

**MEETING MINUTES  
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD  
July 14, 2009**

**PRESENT:**

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

Staff: Valeria Silva, Hitesh Haria, Michael Baumann, Christine Wroblewski, Nancy Stachel, Jeremiah Ellis, Kathy Brown, Judy Neece, Yusef Mgeni, Steve Schellenberg, Joe Raasch, Laurie Olson, Brett Johnson, Sharon Freeman, Kris Emerson

Press: Kevin Driscoll, Villager; Doug Belden, Pioneer Press; Greg Patterson, Star Tribune

Other: Rose Serin, Crystal Jackson, Britta Wicklund, Andrea Ylonen, Sally Anderson, Beth Mueller, Carol Hannum, Denise Rodriguez, Jeff Koon, Carlos Garcia-Velesen, Theresa Plasch, James Plasch, Chris Connee, Mary Basques, Jesus Ramirez, Lydia Nobello, Monica Brand Carbycil, Monica Bryand, Gjerry Berquist

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Committee of the Board meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:03 p.m.

**II. AGENDA**

**1. 2009-2013 SPPS Integration Plan**

The Interim Superintendent introduced the Director of Educational Equity and asked him to provide an overview of the report.

The Director of Educational Equity presented the District's 2009-2013 Inclusiveness (Deseg) Plan which essentially updated the 2005-2009 Inclusiveness Plan, allowing the District the opportunity to implement any Board changes in school choice or attendance areas in the spring of 2010 and also fully incorporate the impact of legislative changes in the Minnesota Deseg Rule that takes effect in the coming school year.

The plan was developed to comply with the Minnesota State Desegregation Rule 3535.0100 to .0180 and is required to be submitted to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) every three to four years. The primary purpose of this plan is to increase inter-racial contact and to create and expand educationally justifiable opportunities that contribute to an inclusive learning environment consistent with the intent of the Desegregation Rule.

St. Paul Public Schools is considered a racially isolated school district. A racially isolated district is one in which a school or district has a percentage of students of color that is 20% greater than the average at that grade level within the district or the total percentage of adjoining school districts.

The Minnesota Deseg Rule has three fundamental tenants: (1) parents must be provided with choice; (2) those choices must be voluntary and (3) those choices must result in racial

balance. So there is a race line rule through which the district is required to voluntarily achieve integration or racial balance on an inter-district basis between adjoining school districts and on an intra-district basis within the district.

With the present rule, because the percentage of students of color is approximately 75% within SPPS, it is very difficult for the district to achieve racial balance on a voluntary basis on an intra-district basis. Many of the district's efforts have focused on inter-district initiatives and increasing inter-racial contact within the East Metro Integration District (EMID) and its 10 member districts.

The plan is central to reform efforts the District is implementing and to achieving increased academic outcomes for all SPPS students. The District remains committed to inclusiveness and working within and across districts to achieve the State of Minnesota's objectives in this area.

Significant changes in the Deseg Rule were made this year by the Legislature. In the past the SPPS plan has been received the MDE; beginning next year the budget must be reviewed and approved by MDE. Funding from the MDE is a little less than \$20 million in integration revenue for SPPS (commonly referred to as deseg funds). These funds are now required to be allocated on 60-30-10 basis. No less than 60% of the funds must be spent on direct student services; no more than 30% on professional development that involves cultural proficiency training to expand inclusiveness and no more than 10% on administrative services. A study group is being established to exam further changes to the rule. The 60/30 will go into effect next fiscal year. The plan can be brought back to the SPPS board for amendment as implementation of the changes evolve.

The report provided an overview of district demographics, SPPS objectives, instructional programs, alternative learning programs, community education (family programs, adult learning), the SPPS multicultural resource center, the inter-district classroom partnership initiative (EMID), instruction for ELL, staff development and human resources; choice, application and preference; community outreach and involvement; work with community based service providers, educators, low-income parent and parents of color; additional inclusiveness initiatives; compliance and integration revenue funding.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Congratulations were extended to administration on the coherence, articulation and alignment of the content of the plan which ties together all of the various diverse elements to reflect the key values and beliefs of the district and connects it with mission, vision and goals with an implementation structure.
- It was recommended that as board goes through its monitoring work it would be valuable to use this report as a basis for reporting out and wrapping into the greater plans of the district. It would be useful in reporting out. It was suggested October might be the time to address the relevance between the Inclusiveness Plan and how to incorporate new ideas about framing agenda items around monitoring and tie to how decisions and choices are made to tie everything together.
- What are the potential implications of the school choice discussion within the parameters of the deseg plan and the funding? What are the impacts on options in the choice discussion? The district's obligations to the State and the guidelines set forth in the Inclusiveness Plan are at the forefront of any discussions and set the framework for discussion on school choice.
- Will deseg money be used for the cultural proficiency development around cultural competency? As the Board is aware ARRA stimulus funding will be used to pay large part of cultural proficiency training.
- The 30% will go toward something else? All the issues are under review due to the new legislation. So additional time and study is necessary to find how it applies. The district is tracking the deseg funding to be sure it is being spent appropriately and in

alignment with MDE directives as to what is appropriate. Efforts are underway to be sure the district cultural proficiency professional development compliments and supports all the other professional development (math, science, etc.) so they work together. There is extensive collaboration on all professional development issues.

- The Interim Superintendent indicated administration would create a summary sheet for the Board to help them understand what impacts of decisions/funding might be.
- A correction to page 22 was noted – the use of Webster’s old name
- Director Hardy indicated he would abstain on the vote as he would have follow-up questions which will need to be addressed.
- A request was made by a Board member that more time be spent under the Board monitoring function talking about results, outcomes and how did it change things for the better for kids.
- It was noted that a waiver for schools designated as language academies was granted in order to improve immigrant academic performance as quickly and effectively as possible. There are currently eight schools designated as racially isolated by the State because the percentage of students of color is more than 20% greater than district average at grade level. One of the issues the legislature is considering is the fact that if a school has 20% more students of color than district average it is racially isolated. However, if a school has a percentage of Caucasian students that is 50% higher than the district average the rule is silent. This is being examined by the study group on the basis that inclusion in both directions to provide equity.
- What is expected from the State relative to the report? The state receives the report this year; in future they will be approving it.

**MOTION: Ms. Kong-Thao moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the 2009-2013 Inclusiveness (Deseg) Plan as presented. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

**Motion passed 5 in favor, 1 abstention (Hardy)**

2. Review of Longfellow, Roosevelt & Sheridan Recommendations

The Interim Superintendent indicated the Board has reached the final steps in the current stage of rightsizing and consolidation recommendations to the Board. She review the various times the subject had been brought to the Board for discussion. She recognized the decision to close schools is one of the more difficult decisions a Board has to make. She indicated administration has given the Board its best thinking on what needs to be done and has brought forward proposals and provide engagement on the issues. Ultimately the recommendation is about working to create a positive outcome for each student across the system even though it means short-term hardships for some. Administration is bringing forward the recommendations due to enrollment declines, it will continue to decline and the infrastructure is too large to adequately support the type of quality programming desired for each student in each school.

She recognized parents and families will be affected. Schools play a role in life of the community at large beyond that of educating children. Administration recognized that closing any school central to a neighborhood and which is a gathering place for the neighborhood will have unintended consequences to the community. Administration hopes to continue to dialogue with communities to address programs and services the buildings have served in order to continue those programs and services.

The Chief of Schools reiterated administration’s desire to continue to work with the communities affected. The district has limited resources so it needs to look at every opportunity it has to enrich the lives of all of its students and at the same time reducing expenses. Follow through needs to include not only the service to students and families attending the schools but also the families of children that live in the community and use

the school. She then presented a review of the criteria and matrix which was used in reaching the decision on which schools to close and the Scenario Team formed to apply the criteria and make recommendations. The recommendations brought forward represents administration's best thinking based upon the direction provided. She reminded the Board the recommendations are for the temporary closure of Longfellow and Roosevelt and the repurposing of Sheridan and the future use of the facilities will be examined along with any changes in the structure of the choice system.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- A Board member acknowledged that a difficulty she is having is when the schools are quantified though the process used much of the nuance is taken out of the process. She has valued input from community resources and administration's input on and the resources put into the efforts. She reminded Board members it was the Board who asked administration to provide measurable information they could work from.
- Sheridan, the academic program has enjoyed years of success and the student population has been stable though somewhat under capacity and since repairs would need to be done if it is repurposed – are correct decisions being made? Response: One of the difficult things when looking at the matrix there is a certain point where there was clarity in terms of academic performance and where things fit. When you move beyond that there were decisions to be made taking in all three areas. The Board was reminded administration was not directed to weight any of the areas any heavier than other areas. Administration used a measure that was consistent across the district. Criteria was applied using the School Accountability Measures as well. The School Accountability Index uses the measures from the Shared Accountability Framework to look at growth (a school compared to other schools across the district), proficiency, attendance and discipline for the NCLB recognized subgroups as well as grade levels and gender so the measure goes beyond AYP. All of these have an impact on academics. The application was consistent in the application of these measures across the district.
- How did the "Banners" play into considerations? Administration noted the criteria for banners has changed from year to year and have not been based on the same set of criteria over time. Since NCLB, the criteria have been gradually changing as various district, state and federal programs have been implemented.
- The community wants to know what Sheridan's repurposing will be. Will it be a good trade-off for a neighborhood school which has seemingly been successful for a number of years?
- With a broader view, in terms of the parameters. What would the impact be if a two year framework rather than 3 or 5 years was used? Similarly with the facilities index, how were the FCI data points established and why were cut-offs set as they were? There is a perception that choices on indices has determined what schools close. How were the parameters arrived at? Response: As the process progressed administration desired to be and has been transparent about the criteria. Once the criteria were established, a vetting process was conducted with the community. Where greater transparency might have been achieved would have been to go the next step in terms of a weighting of the criteria and how the points would be assigned outside of the Scenario Team process. Points were assigned but there was no weighting of various areas; the points were static, one area was not weighted greater than another. All points were applied consistently across all schools as the process was applied.
- What would happen if items were weighted? Response: It would establish a different scenario and would involve an entirely new processing of the data.
- The Chief of Schools has done a summary of academic numbers using two years instead of one as is reflected on the original matrix.
- What would happen if no schools were closed or only one? Response: The District would face a hole in the budget which would need to be closed. Administration would

look to other schools for potential closure or other areas to find an equal amount of money to balance the budget. It is a simply trade off of pain from one area to another.

- In order to understand the assumptions, is two years generally what was used? For the facilities why were specific number breaks used? Why were specific criteria chosen? Response: For the facilities condition, the bulk of SPPS buildings are in good condition compared to the rest of the nation. All buildings fell within the good range. Operations provided input on where the break points should be; it was what made sense between average and good within the spectrum of SPPS. The most difficult area was the educational value area. The criteria included such things as uniqueness, testing scores, growth measures. Administration went back to the Shared Accountability Framework for consistent measures to use. Enrollment trend data, has it declined, how, has it increased, how, etc. Capacity was put at a straight 80% as the cutoff. Enrollment trends was averaged over several years.
- Clarification was made that the current documents were based on one year's worth of academic data and the point award was explained for each area.
- It was noted that when administration looked back two years – 2 of the three schools remained static, Sheridan did move up.
- Why did administration choose a one year snapshot for the academic piece? Response: If data was used going back multiple years the basis of its calculations has had adjustments made to the method of measuring growth so it would not be consistent (the MCA changed to the MCAII, the district no longer administered the SAT 10). Administration went back as far as the measure was consistent. The district was looking to be consistent in the application of measures across all schools.
- Secondary factors impact on schools, specifically North End. It currently has all zeroes. How can it been seen there is a trend for improvement? Response: In terms of North End the third grade scores (on MCA) showed a 39% gain in math and 31% gain in reading. The only other school in the district that came close at that grade level was Crossroads Montessori. The investment is paying off. The key thing about that type of investment is that it takes investments beyond the school district. In terms of North End, it is an Achievement Plus school being implemented so there is involvement by the Wilder Foundation, by Invest St. Paul where the city has not only invested money in that area through MELF scholarships but has the support of the councilman in that area to improve services available at the school. There is the Transitions Initiative Team, the St. Paul Children's Collaborative. This is well beyond just SPPS investment. So if the question is asked, what would it take at any school, at that level of investment there should be improvement or return on investment would have to be questioned.
- North End is only at 41% capacity, there is this investment but the enrollment numbers aren't there yet. If the same kind of community investment were made with Roosevelt, what keeps the district from seeing what could be done to turn it around? Response: At North End there should be an increase in enrollment based upon the results and the fact the Star and Tribune identified it as a "Beating the Odds" school. One of the differences is that North End is a neighborhood school so it has suffered from mobility and the ability to maintain stable student population as opposed to Roosevelt which is a magnet school which draws city-wide and should be able to keep enrollment at higher levels if it is compared with other magnet schools in the district. Neighborhood schools have a special challenge so the two can't be compared equitably.
- It was noted that partnership decisions are made by the partners not by the district. They have their own criteria and decision-making process; the district has no control over those investments.
- Roosevelt's community has proposed all kinds of plans and solutions. Why won't those work? What other scenarios are there, what other schools could be closed? Response: Specifically to the alternative plan from the Roosevelt site council; given the economic situation it would be difficult to hold the school harmless for five years. The transformation into an academy (boys and girls classrooms) – this is exactly what has

been put in place at North End. There have been some initial gains but what was done at North End was done because of additional funding which allowed it to maintain specific gender-based classes when enrollment numbers were lower. Racism training of all teachers and staff – this is a union issue. Additionally there is almost no time as it is to happen before this school year to implement in 09-10. Teacher and principal issues – the principal has already accepted another job in another district. When it is looked at as a totality it can not realistically be implemented in 09-10. The district has to match capacity to enrollment and it doesn't matter which school is put on the table, every school will find valid reasons why it shouldn't be closed. If not Roosevelt, then what other school?

- A past issue has been that the district has historically not done a good job in ensuring strong leadership at schools and consistent implementation of best practices. It has gotten consistently better. Performance is also tied to consistent delivery of academic services in schools. To what extent does the historical framework, as well as leadership, the teachers and general support and expectations, to what extent is that the cause of the academic achievement issues the Board is looking at in this bottom performing schools and what is being done about it? Response: The Interim Superintendent stated many schools have suffered from neglect based on who they serve not only in St. Paul but across the country. The advent of NCLB allowed the disaggregation of data and brought the achievement gaps to the fore. The district begun to call out the achievement gap and recognize the fact some schools have been places where the least experienced and newest teachers and unsuccessful teachers have ended up. It has also looked at principal leadership and put in very stringent accountability measures for principals. It has also looked at a stronger relationship with the teachers union around shared expectations. One of the issues under discussion is the tension between the need to mandate certain things in a site based system. This year the district will ensure that every decision it makes is driven by the Office of Academics and Schools. The district is looking at three things in its strategic plans – literacy, mathematics and cultural proficiency and the implementation of these with fidelity. Within the budget, funds have been allotted for a Leadership and Learning Institute to determine what is working, how it is working and how that is tied to student outcomes. The district will stop things which are not working and moving to those that do. The district is investing in professional development for the teachers because the majority of the teaching staff want to do right by students. The district needs to provide good coaching and professional development embedded within the school day. Training is being provided to principals to give them the leadership training they need. Steps are being taken to address this issue, it will take time.
- Unease was expressed about the process – what are the best choices? The matrix is helpful for the way data is presented and explains what the unease is. The district has focused on academic performance; it has been a guiding vision on where resources are allocated, etc. There are several schools on the matrix that have zeroes on internal measures and AYP but fall outside the criteria to be considered for closure because they are in a better facility and/or enrollment trend. Is this really the right way to measure this? Many schools are academically zeroed out but gain for enrollment trends and facility reasons? Is the Board comfortable in closing schools not for academic reasons but for facilities reasons which aren't clear cut?
- If the Board were to revisit what the recommendation has been is there interest in looking at something specific? The Board needs to provide as clear direction as possible in order to arrive at a valid recommendation. There are several ways to go weight or change criteria; add nuance to criteria or change the metrics within current matrix. Fundamentally the district is caught at time where programs are still attached to physical buildings. It is imprudent to discount the facilities piece; too much has been invested in arriving at the data to ignore it. It is problematic when there is an inadequate educational program; bad academic performance not acceptable wherever it is. To discount the importance of the facility conditions and enrollment trends, which is in part about community perception, in a decision is unjust because they are related

as long as programs are delivered in buildings. The Board approved the criteria and they did the job, they may just not be perfect. The three factors have to be considered and the decision must be made, it can't be put off.

- The opinion was expressed it would be worth it to go deeper into academic performance and perhaps factor in technology.
- The Board was reminded it needs to be aware of what it is doing and own the reasons for closing the schools.
- The current proposal is in two categories: (1) Sheridan, for a variety of reasons is not as clearly focused. If the board declines to repurpose Sheridan what does that do to capacity issues on eastside, district-wide, to the budget and the critical need of the ALC program? Response: It is possible to pull Sheridan off the table but administration couldn't guarantee it wouldn't be brought back. It is not unreasonable, given the fact the district will be entering into discussions about school choice and a regional model. Unlike the other two schools, Sheridan is a neighborhood school and the other neighborhood schools in that immediate area of the East Side are fairly full. It will require the redrawing of attendance boundaries and assignment areas for the children who currently go to Sheridan to fit them into other schools in the area. It would not be unreasonable to do this and allow the school choice discussion to play itself out in April 2010. Based on what the Board decides to do with the recommendations that come forward to relook at Sheridan at that point and in that context. The budget impact is that the savings would go from \$2.4 million to \$1.95 million. This would be an actual \$522,000 which would need to be found elsewhere in the budget for 2010-11. Are additional non-capital costs factored in? No. There are more variables, nuances and issues around Sheridan. If the Board takes Sheridan off list for repurposing in 2010-11 it is off the list and becomes no more at risk than any other school is at risk for whatever criteria is used in the future for school closings. It is not at special risk nor is it protected, it simply goes back into the "pool."

**MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the Committee of the Board meeting recess and the Board move to its Board of Education meeting. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

**Motion passed**

The meeting recessed at 8:35 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:40 pm.

- Is the district looking at potential alternative learning programs and if so will they (a) including new students in the program, (b) moving an existing alternative program from University Avenue to the east side location or (c) making this location an additional option for all alternative programs? Response: A formal proposal for ALC programs has not been developed. The Chief Academic Officer stated that no plans have been prepared, the department has been working over the last couple years on getting students out of leased spaced into owned space so that is one consideration which can be looked at if a building becomes available. The ALC population is flexible fluctuating as the economy changes. Since there are increasing numbers of ALC students currently, the district has changed the way it is delivering instruction by delivering in a two tier structure. At this point no decision has been made for additional expansion as the data is still being studied. The district is beginning to see an Increase in ALC students from the East Side; at this point there is no definitive answer as to why there is this increase in students. It is a fact that public transportation is an issue for east side students.
- REQUEST FOR INFORMATION: Additional information on student numbers relative to the east side and other options for sites for ALC on the east side.

- Concern was expressed, regarding Roosevelt, about the district's commitment to the West Side from the west side community. How will the district deal with the concerns about equity that the community has raised? A Board member stated the district is obligated to work with the West Side to reinforce that SPPS does not end at the Mississippi River. Response: The decision to bring forward Roosevelt was not an easy one given the concerns around the community implications for the West Side. Should Roosevelt close, the district will work with the two remaining elementary programs to ensure they have an adequate level of reinvestment in those programs. In order to avoid a vacuum in the community the ECFE program will be relocated within the community. It is hoped the district can work with Neighborhood House and other community organizations so potential use of the building through joint use agreements, etc. The temporary closing does allow programmatic change through choice and the proposed regional models. Roosevelt has the lowest number of students actually living on west side attending it. The district will continue dialogue with community and work to the benefit of West Side kids.
- Relative to the Roosevelt building what is a realistic timetable for reconsideration of future use after closing. Response: The temporary closure is for 3 years. Enrollment needs to be matched to capacity so there is a need for only so many elementary programs district-wide. Administration's goal is to come to the Board in April 2010 with recommendations relative to choice and the regional model. The timeline is at the Board's prerogative,
- Can all the West Side students be accommodated at the other two West Side schools and what about the early childhood program? Response: Yes, there is space to accommodate the West Side students at the west side schools. There are two pre-K programs at Cherokee and there is a desire to add a pre-K program at Riverview. There is room to move the pre-K programs.
- At Roosevelt there is the transitional language program where will that go? Response: Riverview does have a bilingual program. At Cherokee has added a bilingual program in kindergarten and pre-school and plans on growing it up. The number of language programs in the district has been expanded greatly but those have not filled. The demand will have to be reviewed relative to offerings.
- Will a conscious effort be made to offer choices to parents to help them to transition to the school that's best for them? How will the district continue to keep parents engaged in during the transition? Response: One reason to make a decision now is to determine what next steps are so parents can fully participate in the choice process as it occurs. The district is planning to replicate the efforts made in the Homecroft situation so that every student is tracked to ensure every family has made application and to ensure families attend the Parent Fair and visit other schools so they can make informed choices.
- Where will the kids at Roosevelt go? Why are West Side kids not attending West Side schools, how many are making other choices?
- A gap is being created in capacity issue which needs to be solved. Few elementary kids are lost, they stay with the SPPS schools; it is at the middle and secondary level that the district is losing enrollment. The district won't capture more elementary capacity. The number of kids not choosing SPPS on the West Side has to be considered as the district moves forward with choice so it isn't undercut.
- A preference was expressed for a separate action for each school.
- Longfellow – will consideration be given to moving the classical program to another building?
- Schools and communities have been impacted by poor decisions made in the past relative to building repair, etc. that are now penalizing those schools. This should be kept in mind in future considerations.



**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education remove Sheridan from consideration for repurposing. Motion seconded by Mr. Hardy.**

**Motion passed.**

- The maker stated she was proposing this because she is a proponent of school choice. She noted she felt the choice system makes it harder for neighborhood schools to get the attention, the funding; they have the mobility impact, etc. She stated she didn't want to make decisions on neighborhood schools outside the context of the choice discussion. The decision about future schools capacity adjustments within the context of choice decision.
- Sheridan is a successful school and staff, parents, families and the students are moving to make the school even more successful.
- Thanks were expressed to all the advocates who spoke for all the schools however; the Board makes its decisions based on the good of all students.
- A request was made for on-going guidance relative to the East side ALC services and a continuation of the conversation into the fall, winter and spring. The prejudice against ALC should be included in this conversation.

**MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved that Roosevelt be removed from consideration for the proposed closing. Motion seconded by Mr. Brodrick.**

**Motion failed. 1 Yes 5 No**

- The maker stated he thinks Roosevelt is in a location where a viable school should be and he is not comfortable, based on many factors, with Roosevelt being the school to be closed first.
- The question was asked if not Roosevelt, where would we go next? The unintended consequences have occurred already. While agreeing with many points raise relative to Roosevelt there is not a strong enough reason to take it out of consideration at this point.
- Another Board member stated this is a very difficult decision but if not this one, which one? The hurt will be inflicted somewhere. This situation is not limited to St. Paul but is happening across the state and the country. In these economic times the Board needs to do what needs to be done, hard though it is, to keep the whole system viable and do what is best for all the students of St. Paul.
- The maker closed by saying he sees great potential for the West Side through the obvious community and parent commitment to the school and to the area.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education accept, with regret, the recommendation to temporarily close, for up to three years, Roosevelt Elementary School effective June 15, 2010. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.**

**Motion passed. 5 Yes 1 No (Hardy)**

- The families and teachers at Roosevelt and Longfellow have been doing their best over the past years to get the performance up to where the kids deserve. Unfortunately these efforts have not yielded results. When you reduce the number of buildings and increase the density the SPPS classroom numbers are still low. When more resources can be put where the kids are, when you don't need to pay for the buildings, the kids can be given resources they deserve so they can be better prepared to go on. SPPS is required by law to balance budget and there is no place else to go to do this.

- There is hope that in the temporary closure there will be active efforts to better support and re-energize the community and engage in a process to solicit support and investment in the community.
- Director Goldstein indicated he would abstain until the Board meeting.
- With regard to partnerships, both community based and citywide partnerships. There is a lot of belief, strength and power in the West Side community (and also in Longfellow's case) but not enough kids from the community going to the schools. SPPS is investing in the West Side to create a strong sustainable articulation of pre-K through high school where kids will get the very best education. The district is working with community and partners to find a use for the building which is a historic community center and to find an opportunity in non-elementary or other uses. Administration was encouraged to be sure that West Side kids wanting to stay at West Side schools have that chance.
- Mr. Brodrick indicated he to would abstain. There was then a discussion of the ramifications of this.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education accept, with regret, the recommendation to temporarily close, for up to three years, Longfellow Elementary School effective June 15, 2010. Motion seconded by Mr. Goldstein.**

**Motion passed. 5 Yes 1 Abstention (Hardy)**

- The data are most clear in this instance; there is a lot to offer at all these schools. Over the years Longfellow has put together many important initiatives and been a leader in many instances but they are not delivering for the kids. This closure will reallocate resources and redirect them more appropriately

**INFORMATION REQUEST:** Director Hardy requested administration supply the numbers of students currently in alternative schools broken out geographically and proposals for where else alternative schools could be put on the East Side.

The questions was asked if this represented the consensus of the Board or should the request be expanded to consider other space use (i.e., Arlington) and leased space with perhaps reconsidering the need to get out and think that about what programming the district wants to do and find a way to make it happen even if it involves a lease of space.

Guidance was given for both Longfellow and Roosevelt around partnerships and community relationships and the use of the buildings and that that be applied equally and that the conversations happen.

3. Standing Item: School & Program Changes  
This item was covered previously in Item 2.
4. Standing Item: Policy Update  
Postponed to August COB
5. Standing Item: Superintendent Transition  
The Board Chair indicated she would report on this area at the upcoming Board of Education meeting on July 21.
6. Work Session
  - **CBFAC/CEAC Discussion**  
This area is about the charge to the two advisory committees and an action regarding modifying the CEAC term limits.

**MOTION:** Ms. Carroll moved that the Committee of the Board recommend that the Board of Education allow the current members of the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC) to be eligible for re-nomination if they so desire. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

**Motion passed**

- Does the recommendation include the assumption that it would be problematic to add anyone to committee? Response: There are currently nine members serving the maximum number can be up to 21 members. The advantage of having the current people stay is they have developed the new capital bonding process and there is value in their going through and continuing with this capital bonding process as well as in setting up a feedback mechanism for the process..
- How many additional members are needed and how many current members are interested in returning to CEAC and CBFAC?

**MOTION:** Mr. Hardy moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education approve the Citizens Budget and Finance Advisory Committee charge for 2009-10 as reviewing and refining of the project to develop a method of collecting data on departing students and analyzing that data for trends and to study and review the budget training materials for site councils and the general public. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

**Motion passed.**

### III. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION:** Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

**Motion passed**

The meeting adjourned at 10:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marilyn Polsfuss  
Assistant Clerk