I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Legislative Recommendations for the 2016 Session

The SPPS Legislative Liaison stated the 2016 session is a non-budget year with a focus on bonding. The tax and transportation bills are still on the table. The Governor will have supplemental budget recommendations based on November and February forecasts. The legislative session must end by May 23, 2016. All members are up for re-election in 2016.

She went on to say focus is the key with areas of focus on:

1. Voluntary Pre-K funding priorities include:
   - Funding voluntary school-based half-day and full-day four year programs on a per pupil basis
   - Ensuring the ability to scale programs as needed based on the community
   - Providing incentives for shared curriculum, training and PLCs with private center and in-home child care and
   - Continuation of learning readiness for at-risk three-year olds.

Early learning enrollment for SPPS shows:
   - 1,708 students in Pre-K classrooms (Special Ed 7% [16 to 17% when all students are identified]; 71% free/reduced lunch and 51% ELL)
   - 289 students in Montessori Pre-K (8% Special Ed, 68% free/reduced lunch and 47L% ELL)
   - 593 children on the waiting list
   - 342 have priority consideration for special ed, free/reduced lunch and ELL
   - 184 are waiting for the full day programming.
   - 58 classrooms operating (10 all day programming)

2. Special Education funding focus areas are:
   - The SPPS cross subsidy for special education is over $900 per pupil (average cost per student $2800)
   - The state-wide cross subsidy is estimated at $584 million for FY 15 and will rise to $656 million by FY 19.
• The regular and excess cost formula must better recognize the cost and concentration of special education students and the tuition billing for intermediate and charter schools serving concentration of special education students.
• Any new mandates must be funded in the year of service requirement
• The State should maximize Medical Assistance (MA) reimbursement for health related services in IEP’s.

3. Areas of focus for Teacher Development and Evaluation include:
• Provision for on-going teacher development revenue for non-QComp districts (funding was only for one year).
• Revenue to support EAs and TAs to obtain teacher license (especially in high need areas) using tuition assistance and/or stipends
• Support for policies and programs to maintain and expand College in School (CIS) teachers
• Amendment of the Board of Teaching Rule to allow world language teachers with secondary license to teach middle school without annual waiver.

3. Other areas of focus are:
• Testing – Require State to
  o Pay directly for annual administration of the ACT test
  o Repeal requirement for new high school writing test
  o Provide flexibility for districts to administer assessments in the way that is most efficient for them (e.g. paper and pencil, on line)
  o Continue use of multiple measures (e.g. attendance, graduation) including growth models.
  o Provide resources to support district use of formative assessments.
• Metro Transit Sales Tax
  o Support the Metro Transit dedicated 1/2 cent sales tax. The revenue will be used to add equipment and expand routes, increase ridership and provide more access for school and work and meet the demand for millennials who drive less and chose more transit options.
  o This is an important investment for the regional economy

Questions/Discussion:
• What is current Special Ed subsidy? Response: $900/pupil or approximately - $36 million total (2014 information).
• Where is the District relative to IDEA who were supposed to fund 40%, where is that now? Response: They are funding at 16% so it has gotten worse.
• The Metro Transit (MT) sales tax, does this have anything to do with the bus barn? Would the sales tax address this issue? Response: Metro Transit has several factors they need to address: They need to add buses but have no budget to buy more. and they need to build a "bus barn" to house any new additions.
• Would this sales tax make a difference in issues preventing MT from meeting students' transportation needs? Response: MT would not guarantee, even if it had more funding, that it would accommodate SPPS routes. In talking with Met Council there is no guarantee for this either, funds could be used for other purposes. Without added resources MT cannot add capacity at all.
• If it got the half cent sales tax would MT expand routes to transport students, is there enough route structure available now to meet student needs? Response: That information is not available. MT is not promising anything.
• College in Schools (CIS), how does this new ruling affect teachers? Does it create problems licensing teachers, do they need to get another degree, etc. Response: the Higher Learning Committee says, to teach CIS, teachers need a masters in the content area and 15 graduate credits in the content area. The U of MN has a whole program where CIS teachers work directly with the department in the area they teach. The whole structure ensures rigor and training. Few CIS teachers have a master in their content area or the 15 credits. The U of MN will need to take a look at equivalencies in areas of
MNSCU does not have capacity to add the course work necessary for teachers to get their 15 credits. MNSCU now has a requirement of 13 credits. MNSCU is looking at equivalency to allow credit for documented work done by teachers. This is particularly problematic in the career and technical areas.

- SPPS also needs to look at how it can collaborate with SPFT on pre-K and testing areas. Should something be added regarding the Accuplacer test? Response: The Commissioner of Ed does not want anyone to use Accuplacer but there is nothing available to replace it at high school level. MNSCU is looking at its use of the test as well. What it is replaced with needs to be available to students; Accuplacer is available online. SPPS should have a stand regarding Accuplacer and should make finding a replacement a high priority.

- Will the requirement for the high school writing test be repealed? Response: It is too early to guess how that will play out. There is no funding for the test and no appropriation for developing the test. At this time, MDE has not started development of the test due to lack of funding.

- American Indian Education, is there any possibility of getting more funding for Indian Ed programs? Response: The Commissioner of Education is excited about the work going on around American Indian education programs, so it may be in the supplemental budget recommendations. There is a lot of interest in this.

- The Board requested Administration provide them a copy of the update legislative agenda. They also asked Administration to let current and new board members know specifically how they can help advocate for this agenda (contact legislators, comment at hearings, etc.).

- If SPPS could have a two tier bus system it would be a win win situation. Response: This could only be done if MT is in the picture and with more money.

- What about the legislature helping on this? What are the possibilities of MT taking on its obligation to provide mass transit for the metro area in order to allow students to start school at a reasonable hour? What are the chances with the legislature and MT? Response: The Legislative Liaison indicated she had talked to lobbyists. The transportation bite was huge last year, proposals for the bill are very different and everyone will be running for election next year so increasing budgets is not a high priority. If enough mayors and counties get behind the Met Council and provide more support for a provision tying the transportation issue with regional economies and the world’s best workforce, maybe. There is support around the initiative from a long-term standpoint as more millennials are riding mass transit there should be better support in the future. There has to be a strong belief in the importance of having mass transit to get to work and school. The issue could become part of trade-offs if there is a transportation bill at the end of session. It all depends on where priorities are for new taxes. Work will be done to try to make it one of the Governor’s budget recommendations. Demographics are aligning right for this over time.

- In the last session, MT had a bus barn in the bonding bill. If it is still in the request for capital bonding would that be an issue to support? Response: The Legislative Liaison stated she would need to make some calls to see what the bonding agenda is.

MOTION: Ms. Doran moved the Committee of the Board Recommend the Board of Education accept the Legislative Recommendations for the 2016 Session with the proposed revisions. Ms. Seeba seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

B. Administrative Response to American Indian Resolution of Concurrence

Staff provided Administrations response to the American Indian Resolution of Concurrence given to the Board on April 4, 2015. They stated, "the district respects the resolution put forth by the Parent Committee, and although pleased to be able to fulfill some requests, they regretted they are not able to fulfill every portion of the resolution at this time. It is their hope the Parent Committee does not view this in a negative manner, but rather as an identification
The Resolution expressed the parents' concerns about the attendance and graduation rates of American Indian students in SPPS. They requested that the Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Department work with the Parent Committee and Indian Education to develop a reporting structure to ensure that they receive timely and consistent information on all Native students. Administration responded:

1. REA will provide, on a quarterly basis, summary data on attendance in alignment with SPPS' current reporting calendar. In addition, John Bobolink, will be added to the enrollment monitoring communication list for the beginning of the year enrollment monitoring. Early enrollment monitoring does not include racial designations, however it would be useful to provide these daily reports as schools with larger populations of American Indian students can be monitored and/or contacted by Indian Education program staff.

2. REA will provide to Indian Education program staff, individual student level data via existing data reporting structures for requested students which will include:
   - Students that have self identified as American Indian via Campus
   - Students that are identified via Indian Education with a Indian Education “flag”

3. The SPPS Office of College and Career Readiness (OCCR) will support in providing quarterly data, by high school, and by grade level, for all American Indian students in an aggregate and non-identifiable format, in the following areas:
   - On Track to Graduate
   - Transition
   - Tests
   - Credit Recovery
   - Credit Recovery and Tests
   - Cannot Graduate by June of the Senior Year

A sample of quarterly data that the OCCR will supply to the Indian Education Department team and the teams located within the Academics Division and REA was provided.

OCCR is proposing to use the quarterly data to aggressively market opportunities like Evening High School (EHS), Summer Term (S-Term) and S-Term at Saint Paul College (SPC) as opportunities for American Indian students to successfully recover credits not earned during the core academic day and/or year. We would also propose to work collaboratively with the School Counselor in the Indian Education Program to provide technical assistance and training on how to create the 9-12 Graduation Progress Data Tables for quarters 3 and 4 for the purpose of building organizational capacity in both collecting, analyzing, and using data to improve how we serve our American Indian scholars and increase the percentage and number of American Indian High School graduates.

Additionally, the OCCR Department of Post-Secondary Partnerships will commit to working more closely with the Indian Education Department to analyze, plan for, and implement more opportunities for American Indian students to enroll in and complete
advanced/accelerated course-work in high school, including, but not limited to the following:

- International Baccalaureate (IB)
- College in the Schools (CIS) through the University of Minnesota
- Concurrent Enrollment with Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College for Ojibwe 3 at Harding High School
- Advanced Placement
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses and Advanced CTE courses
- Power of You (PoY)
- Career Pathways Academy (CPA)
- Gateway to College (GtC) Area Learning Center at SPC
- CLEP Exams

As such, it will be imperative that the OCCR team and, more specifically, the Department of Graduation Progress and Acceleration, meet with the team members of the American Indian Education Program on a regular basis to mindfully inquire about the post-secondary aspirations of American Indian students in SPPS and progress monitor our attainment of the goals we set based on the standards and commitments that we collaboratively make with one another. It is important to the OCCR that the cultural values, Native/Indigenous perspectives, and multiple identities, clan, tribal affiliations of the American Indian community be valued, listened to, and honored so that we might work in tandem to increase graduation and college and/or career readiness for each American Indian student in SPPS.

The current graduation rates for SPPS American Indian students are unacceptable and the OCCR's ongoing commitment to improving both graduation rates and college and/or career readiness for all American Indian students enrolled in SPPS will be a top priority moving forward. The Director of the OCCR will be the primary point of contact, along with the Supervisor in the OCCR, with the American Indian Department and team, moving forward, and will ensure that appropriate supports and, internal to the OCCR, accountability measures are implemented to increase graduation and college and/or career readiness for our American Indian students.

Staff provided an "Initial College and Career Supports Plan for American Indian Students":

- 3.5 FTE College and Career counselors: proactive counseling with an identified group of American Indian students at the schools that have College and Career counselors. **Measurable Goal:** College and Career counselors on a weekly basis with a case-load of American Indian students at each school that has a College and Career counselor.

- Professional Development for school counselors: Darren Ginther, OCCR Supervisor, will reach out to John Bobolink, Director of Indian Education and Kerrie Troseth, Counselor for Indian Education, to identify the best ways to provide ongoing American Indian specific professional development for school counselors. **Measurable Goal:** American Indian staff will collaborate with OCCR staff to provide professional development at three PLC counselor meetings during the 2015-16 School Year.

- Gateway to College ALC at Saint Paul College: Darren Ginther will connect with Kerrie Troseth on identifying American Indian/Native students for enrollment into the
Gateway to College program. This intentionality will be for identifying American Indian students (American Indian/Native) for earning college credits through dual enrollment at Gateway to College at Saint Paul College. **Measurable Goal:** enroll three American Indian students into the Gateway to College ALC at Saint Paul College in the second term of School Year 2015-16.

- Initiate concurrent enrollment course for Ojibwe 3 at Harding High School through the partnership with Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College. **Measurable Goal:** begin the concurrent enrollment course in Ojibwe 3 at Harding by the 2nd Semester of School Year 2015-16.
- Quarterly Progress Reports for American Indian students by school, by grade level, and by student in aggregate and non-identifiable format. **Measurable Goal:** three progress reports created and disseminated for School Year 2015-16.

The parent committee expressed belief that there may be Native students who are eligible for but not receiving the interventions that are available to address truancy, behavior issues, and academic failure, for example through the SAT process. As such they felt better training and education may be needed to help District and school staff understand that Indian Education services are supplemental and Native students should therefore be served by all of the standard programs and interventions that are used for students of any other race. They also requested additional resources to support home visiting, Check and Connect, and/or other advocacy staff to serve Native students. Finally, they requested that the District work with the Parent Committee, Indian Education, and the community to better understand and address the basic needs of these students and their families and to develop better wraparound systems to serve and engage these students who are struggling with truancy and not on track to graduate.

The district responded it agrees with the Parent Committee that further attention needs to be given to ensure that American Indian students are receiving the academic, truancy and attendance intervention services that they are eligible for. SPPS also acknowledges that the role of Indian Education Program services as supplemental. Indian Education staff should be informed and included in all interventions provided to American Indian students, but it should be the work of building staff to provide these services and interventions, as is the case for students of other ethnic backgrounds.

Staff indicated SPPS is in the process of developing a district wide SAT referral process that includes a referral form on CAMPUS. This will allow it to gather data which will inform the district as to how many SAT referrals are being made and for which students. The district will continue to educate and reach out to building level staff around the unique supplemental nature of Indian Education services.

The district stated it was aware that the Indian Education Program has implemented their own Check & Connect program, and will reach out to all Check & Connect coordinators in the district to collaborate and support the efforts of the Indian Education program. SPPS has developed a partnership with the American Indian Family Center to provide culturally relevant mental health services at Harding and to expand on the partnership that already exists at AIMS for Tier 3 Intervention. Also, the Office of Family Engagement created a staff position dedicated to working with American Indian families experiencing attendance issues. This school year work will focus on 6th grade American Indian students attending schools other than the American Indian Magnet School.
Staff indicated the District welcomes the opportunity to work with the Parent Committee, Indian Education, and the community to better understand and address the basic needs of American Indian students and their families and to develop better wraparound systems to serve and engage students who are struggling with truancy and not on track to graduate. The district acknowledged the historical impact educational systems have had on American Indian people throughout history, and even though the district feels that great strides have been made to improve education for American Indian students, the district realizes there is much more work ahead for everyone as they explore ways to improve the current systems affecting SPPS American Indian students.

*The Parent Committee indicated is appreciated the district’s plan to address their concerns for this request and would further appreciate additional updates throughout the school year.*

With regard to the District’s racial equity code, the parent group requested the District update its policy to ban the wearing of racist mascots in all SPPS sites and programs by students and staff. Specifically, they are in support of the Harding student resolution to ban the R- and that the reasons behind the ban are communicated effectively and empathetically to ultimately build the District community’s inclusiveness.

Administration responded the district has a dress code policy - 501.03 - Student Code Dress. The policy includes a tenet that states the following: There shall be no other restrictions, except as previously stated, on any student’s hair style or manner of dress unless the hair style or manner of dress presents a clear and present danger to the student’s health and safety, causes an interference with work or creates classroom or school disorder.

As the Harding students eloquently stated in their February 2015 resolution to the Board of Education regarding an incident that occurred at their school when a fellow student wore a Washington R-word jersey at school, such apparel can create classroom and school disorder. The current district policy, addresses this point; however, this policy can be supported with a procedure to provide more consistent enforcement of the dress code policy. The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Policy, will collaborate with students, schools, and administrative departments to develop a procedure for student dress code that will be in alignment with the District’s Rights and Responsibilities Handbook. This procedure will be reviewed at the next quarterly meeting.

*The Parent Committee stated it admired the work of the American Indian Student Advisory Council at Harding in bringing to light the historical significance of the "R-word", it's usage and symbolism on sporting apparel and the school disorder it can create. The Parent Committee would like the District to understand how important it is for this committee to stand behind and support the efforts of their American Indian students. They strongly urged the District to continue conversations to include a banning of the "R-word" within district policies.*

With regard to the parent group’s request to learn more about the racial equity teams Administration indicated the Office of Equity is available to share the work of racial equity teams within the district and the impact this work has made for American Indian students. The Director indicated she would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Indian Education Parent Committee to discuss equity, as has been done in the past. Administration provided a list of several projects that the Office of Equity is currently providing.

*With regard to culture and language, the parent committee requested the District consider*
funding 1.0 FTE for a Lakota language teacher to allow for one full-time teacher at each site – AIMS and Harding – and for more advanced language instruction. (Currently there is 1.0 FTE split between the two schools and only one level of Lakota is offered.)

The district stated it respects the request of the Indian Education Parent Committee and will explore possible funding sources within the district for a fulltime L/Dakota language teacher in order to allow for a full time teacher at both AIMS and Harding. They understood the Parent Committee’s intention for the Resolution to affect change for the immediate school year. However, budgets for the next school year are provided to building Principals in March, this is the time when school personnel and course offerings are finalized for the next school year. The addition of a L/Dakota language teacher would at earliest be considered for the 2016-2017 school year. In order to make the Parent Committee and Administrative Response process more immediately effective in the future, it would be optimal for us to align this process with the district’s budgetary timeline.

Administration went on to say teachers are traditionally funded and hired through the individual schools they work at based on the needs of the school. At this time the one L/Dakota language course offering at Harding High School does not warrant the hiring of a full time teacher. Likewise the four sections of L/Dakota language at AIMS does not warrant a full time teacher. It is the combination of course offerings between the two schools that does warrant one full time L/Dakota language teacher between the two schools. If additional sections of L/Dakota language, or other classes with a L/Dakota based content were to be added to the course offering, then the need for a teacher with knowledge of L/Dakota language & culture could be considered. Additionally, the district will explore options to add L/Dakota language and culture based courses.

Administration stated Saint Paul Public Schools supports the work of Indigenous and World Language teachers throughout the district through a lead teacher on special assignment in the Office of Teaching and Learning. This work is grounded in the proficiency guidelines and the World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Over the 2015-2016 school year the Indigenous and World Language curriculum will be going through the curriculum review process, reviewing and enhancing each program’s support for student success, with attention to the particular needs that indigenous language education presents. Intentional collaboration between the Office of Teaching and Learning, the Indian Education Program and the work with the Indian Education Parent Committee will be a part of this review process.

The Parent Committee responded it would like the District to seriously explore funding possibilities to provide a L/Dakota language teacher at the American Indian Magnet and Harding High School. As the only school district in the state, and possibly the nation, to provide a PreK through 12 opportunity to study both Ojibwe and L/Dakota Language, these course offerings should be viewed as a source of pride and fully supported by the District to implement for the 2016-17 school year.

With regard to the demonstration grant that Indian Education received, the parent committee encouraged the District and Indian Education to use these resources to design, implement, and study a rigorous model for American Indian AVID as well as the early childhood language immersion program. They requested the District’s matching funding to support these efforts plus providing technical assistance, support, and oversight as needed.
from staff across various departments with relevant expertise to ensure the best experience possible for their students and families as well as successful outcomes.

The district stated it respected the request of the Indian Education Parent Committee for the district to support the Indian Education programming provided through the Federal Demonstration grant. The Office of Early Learning and Office of Teaching & Learning have assisted the Indian Education Program in the program development and implementation of the Caa/Mitig Federal Demonstration grant PreK and AVID programming. Beginning in the Spring of 2015, Office of Early staff worked alongside the AIMS cultural specialists to integrate Lakota and Ojibwe language into existing Areas of Study, vocabulary cards and center based materials. Office of Early Learning and AIMS cultural staff co-created lesson plans specific for morning meetings, small group instruction and skill based transitions. In addition, the OEL and AIMS staff partnered to plan and implement a family welcome event in August 2015.

The Indian Education Program has also included a Check & Connect component in alignment with the district’s effort to bring this model program to the district. The Indian Education program has secured the Evaluation services of The Systems Improvement Group under the University of Minnesota’s Institute on Community Integration. The Systems Improvement Group will work with the Indian Education Program to create a logic model and evaluation plan. Results of this evaluation will be shared with the Indian Education Parent Committee, and all interested parties on a yearly basis. Administration expressed its regret that the district does not have the ability to provide matching funding at this time. However, Saint Paul Public Schools will continue to support Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) offerings at American Indian Magnet and Harding High School by continuing to provide the funding for the American Indian Studies program at these schools. To further support the success of American Indian students SPPS district AVID staff will directly support Angie Harper at Harding High School, who is AVID trained, to embed adaptive AVID components into the work she is involved in. Research shows that students who maintain ongoing work through AVID and AVID trained staff over the course of their secondary programming have an increased likelihood of success beyond high school graduation.

*The Parent Committee strongly encouraged the District to provide matching funding for the 2015-17 school year.*

The parent group requested the District reinstate the quarterly wraparound meetings with various District departments and/or implement other strategies to ensure the District’s administrative response to our Resolution is attended to. They requested that the Chief Academic Officer or the Indian Education Program Supervisor report the results of that meeting and the District’s process on the administrative response to the Parent Committee on a quarterly basis.

Administration stated the Indian Education Program Supervisor will work collaboratively with the Office of Family Engagement to re-establish the quarterly wrap-around meetings. The Indian Education Program Supervisor is available for results and updates from these meeting at anytime, but will be reported at the Indian Education Parent Committee meetings. The Indian Education Program Supervisor has also been invited to attend the monthly Leadership meetings, comprised of the different district departments overseen by the Chief Academic Officer. Quarterly Wrap-around meetings are currently schedule for October 20, 2015,
January 19, 2015, April 19, 2015, and July 19, 2015. This schedule will continue in the follow-
school year, and meetings will be co-facilitated by the Chief Engagement Officer and the
Chief Academic Officer.

Questions/Discussion:

- The Director of Indian Education and the Chair of the Parent Committee provided some
  additional comments regarding the Administrative Response.
  - They stated there is a need to dig deeper to get preliminary data to capture those
    students in need before the end of the first grading quarter to address their needs
    before it is too late. They stated they wished to receive student data at the begin-
    ning of each year and every other month thereafter. They appreciated the District’s
    willingness to cooperate in this. They want to have measurable outcomes to see
    over a period of years to identify where gaps are and how to improve/address them
    and to partner with the District to achieve this. Administration indicated Indian
    Education is getting their own data dashboard this year.
  - Regarding additional PD for school counselors, Student Assistant Teams are part of
    the IEP process. The committee want these teams to get a clear message that when
    they are dealing with Indian students, if there are staff in place, it is their duty to see
    the processes are carried through per Indian Ed Supplementary Support process.
    This needs to be more unified across the district moving forward. Counselors need
    to be provided with American Indian PD.
  - The parent committee encourage the Board to get behind the mascot issue. 
    Administration indicated they were proposing the new Student Advisory Team take
    this issue on as one of their first projects. The parent committee stated SPPS will be
    pioneering in this area. They stated this is a "cry for respect."
  - They expressed their appreciation for the racial equity teams willingness to help
    support Indian students.
  - They provided additional background on the need for an additional L/Dakota
    language teacher indicating SPPS sets the bar for other districts across the nation by
    offering both Ojibwe and Lakota language PreK through 12. Indian Education is
    looking for the District to support an additional L/Dakota teacher to further engage
    students in their language and culture. It is important to provide Indian students a
    sense of cultural continuity in support of familial culture and a sense of belonging. All
    of that helps to give students a sense of personal value, lack of which lends to the
    adolescent suicide rate among American Indians. The committee challenged the
    board and district to provide a timeline on their commitment to find funding for this
    and from whom. They stated that within Minnesota there is a dialectical difference
    between Lakota and Dakota and the community is losing its first speakers who
    provide a history of the Dakota language as a living history and world view. The
    Indian community is working on a Dakota language revitalization and this is an
    opportunity for the District to embrace this.
  - Administration asked how Indian Education was spending its $126,000 grant. They
    replied it is not enough to provide services to all 694 American Indian students in St.
    Paul and that the grant must serve all Indian groups within the St. Paul community. It
    will be used for some program costs, staff development, evaluation of the program,
    hiring six new academic supports (tutors/mentors), some student activities, for the
    Check and Connect Program along with a marketing and promotional piece to
    promote what Indian Education does and providing a positive message to Indian
    students. They are looking for a partnership with the District and asking for a timeline
    to make the matching fund request within the upcoming budget cycle. Administration
    announced upcoming community budget sessions which the community might want
    to attend.
- Would the additional L/Dakota language teacher position be hard to fill? Response:
  There is enough programming on language revitalization and people working on getting
  licensure in the Metro area to find someone however the Dakota reservations are picking
  up licensed teachers and giving better pay than SPPS. It will be somewhat more difficult
  than finding a Spanish or French teacher.
• If you look at funding number 5 and 6 in the upcoming budget conversations what would the number be?  Response:  Around $150,000.
• For #2 – it seems SPPS is not doing a good job of identifying students who need help. Why is there a problem identifying students?  Response.  It is not that they are not identified, they need to be identified sooner.  In the past staff had to manually pull their own information because Indian data is so small a part of the data set it is not seen in the data; Indian students fall through the cracks.  Administration stated it would be providing student information to Indian Education so data will be there for use now..
• Board members requested staff send this report to the newly elected board members – as it is or will be a budget issue.
• What are the next steps –what is happening in other schools across the district, how can the Board help to get Indian students to a higher academic level?    Response:  Students are in the same situation regardless of school and this is true across the nation.  The Miriam Report examined education for American Indian students and found the educational system had and is failing these students. Good results do seem to happen when culture and language are included.  It is a fact that every dollar allotted to Indian Ed must be fought for.  American Indian people are resilient and survivors, they know how to adapt to changes.  American Indian kids are not seeing themselves represented in school settings. The new demo grant will allow Indian Ed to examine the various pieces, deal with immediate issues and build toward a bigger picture. There are enough committed parents who will push for accountability from the American Indian Program so there is a need to have good evaluation to know where the program is at. There is a need to create partnerships within the community, district and within the program.
• How many of students failing classes are a result of poor attendance?  Response:  A large percentage of them.  At some point these students do not feel welcome in class which contributes to lack of attendance or there is an incident that puts them off or frightens them out of attending.  Students are coming to school and not being seen, they are present but not seen.  There is a need to find out how to zero in on these kids to bring them into the setting and make them understand what is needed to succeed.  Knowing about their history and roots helps and that is part of the racial equity work.  There needs to be understanding not all kids fit into a certain box and need a different kind of intervention.  If you look at Latino and Latin American kids you will find the same degree of failures.  Teachers and staff all over this nation do not have a good understanding about native history, thought, culture.  Again, that is equity training work.  There is a need to push equity more for teachers. Racial equity work needs to include more student voices.  Students need to be seen and heard.  Staff needs to take action with interventions for each child.
• A Board member stated they were pleased to see more intentionality around these issues throughout the years.;  She was hopeful with the smaller count number that kids can be identified and help can be provided.  She extended the Board's thanks for all the work accomplished.

**MOTION:**  Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board Recommend the Board of Education accept the Administrative Response to the American Indian Resolution of Concurrence as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

The motion passed.

C. School Start Times

The Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Policy stated the purpose of the presentation was to support the Board in its discussion of the five options for school start times for the SY 16-17 leading to a Board motion for the Regular Board meeting on November 17.

The options were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Description</th>
<th>Later Start Time for more Secondary Schools</th>
<th>Start Time Changes for Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Cost Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Recommendation Option #1 - Continue working w/ Metro Transit for expansion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 - Change start times system-wide</td>
<td>Yes - All middle &amp; high schools</td>
<td>Yes - 25 schools earlier, 7 schools later</td>
<td>$2 Mil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 -- End discussion with No Change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 -- Expand later start to 1 high school and early start for 5 elementary schools</td>
<td>Yes - 2 additional high school w/ yellow buses</td>
<td>Yes - 5 or 6 elementary schools earlier</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 -- Expand later start to 3 high schools and go to early start for 10 elementary schools</td>
<td>Yes - 3 additional high schools w/ yellow buses</td>
<td>Yes - 10 elementary schools earlier</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Leading Recommendation - Option 1 Continue working with Metro Transit for expansion. Johnson High School would start at 8:30 a.m. and partner with Metro Transit. SPPS would keep the current three tier set-up with most other secondary schools at 7:30 start. All elementary schools would remain at 8:30 and 9:30 starts. SPPS would continue to work with Metro Transit and revisit start times when partnership expansion options are available.

Implications of Option 1:
- **Positive**
  - No cost increase over current structure (besides annual inflation)
  - Allows time to continue studying pilot at Johnson
  - Keeps open the possibility of change in the future
  - Will not require multiple start time changes for elementary schools as Metro Transit becomes able to partner at more schools
- **Negative**
  - Teens still waking up before research based recommended time
  - Much of the community is eager to see transition to later start for secondary students.

2. Option 2 - Change Start Times (7:45, 8:35, 9:30). Secondary schools would go to 8:35 start. Community elementary and some regional magnets would go to 7:45 start with no bus pick-up before 7:00 a.m. District-wide magnets and some regional magnets would stay at the 9:30 start. SPPS would continue partnering with Metro Transit at Johnson.

Implications of Option 2:
- **Positive**
  - Later start for all secondary schools (8:35 a.m.) meeting research-based health benefits for adolescents and meeting community expectations for later start times.
  - The first tier would have a later start (7:45 a.m.), 15 minutes later than the change proposed last year.
- **Negative**
  - Start times may eventually change again after Metro Transit is able to expand the partnership.
  - 78% of schools would have a new start time (25 elementary schools will move to first tier and 7 elementary schools would move to the third tier).
  - There would be a $2 million increase due to less efficient routes.
It would impact family time
It would potentially cause shifts in childcare needs for many families
It would have impacts on staff and stability of schools
It would require reconfiguration of EDL bussing, which may require longer rides home.
It would create scheduling challenges for games at Parks & Rec sites.

3. Option 3 - Discontinue Analysis and keep the current structure for the foreseeable future. Conclude the analysis of changing start times structure.

Implications of Option 3:
• Positive
  o It would end the uncertainty of school start times
• Negative
  o It is not responsive to secondary students and parents
  o It is not in the best interest of adolescent students

4. Option 4 (Hybrid Option) - Later start for one more high school and early start for five elementary schools. One additional high school would go to an 8:30 start with yellow bus transportation. Five community elementary schools would go to a 7:45 start, with no bus pick-up before 7:00 a.m. All other schools would stay on the current schedule. SPPS would continue partnering with Metro Transit for Johnson HS.

The following would be considered in the selection of the early start elementary schools.
• One school from every Area except Area D
• Mix of high and low poverty schools
• Mix of PK-5 and K-5
• Number of bus routes
• Location of school and size of pick-up area.

Implications of Option 4:
• Positive
  o Allows SPPS to go to a Phase 2 of changing start times, even without Metro Transit
  o It allows SPPS to learn from the earlier start time for elementary schools
  o Parents of secondary students may appreciate SPPS’s continued movement toward system-wide change.
• Negative
  o Only two secondary schools have a later start time
  o The communities selected for the early start elementary schools will likely be displeased
  o Tight timing does not allow for adequate community engagement
  o Some of the elementary families may try to transfer to a different school to avoid going to school earlier
  o There could be a potential increase in the number of teacher transfer requests disrupting continuity of staff
  o After school services will be impacted by only a few elementary schools moving to earlier start times
  o It would increase the challenges of scheduling games at Parks and Rec sites (currently SPPS must be off fields by 5:00 p.m. for the adult leagues).

5. Option 5 (Hybrid Option) - Later start for three more high schools and early start for 10 elementary schools. Three additional high schools would go to an 8:30 start with yellow bus transportation. 10 community elementary schools would go to a 7:45 start with no bus pick-up before 7:00 a.m. All other schools would stay with the current schedule. SPPS would continue partnering with Metro Transit for Johnson HS.
Implications of Option 5:

- **Positive**
  - It allows SPPS to go to a Phase 2 of changing start times, even without Metro Transit
  - Parents of secondary students may appreciate SPPS’s continued movement toward system-wide change
- **Negative**
  - Middle schools and three schools with 9-12 would still have early start times
  - More elementary schools would be impacted
  - It greatly increases the challenges in the scheduling of games at Park & Rec sites.

Over the years, SPPS has heard from many families about later start times for secondary students. Teens have later sleep patterns, which are largely biological, not behavioral. Research shows later school start times for teens have many benefits.

In 2014, SPPS engaged in an extensive discussion with the SPPS community, “Rethinking School Start Times.” Thousands of responses from students, families and staff were received. The feedback was mixed regarding the proposed changes to start times. A two-tier system was discussed at that time but was and still is not feasible. The Board voted to approve a recommendation not to change start times while asking Administration to commit to continued consideration of the topic.

In SY 15-16, Johnson High School launched a pilot program evaluating a later start time (8:30) and the use of Metro Transit Student Passes for transportation. Early indicators are positive. 1,100 Metro Transit passes were issued. There have been no reports of issues on the buses. 25% of the opt-out students have switched to using Metro Transit and there has been increased participation in after-school activities. Students will be surveys in the fall of 2015 and the spring of 2016 to gauge the impacts of a later start time.

SPPS has continued working with Metro Transit with a mutual interest in expanding the partnership. Multiple SPPS schools are served well by Metro Transit bus routes and the LRT green line. Unfortunately, final analysis revealed that Metro Transit does not have the capacity to add service to another SPPS comprehensive high school.

Questions/Discussion:

- Why is Option 1 - working with MT when it appears there is no partnership at this time? Why is that the leading recommendation? Response: The Superintendent stated she believes SPPS can work with MT. SPPS should not expect MT to take all kids right now but SPPS should ask kids how they would utilize MT and see how that would impact MT. The MT opportunity is needed by kids and is working at Johnson.
- A Board member stated she felt that unless SPPS moves somewhere with school start times to indicate their importance there will be no reason for MT to change its priorities. She could support that priority through option 4 so SPPS could have information for parents by School Choice time. Currently there does not seem to be a great sense of urgency on either part.
- Another Board member stated if SPPS does nothing there is no pressure however the opposite could happen, if SPPS provides yellow buses it could relieve the pressure on MT. If SPPS says this high school will move next year it could then have a specific conversation with MT on how they might provide some form of transport option for students.
- Why does SPPS need to negotiate with MT as to who needs a bus pass? Response: There is no need to, they can be purchased.
- Why should SPPS support MT’s request for a half cent sales tax, would that move them in SPPS’s direction?
A Board member stated the Board has discussed the various options and expressed appreciation for the impacts chart. Options 1 and 3 seem to have the least impact but do not address the reason for the conversation in the first place. Options 4-5 seem about the same but in reality would present very different challenges. Parents are still concerned about the impact to elementary kids with earlier start time. Safety and the impact on kids and families are concerns. She felt the Board still does not have enough information on the impact on younger kids. Response: Currently there is no credible research that links elementary school start time and advantages and disadvantages. It does not exist. What there is is more about hearing from families or talking with districts who have done it for a period of time.

I am comfortable with option 4, it is doable. There is a partnership with the City with programming and the fields that need to be shared. Feel it would be a good starting point.

Parks and Rec will not give up adult league money, that is very lucrative for Parks and Rec. We can hope conflicts can be solved. High schools take the fields between 2 and 4 now. This currently seems to be working for Johnson. Response: SPPS has been able to manage it so far but it really depends on the season. Spring will see greater potential for conflicts. The impacts depend on the season and the sport and whether schools are in or out of the conference.

If everything shifts, what would be the academic impact if students miss last period? Response: That is happening currently. There are study halls and hopefully for most students that is their last period.

If SPPS moves start time for middle and high schools that is better for them. There will be problems needing to be addressed. Response: SPPS is working with partners on this.

A concern heard from Park and Rec is many students who work in recreation centers are high school students and if they are not out of school, who will work with the kids.

#4 is doable, get more bang for buck under #5. The goal of a later start time would help more kids.

If SPPS went with option 1, what is timeline for conversations with stakeholders (MT and City) and would there be time next year so there can be a viable plan to move more high schools to a later start time for 17-18? Response: The MT option is not promising. There could be hope to have some kind of hybrid options available for next school year. Hopefully SPPS will know more if a Transportation bill is passed. There are also the surveys of students at Johnson so SPPS can learn more about how students use MT. There could be a poll of the other high schools to see how many students would be interested in having a MT pass and where those numbers are greatest. SPPS can survey current high school students and continue its conversations with MT regardless of what happens with the Transportation bill.

What would SPPS do with families of elementary students? It appears elementary families have not understood this would impact them. Response: SPPS would need to engage parents and educate them about the impacts and allow staff time to reach accommodation with the changes. SPPS cannot afford to add more after school student contact time for elementary students.

If the ultimate goal is to have middle and high school students district-wide have later start times, what is accomplished by doing this in a piecemeal fashion? Response: One thing would be to learn what would happen with elementary students without changing to the system-wide option 2. SPPS could learn from adjusting just a few. It would also allow partners to adjust their systems and programs, staffing model, etc. SPPS will need to adjust as well and these changes will impact other programs/partners down the line. They would like to have time to make these adjustments as they will need to service kids coming to them at different times.

Have your heard from staff that teachers do not know they will be impacted by this? Response: There have been lots of conversations, there has been broad communication, much speculation about who it will be and what does it mean. People want to know when, how, what and who - then it gets personal and they can review their options.
The Assistant Superintendents indicated that elementary schools with no changes makes life the same, easier. If SPPS makes quick change, it will be a change for families and depending on the school, may create attendance issues for schools with high poverty students. It may increase staff instability for a time. Staff needs to know and understand impacts so if someone needs to opt out and find a different position they can do so. It may also impact teacher/student relationships within schools.

A Board member stated everyone has heard the science around start times, it is not debatable. The people SPPS has heard from have been overwhelmingly secondary families. There is a higher concentration of EL students at elementary. SPPS has not looked at the impacts at poverty level. Free and reduced is higher at elementary than secondary. SPPS hears less from families in poverty, EL, people of color and SPPS must know more of how changes would impact them.

A Board member stated she feared the impact on elementary students. If SPPS change is slow and incremental it can be assessed however if it is not done across the district it could become an equity issue.

If the purpose were student achievement and closing gaps we know elementary kids are getting poorer and there are more students of color. Can we be sure we are not exacerbating the problem. Staff reviewed the district demographics.

SPPS is 70% kids of color. We know there is increasing poverty in the community. The majority of kids in St. Paul attend SPPS. High poverty and more kids of color and the achievement gap is not closing. SPPS is leaving it to families to figure out how to cope with impacts of the earlier start. It will not benefit children’s academic achievement without MT coming in. SPPS needs to think about the end game and we know MT is 4-5 years out at minimum. That puts elementary kids at risk.

In my four years on the Board, I have known changing start times is the right thing to do. It is systemically irresponsible not to do so. SPPS is at the forefront in most instances and should know changing start times is the right thing to do for kids.

Elementary kids will be impacted and we do not know how and there is no data to help in that area.

For Options 4 and 5 high school principals are aware of the research, etc. There is no disagreement about the research but there is also the importance of after school activities. As policy makers we do not understand why MT cannot serve St. Paul students. Changing start times benefits high school students but not without the benefits of a MT bus pass. SPPS is a system so impacts hit all in one way or another. A long while back high school did start at 8:30 then SPPS went to centralized busing and here we are now.

The end game could be that MT gets on board and then fewer elementary schools would need to change.

Most of current research has been the impact on secondary, it is also important to look at impact on elementary. The ability to take MT adds a layer of equity for access to jobs and activities beyond sports. It would be beneficial to assess SPPS demographic groups of student in elementary to see where areas of greatest impacts might be.

In general, transportation needs to even out three routes, middle school complicates things. SPPS would have elementary moving earlier with MT. With Options 2, 4 and 5 there will be elementary schools that need to go to a 7:45 start.

A Board member stated she felt a need to do a reset and look at having Administration establish a plan that would look at benefits of later start times for high school and maybe middle school and look with MT and without along with options that include community and family input. Then bring the plan to the Board next July being sure it is a multi-year plan.

**MOTION:** Ms. Carroll moved, for discussion purposes, acceptance of Option #1. Ms. O’Connell seconded the motion.

- The motion will need to be fleshed out to incorporate some of the discussion items.
- Opinion - Feel doing the right thing for kids by moving forward to change start times
• Statement - Do not want to see Administration come back having five options on the table again.
• Opinion - Like option 1 to gain further input/knowledge on impact to elementary. Would also entertain Option 4 with an assessment of impacts on secondary and elementary kids
• Opinion - Administration will not have enough data by October 2016
• Superintendent - Either do it or don’t
• If have to make change Option 4 would be second choice.
• Option 4 - this option to get data, to get feedback from elementary schools. Would like timeline if continue to move to change all schools.
• What is specific game plan if go with option 1? If do this, Administration cannot come back with multiple options, come with one option. Like option 4 as believe in pilots.
• There is value in seeing how this would work with a smaller subset.
• Board needs to create a committee with staff and begin work on this. The new board needs to get involved. There needs to be more parent and community involvement. This would be a way to start new Board in on how to do true community involvement that measures what needs to be measured. How will everyone manage the transitions. If move to full scale what can SPROKETS do, Parks and Rec, Be sure to get communities of color and poverty involved. Need to hear the voices of those not usually heard from.
• The work done around engagement of parents and communities was exceptionally well done for this issue. Conversations are in addition to some really good work that has been done. SPPS has many on both ends who love or hate the change options.
• Going forward need to frame issue differently – different questions to be addressed, how manage transitions and changes so do not harm academic achievement of students.
• Any other information the Superintendent should bring to the presentation at BOE? Response: The big appeal for secondary students is MT, it gives them all transport options for after school, work, activities and weekends.
• Impact chart needs to be addressed at the BOE, motion can be done during Superintendent's report.

RESTATEMENT OF MOTION with call for voice vote:

Ms. Carroll moved acceptance of Option #1. Ms. O'Connell seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the following voice vote:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Seeba</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carroll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brodrick</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hardy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Doran</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Vue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O'Connell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion passed with four in favor, one abstention and two no votes.

It was noted additional work would be done on the initial motion to clarify Board expectations for Administration.

FINAL MOTION TO BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ON 11/17/15

The Committee of the Board recommended the Board of Education select Option 1, to retain existing start times for the 2016-17 school year. Further, by the summer of 2016, the Board expects Administration to bring forward a multi-year plan with clear outcomes, to continue aggressively pursuing a Metro Transit partnership as part of a long-term solution, and to engage internal stakeholders and SPPS’s many community partners to find ways to have fewer negative impacts and more positive benefits for both elementary and secondary as the change to the start...
time process moves forward. The option does not preclude the administration from actively
pursuing other pilots with Metro Transit in the 2016-17 school year that may prove viable.

D. Standing Item: Policy Update - None
E. Standing Item: PLTT Update - None
F. Standing Item: SSSC 2.0 Update - None

G. Work Session

1. Establish date for closed BOE meeting
The Board opted to have two closed meetings the evening of December 8.

2. Board Check-In
It was suggested stakeholders might be encouraged to explore and report on transit
experiences within the MT system to SPPS. It would provide information to SPPS and
perhaps put some pressure on MT.

3. Discussion on Accountability Relative to the Racial Equity and Bullying Policies
   • How does SPPS hold people accountable? Response: Administration expects
     adults to interrupt bullying when seen.
   • Section 4 in the Racial Equity policy is on accountability. How can we strengthen
     the accountability portion of each policy. How do policies intersect with Vision
     Cards? Response: The Racial Equity accountability section is the most clear.
     Monitoring around the Strategic Plan looks at elements that support racial equity and
     can be found on all cards. Bullying prevention metrics for leadership, staff role,
     student engagement are harder to quantify,
   • Outcome metrics on racial equity and bullying are not on the Vision Cards. There
     are internal plans for goals and outcomes, they are more process outcomes. One
     area is the curriculum adoption process that is now looking for more culturally
     relevant materials.
   • Can the Board put words to how to measure how SPPS is carrying out the Racial
     Equity policy and how that transfers to "soft" areas, expectations
   • Monitoring and pushing the conversation on how policy outlines areas to be looked
     at, how it shows up on performance evaluation.
   • The Board has no mechanism in place to further evaluate policy implementation on
     very important policies. It should move back to the process of picking several high
     impact critical policies and look at monitoring them in a cycle.
   • Baseline pieces need to happen to ensure training is being done to reach
     expectations of both policies.
   • Administration needs to be sure to point out areas of proactivity and prevention that
     are working and expand them across the system.
   • Staff should consider a Vision Card on School Climate.

4. Future Board Sessions
The Board discussed possible dates/locations for a Board Retreat. No decision was
reached.

III. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss, Assistant Clerk