

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD
June 9, 2009**

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

Staff: Superintendent Carstarphen, Michael Baumann, Michelle Walker, Christine Wroblewski, Suzanne Kelly, Jim Engen, Kathy Brown, Harold Turnquist, Dave Peterson, Joe Raasch, Hitesh Haria, Teresa Rogers, Cody Harris, Tim Hagker, Ellen Peck, Chuck Peck, Patricia Oneill, Rebekah Doyle, Jessica Chiasson, Jessica Maya, Jeremiah Ellis, Jaber Alsiddiqui, Cecilia Dodge, Dennis Hale, Kevin Umidon, Valeria Silva,

Other: Alyce Gumbrell, Joann Ellis, Ken Schultz, Jan Magrane, Jonelle Ringolde, Andy Mosca, Dennis Hale, John Krenik, Al Oertwig, Kevin Huepenbecker, JoAnn Clark, Thesban Green, Jennette Gudgel, Cricket James

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:56 p.m.

II. AGENDA

1. Master Operations Plan

The Chief Operations Officer indicated operations are a fulfillment function aligned to district priorities and the Strategic Plan. The department reviews how it serves students every day and looks for areas of future focus. District-wide strategic operational initiatives include: large scale system changes, the Facilities Condition and Education Adequacy Assessments (FCA/EAA) and a strategy to address technology.

Operations encompass six primary areas: facility operations and maintenance, nutrition and commercial services, transportation, information technology, facility planning and security and emergency management. Initiatives within some of these areas include:

- Large scale system change initiatives include school choice/transportation; rightsizing/consolidation; efficiency and effectiveness, budget and academics to strategically reorganize for success.
- Facilities Condition and Education Adequacy Assessments' on-going work includes: a facilities master plan; a deferred maintenance schedule, a leasing strategy and revised capital bonding request process to provide data-driven decisions for district-wide facilities investments.
- The technology strategy impacts everything done within the district to support student achievement, provides for staff needs, infrastructure in support of current and future uses; integration of hardware, software, data warehousing and technology teaching methods in order to align technology systems to district priorities.

The master Operations Plan highlights key operations strategies within a framework in support of a premier education for all.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Master Operations Plan and extend the Board's thanks for its development. Mr. Brodrick seconded the motion.

Motion passed (Unanimous)

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The comment was made that one key to providing a premier education for all and marketing the district is what is done with information technology and what can be done with it in the future.
- Input was offered on revisions to the document. Administration responded there is a specific model for the district communication structure and there are implementation guides which flesh out the various areas addressed within the master plan.
- Thanks were extended to Operations for fitting the master plan to the strategic plan and tying it to academics

2. SY 2009-2010 Transportation Bids including (Annual Vendor Performance Report Including Utilization of Sick Leave, Turnover, Recruitment & Retention)

The Chief Operations Officer stated transportation bids were opened on June 4 and provided to Board members on June 8 for their review prior to the meeting. Additionally, recruitment and retention plans were provide for Board review along with turnover rates and sick leave utilization practices for each of the lines submitting bids. For SY 2009-10 there are only minor changes affecting school start times: Nokomis Montessori Magnet School has a five minute later start and Franklin Music Magnet will operate on a five minute earlier start schedule.

All St. Paul school bus contractors were in compliance with District contract and operational standards for the 2008-009 school year. District safety staff conducted random compliance audits of all of SPPS contractors this spring. The areas audited were compliance with Federal Regulations and Minnesota Statutes and compliance with contract requirements. A GPS requirement has been implemented this year so all buses will carry GPS tracking devices which will allow the district to track arrival, pick-up, stop timing, etc.

The contract period for the transportation bids runs from September 7, 2009 through June 13, 2010. There was approximately a 1.5% decrease in route service bids over previous year and approximately a 2.6% increase in field and athletic trip rates over previous year. The net result was a \$700,000 budgetary savings for the upcoming year.

MOTION: Ms Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Brodrick, that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to award basic routes to the indicated low bidders conforming to the Specifications for Bid and accept the rates for Additional Service, Hourly Rate Service and Field Trip Service as bid with the utilization to be made based upon the availability of equipment.

