

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD
May 5, 2009**

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

Staff: Supt. Carstarphen, Jill Cacy, Nancy Stachel, Michael Baumann, Michelle Walker, Suzanne Kelly, Jeremiah Ellis, Jim Engen, Maia Sierra, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Harold Turnquist, Brian Kinder, Judy Neece, Sheila Martin, Eliza Tocher, Matt Mohs, Liz Parr-Smestad, Kate Wilcox-Harris, D. Thomas, Nancy Walker, Vance Peterson, Richard Vanyo, Kaye Peters, Amberly Colbert, Lori Borgeson, Kathy Brown, Jayne Meza, Lisa Jones, Ashley Cannaday, Marty Gaslin, Frank Feinberg, M. St. Sauver, Marty Davis, Rebekah Doyle, Lori Haaland, Lori Borgesen, Shirley Heitzman, Steve Shellenberg, Hitesh Haria, Joe Raasch, Linda Dixon, Ann Lovrien, Jackie Felt, Teresa Rogers, Kathy Denman-Wilke, Fadi Fadhil, Bryan Digidio, Rich Vatergen, Dennis Hale, Pat Mergens, Dawn George, Mary See, Yusef Mgeni, Michael Thompson, Dan Rodriguez, Denise Quinlan, Stacey Akyea, Marcy Doud, Marilyn Baeker, Lois Vosika-Weir

Other: Doug Belden, Emily Johns, Sam Yang, Jacqueline Thomas, Maureen Sawyer, Kwasi Nate Russell, Bob Goerne, Alyce Gambrell, Amy Derwinski, Jerry Ostertag, Andy Mosca, Jeff Koon, Tisha Sherdan-Kurf, Pat Quinn, Bob Banks, Kody Kirk, Jennette Gudge, May Dore, Taman Ghidalia, Kathy Karun, Mary Catherine Ricker, Vallay Varro, John Albers, Richard Penny

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Committee Chair called the meeting to order at 4:47 p.m.

II. AGENDA

- **Quarterly Financial Report**
- **Presentation of Recommended 2009-2010 SPPS Budget (including Referendum Report) & Update on Federal Stimulus Package**
- **Recommendations for Large Scale System Change (LSSC) for 2010-2011**

1. Quarterly Financial Report

The Chief Budget Analyst stated the total projected general fund balance is projected to be \$61.2 million with \$31.1 million the reserved portion. The designated fund balance unreserved is projected at \$30.1 million, with \$3.2 million of it designated. The unreserved, undesignated fund balance is estimated at \$27 million or 5.1% of current year general fund expenditures which is within the guidelines established by the Board of at least 5%.

Revenue will be under budget by \$1.4 million due to lower than expected expenditures in several areas. Expenditures are projected to be under budget by \$6 million. Though there was some fluctuation in both revenue and expenditures from adopted budget, there is no major change anticipated in the financial position. There is no action required of the Board on this item.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Clarification was requested that current expenditures are below budget and it is anticipated that year-end expenditures will be below budget as well? Response, that is correct, but since expenditures fluctuate widely there are no projected figures at present.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved that the Committee of the Board recommend that the Board of Education accept the report. Motion seconded by Mr. Conlon.

Motion passed.

2. Presentation of Recommended 2009-2010 SPPS Budget (including Referendum Report) & Update on Federal Stimulus Package

The Superintendent extended her thanks to all principals, site councils, administrative staff and Business Office staff for pulling the presentations together. She stated the District is faced with another budget shortfall projected to be \$25 million. Enrollment decline and a structural deficit are the primary forces behind this shortfall. \$10 million of the deficit is a result of a projected drop in enrollment for 2009-10 centered at the secondary level, particularly at the senior high. The decline is projected to continue for next four years at minimum and will be an on-going structural deficit issue for the District. Several Initiatives have been initiated to target getting kids in school and keeping them in school but their impact is not yet being felt. This is a discussion which should continue between Board and administration in preparation for the FY 2010-11 budget. Additionally, there may be a need to make an additional \$10.4 million in cuts above the \$25 million for a total of \$35.4 million if the Senate's budget proposal survives conference committee and approval by the Governor. In the end the 2009-10 budget is balanced, moves important initiatives forward and sets the stage for continued improvement in future years while also taking into consideration the seriousness of the budget deficit.

The Interim Chief Financial Officer indicated the 2008-09 adopted budget was the base budget on which the 2009-10 budget was built. He explained the process used in formulating the budget. The \$25.1 million shortfall is still projected and plans have been put in place for an additional \$10.4 million in reductions should that become necessary.

He indicated extensive public participation has been obtained through input and comments from staff and the public have been gathered from five community meetings, general communications from the public, comments at Board meetings and through the SPPS web survey. He then reviewed the input obtained from the surveys to date. These responses indicate a majority of staff and other respondents agreed with all reductions except the following: ELL, Special Ed, Itinerant Music, Operations and School Allocations. While a majority of staff respondents did not agree with the recommendations to freeze Cost of Living Allowance or Health Insurance contribution increases, a majority of other respondents did agree with freezes in both areas. Further details and analysis will be provided once the survey closes at the end of May.

