

**INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625
Saint Paul, Minnesota**

**COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
360 Colborne Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102**

**December 2, 2025
4:30 p.m.**

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:32 p.m. by Chair Henderson.

2. ROLL CALL

Board of Education: E. Valliant, J. Vue, C. Franco, Y. Carrillo, H. Henderson
U. Ward and C. Allen were absent.

Staff: Superintendent Stanley, K. Bergstrom, S. Dahlke

3. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE MAIN AGENDA

MOTION: Director Henderson moved approve the other of the main agenda. The motion was seconded by Director Vue. It passed by acclaim.

4. SUPERINTENDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Superintendent Stanley noted her attendance at the Hmong New Year Celebration, as well as the first night of the districtwide hockey team, and wished them the best of lunch in their first formal game as a Saint Paul hockey team.

5. TXUJ CI FACILITIES WORKGROUP REPORT

Members of the Txuj Ci Facilities Workgroup then presented this report. Topics included the purpose, history, timeline of meetings for December 2023-March 2025, and current Txuj Ci facilities interim options.

The purpose of the presentation is for the Board to understand Txuj Ci Facilities Workgroup interim vision to move forward to vote in favor of Option A at the December 16, 2025 BOE.

The history was reviewed, including from Phalen Lake and Jackson in 202, to Envision SPPS in 2021, to the relocation of the PreK programs to the current timeframe.

Next was the timeline of the Txuj Ci Facilities Meetings, from December 2023 through March 2025, and it was a collaboration between board members, district administrators, parents, educators, and building principals from both the Txuj Ci HMong Language and Culture Upper and Lower Campuses. Phase 1 and Phase 2 plans were reviewed. Phase 2 interim options were then discussed, including the goals for the interim solution and the three options. Additional discussion points were also reviewed, with the work group recommendation with general agreement - Relocate Hmong Studies (HS) program to another site - temporarily while the PK-8 is being developed. A-1: Prosperity.

The current Txuj Ci facilities options were also reviewed, and included:

- Option A (recommended by Txuj Ci Facilities Workgroup)
 - Move Hmong Studies to Prosperity Heights

- Return 5th grade to Lower campus
- Option B (never offered of before October 7, 2025 COB)
 - Move Hmong Studies to Hazel Park
 - Return 5th grade to Lower campus

Members of the workgroup also noted parent concerns in no action between these two options.

The full presentation can be found in the BoardBook.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- It was noted the importance of the differences in Hmong Studies and Hmong Dual Immersion, and that Hmong Studies is about understanding the culture, traditions, history of the Hmong people, and helping studies to learn the culture of the Hmong people and culture for both Hmong students, and those who are not Hmong. Hmong Dual Immersion is, in addition to learning about the culture, it is also learning the Hmong language, both Green and White, and for students to be bilingual by the time they enter middle school. The experience in Hmong Dual Immersion programs was also noted, with PreK-3rd grade reading and speaking the Hmong language, and then in 3rd grade English is incorporated.
- Families also shared their experiences in PreK and the early learning hubs. Families felt isolated at the hub, and requested that their PreK students be moved back to Txuj Ci.
- Director Vue requested an explanation for the rationale for creating a HDL program at the early learning hub. Dr. Stanley noted there was a goal overall to look at enrollment increase, and there were many families on the waiting list for PreK, and we know that students are more likely to stay in the district when they attend PreK in SPPS, so the goal was to ensure as many families are able to attend PreK in the district, which is why the East Hub was created and opened to ensure that families on the waiting list would be able to attend. That was the intent. The impact was that families were frustrated, and families were not engaged. Presenters then shared information about Txuj Ci.
- Director Franco requested information about the infeasibility of the K-12 school. That is information that can be sent.
 - Further information was also provided at the meeting. Chief Turner noted that at that time, SPPS does not support a PreK-12 design for several reasons – including that it is not an academic design in the best academic interest of students. There was one school that was this model called Saint Paul Open, and it closed several years prior, and moved to the current designs of school. From a facilities perspective, there is not currently a building nor land to offer a quality PreK-12 design to fit within our operational and facility design, as well as within our academic.
- Director Franco also asked the workgroup about their initial understanding of the timeline. Response: When we first met, our understanding was that it was a 5-year timeline and we were willing to have the 5th graders at the Upper Campus and for PreK to return to the Lower Campus for 5 years and that it was temporary.
- Director Franco also requested that the workgroup share about the current recommendations and considerations into the move. Parents noted that with the constraints of the building capacity, the 5-year plan included to move the 5th graders to the Upper Campus, and PreK students at the East Hub would then come back and have a true relationship with their peers, and that the 5th graders at Upper would be for 5 years, until they can all be in one school again. That was the main focus because of the 5-year plan, instead of the 10+ year plan. Phase 1 with the 5-year timeline, and the options were reviewed – including A was to keep PreK at the Hub and Lower would have grades 1-5; Option B was to bring back PreK and move 5th grade to the Upper campus; Option C was to split the program.
- Director Franco requested information about the sacrifice of moving the 5th graders at that time. Parents noted that a true language immersion program is PreK-5, and 5th graders at the Upper campus in the HDL program have less resources for HDL as part of the curriculum, and there is not a HDL coach to help with curriculum, and the 5th graders need to be back at the Lower campus. The understanding at the time is that it would be temporary.

- Director Carrillo requested if the workgroup was present or experienced the Envision process, and the closing and merging of two programs, and now looking to split into two schools, and the time into those decisions. He also requested information on the students enrolled at Jackson when it closed? Response: The K-5 enrollment at Jackson when program closed and merged was 319, which was inclusive of all 3 programs at that site. Primarily at Jackson, we heard families say it felt like the “haves and have nots” and because Phalen Lake was larger and had additional programming options and specialists, and afterschool programming, Jackson was closed because of the size and to want to build a strong program with citywide bussing to combine resources to be a stronger, more well-rounded school.
 - He was wondering from the parent’s perspective, about the process with Envision, and as a starting point about the programs and our asks now. Was there an ask at the community at that point in terms of facilities, or only focused on merging the programs? Response: We were not involved in that decision, and told that Jackson was closing, and hoped for a plan for growth and a well-rounded education. Another parent noted their experience with Txuj Ci after enrollment in the Early Learning Hub. In 2018, there was a group of families advocating for a K-12 building, and a need from community, and Envision changed that. The District could not have foreseen the programs coming together and to be immersed in that. Another parent also noted their experience in thinking about a K-12 program and building, including the history, and found our community wanted one school and one building for PreK-12 and how the Hmong community lives with children together. Our senior high students will be watching the younger students. We would hope for a PreK-12, but with the limitations on that, there was PreK-8, and hope to move forward with that.
- Director Carrillo also noted questions about current configuration when Txuj Ci was formed, and details if there was a strong pressure and waitlist to enroll – was it happening before or after Envision, and when we knew there were a lot of families interested in this program.
- Director Henderson requested from the families their perspective on the need to bring families together and what that meant to them. Response: It was difficult, especially for parents of three children all in different buildings, including bus schedules, and to become accustomed to three different schools. Another parent shared that with a child at the Early Learning Hub in the HDL program, there was an assumption they were still part of the Lower school, but it became clear they were not, and information was not passed to families, including about the Hmong New Year and different principals. Parents also expressed that although their child was being grounded in a program that supported their culture and identity, that they did not feel part of the larger community.
- Director Vue noted questions about why the presentation about the 5 year timeline, and then change it to 10 years? Response: A 5 year timeline was not presented in details, but there was a slide that references occupying a building to 2030-2031, and used 5 years as a general statement, and to remember that the school will be for the youngest children, not the current students in the building. The 5 years was an approximation, and it was moved to the amount of time it would take, and revised to the 10 year timeline. The 5 year timeline was in direct correlation once a decision is made about the facilities master plan process, and other designs shared including Obama, Frost Lake, and AIMS, and referenced gatepoint checks. It is a 5-year process once a decision is made about the pre-planning, funding, and working with the State, and an average of 2-3 year construction process.
 - Knowing that the 5 year timeline was approximation, it was still used to make a decision? Response: We don’t have notes that we presented 5 years, but assumed 5 years there would be a decision, and heard clearly that families heard 5 years, and there were different experiences. A parent noted that other staff also were working on a 5 year plan.
 - Director Henderson appreciated the additional pieces and steps to go into the creation and outcome of the final building, and context to hold – there are multiple steps in the construction of a new building, and additional points and pieces.
- Director Carrillo requested information about the conversations about other potential sites other than Prosperity Heights? Response: There were no other sites mentioned other than the East Hub. It was asked if we could build onto the Lower Campus, but we cannot build onto Prosperity. There was also a feasibility study, as to the criteria to land at Prosperity or if other sites were considered, and cost or prioritization, and how we arrived at Prosperity in the short-term solution,

but that the feasibility study was directed to the long-term vision. Chief Turner added them at the time, Prosperity was the only vacant building.

- Director Franco noted that in the Phase 2 presentation was around Board action, and the first set did not require board action, and the restructuring of the course offerings. He noted the updates from Director Vue and the work happening. He also noted the leadership transition during that time, and the engagement by Dr. Stanley. He appreciated the continuation of the process, and to Administration to ensure the Board was brought along in the decision making.
- In Phase 2 of the workgroup, when the decision was first around the intent and goals of Phase 2, through conversations what were the parent perspectives around all the moves? Response: Parents noted that there were conversations about the selections of options that would be least disruptive and in seeing one option was to move to three buildings, it was disheartening. She also highlighted the conversations to Hmong Studies to enhance its curriculum and programming. They need to be highlighted at the School Choice Fair to allow our community to understand this program and commit to enroll into the program. This is temporary and leading to a PreK-8 building. During that time Txuj Ci Upper was also beginning to develop its curriculum, and how to ensure we prepare our programs to enter into a building that will include everyone and to complement each other. Most of the perspective was on growth and well-rounded programs. There are currently constraints for our students. The decision was made to have the ability to grow both programs and for Hmong Studies to make their program special, and to upgrade their curriculum and wanting to grow both programs. Parents also spoke about the potential cuts to Hmong Studies and that enrollment was not there for Kindergarten. Hmong Studies is sustaining themselves, and there are opportunities for both programs to grow in enrollment and in academics for a well-rounded education
- Director Franco noted the hope for a PreK-8 building, and the hope and distrust on this topic, and understanding how parents and families feel and knowing about how systems have not supported folks, but hopes we can continue to work together to understand how to make it feel within reach, even though the timeline has been extended, but to demonstrate the work to build trust again.
- Director Henderson lifted the responsibilities to demonstrate and the expectations to work together towards the PreK-8 building. She also thanked the parents who presented and to the workgroup for the recommendation, as well as the staff, parents, students, and families.
- Parents also noted the history of the workgroup, and the starting 33 members, and there are now about 12-14. It is about ensuring we arrive at a long-term solution, which is the PreK-8 building. She also noted the learning of the language in this work and around facilities master plans, and the expectation to the district to put it into place. She also noted the hope to promote at the School Choice Fair in December. Parents also noted that these options were from the District and not the workgroup. We need to move forward for the students and for Txuj Ci, and encouraged board members to visit at 2 p.m., which is the last lunch for the younger students, who start their school day at 9 a.m.
- Director Vue requested that parents share their perspective on the action to be taken at the upcoming Board of Education meeting. Response: It will be a major decision – we want our students to have the best education and they are currently stuck in a little jar, and there is not room to grow or for specialists, or for other students to learn the Hmong language and culture, and to share the beauty of the culture and heritage. Whatever is decided will affect families, and will impact the choices of families. Parents encouraged the Board that in whatever they decide, they keep the decision for the long-term, and not another stop gap. They also noted that the actions and inactions have profoundly affected their families. They noted that the word “hope” does not exist in the Hmong language – we know, we think, we want, we need. We have been wanting a school and needing a school. There has been no follow through with actions. When the workgroup came to the Board in February, there were actions, which were completed and recommendations were made. While they do not know the vote, they asked the Board as their elected officials and leaders the questions about what they are going to do, and to ensure the people that are served are given the dignity and respect they need.
- There is work to be done to build and rebuild trust, and to meet the needs of the entire community. The Board thanked the workgroup members for being present and for the conversations, and continuation.

5. BREAK FOR PAY26 LEVY TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AT 6:00 P.M.

MOTION: Director Henderson moved to recess the Committee of the Board meeting to move onto the Special Meeting scheduled to begin at 6:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Director Franco.

The motion was approved by roll call vote:

Director Ward	Absent
Director Vue	Yes
Director Allen	Absent
Director Carrillo	Yes
Director Franco	Yes
Director Valliant	Yes
Director Henderson	Yes

The meeting recessed at 5:48 p.m.

MOTION: Director Henderson moved to reconvene the Committee of the Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Director Vue.

The motion was approved by roll call vote:

Director Ward	Absent
Director Vue	Yes
Director Allen	Absent
Director Carrillo	Yes
Director Franco	Yes
Director Valliant	Yes
Director Henderson	Yes

The meeting reconvened at 6:27 p.m.

5. SPPS 2026 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA DISCUSSION

Jim Grathwol, Legislative Liaison, then provided this report.

Within the presentation were details on the key legislative fiscal gains in 2023-2025, and risks and opportunities in the 2026 session.

The full presentation can be found in the BoardBook.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Director Franco requested further information on the PFML and unemployment insurance for hourly workers, and worker protections. What is our plan in addressing, and specific asks around those? Response: We asked that they fund the mandates, and to have impermanent funding source, and recommend the Board adopt a permanent funding source for unemployment insurance. For PFML, we'd like to see the system work and it has been negotiated in contracts, and to ensure the contracts work.
- He wanted to be sure we are not taking a position on removing protections for workers, and to actively seek collaboration on a solution, including the funding solutions.
- Director Henderson noted that she is hearing and to be clear on the messaging, that we believe that workers should have and continue to have access to programs, and it is also the responsibility of the State to adequately fund and support districts. Mr. Grathwol stated affirmatively that we are not recommend to adopt in opposition to PFML, and the reason we have a partially funded

unemployment insurance enactment is because we advocated on the second to last day of the session, and to help fund it. Without funding, it is not sustainable, and those costs then come from the classrooms and schools. No unfunded mandates. It is also the proper object of the state legislature to find new missions to accomplish under the schoolhouse roof, including expended Medicaid billing to extend the roofline.

- Director Franco noted a few requests, including the study and strategy of maintaining when there is a proposed reduction of \$250M in the state education budget, and would also like to see the district discussing enrichment programming, including attainable items. There is a discussion with the Saint Paul Delegation to know our priorities and other hopes, and it should include out of school funding, 21st century learning. The federal government is not helping, but there are some pieces such as activity buses to increase participation in athletics and other components such as reading programs that could be “icing on the cake” or to enhance our ability to deliver core services in the way we need to.
- Director Valliant requested information if there are other areas of change or work from the federal level that we should prepare, including in teacher shortages, and impacts of the recent bill. Response: This administration operates differently than the previous administration, and act outside the boundaries of typical legislative action. Eventually the “chickens will come home to roost” and impacts will be felt including in Medicaid and ACA tax credits. The administration cannot change federal legislative appropriations, that is to Congress, and while executive orders are somewhat performative, removing categories from licensure funding and student loan assistance programs, we not sure they can do that. Further information was also provided on compensatory revenue. The administration is using defenses to confuse the public and to distract from other issues, and we need to carry on and continue to advance the educational experiences of our students, while staying informed about the executive orders and announcements.
- Further details were also requested on the cascading impacts due to federal actions around Medicaid billing, including within Medicaid expansion to over school-related health services, and more individuals on medical waivers. The other pieces is that the implementation has taken longer than expected, and impacts to IEP updates.
- It was also noted that in bargaining with SPFE, we committed to shared action to sustainable funding at the state level. Response: We are working together to establish agenda items, and to look at who is lobbying and the best messenger for each topic to work together.
- Director Henderson noted this feels exciting and there is also a healthy amount of apprehension, and work to do before the start of the session, and opportunities for the Board to be in spaces and to leverage personal relationships to deliver impactful messaging.
- Director Henderson also noted ways in which our City and County partners to work together collaboratively on legislative asks through the Joint Property Tax Advisory Committee, to lift the burden off taxpayers in the city, and it will not be solved this session, but to work 307 years out, and a roadmap to share with the community and to hold our elected officials to a goal.
- Director Carrillo noted the equalization work with our state partners and new equalization factor, and the idea is that we are at a disparity due to the number of tax exempt institutions in the city, and to work with our partners collaboratively to bring extra tax dollars that offset our local voted levies.
- Dr. Stanley noted that she appreciates seeing Mr. Grathwol in different spaces including AMSD, and the opportunities to connect about a Legislative Action committee for SPPS, including engagement of students to be at the table to advocate.

6. POLICY UPDATE

a. Policy 507.01 - School Sponsored Activities: Performances

Craig Anderson, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning, the presented this proposed update. Changes include an added Policy Purpose and General Statement of Policy.

The full presentation and draft of the proposed policy revisions can be found in the BoardBook.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- None

MOTION: Director Henderson moved to place this revision of Policy 507.01 - - School Sponsored Activities: Performances to the consent agenda for the December Regular Meeting because there were not substantive changes made. The motion was seconded by Director Carrillo.

The motion was approved by roll call vote:

Director Ward	Absent
Director Vue	Yes
Director Allen	Absent
Director Carrillo	Yes
Director Franco	Yes
Director Valliant	Yes
Director Henderson	Yes

b. Policy 606.50 - Selection and Reconsideration of Library Material

Craig Anderson, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning, the presented this proposed new policy. The full language was reviewed, and included the purpose, general statement, definitions, responsibility for selection of library materials, individual student access to specific library material, and reconsideration of specific library material.

The full presentation and draft of the proposed policy can be found in the BoardBook.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Director Henderson requested information on the context for the convening of the committee. Response: If someone takes offense to an item in the library, they have the ability to submit a form, and within the procedure, there will be a committee to look at the entirety of the request and the material itself to make a determination.
- What is the role of the media specialist in the committee? Response: The principal shall within 10 days of receiving the complaint request from the district media specialist to bring a committee that includes a building administrator, two classroom teachers, a school support staff, four parent/guardians, and a licensed media specialist not assigned to that school, and a process to determine the request.
- What would happen if rather than someone objecting to a material, there is an objection to the material that is being obstructed by a media specialist? Response: That would be in the human resources realm.
- Much of the decision making around what is allowed or not allowed is within the discretion of a library media specialist, but what is the space if the discretion is counter to the values or needs of the school community.
- Director Carrillo noted questions about the paragraph about principals previously provided, which was included in the procedures, which is not approved by the Board, but discussed with the Policy Work Group.
- The only licenses library media specialist not assigned to the school is not a part of the committee by default? Response: Yes, to ensure there is not a conflict between the person who chose the materials.
- It was noted that MN Statute 134.51 was the basis for the reconsideration? Is that statute to have the reconsideration, or our own interpretation of the statute? Response:
- Director Carrillo wanted to understand the direct relationship and if this is a requirement. He noted concerns about a repeated effort or campaign by a group of people not related to the school to bring complaints to the school about library materials – can the procedure prevent that from happening? Can it state that after the review of a specific material, that there is a moratorium on it being reviewed again within the school year. He can see this being weaponized. There is also a need for discussion at the policy committee level to determine the ramifications of having this avenue which may be used in a good way for folks to have input on the library materials, but wanting to ensure it is not weaponized.

- Director Valliant noted questions about the reconsideration of specific library materials by parents or students, and wondering how much work that may create, and when would a parent specifically choose to have that item not available to their student versus wanting to have it removed from the library. Response: The data is that in the past six years, there has been one request brought through the committee, and the others have been where the parent understands their right to not have their student interface with that material.
 - Director Henderson noted that this is a different time than 6 years ago. This is from the ability to ban books bill, and this is from statute. She noted caution and want to be assured the language protects the district to the fullest extent, but also protects students to access well-rounded and robust materials in the library.
- Director Franco noted the reporting mechanism discussion at Policy Work Group and a way to ensure if there is a book being considered for removal to make that information to the Board to know if books are being removed from the shelves, but also if a book is raised to the level to being removed, and looking at the mechanism for notification across the district, so that folks are not purchasing the book and avenue for more discussion if it is challenged somewhere else.
- Dr. Stanley noted that during the height of this, MSBA met with superintendents to draft this model policy, and it may be beneficial to look at other policies with MSBA-added clarity to ensure it is not weaponized but used to protect access for students.
- General Counsel noted that in looking at the statute, there is a context challenge or reconsideration, there is a duty to submit a report of the challenge to the commissioner of education, and to the Board to report the details of the challenge to the agency and Board.

MOTION: Director Henderson moved that the review of Policy 606.50 at the December 2, 2025 Committee of the Board meeting be considered the First Reading of the three reading process, and that the review of the policy at the December 16th Board of Education meeting will be considered the second reading. The motion was seconded by Director Franco.

The motion was approved by roll call vote:

Director Ward	Absent
Director Vue	Yes
Director Allen	Absent
Director Carrillo	Yes
Director Franco	Yes
Director Valliant	Yes
Director Henderson	Yes

c. Recission of Policy 702.01 - Bonded Officers and Employees

Daniel Moser, Executive Director of Financial Services, then presented this proposed recission. The rationale for the proposed recission was reviewed, including that MN Statute 123B.14 Subd. 6 - Performance Bond; When the duty devolves upon any person employed by a board to receive money and pay it over to the treasurer of the district, the district must require a bond from such person and pay all premiums therefor. The amount of each bond shall be fixed by the board and the bond approved by it. The bond must be not less than \$500 conditioned for the faithful performance of the duty and be filed with the clerk. In lieu of individual bonds, the district may prescribe and keep in effect a schedule or position insurance policy or blanket bond in such aggregate amount as the district determines, insuring the fidelity of such persons in the amount of not less than \$500 for each such person.

The full presentation and draft of the proposed recission can be found in the BoardBook.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Director Franco noted the recommendation to continue to make this a practice, and to ensure it is documented to carry insurance on the elected officials. Response: Under MN Statute, the school district has a duty to defend and indemnify all school board members, and under another statute, we

have the right to purchase insurance to cover that indemnify. We need to indemnify and defend school board members either way, it is whether we do it with insurance.

- Do we need to include this in policy in case future board decide not to? Appreciate the assurance that we are all covered.

MOTION: Director Henderson moved that the review of Policy 702.01 at the December 2, 2025 Committee of the Board meeting be considered the First Reading of the three reading process, and that the review of the policy at the December 16th Board of Education meeting will be considered the Second Reading. The motion was seconded by Director Carrillo.

The motion was approved by roll call vote:

Director Ward	Absent
Director Vue	Yes
Director Allen	Absent
Director Carrillo	Yes
Director Franco	Yes
Director Valliant	Yes
Director Henderson	Yes

d. Policy 504.00 - Drug Free Schools

Kathy Kimani, Director, Office of School Support, presented this update.

Within the presentation were details on the review committee, policy purpose, general statement, definitions, exceptions, and enforcement.

The full presentation and draft of the proposed policy revisions can be found in the BoardBook.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Director Valliant requested information referring to the General Statement and in describing hemp-derived products, and wondering if that includes garments made from hemp, such as hats and shirts.
- Director Franco noted questions about the locations and general business within the definitions, and jurisdictions and liability for students who may be at partner locations. Response: If a student is participating in a program or work environment where they are under the supervision of the District, they would be on school business, or if under the supervision of a school employee. There is a difference if the student is at a location such as a rec center or after-school care that is near the school, and the jurisdiction of that agency. If the student is at an athletic event that is at another location, it would be considered district business and fall within this policy as well.
- Director Valliant requested information on fresh or dry flower, and pocket flower, because there are differences, as well as further clarification on the leaf and flower, because they are two different parts of the plant, as well as fresh leaf.

MOTION: Director Henderson moved the review of Policy 504.00 at the COB meeting be considered the first reading of the three reading process and that the review of the policy at the December Board of Education meeting will be considered the second reading. The motion was seconded by Director Vue.

The motion was approved by roll call vote:

Director Ward	Absent
Director Vue	Yes
Director Allen	Absent
Director Carrillo	Yes
Director Franco	Yes

Director Valliant	Yes
Director Henderson	Yes

5. 2027-2033 STRATEGIC PLAN AND FACILITIES PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS

Superintendent Stanley then presented this report. This is grounded in the Entry Plan Phase of Leading.

Two interconnected, community-driven planning processes that will shape our future:

- 2026-27 to 2032-33 Strategic Plan launching our new strategic direction
- Facilities Portfolio Analysis ensuring equitable distribution of fiscally sound and sustainable facilities

Information on the 2026-2033 strategic plan was shared:

- Determine Educational Needs
- Establish Priorities
- Identify & declare Strategic Objectives
- Set Key Indicators of Progress
- Focus Resources

Details were also provided on the 2026-2027 strategic plan community engagement, three priority areas of Excellence in Instruction, Deliberate Inclusion, and Sustainable Infrastructure. Strategic plan phases were reviewed.

Information on the Facilities Portfolio Analysis included the need for:

- Fiscal constraints
- Innovative spaces for student programming
- Ensure every student has access to safe, well-kept, well-resourced learning environments

Any changes to our facilities configuration would be implemented in Fall 2028, providing a full transition year (2027-28) to support students, families and staff through thoughtful planning, staffing decisions, enrollment processes, and facility and program modifications.

Community engagement and phases were also reviewed. Integration and alignment with the strategic plan process was also shared. Board involvement in both processes was also presented, as well as the rationale for this approach.

The full presentation can be found in the BoardBook.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Director Vue noted the strategic plan is grounded in dignity and belonging, and that we do not move the goalpost based on the fiscal year, but to suggest that the Board develop guardrails on what it means for those we serve. Director Franco noted that it seems like a value to uphold in this process, and how we will do the work, and those things will be defined through the work of the strategic plans, and guardrails for the process, and this is an opportunity to think about additional guardrails we may want in place. This is equity and belonging to ground the work to get us to a well-rounded strategic plan, that centers those core components. Director Valliant also noted there should be specific goals that are directly related to equity and belonging, and to have them as values, but also to put forth specifics so they don't get lost. Chief Grey Akyea noted there was a need to take conceptual and interpreted in many different ways to have a concrete and shared understanding, and to move to a more aligned place in a more strategic direction. Director Valliant noted the need for the Equity Department to put forth goals for the district, which will be the guardrails to work. Director Carrillo appreciates the desire to center goals around equity and dignity, and to ensure it is not the historical trend of favoring the few at the expense of many who have been disadvantaged in our organization. We need expectations for ourselves, as well as our community to engage in this work and framed in a sense of SPPS the place for everyone and to share resources amongst each other. He also noted the advisory groups and their work in the

strategic plan and transparency will be key and who they represent, and then step into the hard work of the strategic plan.

- Director Vue noted he sees the phase lay out for the strategic plan, and consider the Board having a report at the end of each phase, voting to approve it, and then moving onto the next phase to monitor the design of the strategic plan. Is the purpose of the vote to have a mechanism to say the Board needs more, or to move to the next phase? It would be a mechanism for the Board to assert influence and collaborate with the Superintendent. Director Franco noted there is an intent to provide consistent memos to the Board and regular updates at the Committee of the Board at a minimum. Those are opportunities for check-points. He wondered if there are specific points in time, and what the vote would commit the Board or not, because they will always have the ability to go back to the community for further engagement. Director Henderson noted that if the Board is reacting to the work after it has been done, and not expressed concerns throughout the process, it is outside the governance capability and potential. She believes there are ways to be engaged outside the voting process as a checkpoint in the process, but Board members to be aware of the process is crucial and built into the process. Director Carrillo noted he would not want to vote on any part of the strategic plan until the launch itself, because it is the prerogative of the superintendent to develop the plan, with other ways for the Board to be involved and offer feedback. This is a January-July process, and interacting with the outcome of the strategic plan. If we come to a board adoption in July and not sure about the strategic plan or surprised by it, it may be a failure in communicating, and not a failure in governance, and speaks to the relationship with the superintendent. He would spend more time crafting checkpoints in the facilities portfolio review, where we do owe the community a formal review process. Director Valliant noted that Director Vue asked to vote on the report, not on the plan, and report on the vote could agree on the report and accept it. It is not voting on a process or point in the plan – only the report. Director Vue provided more information on his rationale. It is to demonstrate to the public that the Board is engaged and accountable and do have the community's interest in mind. Director Henderson requested information if the Board were to vote a report down, and what it means for the phase as the Board's votes are directives. Director Valliant noted if the report is voted down, the Board is stating that pieces are missing, but we need to be clear about it. If board members are unhappy with, for example, community engagement, and the expectation is that it is redone, and an understanding that is different about what the vote means and the next step to that report. She is in favor of an accountability checkpoint, but does not want to put the Board or District in a position where we are unsure of what the next steps are in the process. Director Franco agreed with Director Henderson and that when the reports and memos are received, to ensure they have insight on next steps and the structure of the pieces to be embedded into that report, and if there were questions, that it would not be unheard in the process.
- Director Vue noted the decision does not need to be made tonight, but for further discussion.
- About the taskforce, how long will that taskforce be active based on the design and planning for the new strategic plan? Response: From January to the recommendation to the Board for the strategic plan. They will be very active initially, and then there will be a break to analyze the data, and take that information back to them to receive that information, provide feedback, and then make final touches to bring the proposed plan to the Board, and the taskforce would be sunset once the recommendation come before the Board in June 2026. Then the Board would review, offer feedback, and then take action.
- How many meetings will there be for the taskforce? Response: About 7-8 meetings.
- Director Vue noted consideration to compensate members of the taskforce through a stipend. Dr. Stanley noted that those were built into the budget. In terms of amount per member, that information will be provided from a management level.
- Director Valliant noted appreciation for the set-up, and that we should have specific equity goals in order to inform and lead with equity.
- Director Vue noted a point of clarification around the facilities portfolio engagement, and if this is a different task force, and if they will be provided with a stipend? Response: There is not a current budget built for this, but the Board would appreciate that it is.
- There will be no major decisions around the facilities configuration until the 27-28 school year? Response: Yes, the Board would receive the recommendation in Jun 2027, they would examine,

deliberate, deliver feedback, and act on it for August 2027, and use 2027-2028 school year to move to implementation. There may be scenarios where some recommendations start in Fall 2028, but some delayed to 2029. We want to take a year to plan that out and allow for transitions, which is based on feedback from the Board and community members in her 100-day onboarding.

- The strategic plan will be voted on in August 2026 – does that mean the allocations during the spring is based on the current strategic plan? Response: Yes, the allocations in February.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Director Henderson moved to adjourn the meeting. Director Franco seconded the motion

The motion was approved by roll call vote:

Director Ward	Absent
Director Vue	Yes
Director Allen	Absent
Director Carrillo	Yes
Director Franco	Yes
Director Valliant	Yes
Director Henderson	Yes

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

For clarity and to facilitate research, these minutes reflect the order of the original Agenda and not necessarily the time during the meeting the items were discussed.

Prepared and submitted by:

Sarah Dahlke, Assistant Clerk, St. Paul Public Schools Board of Education