Motion Passed (6 yes; 1 abstain (Hardy))

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What was the overall decrease when the general routes and the field and athletic trip rates are netted? The overall decrease was about \$50,000.
- Does the District still have a fuel cap in place and has it kicked in? Yes, it is \$4.50. The cap has not kicked in even during last year's high prices.
- There is a \$700,000 cut in transportation – where are those cuts? The original proposed budget for transportation included an estimated increase in contractual costs. As part of the \$25 million budget cut effort, the transportation budget was reduced by \$700,000 in the transportation contract line. The bids and total estimated contractual expenses came in at the reduced figure; therefore there was an actual \$700,000 savings. A request was made to see how this played out in writing.

- The ALC bus routes increased, why? Market forces determine the bid costs and there was a significant increase in ALC costs. The assumption is that these increases are due to the greater variance in timing for ALC routes, necessary driver overtime, etc.

3. Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC) Recommendations on Capital Bonding & Administrative Response

The Chief Operations Officer introduced the CEAC chair, Andy Mosca. He stated at the May 20 Board meeting, CEAC recommended and the Board approved, that the 2008-09 school year would be used to design an appropriate process for future capital expenditure proposals using the FCA/EAA as guidelines. CEAC has done that and he then provided a brief overview of the capital bonding process model and described the feedback process from the schools. He expressed some frustration with the lack of response from the schools.

Administration stated it supports the capital bonding process adopted by CEAC and thanked CEAC for their hard work in creating a data-driven process that will effectively align resources with district priorities.

The Chief Operations Officer stated the sale of capital bonds must be authorized by the Board in November. In preparation for meeting that deadline, building administrators were sent a list of potential capital projects compiled from the FCA/EAA data and were asked to rank the projects in terms of priority. Administrators were also sent information on submitting one additional capital proposal for their site. The priority ranking lists and additional capital proposals are due back to Facility Planning on June 10. The joint administration/CEAC recommendation for capital projects will be presented to the Board on September 22.

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee recommendations and the administrative response and that the Board instruct CEAC and administration to work on developing an evaluation/feedback process Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll

Motion passed.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- At what point within the process can schools make additional requests? Response, there is nothing within the model for a time/forum for the schools to meet with CEAC. Facilities staff do meet with the sites, but CEAC has not made a place/process for schools to meet with CEAC. There are two reasons: the first is practical, CEAC has a limited number of meetings and little time to address that type of session. The second is CEAC intentionally moved away from a process that favored those best able to present a proposal. CEAC prefers not, without direct instruction from the Board, to create that process again.
- What if sites have a question or want to provide additional information? Administration responded that CEAC or schools can request additional information if necessary through the staff liaison.
- Will the Board see any kind of survey or input on how the process is working? CEAC responded they would like that to be a requirement in order to allow the process to evolve into a better process over time.
- It was recommended that CEAC and administration work together to develop a feedback process to better inform the process as it evolves.
- Thanks were extended for the development of the process and the fact one additional request/recommendation can be made by schools for CEAC/administration consideration. The data driven process will not only save time spent by the schools in developing proposals but will more efficiently and effectively utilize district resources in the best, most necessary way possible.
- Gratitude was expressed that the collaboration between CEAC and AOC has been put into the process so that a single proposal comes to Board.

- Would it be possible to implement an appeal process by the sites to the Board if their single project is refused before the Board sees it? The public can always appeal directly to the Board through letters, e-mails, phone calls, public comment.
 - It was suggested that as CEAC and administration move through the process that the Board be kept abreast with information about what is being done as it is being done so the Board has a sense of the process, particularly since it is a new process and in its first implementation. Just the state of the process along the way.
 - Concern was expressed that an appeal process would muddle the process and affect the integrity and authority of the process and committee.
 - CEAC stated an appeal process, more than undercutting CEAC authority, would give CEAC more power than it has or wants. That process happens through communications with the Board. Though the process is data driven, a data base could be built to track what is going on; particularly with the additional proposals. Schools should get feedback from either CEAC or administration, especially on the additional proposal and its status. It seems a data base might be a best option listing the schools, noting which projects were passed and the reason, which projects will never be implemented and which projects are viable and fundable but just not in the current cycle. These last projects could be revisited at a later time. If the Board had access to that data, it would allow them to have a feel for the site's needs (perceived or real) and would inform the Board about the process.
 - The Board was reminded that they need to recruit members of the two committees as soon as possible. The Board requested this information be incorporated into the various calendars and that the board work on recruitment of new members.
 - With regard to technology, school computers reside in the school budgets. Infrastructure (networking) resides with the district. Operations is in the process of developing a technology strategy. This would be addressed by CEAC under "other considerations".
4. Citizen's Budget and Finance Advisory Committee (CBFAC) Presentation & Administrative Response

The Chief Interim Financial Officer noted he facilitates the work of CBFAC. He introduced the CBFAC chair, Kevin Huepenbecker, who presented the report.

The CBFAC topic of study (enrollment trends, their impact on the budget and recommendations) was approved at the April 15, 2008 Board meeting. Over the past year the group received various presentations (Student Placement; Research, Evaluation & Assessment; the State Demographer and the Chief of Accountability Officer). They studied data from various SPPS websites as well as State data provided through the MARSS staff.

CBFAC learned:

- All major revenue sources are tied to enrollment
 - The birth rate in St. Paul has been steady for the past 25 years
 - Enrollment in SPPS has been declining for the past 10 years
 - A secondary level enrollment decline is projected for the next several years for SPPS
 - Approximately 7500 students residing within the SPPS attendance area attend school elsewhere (2500 in other districts; 5000 charter schools)
 - Approximately 835 out of district student attend SPPS
- 80% of revenue comes from Weighted Average Daily Membership (WADM)
- Staffing & program decisions are dependent upon enrollment
- Current infrastructure is designed for 45,000 students, not the present 38,000.
- Projected revenues will not support current or future budget demands, creating a structural deficit.

CBFAC brought forward several recommendations:

- That a method be developed for collecting data on why departing students are leaving and where they are going and that this be analyzed for trends and other information to be used to develop a plan to attract and retain students.

- That a plan be developed and implemented to better inform high school students and their parents of programs and opportunities for high school studies as a method of retaining secondary students.
- That successful programs (those with waiting lists) be replicated to retain/increase enrollment (per LSSC proposals)
- That a long-term building maintenance schedule and projected budget to support this be developed
- That the District work collaboratively with all bargaining units to recruit and retain the correct number of the best and brightest staff through performance assessments and credentialing.

Administration concurred with the CBFAC recommendations and publically thanked the members of the committee for their hard work and due diligence of their task. The administrative response included:

- Development of standardized data collection on students leaving and those attracted to SPPS – this is aimed at really looking at departing students and those who are currently being attracted from outside the district. This would include a trend analysis with the objective of developing strategies for attraction and retention. This is part of the broader context of LSSC and this area is being looked at as part of the whole process. Arresting the district revenue loss is tied up with student enrollment.
- Marketing program strategies and seeking other opportunities to communicate effectively with secondary students and their parents, initiatives were in process to do that when the need for change was first articulated.
- Replicating successful programs – the District is looking at programmatic adjustments not the least of which is the ARRA funding process. These efforts are trying to get at and deal with finding and articulating the right programs for the district as part of LSSC.
- Create long-term building maintenance schedule and budget to support the schedule; the district is looking at the details of that within the administration.
- Seeking system change to attract/retain the best possible staff. The district has an HR Management System, it has bargaining units and it must remain within the rules and regulations of those. Those issues and options are being considered on an on-going basis.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- How does administration respond to tracking students who leave or students coming into SPPS from outside the district? The District does reach out to schools which are closing in a respectful manner. With regard to the data collection and follow through on it, some schools are tracking this. Their programs are not consistent from school to school and the District feels there is merit to getting a comprehensive, standardized methodology to use in the data collection. Part of LSSC will address these issues. There is also a chance to get non-standard data from the State which would assist in this as well.
- It was noted the data is necessary so the District knows where it is not meeting the needs of families. It is also important to address perceptions regarding the District which are not always correct.
- The data seems to indicate that the District has had approximately the same number of students available to it over the past 25 years. Birth rates from 1982 (birth rate for Ramsey County 7,956) to 2007 (birth rate 7,693) do not show a wide fluctuation. Despite this enrollment is down from a high of 45,000 a few years ago to the present 38,000. Does the recommendation include drawing more students from outside the district as well as retaining those within the district? Response: Yes.
- It was noted there is a need to understand competition and what can be offered to attract students back into SPPS.
- Which recommendation would be best for the district relative to its current budget situation?
- The recommendations from CBFAC have been brought together in such a way as to bring the pieces together into compelling arguments; thanks were expressed.
- What is the timeframe logistically for moving forward and what costs would be associated with the efforts? The Superintendent filled in the context on enrollment. Choice provides

options for families and they make their decisions on where to send their child to school based on a multitude of reasons. What is a fair market share, when is the district really competitive? There is a market for public schools; the District should be competitive in that. People do have choice which families can take advantage of. The District might explore a formula for best numbers for market share, defining the potential for growth to match the preference of the community of St. Paul. A major other issue facing SPPS is the issue of single family housing in St. Paul being unaffordable for many families. How does the District bring the city's housing development group to the table to discuss the needs of neighborhoods so families can live in the community in an affordable way with schools within their neighborhood? The baby boomer babies issue is also huge as far as impact on budgets the major growth is not within St. Paul but in the suburbs.

- The Chief Accountability Officer clarified a few points about the District's ability to capture information. He acknowledged CBFAC's work with data information on the challenges to the district. With respect to the market share issue, public vs private attendance, there are two different populations and there has not been much change in terms of the percentage of students attending private school. Fluctuation is seen in the public sector between traditional public schools and charter schools. SPPS continues to gain students from charters particularly at the secondary level. These areas are being monitored. What is known has been brought forward in the LSSC recommendations around which grades are particular challenges, etc? The initial parent survey skimmed the surface as to parent's satisfaction level with SPPS. In the community survey which will be out soon questions are posed asking those who have been enrolled in SPPS to provide information and to do focus groups around reasons for leaving the system. The one known firm factor is there are fewer school age children living in St. Paul right now so there will continue to be challenges at the secondary level.
- What things are being done to address some of the concerns such as Phalen Lake, the changes at North End, etc? Is a formal response being developed to guide what is being done in those areas or does the Strategic Plan encompasses those concerns? The Superintendent responded the District should collect better data, share with State as appropriate and collect more information, offer academic programs that are of interest to SPPS families and communities. The District does need a more robust strategy to address enrollment. The Superintendent recommended that for this kind of work the District partner with an outside organization, with guidance from CBFAC and the community, on an enrollment study. Doing the study through a third party establishes transparency on the enrollment issue. Charge them with looking at what other urban districts do, given SPPS expectations what is a fair expectation for enrollment targets. Set the targets and establish a "plan" that is tied to the right strategies for right groups of people. There are a lot of things in play, Federal and State regulations and statutes, expectations from the State Department of Education, etc. She suggested the Office of Innovation and Development be instructed to find funding to get started on this issue, perhaps funding for an initial pilot study.
- The 7,500 St. Paul students in other districts/systems, was it broken down any further? This data is aggregate data; it was not broken down into elementary, secondary. Does the District have that data? The Superintendent indicated the information would be provided to the Board.
- A request was made that the Board be informed of the dates for beginning the search for committee members along with information on the applications and the charge.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the CBFAC Report and Recommendations and extend its thanks for the thoughtful work by the committee and staff. Additionally that staff and CBFAC provide ongoing updates on the specific issues which were called out in the CBFAC recommendations. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

Motion passed.

5. SY 2009-2010 Budget Discussion & Proposed Action Timeline

Administration reviewed the budget planning timeline and the financial climate impacting the budget. They reiterated the need to reduce the budget by \$25 million (\$10 million for the structural deficit and \$15 million for the economic downturn impact). Reductions of \$15,097,406 were made in the district-wide/centrally funded budget areas and \$10 million in reductions came from the schools. The District is still facing an on-going structural deficit over the next several years; this year is just the beginning of addressing that deficit. If budget savings are not attained through the COLA and health care areas proposed, the District will need to cut an additional \$6 million from other areas during the school year. Administration stated the budget is due to be approved at the June 16 Board meeting. It must, by law, be approved no later than June 30, 2009.

The Interim Chief Financial Officer stated the structural deficit is due to enrollment decline, the downturn in the economy with rising costs exacerbating the problem. The projected General Fund revenue for 2009-10 is \$459.2 million; the projected General Fund expenditures are \$484.3 million. The resulting shortfall is \$25.1 million.

He then reviewed the Proposed FY 10 budget including the addition of the ARRA funding. There is \$29.1 million in State stabilization funding; this is a supplanting of funds and does not change the originally projected budget amounts. Additionally there are additional ARRA dollars of \$28.9 million in Title 1 and IDEA which changes the General Fund Fully Financed budget from \$42.6 million to \$71.6 million.

The original budget guidance received from the Board stated:

- Equitable access to resources
- Compliance with all laws and regulations
- Utilizing resources to close the achievement gap
- Allocation on direct student basis
- Targeting funds to meet student needs
- Retaining flexibility at school level.

There was a brief review of the Budget Reduction Summary Chart as presented on April 14 which reflects the reductions to central administration and the restorations to Itinerant Instrumental Music Teachers and Athletics as requested by the Board.

There was a brief review of the budget survey results which had a total of 1,370 responses (858 staff, 512 non-staff).

Next steps are the budget adoption on June 16, 2009 with in-progress budget reporting and fall revision and quarterly updates in fall and spring.

The discussion then moved to the use of ARRA funds beginning with a review of the guiding principles: (1) spend quickly to save and create jobs; (2) ensure transparency and accountability; (3) thoughtfully invest one-time funds and (4) advance effective reforms.

The district utilized the following planning assumptions to ensure Title I and IDEA funding will be used to support components of key district reforms: (1) use two-years of stimulus funding as leverage for sustainable long-term district-wide change; (2) implement well-designed research-based systems that maximize resources; (3) increase fidelity of implementation through alignment with existing efforts and (4) use a project management approach to set and meet clear benchmarks and timelines.

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

- State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (SFSF) - \$29.1 million to SPPS (supplanting State funds)
 - This is the largest source of funding for education.

- The K-12 omnibus bill replaced \$500 million of general education revenue for SY 2010 with an equivalent amount from ARRA SFSF fund. This money has already been accounted for in all SPPS budget discussions to date
- SPPS must apply for funding and account for the monies differently than General Education Revenue.
- The State Fiscal Stabilization Funds provide no budget relief.
- Title I, Part A - \$18.1 million to SPPS over the next two years
 - This funding is tied to the four priority areas identified by USED for ARRA funding: college and career readiness; interventions (for lowest performing students/schools); teacher effectiveness and education data systems.
 - The district will build upon existing efforts to minimize “initiative fatigue”
 - Efforts will be aimed at building capacity and improving professional practices for lasting impact; these include: direct services to students in Title I schools; district AYP professional development initiatives; equitable services for non-public students; parent involvement funding to Title I schools and support for systemic implementation of ARRA initiatives.
- IDEA, Part B - \$10.9 million to SPPS
 - Early intervention services aimed at reducing referrals to special education (State requirement)
 - EIS over-identification or non-compliance with IDEA
 - Special Education reform (improvement of collaboration between general education and special education; reduction of paperwork burden and improved IDEA compliance; assistive technology, transportation, support and accountability)
- School construction - \$32 million for SPPS (Tax credit of \$17 million of interest saved)

It is estimated implementation will require new short-term positions (approximately 29 FTEs for Title I and 50 FTEs for IDEA). Staff impacted by recent budget cuts may apply for and qualify for the new positions.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Concern was expressed on the cultural proficiency piece regarding what is put in place and whether it is a systemic change and measurable and tracked? This will be for all staff (non-instructional and instructional) and will be incorporated into all work. There are three models: district-wide leadership; an instructional track of the base and culturally responsive teaching; and sustainability through train-the-trainers aspects to ensure ongoing implementation and institutionalization to ensure ongoing systemic institutional change.
- The RFP was based on two years of inclusive workplace surveys and was a priority recommendation of the Inclusiveness Council. Other input came from the community listening sessions and input from key stakeholders throughout the community.
- Assessment, tracking and reporting – is in place including the Board and involvement of stakeholders.
- Where will funding be used for positions which may be changed or cut? ARRA funds are short term funding to build capacity in the district. ARRA funds can’t fund direct services to students as the money will go away in two years. ARRA money will be used to get more help to build capacity of the staff in place rather than adding staff. The money will be used to provide more help to each school (special education resource coordinators at each school level 1 for every 200-250 students) taking it deeper into the culture of schools and helping to coach all of the special education and general education staff on how to improve instruction for all children with disabilities including children with physical handicaps and will allow the District to improve instruction for all special needs students.
- The 90 FTEs that would be created through ARRA funding, what will be the primary functions for those jobs? They will be assigned as coaches, intervention specialists so support to administration and intervention staff, resource coordinators in the area of special education, assessment support for new benchmark assessment as well as other monitoring. The other piece is taking a cluster of schools and assigning a behavioral specialist for clusters of schools to work with instructional staff.

- How likely is it that individual students will be impacted by the budget cuts to staff, will these new staff have the qualifications to do the work? The bulk of the positions are instructional support positions and so many of the teaching staff and some senior level administrators would be eligible to apply for these positions.
- How will the ARRA funds make the District better over the next two years? The current administration is promoting the Federal stimulus design as the answer to, in part, the economic stimulus needed to kick start the country, to save and create jobs which may not be the existing jobs (because of explicit guidance associated with the monies) but jobs based on best practices. It will provide deeper support to the people doing the work day-to-day. The District can not hire more teachers when it doesn't have the students. The District must be very careful about how it uses the money. If it is done right it may provide opportunity for people to come back into the system. It should create a better system with higher quality schools, with better outcomes and it becomes more marketable as a higher quality system which could increase enrollment which means it would have to hire more teachers on the back end.

The District has chosen to take the money, use the guidance, in some cases go off the script a little bit for what the District needs. The positions being created are positions which will get support to the people doing the day-to-day work and the kids, or at least as close as possible while also creating new positions (which the District will be held accountable for) as required. St. Paul has set itself up extremely well to be competitive for the next round of grants out of the "Race to the Top" resources.

- Gratitude was expressed that the Federal money is there, because if it was not there it would not change the State's inability to fund education adequately. Without the Federal money the District would still be doing the cuts it is doing, it would also have no hope of restoring some of the positions with new positions.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Goldstein, the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the FY 10 Proposed Budget and ARRA Spending Plan Report and approve of the timeline.

Motion passed. (Unanimous)

- There was discussion on moving the action on the budget out one week. The action is to approve the proposed timeline. This timeline should be doable with further discussion over the next week.
- Would a delay allow reasonable time for administration to make any changes or would a budget revision down the line be a better approach? Administration responded that what has been brought before the Board is its best recommendations to meet a very undesirable situation. It has also supplied the "contingency plan" sheet for Board consideration. Any delay will have impacts in loss of some of the best teachers and staff who are being actively recruited by other districts; SPPS needs to keep its people. Training for key staff is also scheduled for the week following the Board meeting so staff may not be available if the budget consideration moves beyond the 16th.
- It was stated it is important for the Board to make the right decision.
- It was stated it would be beneficial to the Board to know more details relative to reductions. It was suggested that a Committee of the Board meeting be called to allow for further discussion and that prior to that administration supply as much detail as possible to the questions Board members will pose.
- The question of Fund Balance change was raised. Administration cautioned against making a change as keeping the balance at at least 5% is vital to the district for a number of reasons. Is there any "slush" above 5% that might be utilized?
- Regarding athletics, between now and the 16th, if those cuts were to be reduced, would there be time for administration to propose alternatives for consideration? The Superintendent responded there won't be any surprises about where money will be found. The Board has seen every idea administration has found, there is the contingency plan and there are the ones already acted upon (further reduction to central administration and returning funds to itinerant music teachers and athletics), What

administration needs from the Board now, since administration has offered its best thinking on budget reductions, is for the Board to specify reductions, where they want them taken from and where they want it added. Page 46-47 of the Proposed Budget Book analyzes every cut made to every department.

- Administration cautioned the Board must think beyond one school year or one program. There is a structural deficit that is leading to \$106 million in reductions over the next five to six years. The cuts this year are just the beginning.
- A caution was expressed that any changes made be based on data not favoritism or political pressures. The cuts are affecting everyone so additional cuts to save one area put other areas at risk.
- What are the implications and impacts that threaten the Strategic Plan? (1) Cuts to administration (2) Impact of cuts currently on the table and impacts on students around the strategic planning goals and (3) special education and ELL. Reductions to the budget have been done with an eye to doing everything possible to minimize harm to kids.
- The ARRA money being used as support for coaches, specialists? What has been untouchable have been the district funded content coaches. Is it possible to use the ARRA money in that area? This is basically a supplant question.
- If the COLA freeze does not go through, where will that \$6 million come from?

6. Standing Item: Policy Update

No report on policy will be made until the July COB meeting.

7. Standing Item: School and Program Changes Update

• **LSSC – Possible Changes/Impacts on Schools & Programs**

Administration summarized the actions and timelines administration recommends for the LSSC proposal. Administration reviewed a draft of language related to various LSSC changes and the suggested timeline.

- Academic Reform – use of ARRA/Federal Stimulus funds – approval June 16
- Rightsizing/Consolidation – Closing Longfellow and Roosevelt and repurposing Sheridan – approval June 16 but no later than July 21
- Attendance area changes – approval by August 18 - if the Board does take action on the closures/repurposing this allows time for the Transportation Department and Placement Center to react to any changes the Board might dictate.
- School Choice – revised recommendation to hold final decision until April 2010 for implementation in fall 2011. The action is still very necessary but the reasons for the change included: (1) postponed in order to dedicate attention to the implementation of academic reform during the 09-10 SY; (2) further analysis is needed on the impact on transportation services and costs for charter and non-public schools under the Equal Treatment Law; and (3) the additional time will allow for deeper analysis of the effects on desegregation, program articulation and replication and possible reconfiguration of middle grades prior to the final action on the new choice model.
- Employee Effectiveness and Development – as contracts are finalized with approval of more flexible labor agreements as negotiated. No action will be required until completion of each negotiation.

The Chief Community Relations Officer reviewed the LSSC Community Engagement responses from the various public forums held over the past months. She reviewed feedback results on school choice, rightsizing/consolidation, employee effectiveness and development, academic reform and budget. Themes and questions in all the areas were outlined. She reviewed the proposed timeline for action on these items.

MOTION: Mr. Conlon move the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the proposed timeline and move it forward to the Board of Education meeting of June 16. Mr. Goldstein seconded the motion.

Motion passed (6 in favor; 1 Against (Hardy))

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Concern was expressed that the reasons for the closings were not well researched and it was suggested the vote on this be moved to October.
- The question was asked if this could be done. Administration responded the evidence is that if it is going to be done, it should be done the school year before the next school year when the action will be implemented. The purpose of rightsizing and consolidation is to match student enrollment to capacity. So, if not these three schools which three schools should be closed to match enrollment to capacity? That is the bottom line. The schools are losing key staff already along with enrollment decreases. When the decision moves into October it is late enough in the year that the School Selection Guide is already in production and the District is gearing up for the Parent Information Fair. Additionally, it is important to allow time to work with all the families from the schools to ensure they have a first choice, on-time applications made. With three schools it is even more important to have that time. It also would allow staff the opportunity to look at positions and decide on what they want to do.

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education that action on the school closings/repurposing be moved to the October Board meeting in order to allow the communities time to come up with options to make the schools more viable. Motion died for lack of a second.

8. Work Session

- **Superintendent Transition**

The Superintendent reviewed a document on which she has outlined key action items which will serve as a transition plan and provide benchmarks for future actions.

The Board Chair announced work had been completed on an RFP for a search firm to assist in the superintendent search. It should be posted within the next week to 10 days.

The Chair acknowledged the advisory committees and all staff members for the efforts put forth in putting together the information necessary for this meeting.

- **BoardBook Training**

This was cancelled and will be rescheduled.

- **Board Vacancy**

MOTION: Mr. Goldstein moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education not act to fill the vacancy opened by Mr. Conlon's departure but that the vacancy be filled through a special election. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion passed (6 in favor, 1 abstention (Conlon))

III. **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk

