I. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Introductions

II. AGENDA
   A. Youth Commission Presentation
      Time Certain 4:35 p.m.
      1. Introduction
      2. Presentation
      3. Discussion
      4. Action (None Required)
   B. Youth Representation in Board Decisions
      1. Introduction
      2. Presentation
      3. Discussion
      4. Action (Approval of Recommendation)
   C. Proposed Pay 2016 Levy
      1. Introduction
      2. Presentation
      3. Discussion
      4. Action (TBD)
   D. FMP Update
      1. Introduction
      2. Presentation
      3. Discussion
      4. Action (None Required)
E. Standing Item: Policy Update
   1. Gender Inclusion Policy Implementation Development

F. Standing Item: PLTT Update

G. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update

H. Work Session
   1. Board Check-In
   2. Green and Healthy Kids PAC

III. ADJOURNMENT
Who we are - The Saint Paul Youth Commission Transit Access Subcommittee in its fifth year.

Why transit matters to youth - it improves attendance, connects youth to opportunity and opens youth to their environment.

The Project gave 14 students unlimited 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 responses were 11.5).

(1) In the past week, what activities did you use your bus pass for? Results were:
   - 6.17 used it to get to and/or from work
   - 5.67 used it for attending an after school program
   - 5.58 used it to get to and/or from school\n   - 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?
   - 2.33 (number of days/week) did not use it
   - .58 used it one day a week
   - 1.42 used it two days a week
   - 2.17 used it three days a week
   - 2.08 used it four days a week and
   - 2.29 used it five 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 - 10.33 attended programs; 8.87 did not attend programs. 8.67 attended zero after school programming per average week; 2.67 attended one day, 2.08 attended two days, 2.33 attended three, 1.08 four and 2.17 five days.
   - Attendance at tutoring on average week was 6.50 attended tutoring for one or more days; 3.83 did not attend tutoring. Days of tutoring attended were: zero 3.83, one day 2.00, two days 2.75, three days .092, four days 0.50 and five days 0.33 (average 11.5)
• Attendance at work on average week: 6.25 attended work for one or more days; 3.08 did not attend work. Days of work attended were: zero 3.08, one 0.67, two 1.25, three 1.00, four 1.42 and five 1.92.

Recommendations:

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=kWuIJqKe4So.
Youth Voice in District Decisions

Board Task Force Presentation
Committee of the Board
September 8th, 2015
Outline

• Background
• Objectives for student engagement
• Task Force recommendations
• Examples of student engagement issues
• Implementation guidance
• Discussion and board decision
• Students have always been at the center of SPPS decisions

• In recent years, “student voice” has been explicitly named and focused on in SPPS

• Board and Administration support student voice in key decisions, from the classroom to the boardroom

• The Board began working with students and staff in fall 2014 to deepen student voice options.

• A Board-appointed Task Force was created in spring 2015

• Today’s recommendations follow those many discussions plus guidance from the July 21 2015 COB work session
Objectives for Student Engagement

• Hear student voices on issues important to them, and on issues important to Administration and Board

• Engage students on issues where their perspectives will influence decisions

• Deliver authentic student engagement
  – Engage students who have a stake in particular issues
  – Provide students the information they need to participate in a meaningful way
  – Seek the full range of student perspectives
  – Monitor and adjust process as needed
  – Routinely report out impacts of student voice on decisions
Recommendation: Student Advisory Team

• **Framework for 2015-16 Pilot**
  – Group of high school students serve as special committee
  – *Key task is to help design and periodically deliver student engagement – but not “speak for” other students*
  – For pilot year, Team also works on structure, selection, etc.

• **Opportunities**
  – Select Team members with diverse backgrounds and life experiences who have varied perspectives on how to engage students
  – Leverage the fact that students are best positioned to figure out how to reach out to and engage students
  – “At the ready” to partner with Administration and Board
Engagement *Examples*

1. **Major districtwide efforts** such as school start times or FMP implementation, or **specific policies or similar** such as gender inclusion, Rights and Responsibilities handbook, etc.

   – Purpose: Get input or feedback from key stakeholders to shape decisions by board or administration

   – Process:
     
     • Engagement process designed collaboratively with staff, Student Advisory Team, and families
     • Staff responsible for implementation in partnership with others; tools include brainstorming sessions, scenarios, workshops, etc.
     • Staff responsible for monitoring and reporting out
2. **Time-sensitive class/grade, school, or districtwide questions**

---

**Purpose:** Identify issues important to students of all ages, get implementation feedback, test simple option or ideas.

---

**Process:**

- Design replicable approaches with Student Advisory Team and staff.
- Staff is responsible for implementing with students and others.
- Example tools are iPads for quick polls or “pulse checks” to students; easily tailored for age and primary language.
- Staff responsible for monitoring and reporting out.
Implementation Guidance

• **Launch pilot in fall 2015**
  
  • Support with staff and modest budget
    – Coordinate with Community Ed, Family Engagement, etc.
    – Support group to convene and make strong, early progress
    – Provide funds for supplies and logistical support
    – Focus communications on the Team being a pathway to reach *all* students, not a position to “speak for” others

• **Monitor explicitly for attention to student voice**
  
  – From district and building staff
  – In all relevant decisions
  – Report out to public *and especially to students* so they see their impact
Recommendation

The Student Engagement task force recommends the following be adopted at the September 22, 2015 Board of Education meeting:

• Create a Student Advisory Team that will be a liaison for student voice to partner with Administration and the Board on selected topics.

• The Team is selected in early Fall 2015 to begin the pilot in Fall 2015.
Proposed Pay16 Levy

Committee of the Board
Marie Schrul
September 8, 2015
Purpose

To provide information to the Committee of the Board on the Pay16 levy calculations to determine maximum levy ceiling
Agenda

• Planning Assumptions
• Levy Basics
• Factors Impacting Levies
• Levy Process/Calendar
• Estimated Pay16 Levy Ceiling
• Requested Actions
• Questions
Planning Assumptions
(staff estimate)

• All figures in this report are based on Administration’s best estimates, using the statutory authorized amounts
• MDE provided preliminary Pay16 levy calculations on September 7
• MDE continues to make adjustments to the SPPS numbers
The Basics

• School levy authority is established in law
• School budgets are a combination of state, federal and local funding, including the voter approved referendum
• Pay16 school levy funds the 2016-2017 school year
State Legislature
• Sets Property Tax Policy
• Establishes Property Classes & Class Rates
• Determines Levels of State Aid
• Sets School Formulas
• Underfunded Mandates to Local Governments
• Levies State Business Tax

Who Determines Your Property Tax?

Property Tax

Taxing Jurisdictions
• Determines Levy Amount

County Assessor
• Determines Market Value
• Assigns Property Class

Source: Ramsey County
Major Factors Impacting Property Taxes

- Is the property tax levy going up, down, or staying the same?
- Is there additional money available to reduce the local tax burden?
  - State aids (local government, county aid, or school equalization increases)
  - Fiscal disparity distribution
- How is a home’s market value changing relative to other homes? Compared to other types of property?
- Are there increases to the tax base that are not the result of inflationary or deflationary changes to the values of individual properties?
  - New construction
  - Property going from exempt to taxable
  - Decertified tax increment financing districts
- Legislative changes?
Factors Impacting Levies

- Changes in pupil counts
- Legislative changes to formulas
- Pension contribution changes required by law
- Capital bonding, refunding of bonds, abatements, health and safety projects, lease costs
- Employment changes that drive severance and unemployment levies
## Pay 16 Levy Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August-early September</td>
<td>District submits levy information to MDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>MDE provides preliminary calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8</td>
<td>COB discusses Pay16 levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>BOE sets ceiling for Pay16 levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>JPTAC (Joint Property Tax Advisory Committee) adopts joint levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>SPPS provides Pay16 levy ceiling data to Ramsey County and MDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1 – November 15</td>
<td>Ramsey County calculates taxes and prepares tax statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13 estimated</td>
<td>Ramsey County mails tax statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>SPPS holds public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>BOE certifies Pay16 levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31</td>
<td>SPPS certifies Pay16 levy to Ramsey County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SPPS Levy Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Fund</th>
<th>Pay16 Levy Categories</th>
<th>Pay16 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>

9/8/15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Certified Pay 15 Levy</th>
<th>SPPS Estimated Pay16 Levy Ceiling 9/8/15</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total – All Levy Categories</td>
<td>$136,407,114</td>
<td>$140,156,363</td>
<td>$3,749,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requested Action

• Recommend maximum Pay16 levy ceiling of 2.75 % over Pay15 for approval at September 22 BOE meeting

• Set the Pay16 levy ceiling at the September 22 BOE meeting
Questions
Facilities Master Planning

for 21st Century Learning

Committee of the Board, September 8, 2015

Tom Parent, AIA, LEED AP
Director, Facilities Department
Goals

- Provide background and context so Board can take action on the outcomes of the FMP
- Inform Board about 900 Albion disposition
Agenda

• Background
• Final phase of FMP process
• Discussion of 900 Albion
Developing philosophies: Facilities Mgmt

Expert-based

1865

Community-based

2015
Historical Perspective

“Prosperity Heights school parents protest inadequate building”
St. Paul Dispatch & Pioneer Press, September 1949
Historical Perspective

The District spent 7 years after those pictures were taken acquiring new land and building the building we know today as L’Etoile du Nord Lower.

1923   3 portable classrooms erected on site
1950   Building vacated
1953   New building completed and portables demolished
1956   Major building addition completed
2010   Building vacated
2013   L’Etoile du Nord (grades PK - 1) opens on site
Long Term History

Randolph Heights, 1960 (Minnesota Historical Society)
Note: 34 students in this picture

Randolph Heights, 2015
Note: 26 students per class, average
Facilities Master Plan - Planning Process
May 2014 – December 2015

PHASE 1: May – August 2014
Gathering and STUDYING IMPORTANT DATA that will impact the district’s plans for improving all of its buildings and land

PHASE 2: May - December 2014
ESTABLISHING THE STANDARDS the district will use to decide which improvement projects to do first

PHASE 3: January – June 2015
SCHOOLS and other district buildings DEVELOP THEIR OWN PLANS on how to improve their buildings

PHASE 4: June - December 2015
FINALIZING THE DISTRICT’S PLAN for making building and land improvements; sharing the plan with families, students, staff, partners and community
Facilities Master Plan - Planning Process

- **May - August 2014:** Steering Committee
- **May 2014 - December 2014:** Phase 1 - Prepare to Inform
  - Data Collection and Evaluation:
    - Strong Schools, Strong Communities 2.0 (strategic plan)
    - Enrollment and building capacities
    - Demographic research
    - Personalized Learning; Technology Plan
    - Updated Educational Adequacy Assessment
- **January - June 2015:** Phase 2 - Consult > Involve
  - Establish District-wide Priorities, Baseline and Criteria:
    - Determine large-scale system priorities
    - Audit each site facility gaps/needs (baseline)
    - Determine facility improvement prioritization criteria
    - Estimate improvements costs
    - Funding recommendations
- **June - December 2015:** Phase 3 - Involve > Collaborate
  - Develop Site-based Priorities and Plans:
    - Site and floor plan improvements and modifications
    - Prioritized phasing of projects
    - Estimated improvements costs
    - Determine district’s facilities governance committee structure
- **Phase 4 - Inform:**
  - Finalize Plan and Share Results:
    - Inform stakeholders
    - Convene district facilities governance committee
    - Board of Education presentation
September-November: Engagement
Community Engagement

Upcoming Presentations

● 65 school community meetings
  ○ PTAs, SPFT, school staff
  ○ FMP Workshop teams
● District Council (i.e. neighborhood) meetings
● FMP committee
● Open House(s)
Upcoming COB Presentations
Tentative COB Topic Areas

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
Existing Funding Paradigm

$30M Annually (approx)

Health & Safety Levy
• Health & Safety Projects
• Restricted Funding
• MDE Approval
• Planned in 1-year intervals, 18-mos prior

Alternative Facilities Levy
• Deferred Maintenance
• Restricted Funding
• MDE Approval
• Planned in 2-year intervals, 12-mos prior
• 10-year list required

Capital Bonds
• Betterment of School Facilities
• Restricted Funding
• BOE Approval
• MDE Approval if combined into projects over $500k
• Planned in 1-year intervals, 18-mos prior

$15M

$11M

$4M

$15M

Capital Bonds
• Betterment of School Facilities
• Restricted Funding
• BOE Approval
• MDE Approval if combined into projects over $500k
• Planned in 1-year intervals, 18-mos prior

$15M

$11M

$4M
Future Funding Paradigm

Long Term Facilities Maintenance (LTFM)
• 2015 State law change
• Deferred Maintenance
• Health & Safety Projects
• Restricted Funding
• MDE Approval
• 10-year list required, submitted every 2 years
• Coordinated with Capital Bonds

Capital Bonds & Certificates of Participation
• Betterment of School Facilities
• Restricted Funding
• BOE Approval
• Planned via the FMP
• Coordinated with LTFM
900 Albion

Stats:
• Formerly Riverside Elementary
• Site size: 5.4 acres
• School square footage: 14,900
• Original construction: 1924

General information:
• Site purchased in 1924
• School operated 1924-1974
• Building leased to City of St. Paul
• Reopened in 1983 for Community Ed
• Vacant since 2014
Based on 2015 FMP findings, site does not have long-term strategic value for SPPS:

- District meets area F2 academic and program needs without this property.
- Small size and irregular shape makes the site inefficient for K-12 use.
- Property suited for mixed-use housing, which closely aligns with St. Paul’s Fort Road Development and Comprehensive Plans.
Based on 2015 FMP findings, site does not have long-term strategic value for SPPS:

- Building in the worst condition in the SPPS portfolio.
- Reuse of 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.
Superintendent recommends offering the site to the City of St. Paul for purchase in accordance with BOE procedures.

City of St. Paul would have 30 days to respond to SPPS with interest, intent, and proposed compensation.

BOE reviews City response and determines next steps.
Questions?
Gender Inclusion Policy Implementation Update
Supporting Students and Families

Committee of the Board
September 8, 2015
Policy Tenets

1. Respect all students’ gender identity and gender expression by honoring the right of students to be identified and addressed by their preferred name and pronoun.

My name is part of my identity. If you cannot call me by my name, you cannot see me. I refuse to be invisible.

- Student, grade 11
Policy Tenets

2. Prohibit, within academic programming, the separation of students based upon gender unless it serves as a compelling pedagogical tool.

I remember in elementary school having to be in the boys’ line. But I knew I was not a boy. Why did I have to be in that line? Why did we even have a boys’ line? I mean it makes no sense.

- Student, grade 10
Policy Tenets

3. Permit 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 identity.

I just want my daughter to have the same opportunities as my other daughter.

-Parent of a middle school student
Policy Tenets

4. Provide all students access to facilities that best align with students’ gender identity.

You can’t do equity half way.
-Parent of high school student.

I may not even want to use the “boy’s” bathroom, but I should be able to since I am a boy.
-Student, grade 11

We are not some sort of predator. We just want to be able to use the bathroom without getting a tardy.
-Student, grade 9
Procedure is posted

• The Gender Inclusion procedure is posted in the online procedure manual
• It outlines how the policy is to be implemented
• Was developed with feedback from students, families, school staff, advocacy organizations, and SPPS Legal Department.
Name / Gender Change Request Form

- The 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
  - Facilities Access
- Info in new tab in Campus
Professional Development

• Staff is providing professional development to:
  – Principals
  – School clerks
  – Athletic Directors
  – Student Placement staff
  – School counselors
  – Customized support as requested

• **Out for Equity** is available to support to students, families, and school staff

• Office of Equity is piloting AMAZE Program at 8 elementary schools
Cross-functional Collaboration

- The implementation of the policy and procedure has required support from departments district wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Equity</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Campus Support</td>
<td>Student Placement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Family Engagement</td>
<td>Strategic Planning and Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Inclusion Webpage

• The Gender Inclusion webpage has links to the policy, procedure, forms, and other resources

http://www.spps.org/genderinclusion
Questions?

Out for Equity / outforequity@spps.org / outforequity.spps.org
Heather Kilgore (Engagement Office) has indicated The Green and Healthy Kids PAC has expressed interest in participating in a listening session with some Board members. She was also wondering where the listening session process was so she could bring it to the other PACs to see if they wanted the "listening session" format to continue as it was in the past or if there was another way in which the PACs would like to interact with the Board.

(Rec'd 7/14/15)