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

II. AGENDA

A. FY 16 Budget Update

The CFO reviewed the goals and budget guidelines for the FY 2015-16 budget.

SPPS will receive an additional $7,825,000 in revenue from the legislature; $6,780,000 in General Fund and $1,045,000 in Non-General Fund. This increase has been applied to the FY 16 budget proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Ed Formula 2%</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$4,870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensatory Education 2%</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Time &amp; Concurrent</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Aid</td>
<td>Non-General</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Readiness</td>
<td>Non-General</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECFE</td>
<td>Non-General</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,825,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 15-16 General Fund Preliminary Big Picture (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 15 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 16 Preliminary</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$529.1</td>
<td>$534.8</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.5*</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>537.2</td>
<td>537.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The ending FY 14-15 (6/30/15) Unassigned Fund Balance is projected to be 5.2% (as of the March 2015 quarterly report). The $2.5 million use of fund balance for FY 15-16 has been accounted for in the projection.

FY 2015-16 General Fund Projected Shortfall Updated to Reflect Additional General Fund Legislative Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount in Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary increases to all expenditures (salary &amp; benefits increases, utilities, contracts, supplies, equipment)</td>
<td>$14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSC 2.0 support for program articulation at sites</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional projected FY 16 contractual commitments for Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class size at high poverty sites, Board resolution staffing, content areas

class size 2.8

TOTAL $19.3

Offset by original FY 16 projected revenue increase (included a 1% legislative assumption) (1.3)
Offset by estimated additional General Fund legislative revenue increase (4.4)
Unassigned Fund balance available to offset costs (2.5)

TOTAL REVISED SHORTFALL $11.1

FY 2015-16 General Fund Proposal to Address Projected Shortfall of $11.1 Million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REAVISED SHORTFALL</td>
<td>$11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most District Department/program budgets will receive 0% inflationary increases along with 5% reduction (7.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing program budgets that have decreasing revenues (4.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing program budgets that have had operational efficiencies (3.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE AVAILABLE</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurpose FY 16 budgeted OPEB amount (1 year only) 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay additional FY 16 Board Resolution staffing to fund direct classroom staff at sites (1 year only)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BALANCE AVAILABLE</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 15-16 General Fund Proposal to Allocate Additional Funding to Sites/Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BALANCE AVAILABLE</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to schools, either a targeted allocation or a per pupil amount of $65/student (5.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to school service support programs directly allocated to schools (substitutes, MLL, Special Ed, Athletics) (0.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to district-wide support programs (Community Engagements &amp; Finance) (0.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE AVAILABLE</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 16 General Fund Big Picture - Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 15 Adopted (in millions)</th>
<th>FY 16 Preliminary (in millions)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>$246.1</td>
<td>$253.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Service Support</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-wide Support*</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>2.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$537.2</td>
<td>$537.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* District-wide support: there is a funding increase due to restricted funding for alternative facilities and health & safety, plus inflationary increases for employee benefits, insurance and utilities.

FY 2015-16 General Fund Budget Reductions School Service Support Programs


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 15 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 16 Proposed</th>
<th>Reduction Amount</th>
<th>Reduction %</th>
<th>Inflation Amt Not Allocated</th>
<th>% Total Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$184,977,526</td>
<td>$175,987,186</td>
<td>(8,990,340)</td>
<td>(4.9%)</td>
<td>(3,102,819)</td>
<td>(6.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2015-16 General Fund Budget Reductions District Wide Support Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 15 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 16 Proposed</th>
<th>Difference Amount</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Inflation Amt Not Allocated</th>
<th>% Total Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$102,018,439</td>
<td>$104,081,036</td>
<td>$2,062,597</td>
<td>2.0%*</td>
<td>($661,591)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is a 2.5% funding increase due to restricted funding for alternative facilities and health and safety, plus inflationary increases for employee benefits, insurance and utilities.

FY 2015-16 General Fund Budget Reductions Central Administration Programs
Areas impacted include: Board of Education, Superintendent's Office, CEO, Chief Academics Officer, Chief of Operations, General Counsel, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 15 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 16 Proposed</th>
<th>Reduction Amount</th>
<th>Reduction %</th>
<th>Inflation Amt Not Allocated</th>
<th>% Total Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,071,021</td>
<td>$3,867,470</td>
<td>($203,551)</td>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
<td>($81,120)</td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors influencing the budget are:
- Fiscal year end projections vs. actual revenue & expenditures impact fund balance
- Enrollment fluctuations impact revenue, class size and building capacity
- Contractual settlements impact expenditure levels
- Legislative adjustments impact revenue
- Previous year's October 1 Free & Reduced lunch count impacts revenue
- Bond ratings
- Inflation.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:
- May want to refer to the repurpose of the OPEB money as being freed up for current OPEB costs thus freeing up other General Fund amounts -- just so it is clear OPEB is being used for purpose intended.
- When will the Board see the other pieces – debt service, etc. Response: There will be a proposed Budget Summary Book before next weekend.
- It was noted the General Counsel took a heavy cut, theirs is a small budget for a large operation. Response: SPPS focused on cutting programs to keep cuts away from schools. The Superintendent gave examples of numbers cut within some other departments.
- How will reductions affect PLTT, what will be the impact on service expectations in technology services to the schools? Response: SPPS is adding 10 field techs to those currently in staff positions. This gives 42 field techs total for next year.
- Will response time change? Response: We can’t provide the same support and services when we do not have the dollars to do it. SPPS may have to reconsider services in upcoming years.
- Will there be a significant change in response time? If so, will there be communication to affected parties so they know what expectations are? Response: The priority for support is to the schools and district teaching plans. The impact will hit administration more than PLTT in schools.
- Thanks were extended to the Finance Department for all the work involved in building the budget.
- Concern was expressed about the areas that are being hit – American Indian, special ed – concern was they were held flat and will still have to cut. Response: Even though the
Board has provided the one time OPEB and Resolution funds, SPPS will still have to address cuts again next year.

- The Board has freed up some money without knowing how it would be used, now that we have firmer detail we do not want to see a loss of support to classrooms – teachers, support staff, etc. How will the new revenues impact staffing at sites? Response: Administration indicated the added 1% would go to schools to address this.
- We are reducing budgets to programs that had decrease in revenues – Special Ed and MLL. Response: The case load count for special ed numbers is declining. SPPS receives formulaic funding from the State for this area. As counts go down, moneys goes down. SPPS still has to meet a minimum level of expenditures to meet guidelines. Also for ALC the per pupil amount the District is funding is greater than revenues received. SPPS needs to find ways to get more revenue in and/or live within revenue received.
- Staff indicated they were confident there would be few or no teacher impacts from the budget non-renewal process. This is an improvement of 15 teachers over previous projections. There will be some layoffs in paraprofessionals group. Overall, SPPS is seeing a reduction in number of layoffs. Schools have received information on new allocations and will provide information on how it will be used by June 11 at which point the final budget can be put together.
- Staff noted schools are bringing back TAs, mobility clerks and other positions.
- How will cuts in technology impact promises in connection with PLTT initiative? Response: SPPS will need to recalibrate if needed. It is important to remember SPPS is into year two of the device roll out. Management has had to reduce some positions but the Technology Department is prepared to deliver on its promise to schools. The plan is every school will have access to tech support for the roll outs. There has also been a revised focus in Teaching and Learning in terms of supporting personalized learning.
- A Board member noted she also did not support delaying the Board Resolution in conjunction with SPF T. Another Board member indicated she supported the use of Resolution monies as she was not prepared to layoff current employees to hire new employees. She was comfortable with delay in resolution to preserve current jobs.
- Concern was expressed about the equity work, with the proposed cuts how will the work move forward? Response: Equity lost three positions supporting schools. It is one of the budgets that received the most cuts. SPPS needs to create more in-house training capacity. For the positive some of the cut positions have moved to schools and can lead work there. SPPS will continue moving the equity work.
- Is SPPS at a point where it will begin to reduce the basic Beyond Diversity work or will it be pushed out for another full year? Response: With the staffing reductions there will be some reduction to the service delivery model. SPPS has made investments in its leaders building capacity in training and a knowledge base across schools to continue the work. The Equity Office will act in advisory capacity but will not be able to provide the same level of direct services as in the past. Beyond Diversity will continue to do monthly trainings, that will not change. SPPS will also continue to build internal capacity to do it as well as there is a capacity SPPS wants to meet each year. There will be a need to work more collaboratively with department leaders to do the work in consultation with the Equity Office. There will be a shift in the model and on-going work to build capacity to do the work.
- As some employees lose a position will they have a chance to bump to another opening or is there the possibility an employee could go to another position at lower salary? Response: Yes, for some units – they can interview for any open position across the district, Paras, TAs, EAs have bumping rights. Yes, there is the opportunity for people to move around, seniority moves the process.

MOTION: Ms. Seeba moved the Board approve the report presented on the FY 2015-2016 budget. Ms. Carroll seconded the motion.

The motion passed.
B. Latino Consent Decree (LCD) Parent Advisory Council Report & Recommendation

The LCD Parent Advisory Council provides their report to the SPPS Board under the directive of the LCD Stipulation, Section VIII - Program Evaluation and Monitoring which states "there shall be from time to time an evaluation made as to the home language background identification and assessment process and the other programs under this stipulation to assure District compliance with all areas under the LCD."

There are gaps between what the LCD stipulation states and what is actually done across the district. The last recorded Implementation Guide dates back to 1998. The current Implementation Guide, as it is today, does not address all the advancements, improvements and best practices in education. To ensure the LCD is implemented in the modern era in such a way as to meet its goal of advancing Latino students, closing the achievement gap and aligning to the District's strategic plan, the Council's goals are to:

- Create a plan for full implementation of the LCD
- Go beyond compliance
- Ensure that the Implementation Guide is created in a meaningful manner and
- Have positive outcomes for Latino students and families.

2014-15 Recommendations were:

1. Language Assessment:
   - Student Information Form - Translation to work in collaboration with the Student Placement Center to translate the Declaration of Ethnic & Racial Background and the Declaration of Student Language forms. The LCD asked to have these forms translated into Spanish by 7/1/2015.
   - Declaration of Formal Instruction - to work in collaboration with the Student Placement Center to create a new Student Intake Form or to insert a section in the Student Intake Form that relates to the Declaration of Formal Instruction for Latino students new to the country. It is important for teachers to recognize how many years students have with their home language when they enter class so they then can assess levels of experience for math, etc. The LCD asked that this information begin to be collected and sent to schools so grade level teams can use it to guide the instruction and/or seek resources to support the student's learning. If approved they asked that this section be in place by 7/1/2015 so the Placement Center can begin to gather the data.
   - Spanish Language Assessment - to work in collaboration with the Department of REA to identify a test, explore, develop and implement a pilot testing program and to administer the test to Latino students new to the country only. This will help guide instruction in classroom in alignment in language student knows best especially in math, etc.

2. Educational Programs
   - Cultural Heritage - to work in collaboration with the Social Studies Department on the Latino/Hispanic curriculum to create a Latino/Hispanic Curriculum Map (MN Standards). Support teaching of academic standards in content area, promote cultural knowledge and support information provided in the Progress Report Parent Guides and to be in compliance with District policy (racial equity). The LCD asked to have this map (K-5) available by January 2016.

3. Parental Contact
   - Home Liaisons & Notices - to work in collaboration with HR, MLL and the LCD program on the requirements pertaining to parental contact and to review the number of staff guidelines, roles and responsibilities. This would minimize the impact when major conflicts arise between schools and parents, promote learning so parents can benefit from the LCD program and what the District has to offer, give parents the
To expand awareness of LCD efforts, parent training sessions were held at six locations between October 2014 and May 2015.

The next steps outlined by the Council include:
- Continuing the task of evaluating and updating the LCD Stipulation Guide
- Select Steering Committee members by opening week (August 2015). The Steering Committee is made up of the 10 member LCD Parent Advisory Council, two LCD/EL teachers, two community members, two SPPS Departments/Programs and one from other programs.
- Meetings with Placement Center, REA, MRC social studies department.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:
- It was noted the language assessment recommendations were good recommendations that would work for Latino students as well as other ethnic groups. The Declaration of formal instruction would be good for all new kids to district as well.
- The comment was made it is exciting to see how the work being done is increasingly collaborative and at a deeper and more comprehensive level, change is happening much faster.
- Item 5A – is this current practice to be continued? Response: This year there were no meetings and the LCD would encourage continuation as it helps inform others on what is being planned and organized. The LCD is focusing on meetings with staff so the whole story is communicated across the district. The LCD hopes to formalize these as an ongoing commitment. Staff noted the meetings were suspended for the past year because of work on the Implementation Guide.
- Recommendation #4, the MN alignment map, what is it? Response: This maps the curriculum to make it equitable across the district. It looks at social studies standards and aligns it with grade level curriculum. It establishes a minimum knowledge and defines material for review to provide greater unity across the district along with more site based participation and involvement as required. This would progress in stages beginning in Kindergarten and progress up through the grades.
- Which recommendations will best help increase academic achievement for students? Response: Recommendation 2 would help students new to the country find which level they are at in formal education so teachers have a clear idea of how to work with the student. Also number 1 in order to figure out where a student is at in language and what type of work is needed. 1 and 2 are connected, too many forms are only in English. If they were available in Spanish (or other languages) SPPS would get better information to help instructors know where students are coming from.
- Have you found PLTT helped with learning this year? Response: Yes, definitely. The students learn at a faster rate than before, it has really helped in getting information to teacher and back. All tasks are submitted through iPads.
- What is this on the form about agriculture and fishing? Response: It is related to the migrant issue. Families with migrant status are eligible for added support and it is information that is reported to MDE.

MOTION: Ms Carroll moved the Board accept the report from the Latino Consent Decree Parent Advisory Council. Ms. Doran seconded the motion.
C. **Standing Item: Policy Update**

1. **Update on Rights & Responsibilities Handbook**
   A diverse group of SPPS staff met throughout the spring to review current Handbook language and propose updates for the *SY 15-16 Rights and Responsibilities Handbook*.

   The focus of the revisions was mostly clarification and compliance related updates. These are mainly due to the fact that in 2013 there were significant content changes made to the *Handbook*. The review group has expressed interest in a deeper review of the *Handbook* for SY 16-17 to make it more student and staff usable.

   The proposed changes for SY 15-16 include updating the language in the *Handbook* to reflect SPPS’ 1:1 iPad environment, clarifying language around PBIS and updating definitions in Level of Violations and Glossary of Terms to reflect current reporting requirements. A summary of the proposed changes was provided to the Board for their review.

   **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**
   - A Board member stated they were encouraged that SPPS has a regular review cycle in place and with the depth of people participating. Staff indicated they intend to expand the depth of participation to more stakeholders (students, parents, teachers) next year.
   - Is language being updated relative to the gender inclusion policy? Yes, it is being put in the area of harassment based on protected status. That data will be collected and reported to OCR.
   - There is some trauma influenced home training being done for some employees, is that be incorporated as well? Response: That is not something the group has dealt with. It has mostly been PBIS, Campus, Personalized Learning around changes; that is something that could be considered in future.
   - It was noted this would be an excellent first step in participation for the Board’s student advisory group it is an area to get feedback from them.
   - It was noted there is a need for active input by students, parents and teachers perhaps having them come up with agreed upon expectations as an end result. Response: The Handbook is just a tool, what is hoped is that schools are partnering with families on what it looks like in the school building. Administrators have asked for more time and training on how to use the Handbook as a tool to work toward how schools want to work, what is wanted/expected for schools and students.
   - Designed engagement would be a valuable addition to the process.
   - A Board member asked if staff was thinking about an e-version aspect of the *Handbook* that has interactive dimensions. Response: Staff is exploring ways to leverage technology relative to the *Handbook*.

   Thanks were extended for the update.

D. **Standing Item: PLTT Update** - No report

E. **Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update** - No report

F. **Work Session**

1. **Board Check In**
   Staff asked the Board for input on their desire for equity development for FY 15-16 and their goals for next year (now through January and then goals as Board transitions in January), areas of focus and reason for that focus. Comments included:
   - Board desired one session during the summer months
• Start a conversation about the accountability piece in policies – Racial equity particularly has a need to put teeth around it
• Accountability/support to continue work on how Board members hold themselves accountable and moving to higher level
• Internal facilitation rather than outside at least for the next six months
• Need more school examples so can tell “the story” better
• It was suggested the group consider a shared school experience
• Participation in equity circle within a school(s)
• Utilizing skills to build on as move from Board to community member
• Interest in meeting with City Council, County Commissioners to share perspectives/results to yield output, plan, commitment.

In summary areas are: Develop ability to apply work both inside and outside of Board work, continue to have deep conversations to speak to work, understand how work looks in practice at schools, how work can be done with City/County to advance racial equity development/goals and identify and increase measures on Racial Equity Policy,

2. **Board Budget Review**

The Board reviewed the coming year budget and where cuts had been made within it.

3. **Update on Student Involvement with the Board**

Staff provided some background information comprising an article entitled "Ladder of Youth Voice" by Adam Fletcher describing eight levels of youth voice/participation. Staff then reviewed gathering information and Student Advisory Board recommendations along with other considerations that area being proposed.

The object of this effort is to develop a system to achieve authentic student voice in decision making relative to the Board. Within the spectrum of options for involvement having students serve in a consulting position might be the best option.

The Youth Leadership Team (through Community Education) is a group of secondary students who participate in year-long projects related to social justice. This might be an option already out there.

Staff provided a summary of the material provided. Students want:
• To be involved in decisions affecting them (curriculum and funding decisions).
• They want authentic power not just be a token.
• They want to be sure there is a diverse voice.
• They want to get something out of their participation such as leadership development opportunities (mentoring by Board members, skill development, access to leaders - District, City).
• This is seen as a prestigious opportunity for students.
• Staff recommended a student advisory board with representatives from each high school in the district as well as comprehensive schools, LEAP, AGAPE, Gordon Parks.
• Staff suggested the student member should also be part of their school's student council.
• Participation should be through an application process to achieve diversity of experiences and perspectives.

Decisions need to be made as to whether student(s) sit in on Board meetings, whether it would always be the same person or rotating among the group, Criteria would need to be established for the types of decisions students would be involved in and opportunities for development need to be ensured for participating students.
It was noted the Chicago Public Schools have a good model. The work group (Hardy, Carroll and Vue) will meet with staff to develop a proposal to be brought back to the full Board.

Questions/Discussion:
- The work group asked for guidance on representation versus engaging other students. If they are not elected, what would be expected of them? If chose Advisory route would the Board expect them to do consultation with youth in district?
- It would be nice if they would be open to input from students but not required to pursue input from students.
- There is a nuance around there being a requirement that this person consult with the student body/student governance organization in their building for key issues, etc. Something to make the connection back to group that has been elected within their school.
- What is the timeline for this? Response: For the new school year. The applications out in September, if go that route. Another option would start terms in January (Juniors) serve January to January and remainder of Senior year serve in an advisory capacity to the current council. Budget to budget is another option. It could be school year to school year or across years. Junior Senior connection is good idea.
- How have other districts handled multiple age students on council.

4. **Policy Update - Section 200 - Board Policies**
Staff provided a chart summarizing the proposed changes to various Section 200 policies from the policy work group. Policies 204.01, 206.01 (policy and exhibit) and 209.00 will be brought forward to the next Board meeting.

The policy work group will work though the remaining policies and bring forward, for the next Board meeting, those policies that can be revised.

5. **Preparation for the July 20 Superintendent Mid-Year Evaluation**
The work group indicated they were meeting with the Superintendent and CEO to establish goals and process which will then be forwarded to the Board.

### III. ADJOURNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION:</th>
<th>Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Seeba.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion passed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk