrals and suspensions. With this system in place there will be a system of tools for teachers and staff to make corrections prior to escalation. This is an effort to be proactive in addressing behavior. Funding will be utilized to create the model, do professional development and implementing a data system to track/monitor behaviors/incidents.

- The Superintendent commented one of the best things to do to improve behavior is to teach students how to be better students; what it means to be a “good” student. The Federal money allows for getting to the core of getting students to understand their roles and the outcome which is graduation. It allows for moving teachers toward being as effective as possible and then placing them in the most high need areas. The core of the stimulus money is higher graduation rates and early interventions. It is establishing consistency in norms and enforcing them across the entire district consistently.

Community and staff were encouraged to do the survey.

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the Federal stimulus package and proposed recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion passed

2. Presentation of American Indian Education Program Resolution

The Superintendent stated the presentation of the resolution would be made with the administrative response being provided at a later time.

The Chair of the Parent Committee on American Indian Education stated they had changed the presentation of the Resolution of Concurrence for SY 2007-2008 to provide a more comprehensive look at Indian Education by providing supplements that are referred to throughout the resolution and by providing a Summary of Recommendations and Requests which have been developed based on the needs of American Indian students and families.

Recommendations/requests brought forward by the committee were then presented.

- **Align resource allocation to District priorities: American Indian Studies**
 - Meet the budget expansion request of the Committee for continued funding of the American Indian Studies Program, which is set to expire at the end of the 2008-09 school year. It was noted that this budget has been moved out of the school budget and into the Professional Development Office; this means they can keep staff and continue the program.
 - Move the American Indian Studies Program budget and program management within either the Office of Professional Development as a separate program from Indian Education or continue within another district compartment. This has been done.
 - Explore and discuss the possibility of a K-8 program or another option for meeting articulation within the schools. This would provide easier transition for students and continuation for the language studies.
- **Ensure high academic achievement for all students and raise expectations for accountability: increase American Indian student attendance**
 - Continuation and monitoring of the attendance letter and template for the next two years to determine the impact of the strategy on American Indian attendance. They would like to have these issued more promptly.
 - Provide an update on the District’s work surrounding attendance and truancy goals.
- **Ensure high academic achievement for all students: American Indian suspensions**
 - Provide an update report of American Indian student suspension offenses on an on-going basis.

- Allow continual input into the development of the new K-12 classroom behavior model and *Rights and Responsibilities Handbooks* – what is the classroom behavior model and how will these areas be addressed? Are specific definitions provided for various behaviors (e.g. willful disobedience); is there a district standard?
- Now that this project has been discontinued due to budget restraints, how will the District address the seriousness of the current suspension data?
- **Ensure high academic achievement for all students: increase American Indian academic support**
 - Indicate how schools with low American Indian student achievement are addressing the academic needs of American Indian students, particularly those schools with too few American Indian students to reflect a sub-group on the data dashboards. The committee would like to see this combined into the attendance letter and how the student population is spread throughout schools. Further definition/information on suspensions and academic problems American Indian students are having and what, if any, the correlation is between the two. In order to receive services from Indian Education there is a separate form (506) which needs to be submitted, this is not always recognized or completed.
- **Ensure high academic achievement for all students: the District's curriculum must be more inclusive of American Indian history, language, people and cultures**
 - Implement an accountability system to ensure that new anchor lessons are actually being taught in the classroom.
 - Increase the awareness of professional development opportunities in Culturally Responsive Teaching and anchor lessons available to staff. Is it mandatory or other? Do the schools have an opt-out of actually teaching the curriculum?

The committee chair stated SPPS is seen as a leader in this collaboration across the state and has many other Indian Education programs calling for assistance. Further it is through these partnerships that the comprehensive services leading to measured successes will be maintained. She stated it was with hope that the Parent Committee of the Indian Education Program submitted the Resolution of Concurrence with the St. Paul Public Schools for the 2007-2008 school year.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Regarding the shift into professional development, how might this improve the possibility of addressing issues embedded in the recommendations; accountability, data? Data shows that when students know their own history and language, they do better academically. It is important to all students to understand the history of the indigenous peoples in this country. It develops relationships and an understanding of how history affects current life. With the integration of the Indian Land Tenure Curriculum into four of the anchor lessons, it should help all students. This will also become part of the social studies standards and National Indian Education is looking at education for all nationwide. SPPS is on top of this and is a model for bringing the Indian Land Tenure into an urban school district.
- Are there celebration times/events such as American Indian History month? There is a national American Indian History Month (February); there is an Indian Month (May) which is particular to Minnesota and St. Paul has an Indian Day in September. Indian Education is much more concerned with the integration of the curriculum throughout whole year rather than a period approach. The September event provides the most focus locally. The community also holds a Pow Wow every month on the second Friday.
- Clarified was provided that Indian Education is a grant specific program so events need funding support from outside.
- American Indian student attendance, what are key factors leading to truancy/non-attendance? Is it a social situation, cultural? The American Indian Committee Work Group on Attendance did a survey on truancy. The primary finding was students had difficulty getting up in the morning which is a parenting issue on getting kids to school. Other findings were the need for a more exciting classrooms (bored, more computers, interactive activities, games) which speaks to teaching practices. There were other non-specific items listed as "family issues" which need to be explored further. Cultural issues (e.g., funerals)

also impact attendance and this is not something staff is fully aware of and how it impacts students. Parenting within the American Indian community has been strongly affected by the Boarding House period and this needs to be addressed as well.

- Anchors within the Indian Education Curriculum, what are they? Because there isn't a standard testing for social studies and it has fallen under site based management there has not been a lot of consistency across the district. To address this, the district has created 10 anchor lessons that all social studies teachers are to teach to provide consistency across the district. Four of the 10 have an American Indian Land Tenure component within them. Teachers are being trained in it, not all are participating. What Indian Education doesn't know is how will they be sure anchors are taught/implemented; is there an opt-out? The State of Minnesota states social studies curriculum must include Minnesota Native American history. All middle or high school curriculums incorporate State standards and the SPPS Social Studies Department is working on core standards and resources.
- Not all Native American students are St. Paul residents; specific numbers are not available.
- The expansion of funding, the reallocation into Professional Development, clarify that? It was a reallocation of the American Indian Program budget and the teachers in Battle Creek and Harding High Schools.
- What strategies are being developed to get/keep kids into school? The American Indian Work Group has been doing a lot; not only the surveys, but they have created some incentives. As part of the belief campaign, a piece has been created to recognize attendance (absence of 5 or fewer days) and for each year the goal is met, they will be awarded a small eagle to add to it. Many agencies have assisted through grants and services to the American Indian Magnet school in finding why students are not attending. School social workers (3) are involved with the community to provide resources/support. With the advent of a new grant, Family Traditions will be started so families can learn about the historical traumas and how to move beyond them; it will provide family educational prevention strategies.
- Have parents been engaged to be involved in the educational component? American Indian Studies has provided a number of ideas for best practices used at the American Indian Magnet. There is a breakfast club, a lunch brunch for doing well in attendance and families are brought together for bingo nights emphasizing best practices through the game.
- The issue of cultural expectations and attendance, how is that dealt with? Work is done to continually educate parents about the importance of education and attendance.
- Consideration has been given to providing the Boarding School experience presentation to the Board so they are more aware of its impact.
- A request was made that the Board be kept aware of the events going on in community.
- Is there a way to make staff more aware of the need to supply work in advance if absences are anticipated?

The Chair indicated there would continue to be efforts made to have the American Indian languages recognized as a second language. In the near future there may be a resolution to recognize Ojibwa and Dakota in the State Standards. The second thing would be rigor in curriculum and the concept of American Indian history and culture and its alignment and implementation for ALL students.

The question was asked when the administrative response would be available. The Superintendent responded, June.

A request was made that event dates be provided to the Board Secretary so they could be added to the Board's Upcoming Events.

MOTION: Mr. Conlon moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Parent Committee on American Indian Education report on the 2008 Resolution of Concurrence. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion passed.

3. Update on Capital Bonding Process

Andy Mosca, Chair of the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC) stated CEAC members bring a unique set of skills and a high level of commitment to the task assigned them. He stated that, while waiting for the release of the Facilities Condition and Education Adequacy Assessments (FCA/EAA), the committee members devoted themselves to:

- Reviewing and understanding the scope and limitations of their charge
- Reviewing the District's draft addressing rightsizing
- Discussion on the implications of the District's Large Scale Systems Change on the committee's work
- Reviewing the history of the previous CLRSPEC and CEAC committees
- Reviewing the process by which CEAC solicited capital requests from the schools during previous years.
- Reviewing the \$7 million in spending which had previously been identified by the Administration and CEAC as critical for the 2008-09 school year
- Reviewing the District's technology standards and discussing their possible role in the Educational Adequacy Assessment
- Meeting with CBFAC for a presentation on the FCA/EAA by its authors
- Discussing the Board's stated desire for school principals' involvement in any new capital bond process
- Attending a presentation by the State's demographer, learning of population trends that might inform their decisions.

Once the FCA/EAA report was released, the committee focused on the data; first on the Facilities Condition Index Score (FCI) and later to the enrollment numbers. Questions which have continued to dominate their discussions include:

- How sites will participate in the development of a new process and at what point their participation will occur.
- If all available funds should be committed every year or should there be a system of set-asides.
- To what degree should the FCI score influence decisions, should it be the only factor or part of an equation?
- How will other data from the FCA/EAA factor in?
- How does/should a school's AYP factor into the process?
- How does rightsizing factor into the process?
- At what point in the process will sites be invited to submit proposals, if at all?
- If sites propose, when does CEAC review? When does CEAC make its recommendations to the Board?
- Will/should there be limits to the number of proposals a school can submit or the dollar amount a school can request?

He went on to state other realities and concerns the committee has discussed include such things as:

- Because the FCI score indicates schools are in good physical shape, indicating that Facilities Planning has things in hand, should CEAC simply provide an advise and consent role to Facility Planning? Would such a system effectively disenfranchise those communities CEAC is meant to represent?
- If CEAC relies solely on the report data, will it miss programmatic nuances that require capital bond funding or are programs outside the committee's charge, to be discussed but not a factor if FCI drives the process?
- What role does CEAC play in addressing factors that affect decision but can also be seen as outside its charge (e.g., school choice, over/under enrollment, transportation)?
- Because the FCI scores include both facilities condition and education adequacy factors, the committee has requested that the scores be adjusted by the removal of a number of factors the committee feels to be confusing the data. These data will be available only to CEAC; the committee is not suggesting a change in the official report.

Mr. Mosca then went on to review the process CEAC is using in the development of its recommendation. The committee meets and discusses the issues then process recommendations are made. A draft recommendation will be developed and sent to the sites, who will then review and comment on the recommended process. The committee will take the feedback, process it, revise the recommendation and once finalized submit it to the Board for approval and then implement the process.

He discussed the previous capital bonding request process. Clarification was provided on "AOC", that is the Academic Operations Committee which discusses items which impact both academics and operations. It is an internal administrative committee reporting to the Superintendent.

The proposed process was then presented. CEAC wants data driven decisions. The old process was not data driven which allowed political factors to come into play to a degree that was seen as unfair. If CEAC focuses on data within the other parameters established for the committee, better decisions and recommendations will be made.

CEAC intends to draft a deficiency list from the FCA/EAA Reports and capital improvements by site. The sites have not been removed completely from providing recommendations. The school deficiency data and proposed capital work will be shared with sites. This will result in a rank order of data driven projects. There will also be alternative proposals which are non-data driven which come from the schools, those things they feel are important. CEAC doesn't want to lose the knowledge people have of how things happen on the ground in their school which might not be captured in a report. CEAC then receives the school responses back. It is not going to invite sites to present their proposals to CEAC in person. Questions will go through the CEAC liaison to the committee so they are not shut off from the schools questions. CEAC has a great deal to do and a short timeline to complete it. Any other considerations which need to be taken into account (e.g., LSSC) will be reviewed/included. AOC and CEAC recommendations will be reconciled and CEAC will send its final recommendations to the Board for consideration/approval.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Superintendent stated the administrative response is scheduled for June 9.
- A board member stated he liked the process described, particularly the elimination of the political aspects of the previous process; however, why is CEAC not going to allow for presentations by the schools? If schools have proposals CEAC has solicited (under guidelines being developed) they can request additional funds for projects at their school. CEAC will call for those proposals. Schools would have to argue on the basis of established criteria (LSSC, AYP, data from FCA/EAA).
- Relative to the questions posed by CEAC in the report, the Board has an obligation to address those which are still outstanding to assist the committee's work. Response: the questions are being answered, some of the difficult ones have not been pressed and there is uncertainty if they can be answered within the committee. CEAC will press the questions when appropriate (May or June) or let some of them go as the Committee decides they are no longer appropriate.
- School proposals would need to fit into various parameters (LSSC, FCA/EAA, etc.)
- Clarify school input. Schools will rank their deficiencies and submit back to CEAC, certain schools would be able to submit additional proposals for capital spending as determined by CEAC under guidelines which are being developed. There is a mathematical formula being put together which will identify those schools who can make additional proposals. The data comes directly out of the FCA/EAA report. Where trouble could come in is in "enhancements-Area 5". The schools and the Board need to follow the process established by CEAC by honoring the recommendations and holding the line. This will provide equity, a process that looks out for the entire organization/community.
- A request was made that a copy of the CEAC Chairs remarks be provided to the Board.

- CEAC has talked extensively about the political process; they have decided the FCA/EAA Report is a \$750,000 answer to the political question. Objective data is now available that says these schools need these things in roughly this order. CEAC can't stop schools from coming to the Board meeting and making comments but CEAC believes the report, the report, the report! It has focused on the fact that the report and the data are put together in such a way that they can be updated as things happen throughout the district and resources have been directed to do that. The answer to the political question continues to be data-driven, objective reports based on certain measurements that everyone agreed to prior to the report.
- The Superintendent stated she is deeply impressed with the work CEAC has been doing. She encouraged the Board to name committee members each year as quickly as possible in order to facilitate the committee's work.
- The Superintendent stressed it is important to be sure district facilities support the academic mission of the board. Part of providing a premier education for all is looking at the state demographics, the rightsizing/consolidation information, the FCA/EAA Report, the efficiency study piece, LSSC and being sure facility design meets those needs.
- Concern was expressed that this is just a proposal and is being presented as a finality. Concern was also expressed about having another layer in place for the buildings to go through to discuss needs and concerns for those buildings. It appears the purpose of the CEAC committee is being changed. One additional concern was the finality of relying on the report, greening of building issues, social concern issues around buildings are not addressed in the report. Response: the old process had two issues, those schools that have the intellectual means to submit quality proposals in a quality way had a huge advantage over the schools that did not. The process was never fair in that aspect. CEAC has discussed, to a limited extent, the grade issue. As for the sites coming to CEAC, CEAC is running out of time and the presentation to the Board must be made in late May or early June. There is simply not time for the schools to come before CEAC – as a value judgment it is not useful; on a practical level it is not possible. The process is not final; the proposed process recommendation has not been discussed by all of CEAC at this point, that will occur later this week.
- What about student input? CEAC has a student on the committee, who participates to the degree possible. At the schools, the necessity of student input, if and how it happens, would be up to the principal and the site council.
- What CEAC is attempting to do is to impose the same discipline on school principals and site councils as the report imposed on CEAC. There is a process for input from the sites, it has simply been streamlined. The process is an inclusive process but it does impose the same discipline on schools as on the Committee. The purpose is to achieve a process that is fair, equitable and factual.
- Is there a potential for two recommendations (CEAC vs. AOC)? No, time will be taken to reach a consensus between CEAC and Administration so there will be no conflicting recommendations. It was suggested it would be beneficial to define the process between CEAC and Administration to work out any differences that arise. Also, define administration's role in that sites need to submit their proposals to the CEAC staff liaison.
- The mechanism to do Internal on-going updates to the FCA/EAA data. What is CEAC considering around how to factor in major changes (school closing, program redesign)? How would those type changes affect prioritization? CEAC is working on factoring in program changes, simply because since the report was issued changes have occurred. Program changes are different than bricks and mortar, CEAC has experts on bricks and mortar (architects) CEAC is not so expert on program changes. Some on CEAC suggest the expertise is elsewhere in the administration and CEAC is not going to become expert in this area, it is not in the charge. Others argue it can't be ignored, so it is an issue that needs to be resolved. The process needs to reflect the full dimensionality of the various elements involved in change (school, administration, the Committee's responsibility).
- The Superintendent. stated Administration is pulling together a draft Master Operations Plan which will be a facilities plan as well. Guidance from administration will come out of the tightening of parameters around LSSC, the Operations plan, etc. so people have the guidance (academics, operations) they need to assist in their process.

- It was stated the District must make sure what is in a building supports the academic goals of the district.
- Concern was expressed over the breadth of the decisions facing the district, some will have a one year impact, some two, some a multi-year impact. Will CEAC receive input on what the LSSC may actually be so they can factor whatever those changes are into their decisions? The Superintendent responded yes, details would be supplied. The LSSC discussion begins May 5 at which time Administration's best thinking draft on proposed changes will be available to guide considerations.
- It was noted it is vitally important that initiatives are not dependent on individual schools but are moved as a system-driven initiative.
- A CEAC member suggested money should be spent with great reluctance as it is obvious that changes are going to be made and there will be needs over the next couple of years for which a prudent reserve will be needed. CEAC has discussed this as well as bonding issues. It has also considered the costs associated with closing schools and that money comes from the capital bonding money. Some of those costs will be recovered over the years but all of this needs to be considered in the equation.
- A question on bonding was raised; last year projects were avoided so a reserve could be held for the coming year. Although the bonding amount is limited by the State, the District would not want to exceed that by much even if it could because of the ratio of bonding to budget, is that true? That is true; however, under the Federal stimulus money there is a unique window of opportunity if a district is going to bond this is the cheapest way to do it for taxpayers. A request was made for clarification on bonding relative to the stimulus package; is it based on the budget or how does it work relative to ratings, etc. Administration has also requested clarification on bonding relative to this issue. Administration will provide the answer when it becomes available.
- A comment was made that the Cunningham study which has just been completed was (a) objective, it was intended to depoliticize the process so that it would be data driven based on real assessments; (b) the study created a 21st century model that addresses details and provides a firm basis on which valid decisions can be made on facts and (c) it adds more efficiency to the process.
- Regarding the ARRA, school construction, will there be any opportunities? No, there will be no new money at all; there is only a savings in interest which is a pass through back to the taxpayers. The window of opportunity which may provide more funds for capital work via the ARRA might be an answer. However, the pros and cons on doing a lift on the cap from the State for capital bonding must first be addressed.
- The CEAC Chair offered a clarification on (1) CEAC has discussed whether the proposed process appears too CEAC-centric, CEAC understands it is advisory to the Board. What is different from how things worked in the past and what is being proposed is that there is data on which to make and support decisions.

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

Motion passed.

4. Standing Item: School and Program Changes Update

A board member expressed disappointment that no report/update on school changes has been provided. He expressed concern about what is happening with schools under stages 4 and 5; how school and program changes are progressing. He expressed a desire for an opportunity to discuss this area.

5. Standing Item: Policy Update

The Policy Team met and discussed policies on honorary diplomas; a proposed policy will be presented at the COB meeting of May 5. The Team will review policies relative to LSSC as

soon as specific details become available. Procedures relating to the Wellness Policy are under development and will be brought forward soon.

The Superintendent requested a policy outlining what it means to receive an SPPS diploma and expectations leading to graduation in order to establish consistency in expectations. She specifically referenced the Kingsport, TN policy as a model.

6. Work Session

- **Discussion on Implementation /Phase In of BoardBook**

Information was provided on costs to implement the program along with a list of other considerations to be addressed. The Board expressed a consensus for a “soft start” for the public and a “hard start” for the Board to be implemented in July, 2009.

- **Superintendent Transition**

The Board Chair asked board members to reserve the date of Thursday, May 7 for a farewell reception for the Superintendent.

Board members were reminded of their retreat on Sunday, April 12 for a training session and the submission of questions for the facilitator to be given to the Chair as soon as possible.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:	Mr. Conlon moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Mr. Brodrick.
----------------	--

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk