

**COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 24, 2006**

(2/21/06 -- Page 1 and 2 corrected -- Title and name)

**PRESENT:**                    **BOARD OF EDUCATION:** Ms. Kong-Thao, Chair; Mr. Brodrick, Ms. Carroll, Mr. Conlon, Mr. Goldstein, Ms. Street-Stewart, Mr. Oertwig

**STAFF:** Louis Kanavati, Interim Superintendent; Lois Rockney, Patrick Quinn, Mary Chorewycz, Su Yeager, Yusef Mgeni

**OTHERS:** Lipei Xiong, Office of Fund Development Staff: Catherine Stine, Rebekah Doyle, Jennifer Pozanc, Shirley Heitzman, Indian Education Program: Kathy Denman-Wilke, Program Manager; Janice LaFloe, Parent Committee Chair; Jack Mills, Angie Harper, Yvonne Barrett

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. by Ms. Kong-Thao, Committee Chair.

**II. AGENDA**

Ms. Kong-Thao introduced the items on the agenda for the meeting, which were:

- **Grant Allocations/Fund Raising**
- **American Indian Education Program**

**1. Grant Allocations/Fund Raising**

Superintendent Kanavati, introduced Catherine Stine, Assistant Director of the Office of Fund Development (OFD). Ms. Stine introduced Shirley Heitzman, Grants Coordinator, Jennifer Pozanc, OFD Coordinator, and Rebekah Doyle, OFD Specialist. Mary Chorewycz, Executive Director of Research and Development, oversees the department.

Ms. Stine and Ms. Pozanc provided a Power Point presentation on the role of the OFD and the grant equity process. Ms. Stine discussed two types of proposals, 1) District-Level (large grants) and 2) Teacher/Classroom grants (less than \$100,000) and the differences in the grant writing process. Ms. Stine reviewed the district's grant totals including eighteen (18) months of data on district, school, and classroom data. In 2004-05 328 grants were submitted, 239 grants are school grants (73%) and in 2005-06 70 grants were submitted (as of January 12, 2006), 42 grants were school grants (60%). Ms. Stine distributed copies of the power point overheads, a document on the District, School and Program Grants Submitted and Funded between July 2004-January 2006, and the 2004-05 Annual Report, to committee members and others in attendance.

Ms. Doyle, used a Power Point overhead and graphics to present The OFD Process: A Study of 14 Schools' Funding. The presentation posed the question: Is there equity in school funding if all sources of revenue are considered and challenges to creating a complete picture of School Funding Equity. Ms. Doyle remarked the funding and demographic data gathered led to the discovery that schools in this sample with a high need are receiving approximately \$4,111 more per student than schools in this sample without a high need. Ms. Doyle discussed possible explanation for this, which led to the need for further discussion and reaction such as, is this the right data, who do we talk to about this, does this need to change and is there a compelling argument from which we

can develop a district-wide proposal? Ms. Doyle emphasized this study was not done by an accountant and should not be considered accurate – this is a preliminary study for internal use. (Copies of the presentation were distributed to committee members and people in the audience).

Discussion followed. Mr. Goldstein inquired about the type of support and assistance a teacher or another staff member working on a grant received and the time factor. Ms. Pozanc explained it depends on the skill level of the person who is working on the grant, because it can take hours to work through ideas and put it down on paper for review. She remarked OFD staff monitor the small grants to see if there are any recurring patterns that could move it up to a district level initiative so that funding is possible for a broader group of schools and teachers, i.e., the Star Tribune grants. Mr. Goldstein asked how building staff is made aware of the numerous grant opportunities. Ms. Stine said the schools are informed of possible grant opportunities by e-mail and if teachers or administrators are interested they can start the grant writing process.

Mr. Conlon asked if schools or programs want to apply for a grant that is not a district priority, do they pursue this on their own or do they need prior approval to apply. Ms. Stine stated there is a restriction list posted on the website listing the grants that are district-level only to eliminate the possibility of individual schools submitting grants and having them all rejected. She remarked a good example is with local foundations such as St. Paul Foundations who are only going to fund one proposal. She added only the district has the right to submit a proposal because if six (6) proposals are sent to one funder they will reject them all due to district policy.

Ms. Stine discussed the information found in the District, School and Program Grants Submitted and Funded, July 2004-January 2006. She remarked that a 30% return on submission is good and the district's is 50% which is very good. She commended teachers and program leaders on the phenomenal work completed.

Ms. Stine reviewed the OFD Annual Report that included information on the Distribution of Grant Awards, Teacher & Classroom Grants, Reforming High Schools, funding for Science Education, Student Wellness and Community Education. The last section was the approved OFD Strategic Plan for the next year.

Ms. Carroll expressed appreciation for the excellent work done and the key issues being answered. Ms. Street-Stewart remarked the presentation brings fresh insight into what the district is doing now and the idea some schools are not receiving as much because they are not poor is far from the truth and the district needs to get to the point where people no longer have those perceptions. People need to see the whole picture and move into a fuller understanding on the funding process for every school.

Mr. Oertwig remarked that he was satisfied with the success of the OFD but the Board Chair should be involved when "thank you's" are given out in recognition for grants being awarded to the district. Ms. Stine concurred and talked about the importance of the Board developing good relationships with district funders. She invited Board members to join in when there is a grant award celebration or event.

Ms. Kong-Thao stated there was a time-certain item on the agenda and committee members would return to this topic. She thanked the OFD staff for their excellent presentation.

## **2. American Indian Education Program**

Ms. Street-Stewart stated this past year the Board heard a request from the Indian Education Parent Committee for the restoration or provision of dollars for the Indian Options Program. She remarked that on an annual basis the Board receives a resolution

from the Parent Committee and this year the Board accepted the resolution of non-concurrence. Ms. Street-Stewart said the content of the resolution addressed the issue of staffing and funding for the Indian Options Program. The Board agreed to come back and discuss what those possibilities would be at a future Committee of the Board meeting. Ms. Street-Stewart introduced Janice LaFloe, Chair of the Parent Committee. She remarked the chair of the parent committee is a very important position not only in this district but have nationally as well.

Ms. LaFloe provided an overview of the Parent Committee's responsibilities as they relate to the unique cultural needs of American Indian students and the issues that led to the Parent Committee's Resolution of Non-Concurrence to the Board this year. Ms. LaFloe stated this issue has probably been a point of discussion for the Parent Committee and the Board since Site Based Management was put in place. The Indian Options Programs were put in place prior to the time when site based decisions started being made. When site based management was implemented the control of funds stayed with the schools. She remarked the Option programs are city-wide and are the only offering available for Native students although the programs are not just for Native students. Ms. LaFloe noted the program at Harding offers 6 classes and 8 classes are offered at Battle Creek. The Parent Committee's issue and concern is that the position of the Ojibwe Language teacher was cut. A meeting with the site council was held where the parent committee's concerns were heard. The Principal's decision was to implement the budget reduction. Ms. LaFloe asked committee members to reach a decision at this meeting regarding their request for restored funding of 1.0 FTE.

Discussion followed: Superintendent Kanavati acknowledged he has been very supportive of the program, that it is a good program and one the district can not let go regardless of federal funding or federal mandates. Two years ago, as the Area Superintendent, he had supported and promoted the Indian Options program before the enrollment decreased. He remarked the principal at Battle Creek could not in good conscience support a teaching position where there are no students. Mr. Kanavati stated when site based management was implemented, Indian Options was one program that suffered and the goal would be to have the funding restored back to the district so that it could be protected. Even then the principal or site council have a say in this. He stated the problem is, you cannot find a half-time teacher to teach Ojibwe. He noted the parent committee is asking for the \$25,000 so a teacher can be hired to complete the program. He added, to date there are 11 students in the program (7 at Battle Creek and 4 at Harding). Angie Harper, Teacher at Harding High School's Indian Options Program, remarked there are students who would like to enroll in the Options Program but the class does not fit their schedule.

Committee members discussed "ownership" of the program, who is accountable, who is responsible and whether it is a legal issue. Ms. LaFloe suggested giving the funds back to the district and placing them in the Office of Educational Equity.

Mr. Mgeni provided background on the funding of the Indian Options Program. He stated the funds were originally desegregation money and when site based management was approved, the funds went to the buildings on a per pupil basis and were no longer controlled by the Indian Education Program. Ms. Chorewycz explained further how funds are distributed to the buildings. Ms. Carroll asked if a specific budget amount goes to the two schools that do the Indian Options Program and if there is not a legal obligation for these two schools to continue these programs and if they could be looked at as an unfunded mandate for these schools. She added if this is something special then the Board needs to do something different. Ms. Chorewycz suggested finding a grant that would support the Indian Options Program and revisit the program to enhance and rebuild it and possibly restore the support of the building principal. Ms. Denman-Wilke stated the Indian Education Strategic Plan for the next three years is putting Options into the model even though it is not part of Indian Education. Staff is assisting in the surveys, community

meetings, forums, etc. and that data is going to a leadership group that is going to include some of the parent committee members and community leaders who will work to establish Best Practices Models and the direction the Indian Education Program should take. This will take place on February 18. Ms. Harper talked about the marketing being done as a collaborative effort to encourage and attract students to the Indian Options Program. Yvonne Barrett, Parent Committee member, said promotion of these programs needs buy-in from the top and from building staff, such as counselors. She added this should be a collaborative effort that includes everyone.

Ms. Chorewycz stated it appeared the concern is the need for more central oversight which is not dependent on changes in school leadership and the funding situation at the schools. As a way to solve this issue, perhaps the board could send a recommendation to Ms. Rockney and the budget committee stating "if this is how the program is funded we feel it hasn't been adequately protected so we are asking that you pull the funds into a central allocation.

Mr. Kanavati remarked he would meet with Ms. Rockney and request an impact study on removing this from the schools and revisit the subject with the board at a later date.

**MOTION:** Mr. Oertwig moved that funding for the five (5) FTE's plus the \$27,000 be removed from Site Council based control and placed with the Office of Educational Equity. Seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

Mr. Goldstein asked for clarification on funding an Ojibwe instructor and why the languages of Ojibwe, Dakota and Lakota are the language of choice for Saint Paul. Ms. Denman-Wilke explained these are communities that have reservations in Minnesota the Ojibwe population being largest, Lakota second and Ho Chunk third with smaller tribes represented.

Ms. Stine commented the Indian Education Program is one of three different programs that the OFD has had difficulty in finding appropriate grants to fund but they continue looking.

Ms. Carroll spoke to the motion and expressed concern that it is going too deep into line items and program allocation. She suggested the Board insist money that is earmarked be used for that which it is earmarked and the Superintendent figure out a way to make that happen and fast.

Mr. Oertwig amended his motion to address some of the concerns he heard.

**MOTION:** Mr. Oertwig moved that the 5 FTE's and the \$27,000 be removed from site-based control and placed with the Office of Educational Equity for the 2006-07 school year and that the Board get a report back on oversight and collaboration issues.

Ms. Street-Stewart inquired what is the correct amount to restore the original implementation of the Indian Options Program. She added this type of information is needed to move forward.

Ms. Carroll expressed concern there should be tighter accountability that is not educationally oriented.

Mr. Oertwig withdrew his original motion. Mr. Brodrick withdrew his second.

The following motion was made:

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Oertwig and seconded by Mr. Goldstein that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board request Superintendent Kanavati meet with the various parties to come up with a solution so the American Indian Options Programs continue to be offered, including quality review and curriculum development and that the resolution of those discussions be brought to the February 14 Committee of the Board Meeting.

**Motion Carried.**

Ms. Quinlan stated part of the charge of quality review and curriculum development would include course description offerings, enrollment within those for 2004-05, 05-06, curriculum development and where it is at in the course approval process, highly qualified teachers, recruitment of 6<sup>th</sup> graders attending Battle Creek from the American Indian Magnet as to where are they going for future enrollment and what other marketing efforts need to be put in place. Ms. Denman-Wilke remarked that finding a grant would be helpful in funding for doing an assessment of the program.

Ms. Kong-Thao thanked Indian Education Parent Committee members and staff for their presentation.

### **3. Continuation of Grant Allocations/Fund Raising**

The items discussed were:

1. Professional Development/Travel (Ms. Stine offered suggestions on possible grants for Board members).
2. Leadership issues, strategic issues, role issues and governance.
3. Grant writing and Equity in Schools

Ms. Street-Stewart will meet with Ms. Rockney to set up a time to meet with the Citizens Budget and Finance Advisory Committee (CBFAC) in the near future.

### **III. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. by Ms. Kong-Thao, Committee Chair.

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