I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Youth Commission Presentation

The Saint Paul Youth Commission is in its fifth year. It offers St. Paul students a voice in government and issues facing youth in St. Paul. The Transit Access Subcommittee’s goal is to encourage access to metro transit options should students desire it. Transit matters to youth because it improves attendance, connects youth to opportunities (developmental and social) and opens youth to their environment.

The Transit Project gave 14 students unlimited access metro transit cards. Weekly survey data was collected on usage over 12 weeks and students recorded their personal stories for a short video. The participants were 11 Harding students and three Central students. Six were sophomores and eight juniors; seven female and seven male.

The survey asked what students used their transit passes for and how often they use them (average number of responses were 11.5 students over 12 weeks).

1. In the past week, what activities did you use your bus pass for? Results showed passes were used for a variety of uses.
   • 6.17 used it to get to and/or from work
   • 5.67 used it for attending an after school program
   • 5.58 use it to get to and/or from school
   • 5.00 used it for access to tutoring
   • 4.83 used it for social activities
   • 3.17 used it to access sports opportunities

2. How many days in the past week did you use your bus pass to get to and/or from school? Over half used it three or more days a week.

3. How many days of school have you missed in the past week?
   • Zero for almost 9+ students
Other results shows a small number missed one day and very, very few missed two to five days.

4. How many days of the week did you use the bus pass for each activity: sports, tutoring, social activities, work and after school activities?
   - After school Programs on a average week - approximately two-thirds used their passes to attend programs two to five days a week.
   - Attendance at tutoring on average week was 6.50 attended tutoring for one or more days; 3.83 did not attend tutoring.
   - Attendance at work on average week: two-thirds attended work for one or more days per week.

LINK TO PREZI PRESENTATION: https://prezi.com/h7xerolqlumf/saint-paul-youth-Commission/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy
LINK TO VIDEO: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kWuJqKe4So.

The group's recommendation was that the SPPS board consider providing subsidized transit passes to high school students in SPPS thereby increasing their access to academic resources and other options for their development.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:
- A Board member noted even middle school students could benefit from access to transit passes. It would help them develop a relationship with their pathway schools, provide opportunities for extracurricular activities, tutoring and/or mentoring.
- How much does it cost to ride Metro Transit? Response: $1.75 regular and an additional rush hour fee of $2.25.
- With the 14 kids participating and other kids you have talked with, how much concern is there among kids about safety and potential problems using Metro Transit? Response: Students seem comfortable using transit though some are somewhat apprehensive if they are using it for the first time. Parents seem more concerned than students. The group felt greater access would help with that perception by parents. They noted negative concerns come from never having used public transit.
- How were the 14 chosen? Response: Information was put out to schools and the Youth Commission worked out the details. The pilot had a capacity for 30 but ended up with 14.
- Will this continue though this school year? Response: No, the SPYC is adopting a new model for 2016 though two of the group were considering continuing the study on their own.
- It was noted SPPS is resuming its conversation on start times and busing is a one issue in that area. Did this transit study bring out an responses to student start time preferences? Response: Not really, though there seems to be a general comfort with things as they now are due to involvement in other activities. In general students are not opposed to later start times. It would, if bus passes were utilized, decrease reliance on yellow school buses. The group noted a lot of after school activities and work schedules might be impacted if times changed.
- Were the bus passes open for use 24 hours per day? Response: Yes, they are 24/7.
- Students in the study were volunteers, how close did they live to bus stop? Response: The distance varied for each person. It would be important to check into distance to stops if passes are considered.
- The SPYC was invited to share in upcoming conversations about school start time if they desired.

B. Youth Voice in District Decisions
   Because students have always been at the center of SPPS decisions and in recent years, "student voice" has been explicitly named and focused on by SPPS, the Board formed a work group to look at this area. Both the Board and Administration support student voice in key decision, from the classroom to the board room.
The Board began working with students and staff in the fall of 2014 to deepen student voice options. A Board-appointed task force was created in the spring of 2015. The recommendations brought forward at this meeting follow on many discussions plus guidance from the July 21, 2015 COB work session.

Objectives established for student engagement were:

- To hear student voices on issues important to them and on issues important to Administration and the Board
- To engage students on issues where their perspectives will influence decisions
- To deliver authentic student engagement
  - To engage students who have a stake in particular issues
  - To provide students the information they need to participate in a meaningful way
  - To see the full range of student perspectives
  - To monitor and adjust process as needed
  - To routinely report out impacts of student voice on decisions

The Board's recommendation is to form a Student Advisory Team. A framework for a 2015-16 pilot will establish a group of high school students to serve as a special committee. Their key task is to help design and periodically deliver student engagement, but not "speak for" other students. For the pilot year, the Team will also work on structure, selection and other areas as needed.

Team members will be selected from diverse backgrounds and life experiences forming a team that will have varied perspectives on how to engage students. The aim is to leverage the fact that students are best positioned to figure out how to reach out to and engage students. The Team will be "at the ready" to partner with Administration and the Board.

A few examples of engagement brought forward were:

- Major district-wide efforts such as school start times or FMP implementation or specific policies or similar such as gender inclusion, Rights and Responsibilities Handbook, etc. The purpose would be to get feedback from key stakeholders to shape decisions by Board or Administration. The process would be designed collaboratively with staff, Student Advisory Team and families. Staff would be responsible for implementation in partnership with others; tools including brainstorming sessions, scenarios, workshops, etc. could be utilized. Staff is also responsible for monitoring and reporting out.

- Time-sensitive class/grade, school or district-wide questions. The purpose would be to identify issues important to students of all ages, get implementation feedback, test simple options or ideas. The process would be to design replicable approaches with the Student Advisory Team and staff. Staff would be responsible for implementing with students and others. Examples of tools that could be utilized are iPads for quick polls or "pulse checks" to students, easily tailored for age and primary language. Staff would be responsible for monitoring and reporting out.

Implementation would be to launch the pilot in the fall of 2015. This would be supported with staff and a modest budget. It would be coordinated with Community Ed, Family Engagement, etc. The support group would convene and make strong early progress. SPPS would provide funds for supplies and logistical support. The focus for communication about the Team would be using it as a pathway to reach ALL students, not a position to "speak for" others.

Monitoring would be done explicitly for attention to student voice from district and building staff in all relevant decisions. Reports would be made to the public and especially to students so they see their impact.

The Board task force recommended the following be adopted at the September 22, 2105 Board of Education meeting.
MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education create a Student Advisory Team that will be a liaison for student voice to partner with Administration and the Board on selected topics. That the team be selected in early Fall 2015 in order to begin the pilot in the Fall of 2015. The motion was seconded by Ms. Doran.

The motion passed.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Several observations and suggestions were made by a Board member. Would it be beneficial for the group to have a connection into the Board Ex Team as that ties together Board and Administration and would be a first line of communication. Over time the money to support the group should be put into the Board budget. Response: The budget portion of this will be challenging so SPPS will need to look at ways to fund the initiative. It has been assumed the cost would be approximately $24,000. If the student stipend were removed that would reduce by about $8,000 so cost could run $16,000 to $24,000 for the pilot year.
- Transportation will be an issue so it is assumed students would receive a bus pass or tokens. Response: Yes, tokens.
- The number of students was not defined. Response: That is still evolving, 12-16 has been proposed. It was suggested Community Engagement and Community Ed make that decision.
- It was noted the Task Force could make additional clarifications to the proposal before the BOE meeting.

C. Proposed Pay 2016 Levy

Controller indicated she would be providing information on the Pay 16 levy calculations to determine maximum levy ceiling. She noted the figures had been received from MDE only the evening prior and several discrepancies were found. Finance worked to correct these discrepancies for this preliminary report.

All figures in the report are based on Finances' best estimates, using the statutory authorized amounts. MDE continues to make adjustment to the SPPS numbers. SPPS needs to set it maximum proposed levy by the end of September.

School levy authority is established in law. School budgets are a combination of state, federal and local funding, including the voter approved referendum. The Pay 16 school levy funds the 2016-17 school year. The levy funds about 20% of the SPPS budget.

The State legislature sets property tax policy, establishes property classes and class rates, determines levels of State aid, sets school formulas, makes underfunded mandates to local governments and levies the State business tax. The taxing jurisdictions determine the levy amount and the County Assessor determines market value and assigns property class.

Major factors impacting property taxes include:

- Whether the property tax goes up, down or stays the same
- Is there additional money available to reduce local tax burdens (state aids, fiscal disparity distribution),
- How is a home's market value changing relative to other homes/other types of property
- Are there increases to the tax base that are not the result of inflationary or deflationary changes to the value of individual properties (new construction, property going from exempt to taxable, decertified tax increment financing districts) and/or
- Legislative changes.

Factors impacting levies are changes in pupil counts, legislative changes to formulas, pension contribution changes required by law, capital bonding, refunding of bonds, abatement, health and safety projects, lease costs and employment changes that drive severance and unemployment levies. Every piece of the levy has a tie to a particular category established by the State.
The Controller reviewed a proposed levy calendar. She then broke the SPPS levy categories out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Fund</th>
<th>Pay 16 Levy Categories</th>
<th>Pay 16 Adjustments to Levy Categories</th>
<th>Total Number of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Fund</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Pay 16 Levy Ceiling is a 2.75% increase over last year or $140,156,363 (Pay 15 Levy was $136,407,114, a difference of $3,749,249).

The CFO indicated the requested action is that the Board set the Pay 16 levy ceiling at the Sept. 22 BOE meeting at a maximum Pay 16 levy ceiling of 2.75% over Pay 15.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**
- What could impact possible changes to the figures? Response: Within the categories there are areas with inflationary increases (post employment benefits or TRA - teachers' retirement, bonds or alternative facilities) which coming together impact the bottom line.
- What is the ceiling for the City and County? Response: The City ceiling is 1.9% and the County 2.8%.
- How likely are the numbers from MDE to change? Response: The numbers from MDE are not likely to increase. Finance is providing its best estimate based on trends at this point in time and accounting for possible adjustments over time.
- You feel comfortable the State will not come back with number lower than 2.75%? Response: Yes
- The pension portion is what percent - 1/4 to 1/2% in terms of an increase as a combination of Teachers Retirement Fund and PERA? Response: Yes it is almost 1/2% and is almost entirely the Teacher Retirement.
- Is this the last increase year? Response: There may be one more.
- What amount, beyond the 2.75%, could be used as the maximum? What is the most that could be recommended? Is the 2.75% under what could recommend? Response: There is one category that a higher amount could be recommended - the alternative facilities pay as you go could be recommended at a higher amount to the State. We are keeping that amount level with where the State has us at this time.
- The Superintendent stated that since SPPS received the numbers last night, the CFO had indicated she was comfortable with 3%. The Superintendent stated she had pushed to lower that to 2.75% because of the impact on the community. She stated 2.75 will get us there.
- Since we are just setting the ceiling now, why would the Board not set it at 3% even though they may not keep it there in the end? Response: There is not a need to vote on this tonight as the numbers are in flux. The Board asked to see more detail before a decision is made.
- The Legislative Liaison noted the one thing about voting for the maximum levy is that is the figure that will appear on the Truth-in-Taxation notices. There would be the opportunity, following the TnT meeting in December to modify the actual amount. It is true that 3% would offer more flexibility for the District.
- So, in December, SPPS can only go down. Response: Yes, also some levies have penalties, specific authorizations, etc. Most of the levies have specific obligations and if those are underfunded the district will need to draw funds from other sources to meet the obligation.
- A Board member indicated Board members should think about 2.75 and 3.0%. What are the implications for finance? Response: None.
- It was noted that between now and the 22nd would it be better for SPPS to be at 3.0 or higher? In terms of sustainability the higher number might be better. The Board requested information so they can consider variables of various levels (2.75 or 3.00 or higher) relative to sustainability over time. Requested various percentages for SPPS.
• The Legislative Liaison stressed that when considering the levy the percentages for county, city and district SHOULD NOT be added together. She stated this was a common mistake. The percentage increase is the percentage increase for each entity's budget. The computations for the actual levy are very complex.

• Part of the increase is due to inflation adjustments, some legacy costs related to pension and health insurance (retiree), some related to pupil units, changes in formula, previous adjustments. The biggest things driving this is referendum inflation, OPEB and pension obligations.

• A Board member expressed frustration that this is yet another year when the District did not receive the right numbers from the State. She thanked the financial team for their effort in bringing the estimated proposal forward.

• Staff noted that 99% of districts just certify the maximum levy.

• It was noted it would be helpful to find out what Minneapolis is proposing.

• The question was asked if the Board needed an additional COB between now and the 22nd. Response: No on basis of receiving updates over that time period as numbers become available. What makes up 2.75% and other rates.

D. Facilities Master Plan (FMP) Update

The Director of Facilities stated the goal of the presentation is to provide background and context so the Board can take action on the outcomes of the FMP and to inform the Board of the 900 Albion disposition. He provided a "historical perspective" using the L'Etoile du Nord Lower building as an example.

He then moved on the review the FMP planning process from May 2014 through December 2015. September through November 2015 will see more community engagement with presentation being planned for 65 school community meetings (PTAs, SPFT, school staff and FMP Workshop Teams), District Councils (neighborhood) meetings, the FMP committee and at open houses. He also outlined the tentative COB topic areas to come:

• October - Synopsis of 25 year history of facilities-related investments plus current facilities funding realities

• November - Preliminary review of 2015 FMP Report

• December - Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Bond projects.

The existing SPPS funding paradigm is investing approximately $30 million annually from:

• The Health and Safety Levy ($4 million) - restricted funding requiring MDE approval for health and safety projects that are planned in one year intervals, 18 months prior.

• The Alternative Facilities Levy ($11 million) - again restricted funding requiring MDE approval for deferred maintenance. These are planned in two year intervals, 12 months prior with a 10 year list required by MDE.

• Capital Bonds ($15 million) - restricted funding requiring Board approval (MDE approval is combined into projects over $500k) for the betterment of school facilities. These are planned in one year intervals, 18 months prior to implementation.

The future funding paradigm would be:

• Long-Term Facilities Maintenance (LTFM) - allowed under a 2015 law change. This would still be restricted funding requiring MDE approval for deferred maintenance and health and safety projects. A 10-year list would be required to be submitted every two years. This can be coordinated with Capital Bonds.

• Capital Bonds - restricted funding requiring Board approval for the betterment of school facilities as planned for under the FMP. These projects can be coordinated with LTFM.

With regard to 900 Albion, the former site of Riverside Elementary originally constructed in 1924. The site encompasses 5.4 acres with the building square footage of 14,900. The site was purchased in 1924, the school operated from 1924 through 1974 when the building was leased to the City of St. Paul. It was reopened for Community Education in 1983 and has been vacant since 2014.
Based on the 2015 FMP findings, the site does not have a long-term strategic value for SPPS. Academic and program needs for area F2 are met without this property. Its small size and irregular shape make the site inefficient for K-12 use. The property, however, would be suited for mixed-use housing which closely aligns with St. Paul's Fort Road Development and Comprehensive plans. The building is in the worst condition of the entire SPPS portfolio. Reuse of the site would likely require complete demolition and reconstruction. Resources tied up in this property could be used to better support facilities-related needs across the district.

The Superintendent recommends offering the site to the City of St. Paul for purchase in accordance with BOE procedures. The City would have 30 days to respond to SPPS with interest, intent and proposed compensation. The BOE would review the City’s response and determine next steps.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Board policy suggests the property first be offered to the City and at the same time a fair market range be determined. What happens then? Response: It would be offered to the City and any offer would come back for Board consideration if the City decides to buy otherwise it would be put out for sale. If the City is not interested it would be put up for public sale.
- So the request is to approve the designation of excess property and dispose of it in a certain way? Response: Yes.
- Staff noted there are private developers interested in this property and the District’s concern is to get the most value from it as it can.
- Is there no alternative use for district? No again there is great interest in the property and in the City’s comprehensive plan West 7th is designated for high density housing and mixed use development. There is opportunity with this property.
- What is the actual process? Response: The FMP shows the property does not align with District needs as defined by the FMP.
- Is SPPS obligated to sell to city? What is our legal obligation to give the City first option, what if their offer does not meet expectations? Response: General Counsel said the offer first to the City is consistent with official procedure for disposal of property. The offer to the City is an option but SPPS is not obligated to accept that offer, the Board can direct the property be sold by another method.
- What is range of cost saving for district? Response: The operational costs are not significant but the long-term investment value for the District to utilize funds gained from sale of building for other projects is significant.
- Staff noted the building is not suitable for use as an instructional space at least not without significant investment. This is an opportunity for the District to gain funds to benefit the District. If the property is sold, the money goes to debt service for that building first (if any) and the balance would go into operating capital reserves. The Board requested this information be added to the presentation.
- A Board member noted, relative to the District Council meetings on the FMP, that each Board member serves as a liaison with certain District Councils and asked that the Board be notified of the time and location for each of these meetings.

MOTION: Ms. O’Connell moved the District move forward with disposition of the property at 900 Albion Street per district procedures. Ms. Seeba seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

E. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. Gender Inclusion Policy Implementation Development

   The policy, passed in March, is based on the following tenets:
• Respect all students’ gender identity and gender expression by honoring their right of students to be identified and addressed by their preferred name and pronoun.
• Prohibits, within academic programming, the separation of students based upon gender unless it serves as a compelling pedagogical tool
• Permits all students to participate in co-curricular and extracurricular activities including, but not limited to, intramural and interscholastic athletics, in a manner consistent with their gender identify.
• Provides all students access to facilities that best align with students' gender identity.

The procedure is posted in the on-line Procedure Manual. It outlines how the policy is to be implemented. It was developed with feedback from students, families, school staff, advocacy organizations and the SPPS Legal Department. The procedure can be adjusted as necessary over time.

A Name/Gender Change Request Form is available to make changes to Campus. Students and families can update: name, gender, district alternate gender, pronoun, co/extracurricular activities participation and facilities access. The information would be available in a new tab in Campus for all students.

Staff is providing professional development to principals, school clerks, athletic directors, Student Placement staff and customized support as requested. Out for Equity is available to provide support to students, families and school staff. The Office of Equity is piloting the AMAZE Program for eight elementary schools.

Cross-functional collaboration has been strong with implementation of the policy and procedure requiring support from departments district-wide.

The Gender Inclusion Website has links to policy, procedure, forms and other resources. It can be found at http://www.spps.org/genderinclusion.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:
• The Request for Change Form -- is this a change to a preferred name as opposed to legal name change? Can it be used for either? Response: As noted in the box area on the form, by signing the form the parent is acknowledging this is not a legal name change.
• The form allows families to change to a preferred name – what about official documents - diplomas, etc.? Response: The record would show the name in Infinite Campus so it would use the changed name.
• Has there been any abuse in other districts? Response: That was considered, as was sabotage. The change is made under a good faith understanding and principals have the ability to intervene if a name is offensive.
• What happens if a student is not of age and parents do not recognize their desire to change their name? Response: An entire support plan has been developed for students without access to parental approval. Since a student cannot make an official change in Campus until they are 18, the District will help to develop a support plan for them around their name, choices, etc. which, while not official, obtains the desired ends. The support plan protects students in dangerous situations if need be. SPPS always seeks to partner with families but if demonstrated parent support is not available, a student's name and pronoun are respected regardless of what is in Campus. If there is a need to contact the family the information in Campus is utilized.
• What about parents bringing suit for allowing a student to act in way they do not approve of? Response: General Counsel stated parents can always sue, whether they would be successful would be another issue. There is a risk, SPPS acknowledges there is a risk if parents disagree with support provide to students.
• Is there any update on what is being heard from students? Response: There have been many calls from parents, counselors, student support plan meetings, etc. Families have been positive, the Placement Center is receiving forms already on the first day of school. Transitions are complicated and it will take time to move through
the processes. The surprise is this seems to be applying mostly to elementary students so there is a learning curve in addressing staff relative to the elementary side.

- The Board indicated it appreciated the procedure being developed in tandem with the policy.
- Have principals talked with staff relative to the policy and expectations? Response: There was a lot of communication to staff when the policy passed. It is true many staff are not aware of the policy until they heard about it from their principal. Principals are leaders in their buildings and this should have been communicated through them. SPPS is making a strong effort to incorporate this into the “on boarding” of new staff. It will be necessary to reinforce the message in the buildings through monthly principal meetings and their play books. The procedure was just recently posted on-line.
- The Board noted there is a great need to have consistent interpretation across the district.

F. Standing Item: PLTT Update - No Report

G. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - No Report

H. Work Session

1. Board Check-In
   Board members were reminded of the dates for the next two Board Equity sessions - September 15 and October 27 from 5 to 7 p.m. A Board member noted this would require a one-half hour earlier start for the Ex Team meeting on the 27th.

   Discussion was held regarding conversations within Board meetings.

2. Green and Healthy Kids PAC
   The Board indicated they would meet with the Green and Healthy Kids PAC on a date they select utilizing the same format as that used with previous PACs.

3. Annotated Agenda
   The Board Secretary was asked to add a note when the agenda is issued asking Board members to let the COB Chair or the CEO know if additional time is being asked for on specific topic areas.

III. ADJOURNMENT

| MOTION: Ms. O’Connell moved the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Doran |
| The motion passed. |

The meeting was adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk