

6. The provision in the NCLB which permits districts to allow students the option to opt themselves out
7. Advance notice to interested parties so they can attend

Chief of Staff, Deb Henton, continued the presentation and provided further information for each item listed above. She also reviewed additional information pertaining to Saint Paul Public Schools Policy and Procedures noting policies 814.00-Visitors to the Schools, 706.00-Grants and Gifts, 808.00-Buildings and Grounds/Security and 614.00-Free Materials Distribution in the Schools.

Discussion:

The following comments/questions were offered by Board members:

- Mr. Conlon asked why there was an increase in number of students receiving the opt-out form. Mr. Schellenberg, Research and Development, replied that the form is now distributed to students in grades 9-11 instead of only 11-12th grade students.
- Ms. Street-Stewart said her concerns regarding number of recruiters in the buildings, schedules and location of recruiters had been satisfactorily clarified.
- Ms. Carroll comments were specifically related to whether treatment of recruiters in the area of access to students in the schools and level of supervision was comparable in all schools.
- Mr. Goldstein's concerns were lack of consistency at the schools regarding policies and opt-outs occurring throughout the school year.
- Mr. Conlon asked if any other groups beside the military had access to student lists and if there are other groups beside campus recruiters and the military that used the same space in schools (i.e., the Peace Corps).

Chair Kong-Thao stated at this time people in the audience who signed up to express their views could do so.

People who favored access to students in the schools and the people who opposed access to students in the schools were allowed to speak for two (2) minutes each.

Speakers who favor access to students were:

- Sgt. Robert Mazuic, U.S. Army Capt. Jason Quehl, US.Marine Corps
- Cpt. Paul Hernandez, U.S. Army Sgt. Josh Johnson, U.S. Marine Corps
- Gretchen Hintze, Junior, Central High
- Bill Summers, American Legion
- MSG. Dave Eustice, MN Army Guard
- Sgt. Michael Rivera, MN Army Guard
- Cpl.Aaron Eggersluss, MN Army Guard

The following people opposed access to students:

- Lauren Ries, YAWR
- Sean Foltin, YAWR
- Mike Madden
- Shane Davis, YAWR
- Jack Rossback, CAMS
- Willie Jacobson, YAWR
- Karina Sahlin, YAWR

It was the consensus of the Committee to extend this discussion for another twenty minutes. Ms. Street-Stewart stated the issue being presented is based on one specific school site and whether to allow equal access to all recruiters (military, educational, occupational) in a career resource center or in or near the cafeteria.

Superintendent Carstarphen commented on three ways to address the issue: 1) View it from the policy perspective, 2) view from a Saint Paul Public Schools High School practice perspective or 3) view it as an issue around implementation of the policy or practice. She reiterated that, by law, the District is required to give military recruiters the same access to secondary school students as the District provides post-secondary institutions or prospective employers. The number of times recruiters are in a school, especially Central High School, can be tracked to see if there has been some abuse and information can be gathered to find what actual practice in the high schools is.

The other part is the policy/law piece. After discussion around the practice piece it might be helpful to discuss the memo brought forward by the Central High School Youth Against War and Racism (YAWR) with regard to some of their desired outcomes (restrict post-secondary institutions to the career resource center, including the military recruiters). As long as the District is consistent in its access this can be addressed as a practice and made consistent across the high schools in the District. With regard to the physical location (which is not dictated and by law is that it be fair and equitable), the Board can provide direction to Administration to be put into practice in the schools. Superintendent Carstarphen emphasized the District needs to be very sensitive to the access issue which is a legal issue rather than a policy issue. It is very important for Administration to have direction from the Board on access, so it can be put into practice and high schools can be held accountable for providing fair access

The following comments were made by Board members:

- Mr. Conlon expressed concern that certain groups might be banished from the schools and equality of access jeopardized. He commented that micro-managing the schools is not necessary and no action is required.
- Ms. Street-Stewart said the issue presented to the Board has been specific to one school site (Central High School) and how best practices are provided across the District, caution should be taken that ensures compliance and uniformity, guaranteeing access applies to all schools whether it is the school cafeteria or career resource center. She asked if there was an interest in identifying a specified location that would ensure equal access both by scheduling time and the capacity of students in that area. Ms. Street-Stewart remarked that each school's schedule is different and information received from the school indicated the cafeteria was being used primarily for the occasion of recruitment practices. She asked if a location should be identified to ensure students recognize it as the site to meet with all recruiters from the beginning to the school year to the end of the school year.
- Ms. Carroll and Mr. Goldstein both commented and expressed concern that based on what had been discussed the people recruiting for post-secondary opportunities in the lunch rooms are military recruiters and that is not equal access.
- Mr. Oertwig complimented the students who made presentations to the Board and the fact that they understand the rules under which the Board operates to frame their response. He further stated that any one group should not have greater opportunity than another group to have access to the students. He remarked there should be some student opt-out provision that should be generated, as well as the parent opt-out provision, this is something administration can develop and structure following Board direction. His sense is the access is greater for the recruiters than for post-secondary groups. He would like administration to comment on this. Some access is appropriate but excessive access becomes problematic in terms of student time.

Superintendent Carstarphen remarked that administration would be able to respond to the question on whether or not there is a difference for military recruiters access compared to other post-secondary options. She stated she would like to take this back to all senior high school administrators and the District's student leadership group to discuss with a follow-up memo to be sent to the Board.

Mary Mackbee, Principal, Central High School, provided guidance calendars from September through January to Board members to give a capsule look at how often colleges as well as

military recruiters come to Central. In September fifteen (15) different colleges visited, and the Army visited once for the three lunches. In October there was military recruiter from each service branch (Air Force Academy, Marines, National Guard, Army and the Navy) that came to the school to recruit during lunch time. College recruiters are scheduled for hourly visits mostly for speaking. Principal Mackbee stated in the fourteen (14) years she has been at Central there was never an issue up to this year in terms of equal access. There have been colleges in the cafeteria, mostly junior colleges as opposed to the four-year or private colleges who tend to ask for a set-aside space to talk to the students individually or collectively, as a group. When the students approached Ms. Mackbee regarding their concerns she informed them that according to No Child Left Behind (NCLB), everybody had access to the school. The difference may be the visibility, especially the military who come dressed in their work uniforms, as opposed to college recruiters who usually come in suits and go to the CRC because it has a more private atmosphere. It is usually a select group of students who sign up to visit these because they are interested in a particular college.

Mr. Brodrick inquired if the Board were to create a policy where the military would be limited to presenting themselves at the Career Resource Center, would the size of the CRC be a factor in implementing this new policy? Should this be taken into consideration when making a decision.

Principal Mackbee said space shouldn't be a problem as everyone could be accommodated in the CRC, the only problem would be the limited drop-in capability of students to the CRC for those one on one visits as there are 15-25 colleges visiting on a monthly basis.

Ms. Carroll agreed with Superintendent Carstarphen's suggestion that staff talk to the schools about the access issue. She would ask that staff think about the net effect and how decisions are made about who is scheduled where, when, how and what the purpose of a K-12 institution is. Ms. Carroll would like committee members to discuss how the opt-out forms are handled: 1) NCLB specifically provides for minors to opt themselves out. This is a document that either the student or parent sign as provided by law, 2) by law students can opt out anytime of the year and as new students enroll in the District they can sign the opt-out form then and at that time it is recorded in the District's data base. Subsequent requests therefore, prevent access to that information. It then stands to reason that students should be able to obtain the form anytime of the year and sign up anytime of the year. The law states only that the opt-out form is to be provided to the secondary students.

Superintendent Carstarphen discussed several issues raised by the Committee:

- Ms. Carroll's request for additional information regarding military recruiters that was assembled and available for distribution. Principal Mackbee provided a sample calendar with a schedule that will be provided to Board members in the weekly Board packet.
- She talked about the definition of a secondary student – under Minnesota Statute secondary schools are defined as those enrolling people in grades 7-12, or any portion thereof. It was found no recruiter asked for more information on students other than those in grades 11 and 12.
- The opt-out form found under #2 and #3 in her memo to the Board. In response to Ms. Carroll's question on whether parents submit an opt-out form all year round. Yes, that is true. The Superintendent noted there were other details about high schools and when the completed form has to be back so the District can comply with the military request within 60 days as required by law.
- In regard to reminding parents if they had filled out the opt-out form the previous year. This is normally not done because once it is filled out it is done. One thing staff would recommend is that, if parents are unsure, they should just complete it every year. Nothing is done on the school level to remind parents that they have opted out.
- On the question of staff concerns regarding the NCLB provision that states students can opt-out of having their names and addresses given to recruiters without parent permission. The District must give parents, but not the students (who are considered minors until they

reach age 18), a notice that they may opt-out of releasing this information to military recruiters. Administration can still allow students to opt-out and if parents come forward the issue can be discussed further.

Ms. Carroll expressed her appreciation for the information and stated she would like to move this forward.

Mr. Goldstein remarked information given to the Board members by the YAWR student group points out the military recruiters can situate themselves in the cafeteria, as can other groups, but that to see them in the CRC, students are required to obtain a pass. Was setting up in the cafeteria a request from the military or was that provided because there was a determination the CRC was being overrun with organizations?

Principal Mackbee stated it is simply a practice that college recruiters or military recruiters can set up booths outside the cafeteria so students would have easy access to talk to recruiters or college people. She noted that CRC's are fairly new and at one point the cafeteria was the only place they could be.

Mr. Goldstein remarked the requirement that the District must release names of students to the military as part of NCLB makes no sense and there is no connection to the accountability sought in that act and what it requires in terms of reforming education. Why must the District provide names and addresses to the military when it does not provide them to the colleges, when presumably our mission is to prepare students for secondary education? Some parents would argue that part of our mission should be to prepare students for a military career but that is not what our mandate is right now. To the extent that it is reasonable the Board should do what they can to level the playing field in terms of equal access. The military has been given a huge advantage by the Federal government. Mr. Goldstein stated, based on what he has heard he does not believe recruiters have done improper things at the school. They have been very creative, very aggressive and have taken advantage of the opportunity presented. He does not agree the Board has any obligation to provide them anything more than equal access. The fact that in uniform they are allowed into the cafeteria gives them an unfair advantage. The fact they are provided names gives them an unfair advantage. He felt it was incumbent to try to equalize things so it is truly equal access. He believes the Committee should take an action that requests the District to report back to the Committee what the situation is at the respective high schools in term so how we might have some type of career center or a place where students can meet with recruiters. If colleges feel they need privacy to speak with students and do not avail themselves to the cafeteria very often and decided to do their recruitment in the CRC, he does not understand why the military would want to do anything different than that.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education direct Administration to: 1) Further explore with all District schools that provide grades 7-12, how the issues of location, supervision and scheduling might be best handled such that access is equal. 2) Less consultation is required but more information gathered by Administration on how opt-out forms can be made more robust to allow minors to sign and to make it available in grades 7-12 so that student(s) can do it anytime during the year and that parents should be able to call the school and find out whether they have an opt-out form on file.

Ms. Street-Stewart suggested splitting the motion into two parts. She stated the first part has already been offered by administration and what the Committee would need to do is recognize it and look for the report back in a future weekly update. It may take time to get all the information back and that would be handled in the development of the agenda. The purpose is to try to address the issue of location, supervision and scheduling. Primarily the Board wants to hear what the schools are saying on how they can ensure maximum visibility to demonstrate that access is equal. She would like to take care of that part to get it moved off the table.

Mr. Goldstein disagreed and remarked until the Board gets this information that tells us logistically what is going to work best at each high school that, at least for the purposes of Central, the Committee temporarily restrict all post-secondary recruiters to the CRC until the Board makes a decision. Ms. Street-Stewart remarked the information would be back to the Committee within a month or less, which is a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. Conlon expressed concern with 7-12, because a 7th grader could be persuaded about something but over time people make decisions about their life; it is a constantly evolving process and a student might forget they had signed that form. Ms. Carroll commented the form is mailed to students every year.

Chair Kong-Thao stated there are two motions before the Committee. The following motion was made to split the original motion.

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Street-Stewart, seconded by Ms. Carroll, that the Committee of the Board approve splitting the original motion into two parts.

Motion Passed.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education direct Administration to further explore all District schools grades 7-12 on how the issues of location, supervision and scheduling might be best handled so that access is equal.

Discussion:

- Mr. Oertwig remarked administration should make frequency of visits one of their issues.
- Ms. Carroll clarified that the branches should be considered as individual entities and the colleges as individual entities and then look at frequency per unit.
- Mr. Oertwig said frequency of visits would be sufficient.
- Ms. Street-Stewart commented at the discussion time there will be comparative information that would be helpful. The fact is there are program entities within the District that are not post-secondary recruitment visits such as MEP, Central's MEP, Indian Education Program, Chosen to Achieve, all the mentorship programs have opportunities for students to meet at a college fair or in the program structure opportunities to meet with colleges, therefore the Committee must be conscious of the fact there are program obligations that are run by grants and already have their own mission and opportunities to connect with students. She concluded a broad comparison without complications would work.
- Mr. Conlon's concern is one group cannot control what another group chooses to take advantage of or not and if the Committee is implying that the military is getting more access than colleges but colleges are not taking advantage of it. He added another consideration is if a group would be opposed to setting up side by side tables, would they be moved into the CRC where no one would be able to hear them either.

A friendly amendment was made by Mr. Oertwig:

AMENDED MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education direct Administration to further explore with all grade 7 through 12 schools in the District how the issues of location, supervision, scheduling and frequency of visits, might be best handled so that recruiting access is equal.

Motion Passed

Chair Kong-Thao moved to the second part of the motion.

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education direct Administration to pursue how the Opt Out form could be modified in such a way that it allows minors to sign, that it allows that option as permitted under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the State's definition of secondary. That makes it available in grades 7 through 12, so that the students can do this anytime in the year and anyone who is legally allowed to know can contact the school to verify whether or not a form has been completed.

Discussion.

- Mr. Oertwig offered a friendly amendment that the administration develop a mechanism for student opt-out.
- Mr. Conlon expressed concern that this motion was targeted specifically at military and if the Committee is requesting opt-out of one group it should opt-out of no contact with schools or commercial activity. Also, going down to the seventh grade level for practical purposes is unnecessary and more paper work and is micro-managing.
- Mr. Oertwig stated the opt-out is for military recruiters and no one else has access to the information in the District's system except for those recruiters.
- Superintendent Carstarphen remarked as it stands right now based on information gathered by staff, no recruiter has asked for more information on students other than those in grades 11-12.

Following discussion the proposers of the motion agreed to some modifications to the wording as follows:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education direct Administration to develop a formal mechanism to pursue how the Opt Out form could be modified in such a way it allows minors to sign, that it allows that option as permitted under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the State's definition of secondary. That it is made available in grades 9-12 so that the students can do this anytime in the year, and anyone who is legally allowed to know can contact the school to verify whether or not a form has been completed.

- Ms. Street-Stewart stated there is work to be done on the consideration for 7th and 8th graders.
- Ms. Carroll reminded Committee members to read the law so there is no misunderstanding regarding the use of a form.

Superintendent Carstarphen commented that what the YAWR students are asking for would be consistent with law. It would be possible to go through each area and some of the commentary brought forward and distinguish for the Board what is consistent with law and where there is no legal requirement but it is a change in practice or how something is implemented. Finally, the other section has no legal requirement but it changes the issue that military recruiters and Principal Mackbee brought forward regarding the equal access piece. What she sees and staff should be sensitive to, is how much time students are spending on this and are they being pulled out of class so staff can compare military recruiters to post-secondary. It was discovered that military recruiters do their follow-up after getting confirmation from the student or parent and they do that off school time. She summarized it would be helpful for administration to keep digging up the facts, lay them out, do polling of the high schools again and separate how business is done from instructional issues, policy issues, implementation and practice issues. The changes in practices brought forward as it is understood is what YAWR has brought forward and, what they are asking for is not inconsistent with the law so there is room for administration and the Board to take the recommendation or some of the recommended changes in practice and work up to a policy level that allows discussion about mechanisms of free and appropriate access. Superintendent Carstarphen stated, given the motions that are set forward, that the second motion be treated like the first and administration look at the opt-

out forms, look at the law and present to the Board some recommendations. That would allow the Board to debate the recommendations now that the public has been heard. She remarked administration can take both of the motions and bring information back to the Board in its weekly report and work with the executive team to schedule it for further Board discussion and action.

After further discussion a vote was taken on the motion:

CONTINUATION OF MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education direct Administration to develop a formal mechanism to pursue how the Opt Out form could be modified in such a way it allows minors to sign, that it allows that option as permitted under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the State's definition of secondary. That it is made available in grades 9-12 so that the students can do this anytime in the year, and anyone who is legally allowed to know can contact the school to verify whether or not a form has been completed.

The motion passed on a 6 to 1 vote. Mr. Conlon voted against the motion.

Chair Kong-Thao thanked Board members, the students experiencing public engagement, all the recruiters and visitors whose feedback and comments helped the Committee to move forward and administration for their work. Chair Kong-Thao said the Committee would recess and then move back to Conference Room A for the next agenda items.

2. Further Discussion on Committees Reporting to the Board

Chair Kong-Thao stated agenda items IV. and V. would be reversed.

Ms. Street-Stewart remarked it was helpful to receive the reports back from the committees. Although some committees did not return their information, it was the consensus of the Committee to move forward. Ms. Carroll asked for clarification on what would be an example of a desired action. Ms. Street-Stewart provided background information on what the role of these advisory groups is to the Board. She said the Board now has a good opportunity to maximize the benefit of the advisory committees to the Board. One thing to look at is whether the Board is satisfied that there are sufficient committees reporting to the Board given the nature of all the ones the Board currently relates to and who bring information to the Board. Is there room for improvement on the way they bring information to the Board. For example, their meeting schedules and the Board's meeting schedules are not automatically aligned and references to reports coming at a certain time of the year is not enforced. Another example of intended action is how does the Board bring all of this into focus so there is an expectation from the Board directed to the advisory groups, how does the Board want the information to come to them and are there sufficient advisory committees to keep the Board adequately informed.

Chair Kong-Thao added one of the biggest struggles is there are some groups that are more active than others, so how does the Board make sure they are doing what they asked them to do and when they are working on something it aligns with what the Board wants from them. This could be a part of the Board's daily work. Is there a statement of the purpose and working relationship that is submitted on a routine basis so that people on these advisory committees know what is expected of them. This would be helpful to put on the Board calendar and they could sign off on it at the start of the school year and close the school year with those expectations on track.

Mr. Goldstein asked for clarification regarding the purpose of this discussion. What would next steps be in terms of using this response to move forward.

Chair Kong-Thao explained there are two pieces. The groups being discussed currently are the groups that have relationship with the Board. There are other groups that are outside that have not been brought to the Board, i.e., NEAT. The committees listed in the document have direct reporting line to the Board. Four of these committees are mandated by law:

- Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)
- Latino Consent Decree (LCD)
- Community Education Citywide Advisory Council
- American Indian Education Program

Discussion:

- Ms. Carroll remarked that required groups report to the Board in a timely fashion with meaningful information at the time of year where it is relevant.
- Ms. Street-Stewart commented the Board is in the process of policy revision and she would like all those committees in place and old committees that are no longer in existence removed, etc. making sure references are to those that are current. There will always be budget implications that inform us about the priorities for the Board's budget process. Just as the budget process starts at the school sites these groups are organized to give the Board a broad view across the District in particular areas. The budget process is one example.
- Ms. Street-Stewart remarked even as the Board talks about desired outcomes such as Indian Education, there are outcomes around attendance, graduation rates that even supersede the District with the Indian Education Act. Another concern is does the Board see the work that the other groups do in that same way, especially things that fall under the Board's targeted areas.
- Ms. Carroll asked to limit discussion to the four mandated committees because the other committees are very different.
- Mr. Oertwig remarked one decision that should be made regarding the four mandated committees is how frequently the Board wants to interact with these groups. Some of them have annual reporting requirements, such as the Indian Education Resolution. The other three mandated groups do not have a requirement to come to the Board with anything, so he would like to connect with them.
- Mr. Goldstein commented if the Board is not really using the committees' input, the Board should look at these committees, for example CBFAC, and decide if they are still viable in light of the current situation.
- Ms. Carroll commented sometimes these committees are not communicating with the Board and this is not alignment.
- Ms. Kong-Thao suggested dealing with the four (4) mandated committees and then to move on to the other three committees.
- Ms. Street-Stewart noted that in the descriptions was the matter on which the committee is to report: i.e., Indian Education reports on the status of the quality of education services for Indian students. Special Ed reports on the status of special education services in the District. These are consistent among the four groups and something they could report on.
- Another aspect in terms of structure with these entities is they are able to send representatives from their committee as representatives of a District-wide committee to other places.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Oertwig that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education direct Administration to work directly with these four required committees (the American Indian Education Program, the Community Education Citywide Advisory Council, the Latino Consent Decree Parent Advisory Committee and the Special Education Advisory Council), to ensure that they all report to the Board annually and as frequently as necessary to ensure that the Board is properly informed of their perspective when the Board is making a decision.

Motion Passed

Superintendent Carstarphen reported on the meetings that took place between the Board Chair, Superintendent Carstarphen and the advisory committee representatives. A report was brought back to the Committee that included their function, their purpose and their responsibilities. What they asked the Board to do for them are some of the following:

- What are the expectations from the Board on reporting content and the timeliness of reports to the Board.
- There were questions about interfacing with the administration and given the issue with site councils, local decision making vs. administrative directives. The motion was to direct administration to work directly with committees to ensure that. So administration added to the required ones a component that needs to be discussed as it relates to all the other committees so that additional conflict is not added to who they should be working with and how.
- They wanted to have the Board give them feedback over the assignments. The committees felt they worked hard on an assignment and then the Board does not take any action. Even if the Board decides not to take action there should be accountability standards in place, was the job well done, etc. so they have some sense in the quality of their work. The committees did talk about working with administration so they could respond to the issue and provide a broader context for the Board that is not just parent committee focused or issue specific.
- At the heart of the comments made is that the committees really want to bring value to the Board. Some standard questions from the Board to the committee that provide a base line for getting started on their work, so there is a norm for how they talk about it.
- On the other side were the committees the Board is required by law to work with. There are some obligations that have not been done because there is not a standing practice.

Superintendent Carstarphen suggested the Board start working with the committees to lay out the agenda for the year, lay out the policy sections that are being reviewed for policy, etc., and their feedback would be helpful as the District moves forward.

Another charge for consideration is to get people named for the committees and work with the advisory committees to get recommendations to bring forth to the Executive Team for consideration in planning Board agendas and then include them in the policy process so they are making content process and procedure recommendations.

Discussion followed: Committee members expressed doubt that the advisory committees were useful to the Board. Ms. Carroll stated in particular CBFAC, could be better advised so the information they bring to the Board is helpful. Discussion around Gifted Services Advisory Council was intense and the pros and cons regarding their status with the Board was discussed.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Conlon that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education direct Administration to work with the Gifted Services Advisory Council to define a robust working relationship and over time Administration find appropriate ways to report back to the Board on the performance of gifted students.

After further discussion the motion was voted on:

Continuation of the Motion:

It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Conlon that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education direct Administration to work with the Gifted Services Advisory Council to define a robust working relationship and over time Administration find appropriate ways to report back to the Board on the performance of gifted students.

The motion passed on a 5 to 2 vote. Mr. Brodrick and Mr. Oertwig voted against the motion.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education task the Citizens Budget and Finance Advisory Committee (CBFAC), to work with Administration and ERS to provide the Board with their insights. The Board will appoint additional members as soon as possible.

Motion Passed

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Brodrick that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education seek applicants for the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC), by inviting the fifteen (15) members to reapply as well as going through regular Board and District channels.

Motion Passed

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Conlon and seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart that given the lateness of the night that the next item scheduled (Item IV. Discussion on Structure of Public Comment at Board Meetings) be rescheduled to the next Committee of the Board Meeting on February 6, 2007.

Motion Passed

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m. by Ms. Kong-Thao, Committee Chair.

Respectfully submitted by
Diana J. Sanders
Recorder
Saint Paul Board of Education