He then moved on to review the *2009-2010 Proposed Budget Book*, highlighting information contained within the various sections.

Administration reviewed the revised \$25.1 Million Budget Reduction Summary Chart which reflected changes made based on Board action at a previous COB meeting.

The Report on Referendum outlined how referendum funds have been utilized over the past two years. The District continues to allocate referendum money as originally promised in the areas of all day Kindergarten, early childhood family education, pre-Kindergarten, Secondary Programs (math and science), technology, ELL, special education, elementary support and allocation to charter schools.

Administration then moved on to the contingency plan which had been developed to address the worst case scenario of further budget reductions of \$10.4 million.

The final item in the report outlined the preliminary spending plan for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds in the areas of Title I and IDEA. The spending outlined in this area is projected over two years. The funds have a key guideline that it be used to supplements but not supplant.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Presentation of Recommended 2009-2010 SPPS Budget (including Referendum Report) & Update on Federal Stimulus Package as presented. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion passed.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Page 18, the contingency plan – are schools aware they may have to come up with an additional \$1.4 million for the contingency plan? The Superintendent stated the entire plan has been shared with schools and departments. The items highlighted in blue represent the Budget Office looking to find any other possible reductions that might be made in the very worst case scenario. Any reductions reflected are items which are funded out of the general fund not from referendum or designated funds.
- Clarification was sought that the items highlighted in green represent additional administrative recommendations for reductions on top of \$25 million. The other options highlighted yellow, red and blue, are those meant to be prioritized going down? The Superintendent responded to the first item, yes. The other highlighted items are not prioritized but they offer contingencies which can be worked with in order to reach the required amount of reduction depending upon legislative action. LSSC is independent of any of the budget recommendations (except the structural deficit portion) but connected in that you can't do the budget without looking at the future and current budget situation. LSSC is looking at the on-going structural deficit and changes which can be made which will set the District up for future success. The budget and LSSC are presented together so all of the information is out there with time to consider options.
- Pg 18, the two day closure; does this put the District in any kind of risk relative to State law or accreditation? Administration responded it depends where the two days are assigned. It wouldn't necessarily mean less teacher student contact time.
- Special Education and all day K, does this represent referendum dollars? No, these are the non-referendum portion of the items. What impact does the reduction have on those programs? It will mean a reduction in services.
- Clarification is needed on how and why particular decisions were made. What process and criteria were used in deciding which programs received cuts and which were spared? Specific cases: athletics – how was the original number of \$650,000 arrived at when the budget committee recommended at lesser figure? Conversely there are no reductions aimed at professional development or content coaches. A caution was issued that if the decision was made that this area should not be touched, be sure the criteria, determination and process is transparent. There needs to be clarification of the rationale for decisions made, why some programs are impacted and others not. Clarification should be provided between now and the June budget approval. The Superintendent stated there is a process; there is a budget committee which worked on the

recommendations and continues to vet ideas. The District's commitment this year was addressing one simple fact; the District is in a structural deficit coupled with a very bad economy along with past decisions which are impacting the present situation. All of the contingency items submitted are recommendations; the Board does have final say. The administrative proposal brought together the best people (school based to central admin) to develop the proposal consisting of their best recommendations. Administration brings forward these recommendations; the Board can bring proposals or scenarios which can be considered as well. The reason why the District values the content coach design (Strategic Plan Key Strategy F Comprehensive Professional Development and Job Embedded Professional Model for Teachers) is that it directly and effectively addresses employee effectiveness and development (part of LSSC) through the use of research-based best practices. This design offers the best outcomes for students through improved quality contact between the teacher and students.

- What is the actual impact of staff cuts with the \$25 million reduction and if additional cuts are implemented? The initial reductions will result in a total of 265 staff being impacted. If the contingency is implemented it will impact an additional 25 administrators; the school based number is still in flux.
- How will ARRA funds impact staff reductions? ARRA monies are to be used to save jobs and to provide reform. This will more than likely result in the creation of new positions aligned to new designs.
- Can admin provide ways in which staff and community can share ideas, opinions on how to use the money, shape the budget as there may not be time at the input sessions for everyone to bring their ideas forward. Community Relations responded the on-line survey provides opportunities for this kind of input on both the budget and LSSC.
- Teachers on special assignments (TOSAs) who are proposed for elimination, will they go back to classroom or will they replace cuts in other areas? Will administrative reductions be filled by TOSAs? Admin responded typically when TOSAs are cut they go back to the classroom. Relative to the ARRA funds with new designs and new positions, staff that are cut are being encouraged to apply for the new positions/vacancies which open.
- School closings – will the buildings be mothballed, repurposed, what? Two will be closed with no immediate use planned. One will have the current program closed and the building repurposed to another use. Costs will vary due to many different factors. The Board will need to consider building use over the future before any specific plans are made for disposal, etc.
- Layoffs, are the 265 layoffs a net 265 or would it decrease under ARRA funding? The 265 is not the net because a detailed spending plan has not been developed for the jobs which might develop under ARRA. All things will not remain equal, each fiscal year of ARRA funding will be different so there could be change in each of the two years. The key is to have a plan and be able to adjust the plan as things evolve.
- Administration was requested to keep some of the ARRA information on the front burner for everyone. The more information the Board has available to it the better they can refer inquiries appropriately. It is the process and answers to how it will work.
- A comment was made that the increased emphasis on professional development was put in place because there was an increased expectations for student performance. Staff performance and development was put in place in order to allow staff to meet the expectations of them. Content coaches have a direct impact on student achievement and most are in classrooms; they meet a real need for support to teachers in achieving expectations.
- Will the district be more efficient at the end of cuts and use of ARRA funds? Will things be changed significantly? Administration responded it has been stated that how the ARRA funding is used in the next two years will determine the future of urban education for next 30 years. ARRA anticipates that districts will make tough cuts in this economy and not just keep jobs but create jobs designed for the reform model. They are not telling districts how to accomplish this, they are supplying the money and depending on the districts to accomplish the task. NCLB operated with a lot of directives, the ARRA funds

can be utilized to design and evolve programs (district by district) that will be successful. The first round of money is a district's to use for design. Old unsuccessful designs must be given up and new, creative positions/programs need to be put in place. Districts need to be smart in using the funds in order to meet the expectations for reform and immediate outcomes in order to have access to the second and third rounds of funding. This will go from everyone gets to only a few get. If the District is able to be successful in Round 1, 2 and 3 then whatever has been created (even though the District is facing 5 years and \$100 million of cuts due to the structural deficit) needs to be the right and the provide the reforms needed for the students. The ARRA funds are giving the District a step-up to try to create those positions/program that will make a difference; that in the future the District will be willing to give up even more to ensure the positions/programs created are kept and on-going. The expectation is that THERE WILL BE REFORM.

The Superintendent stated the 2010–11 budget will need to be even tighter than this year's. She encouraged the Board to begin making assignments to CEAC and CBFAC now and to include more teachers and parents. The budget process will begin even earlier for next year and it is beneficial to spend a couple months training committee members and educating the community before the budget process really begins. This allows time for conversation and feedback.

3. Recommendations for Large Scale System Change (LSSC) for 2010-2011

The Superintendent opened the discussion stating St. Paul Public Schools (SPPS) is at a crossroads; business as usual is not a sustainable option for achieving its missions. LSSC is designed to provide major systemic changes that will move the District forward. The Board may want/need to move up various aspects of LSSC proposals depending on what challenges face the District. Board may want to begin formulating its actions so they can be considered by the community. Choices must be made to address the systemic issues the District is facing.

The Chief Accountability Officer then outlined the reasons why change is necessary:

- Only half SPPS students are proficient in reading; less than half are proficient in math.
- The achievement gap between white students and students of color is among the widest in the nation.
- Federal and State expectations for student achievement are accelerating
- SPPS is experiencing enrollment declines of approximately 500-600 students a year.
- Projected revenues will not support current and future budget demands, creating a structural deficit.
- The SPPS infrastructure is intended to support more than 45,000 students yet today it has fewer than 40,000 students.
- District resources are spread across a fixed infrastructure making it difficult to provide needed additional academic supports.

Administration selected a guiding question to direct their work on large-scale system change. Given everything known about the District's situation, the efforts of others to improve urban school districts and the experience of America's most effective public or private sector organizations, do we believe our district is currently organized and managed at all levels to produce the results we must have: a premier education for all?

Six input opportunities were conducted for the community and staff to provide feedback in five areas: academics, budget, enrollment, rightsizing/consolidation and school choice. The common themes gained from the input sessions were:

- Academics: lower class sizes, differentiate instruction to close gaps; replicate successful programs; explore more 5-8, K-8 options; improve communication between teachers and parents; and increase cultural proficiency.

- Budget: keep programs that work, cut programs that don't work; be transparent about reductions in administrative costs as enrollment declines and equalize academic programs and offerings across the district.
- Enrollment: choice keeps families in the district, not enough spaces at popular programs turns people away; start early (ECFE, Pre-kindergarten) and focus on improving the elementary/middle connection (marketing, recruitment, K-8 or K-4/5-8 programming); keep class sizes consistent across the district; and examine reasons why parents are choosing schools (charters and in-demand district schools) and change district practices.
- Rightsizing/Consolidation: take into consideration the school-community connections (resources they provide to each other); smaller schools and smaller class sizes are working well (large schools can feel small with smaller programs within them); replicate the schools/programs that have high demand, i.e., at or over capacity, possibly geographically/regionally; look first to close/consolidate administrative sites (e.g., move them into schools with capacity); and consider transportation and how it affects families' choice of schools, specifically the 1-mile radius for busing.
- School choice: choice is a strength, the district has good options and variety and must keep them; conversely, there are too many choices, the systems is too complex to understand; current application/enrollment process is complicated and hard to understand, it also pits schools against one another; focus of academic/program areas which need to be clearly defined; and there is a need to clearly define the pathway between schools (elementary to middle/junior to high school).

These input sessions led to the formulation of the following guiding principles, large-scale system change will:

- Target services to areas that will make the most impact on student achievement
- Scale-up research-based, successful models
- Retain and/or expand high demand, successful programs
- Remove institutional barriers to student and staff success
- Align resources to district priorities
- Seek equitable distribution of programs and resources
- Provide sustainable solutions
- Build internal capacity
- Eliminate ineffective programs
- Meet local, State and Federal accountability obligations.
- Consider community and ancillary implications
- Include all schools, programs and systems regardless of funding source.

The Chief Accountability Officer then reviewed the process through which LSSC recommendations were developed and reviewed the opportunities for reform as presented at the September 4, 2008 COB meeting. She went on the review the current administrative proposal for LSSC recommendations to raise the bar on learning for all students, close the achievement gap and address the structural deficit.

- Academic Reforms (on-going work)
 - Continue implementation of SPPS Key Power Action Items from the Strategic Plan
 - Access Federal Stimulus Funding to accelerate reform opportunities
- Employee Effectiveness and Development
 - Implement Performance Management System for All Employees (professional development and improvement process)
 - Negotiate more flexible labor agreements (seniority and tenure changes)
 - Submit Q-Comp plan to access State revenue
- Rightsizing/Consolidation
 - Closure of building(s) and program(s) – Roosevelt & Longfellow Elementary
 - Closure of program, repurpose of building – Sheridan Elementary
 - Merged program (Humboldt Jr.)
- School Choice

- Revise application preferences from fourteen (14) to seven (7) levels
- Change the school choice system to a three region model, retain one mile transportation option – allow students to attend any school in their region seven schools remain city-wide schools, four will be half city-wide.

The Chief Accountability Officer then moved on to discuss actions which are also under consideration for the 2010-11 school year; specific proposals will be presented by Fall 2009.

- On-going Development of School and Program Changes
 - Articulation of language immersion programs (Spanish and French)
 - Articulation of International Baccalaureate programs K-12
 - Articulation of culturally-specific programming
 - Replication of schools/programs with high demand.
- Middle Grade Configuration Change
 - Change elementary school structure to Pre-K-5 or K-5
 - Change middle school structure to 6-8 (given implementation feasibility)
- Master Operations Plan
 - Adopt and implement Information Technology Strategy, Leasing Strategy and Facilities Master Plan (this may necessitate additional rightsizing/consolidation)

She stated in order to implement the proposed administrative recommendations, board action may include approval of: school closures (MN Statute 123B.51, pending possible 2009 changes); changes in attendance areas (Board Policy 502.00); changes in transportation eligibility (Board Policy 707.00); changes in elementary and middle grade configuration (MN Statute 123B.02) and more flexible labor agreements (as negotiated).

The discussion then moved on to the scenario development process. For the discussion scenario was defined as a potential course of action that directs where to consider adjusting current operations and methods. The purpose of developing scenarios is to identify where and how the “need for change” can realistically be addressed given managerial, organizational, economic and political considerations and conditions. Scenario Task Teams were assigned the tasks of reviewing goals and feasibility requirements, reviewing community feedback themes, developing scenario recommendations starting with critical success factors, reviewing funding/budget needs and analyzing the result using decision-making matrix.

ACADEMIC REFORMS will concentrate on Key Power Action Items from the Strategic Plan:

- Comprehensive professional development with a focus on cultural proficiency
- Stable funding; “SPPS as a wise investment”
- High expectations with a focus on literacy
- Addressing the gaps with a focus on transitions
- System alignment with a focus on efficiency and effectiveness
- A safe, welcoming and respectful environment with a focus on behavior.

Federal stimulus funding will be accessed under the following planning assumptions:

- Use of the funding as leverage for sustainable long-term district-wide change
- Implementation of well-designed research-based systems that maximize resources
- Increased fidelity of implementation through alignment with existing efforts
- Use of a project management approach to set and meet clear benchmarks and timelines.

In the area of **college and career readiness**, SPPS will use stimulus funding to advance the following reforms:

- Implementation of a comprehensive audit of PreK-12 curriculum to ensure rigor of academic courses and identify the efficacy of current interventions

- Identification and implementation of consistent assessment tools (benchmarks, end-of-course exams, progress monitoring) to continuously measure student performance and provide timely information for instruction.
- Implementation of specific elementary and secondary reform efforts to ensure alignment within and across schools and support seamless transitions for students.

In the elementary area, reform efforts will include: ensuring fidelity of implementation of a 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.

Secondary level reform efforts will use stimulus funding to: implement a two-year instructional coaching surge to provide intense support and accountability for tiered interventions in literacy, math and behavior; accelerate development and consistent implementation of district curriculum in literacy and math; and identification and implementation of research-based content literacy reform.

SPPS will use stimulus funding to advance the following **interventions** for low-performing and struggling students:

- Development and implementation of a Response to Intervention (RTI) Model that matches instruction to student needs and provides different levels of support as needed
- Development and implementation of a Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) to decrease office referrals and suspensions, and improve attendance, school climate and behavior.
- Integration of cultural proficiency into all practices to address the factors that contribute to achievement gaps, including disproportionate referral and identification of children of color to special education.

Interventions for schools not meeting District and State expectations for two or more years will mean 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 (dual language/immersion, STEM, AVID expansion)
- Redesigned academic school day and school year and effective use of out of school time including such things as on-going reform of summer school, pilot of the “ideal day,” creative and effective use of extended day and year.

Federal stimulus funds will be used to advance the following in the area of **teacher effectiveness**:

- Development and implementation of a monitored structure for teacher placement
- Realignment of staff resources and program models to improve support to teachers in the IEP process
- Enhancement of professional development to expand the 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.

In the area of **education data systems**, SPPS will use stimulus funding to develop, enhance and align data systems 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, and

- Improve compliance and better manage special education staffing.

The **EMPLOYEE EFFECTIVENESS AND DEVELOPMENT** project will:

- Create and implement a performance management system for all employees to include incentives and modifications to current contract, tenure and seniority process.
- Modify employee labor agreements (through negotiation) to better support: current and changing educational contexts to close the achievement gap and raise the bar on learning for all students; the selection, identification, evaluation and compensation of staff based on agreed performance indicators; optimization of skills to position expectations; professional development for all staff and develop and implement a monitored structure for teacher placement.

Planning assumptions in this area note that (1) in order to improve performance for all students and increase the graduation rate, it is imperative that SPPS create a system to ensure that the most highly effective classroom teachers and administrators are working with the students. It was stated that five years of effective teaching can completely close the gap between low-income students and others. (2) A comprehensive performance management system will ensure ineffective staff are improved or removed from the district. (3) Increased accountability will be supported across all levels of the organizations. (4) The State must approve the SPPS Q-Comp plan; and (5) support is needed from employee unions/members to implement these changes.

The discussion then moved on to review the course of action for each of the above areas noting estimated cost savings; key features and steps which need to be taken as well as an analysis of various aspects for each area. A risk assessment was provided for the various courses of action.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Concern was expressed with the language in several areas of the presentation. It was felt things were being proposed publicly which need to be negotiated before they can be implemented.

Mr. Brodrick moved that slides 16, 17, 19, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40 and 41 be laid on the table until presented to the appropriate bargaining units. Following a brief discussion, Mr. Brodrick withdrew the motion until a later point in the meeting.

- Who was involved in the scenario teams? Administration responded the teams were made up of director or higher level administrators from the following departments: Business & Financial Affairs, Professional Development, Early Childhood, Educational Equity, ELL, all Executive Directors, HR/Employee Relations, Operations, Research, Evaluation & Assessment, Schools (Elementary, Secondary) Special Ed, Student Placement and Community Relations. From the schools there was no one lower than principal level. The Board was reminded that the recommendations are administrative recommendations.
- Clarification was sought regarding the assumption whether current labor arrangements would not enable the district to access Q-Comp dollars and whether the current system of tenure and evaluation is not workable for proper evaluation of teachers? Administration responded this isn't all about teaching staff or one particular union. The conversation will take place across all groups (all employees). What is being said is that across the entire institution collective performance should be looked at in a way that changes practices to better support schools and students. The District needs to be more transparent about how decisions are made. The scenario teams looked at all employee groups, these recommendations reflect their thinking about how to address the deficit, get better employee outcomes and develop a better structure for compensation and development.

The end result desired is a more supported, developed employee team to match with all other reforms.

- It was stated clarification of the language needs to be done so the wrong interpretation is not made, particularly the slides mentioned earlier.
- The program called "Peer Assistance and Review" is that a program being considered? Administration responded the Professional Issues Committee has had a presentation on this program (there are also other models on this) and it is being discussed. It offers support opportunity for non-tenured teachers or struggling teachers particularly through peer assistance.

The **RIGHTSIZING/CONSOLIDATION** project's challenge is that the current infrastructure exceeds need. The objective of the project is to provide an equitable distribution of educational opportunities by closing/repurposing school buildings and bringing fixed infrastructure costs in line with existing budgets and enrollment. Recommendations being brought forward are for the SY 2010-11 unless SY 09-10 required budget reductions necessitate immediate implementation of school closures. (It was noted Humboldt Jr. and Sr. High Schools began merging in 2008-09.)

Primary criteria in rightsizing/consolidation include: educational value/academic performance, facility condition and enrollment/trends (these are measurable factors). Secondary factors which are more subjective include such things as: investments/resource considerations, site specific considerations if operating at capacity, implementation considerations and unintended consequences. Other criteria factored in included: the Facilities Condition and Educational Adequacy Assessment data; district-wide enrollment projections and student demographics.

In setting targets for rightsizing, capacity calculations from the Facilities Condition and Educational Adequacy Assessment used SY 08-09 enrollment to identify surplus capacity. Planning assumptions show:

- Future enrollment projections indicate elementary grades (PreK-6) will remain steady for the next four years; middle grades (7-8) project a three year decline and high school (9-12) project a five year decline.
- District capacity projections (approximate) show elementary with a surplus capacity of 1,560; middle a surplus capacity of 570 and high school an overall deficit of 620 (high school students are not evenly distributed amongst the schools with individual schools either over or under capacity levels resulting in waiting lists at some and numerous openings at others. This deficit will become a surplus in future years.) The target is to match district capacity with enrollment needs.

School programs were examined using data from a wide variety of sources. The cost analysis showed closure of a school brings savings in three areas: operating expenses (utilities, supplies, security, maintenance, etc.), instructional program salaries and transportation. Repurposing a facility generally requires capital improvement to meet the needs of the new program or facility use.

Course of action assumptions asked that the initial recommended actions regarding rightsizing/consolidation hold true regardless of changes to the school choice system or changes to grade level configurations. Recommendations are based on current elementary and middle level grade configurations and future recommendations will require decisions on grade configurations and school choice.

Administration stated the following recommendations are for SY 2010-11 (unless SY 2009-10 required budget reductions necessitate immediate implementation of school closures).

- Closure of building and program at Longfellow and Roosevelt Elementary sites
- Closure of program and repurposing of building at the Sheridan Elementary site

- Merged program – Humboldt Junior (per 2008-09 program change and redesign)

Administration presented a cost and capacity analysis as well as a risk assessment for the recommendations brought forward.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Recommended school closure – when would approval of closures be required? What are expectations about adequate notification? Administration responded the scenario presented is for closure in the 2010-11 school year. Administration is bringing recommendations forward now and administration will provide information on when action is appropriate at a later date. The earliest at would be June 16 or July but the Board should not wait into November or December. There are State requirements for public notification which need to be addressed. Notification must be published in *The Legal Ledger*, two public hearings need to be held, etc. A request was made that the process be defined for Board members so they know the details. There is a need to pay attention to details and impacts decisions may have on other entities.
- The Superintendent stated beyond the two recommended closings and the one program closing/building repurposing and the Humboldt alignment, the only other possibility which might be considered is the articulation of the American Indian Education Program as they have requested. This would have an impact on World Cultures so all of the details/permutations of this need to be looked at. These changes should be sufficient to stabilize the District for a few years. The high school issue can be solved through looking at the distribution of students and rethinking how available space is used.
- Staff at the buildings being proposed for closure. Will staff move to other locations and will they be disadvantaged by being at school scheduled for closure? There is a process through HR and contracts on how this process is handled and which offers protection to staff. Has thought been given to students and families and a process for creating the greatest number of opportunities for families? Administration was asked that it provide the Board with some thoughts in this area prior to the Board making the final decision -- about choices/options/processes available to the school community.
- There are two different things. (1) the process at the schools which requires a public hearing process and those dates are to be determined. If the Board were to take action on the closures by June 16 it would give administration a good 14-15 months to implement the process. (2) In terms of what can be provided to the families and staff at the schools directly affected, it would be ideal to have a full year to do that. A process of incentives for families as they work through the school choice process for the following year needs to be developed. The more time administration has to work out details (what the school change/choice and attendance area process might be) the better in order to take families and staff through what the change means to them, what options are there for them and to allow time for the grieving process.
- Slide 51 – will the Board receive a matrix for each the three schools with information on why the schools were selected? Administration responded that would be provided.
- RE: Slide 53 – please provide a breakdown of cost savings in more detail for each school.
- Have the schools been notified? The names of schools were shared on May 5; the schools and families have been notified along with the City and anyone else it was necessary to notify. Can the schools revisit their SCIP plan to make revisions? Yes.
- What kind of feedback can be anticipated from community and teachers? It will depend on how Board frames the issues. The community should be allowed to share whatever they wish. Closures will generate different responses from repurposing.
- What would it take to keep the schools open? The bottom line is around enrollment; the school age kids are not there. If the schools don't close, new revenue needs to be generated. Some schools are already subsidized just so they can stay open. Some funding might be gotten through more partnerships, new initiatives (Q-Comp, new

referendum or by making tougher decisions about transportation, etc.). In the end it is either generate revenue or cut somewhere else.

- The statement was made there is a need to recognize that the State legislature is not recognizing how far the state is behind in funding education and the impact this lack is having on education.
- What are the reasons for recommending these schools? Are the issues clearly enrollment issues or are there other reasons why they were chosen? The Board needs a defensible position. Administration responded the primary course of action criteria for closings included academic performance, facilities condition, enrollment projections and capacity comparisons as well as secondary (unique circumstances) factors around the individual school.

Administration then moved on to a discussion of **SCHOOL CHOICE**. The current system identifies preferences that serve as tiebreakers to use when there are more applications received than space available; while necessary, the more preferences, the more complex the system of school choice. Administration reviewed the current levels of application preference and offered definitions of terms used in these applications. They also offered an overview of student demographics overlaid on the District map. They brought forward proposed application preference assumptions under two models.

- Regional model (would reduce levels of preference)
 - Current attendance areas and preference areas would be eliminated
 - The Region is the new attendance area
 - There would be a defined walking area which will determine preference into a school
 - Articulation preference within the region would be given where continuations for a specialty program exist
 - Current board action giving preference to in-district students over out-of-district students would remain
- Neighborhood Model
 - Uses attendance areas currently identified
 - To be determined is whether the 10 schools with city-wide transportation have any kind of attendance or preference area (use current ones?)
 - Current board action give preference to in-district students over out-of-district students

Assumptions utilized in the analysis of the two models were:

- Regional model:
 - In the first year of the regional plan, those students who are able to remain in their current school will remain there.
 - Students no longer able to attend their current school will move to a SPPS school within their region
 - Enrollment patterns within a region will change slowly over more than one year; transportation patterns will adjust gradually also.
 - The impact of the changes in the walking distance would be marginal in the first few years, but may increase over time.
- Neighborhood model
 - Implementation of the neighborhood model will require significant movement the first year as students in all schools except the 10 citywide schools will no longer have transportation.
 - Students who live in an attendance area will attend their attendance area school unless they apply to another school.
 - Enrollment at some schools will change dramatically both in terms of number of students enrolled and student demographics
 - There will be many mid-year changes in school assignment for students who are mobile. These same changes will impact some schools much more than others.

- The impact of the changes in the walking distance will be marginal in the first few years but may increase over time.

Administration provided an in-depth discussion of the various alternatives as well as a risk assessment for each. Administration is recommending a three-region city model which would retain one-mile transportation with seven city-wide schools and four half city-wide models.

The presentation wrapped up with a reiteration of the recommendations in each of the four areas and a review of next steps and the timeline.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The schools proposed for closing, could they be given the option to opt out of transportation if they could remain open? Administration responded there is a Equal Treatment Law the District must comply with and the greater point is it doesn't change putting a bus on the road. Administration will look into the issue.
- The citywide schools, do they still have waiting lists? Would moving popular programs into various areas of city alleviate some of the pressure and draw more students? This expansion is under consideration, at least doing it over time. Other draws are all day Kindergarten and where the school is relative to day care.
- The comment was made that if transportation is redone the benefit/cost savings needs to be greater than \$2.2 million. How were the regional lines determined and why the 3 region? The lines for the regions were drawn around natural transportation barriers (University Avenue, 35E) A number of possibilities were looked at and the three region model worked best and was most balanced in terms of reducing complexity and balancing the number of children and demographics in the region. Would four regions have been more costly? Not all models were costed out due to the amount of time each model took to develop and constraints on staff time. It was partially cost but other factors taken into consideration included natural transportation plan barrier, replication of where existing buildings were located, where the population was, racial balance; the three region came out best in the overall. A concern was expressed about Region 3 having so many more kids. Explanation of the reasons for some of the decisions around the three region model would be beneficial. Administration indicated they would provide highlights relative to the decisions.
- The proposal is to close one of the west side elementary schools, merge the junior and senior high. Could administration provide an overview of history as to why there are three K-6 programs on the West Side. How will the District market the merged junior/senior high and the two remaining elementary schools on the west side to make them successful? The Chief Community Relations Officer responded the best marketing tool is the experience families have at the school. Word of mouth spreads. The District offers support to schools in their own marketing with tools so they can retain the students they have and then tell others about the positive experience. Other systemic efforts include what can be done to connect with upcoming family members and ensure they stay in the district schools. For high schools the district is working on addressing transitions across schools. The District wants to work directly with the schools, provide systemic support related to transitions and surveys and focus groups to obtain input on why parents choose schools and why they choose not to attend some schools.
- A warning was given relative to the complexity of the decisions facing the district: avoid becoming so overwhelmed that decision are made carelessly and avoid becoming so overwhelmed that NO decisions can be made.
- Specific to Slides 63 and 66 – the risk assessment relative to the issue of race and the achievement gaps. It is widely spread across the maps and historically is an indication of where all previous efforts have failed to provide the kind of education that will have all students attend school and graduate. The reasons for not achieving at more than just a student's ability are systemic issues that have happened over time to particular groups of people. The Board was encouraged to push ahead in providing opportunities so that

students of color and poor students have a better future. There is a reality is actual students have not benefited from what has already been provided. The positive is that there is a defined, comprehensive approach to define how to change what has not worked. Administration was asked to provide information on outcomes and impact for the students who have not been performing in the district. There is a need to address institutional racism and find ways for the community of color to bring their thoughts forward as well. The Board will look for outcomes that actually will change the success and achievement for students of color in this district.

The Superintendent responded the whole presentation around change started with academics because that is the key thing which has to be done; this means rigor, high quality offerings at every school and knowing it is happening at every school through accountability and assessment (Curricular Design). Testing is the second piece by enhancing data systems to monitor results and change outcomes in real time. The third piece is what is taught; the teacher quality piece. What is happening day to day between the student and teacher and how that is managed in a way which gives very clear guidance and support (employee effectiveness). Rightsizing and school choice are things designed to support what is being done in the other three areas. The District will offer choice, but the number of choices will be fewer and those replications of successful programs. The rightsizing and school choice must support the academic direction and what the staff needs to be the best staff that money can buy. It is essential that the academic and employee effectiveness & development pieces to be at the heart of LSSC.

- Partnerships can help in solving some issues (housing for poor, safe neighborhoods, etc.) The community needs to hear and understand and help the District so a point can be reached where shared accountability around various issues can be established so schools can get better at academics and employee development in order to address student achievement and the achievement gap The District can no longer do it alone.
- The statement was made that if the district and community are prepared to have a model with best programs working and located where they are most effective, it must be willing to give up allegiance to a school building and move to a model of locating programs within the district to provide the most benefit to the most students. Professional development in this context is enabling people to achieve the best they possibly can and to give their best for their students.

The Superintendent stated the District is not trying to change, shorten or end seniority and tenure. The District is trying to change programs and results utilizing the Federal stimulus money in order to get at the second and third round of stimulus dollars. It is about how to get the most seasoned, best qualified teachers working with the neediest children. When talking about guidance on the Federal stimulus funds it is about how to make the most/best happen in the shortest time possible with the greatest impact for kids. It is marrying all the parts to be competitive by showing how many senior, tenured teachers are placed where they can help the kids who need them most.

She went on to say if the District wants to get the money and if it wants to be competitive it must be made to happen within the time period when the money is available. The District needs to be ready to spend quickly, save jobs but at the same time make significant reforms. The results must be demonstrated in one year if there is even to be a hope to get money in the second year while at the same time providing guidance as schools staff for the upcoming year.

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved, seconded by Mr. Hardy, that the Committee of the Board recommend that the Board of Education instruct administration, on the slides containing items which need to be negotiated, that those items on those slides be deleted until a meeting with district negotiators is held for guidance or that the Teachers' Union be brought to the table for the rewriting of those slides. Slides noted were 16, 17, 19, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41 and 69.

MOTION FAILED -- 5 No, 2 Yes.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Conlon stated he would vote no as the slides are already out there, he supports dialogue on the issues but doesn't support changes..
- Mr. Goldstein stated it should be made clear that language pertaining to negotiated items will not be discussed in public and the slides should be clarified not deleted as they contain valuable information.
- Ms. Carroll stated these were important topics for discussion and it is critical they not be buried but discussed openly and transparently. There needs to be a bigger conversation about what makes sense and what would work. The Board is not making decisions about items which are subject to negotiation in this context.
- Ms Kong-Thao stated she was in favor of moving forward but that administration reword the slides in order to clarify the connections and options.
- Mr. Hardy stated he favored the motion stating what concerns him is the specific wording of the current slides came from administrative level and he would like to see the language modified. He stated the Board may have missed an opportunity to get the other voices input first on what could have been brought to the public.
- Clarification was sought on specifically what items on each slide would need to be deleted relative to the motion.
- It was recognized the language needs to be clarified within context. The Board asked administration, in consultation with, in particular, the Teachers' Federation, rethink the whole section in a way that comprehensively communicates the dot connecting and addresses the things which might be misunderstood. There needs to be a more substantive revision. It was suggested that Board members concerned participate.
- What is critical is to present the context, the dot connecting and the topics that need to be explored.
- The Superintendent clarified that administration is not asking for any kind of action on the materials reported relative to LSSC. She asked for Board guidance on whether the Board would like administration to work with other groups first prior to bringing it to the Board? Response: No.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education instruct administration, prior to May 12, to revise the Employee Effectiveness section to (1) more clearly connect content with other major systemic change issues and (2) that the explicit words the board has identified as causing unnecessary confusion and concern be addressed. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Hardy stated considering the importance of this topic, it is time to change past practices and involve other voices in the revisions. This was added as a friendly amendment. That the St. Paul Teachers' Federation be invited to participate in the revisions.
- Ms. Richter of the Teachers' Federation stated the Federation was now in negotiation with SPPS and she could not sit in a separate venue at this time.
- Ms Carroll stated if everyone was in agreement on what revisions were necessary she would withdraw the motion.
- The Chair stated the interest of the Board has been recognized and it is not necessary to put it into a motion which is not appropriate or possible.

Mr. Conlon called the question. Ms. Carroll withdrew the motion.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education receive the report. Seconded by Mr. Conlon.

Mr. Goldstein offered a friendly amendment that Administration will, prior to May 12, to revise the Employee Effectiveness section to (1) more clearly connect content with other major systemic change issues and (2) that the explicit words the board has identified as causing unnecessary confusion and concern will be addressed. Amendment was not accepted.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education receive the report. Seconded by Mr. Conlon.

Motion Passed.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Brodrick again stated he had difficulty supporting the motion with the language currently in the report.
- The Chair asked that Board members to submit any additional questions on LSSC via e-mail to the Superintendent or the Board Secretary.

Ms. Kong-Thao asked that, due the lateness of the evening and the general exhaustion of the Board and audience, the remaining agenda items be tabled and addressed either through the Superintendent's Update or rescheduled. There was a consensus that this be done.

4. Standing Item: Policy Update
5. Standing Item: School and Program Changes Update
6. Work Session

The Superintendent extended her thanks to all staff members involved for the extensive work devoted to production of the LSSC report. The Board also thanked and complimented staff on the depth and breadth of the materials presented.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, the meeting adjourned,

Motion Passed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk