

2004 Total not including administrative fee costs	\$464,461.99
2004 Administrative fee (10% of total)	<u>46,446.20</u>
Total 2004 Contribution by S.P.P.D. for the SRO Program	\$510,908.19
Total 2004 Contribution by I.S.D. 625 for the SRO Program	814,126.00

Dr. Harvey indicated the letter ended by stating if a contract agreement was not concluded by 3/11/05, the SROs would be reassigned to patrol duties and schools would be provided the same police services as all other citizens of St. Paul.

Dr. Harvey stated this cannot be allowed to happen, because, regardless of how the board wants to respond in the future, the only responsible move to handle this is to thoughtfully make decisions in the best interest of the students and as Superintendent she would need a minimum of one year in order to study options and implement different arrangements. Therefore she strongly urged that the new contract be approved so that the SROs remain in the schools.

Dr. Harvey then reviewed the history of the police service in St. Paul schools indicating no documentation supporting conversations in the '80's regarding a 50-50 split between the schools and the city has been identified. At that point in time there was no levy and police officers were assigned to Central High School because of a need at that time and were paid for out of the S.P.P.D. budget. The police department, recognizing the importance of this presence, offered to do more, while at the same time interest in drug prevention was spreading and conversations around the DARE Program were developing.

The police department lobbied for the Crime Related Costs Levy with the view that should they be successful, the dollars would go to the police department to help them to provide their services to the schools. The Crime Related Costs Levy authorization was passed in 1991 (1991 Minnesota Laws, Chapter 291, Article 4, Section 1 – codified under Minnesota Statute 275.125, Subd. 6j) and the dollars were given to the school district. Until 2000 the levy was based on the 1990 census data for the City of St. Paul. In 2000, the revenue calculation changed to a per adjusted marginal cost pupil unit (AMCPU). In 2002 the name of the levy was changed to Safe Schools Levy (Minnesota Statute 216C.44). The following is a brief history of revenue allocation from the levy.

Fiscal Year	Formula	Revenue
1993	1990 population x \$1.00	\$272,235
1999	1990 population x \$1.50	408,352
2002	AMCPU x \$11.00	581,251
2004	AMCPU x \$30.00	1,510,471
2005	AMCPU x \$27.00	1,300,072

The increase from 1993 to 2005 is over 400%.

Dr. Harvey then reviewed the last handout which provided information on the total costs to run the SRO program and the SPPS safety and security budget.

<u>Total Costs of the SRO Program = \$1,352,000</u>	
\$ 510,000	Contributed by the Police Department (Direct & indirect costs: salaries, cars, uniforms, computers)
\$ 842,000	Contributed by SPPS (Salaries)
<u>SPPS Safety & Security Budget = \$2,469,000</u>	
Revenue:	
Safe Schools Levy	\$1,300,000
General Fund	<u>1,169,000</u>
Total Revenue	\$2,469,000
Expenditures:	
SRO Contract	\$842,000

Greeters (School Safety Assistants)	560,000
Central Security & other staff	451,000
Contract Security	278,000
Other Costs, Fringes	<u>338,000</u>
Total Expenditures:	\$2,469,000

The subject is complex, it has evolved over a long period of time and the needs and situation of the school district have changed over time as well. Dr. Harvey stated as the partnership evolved the S.P.P.D. bent over backwards in order to move the partnership forward to provide the services needed within the amount of resources they had of offer. Dr. Harvey stated the world of safety in the schools has changed greatly and evolved to where it is now and it is important to consider the contribution of the officers who work so carefully with the students. Dr. Harvey indicated that it was important that both partners understand both sides of the equation and presented the board with a contract that is in the best interest of the students.

Discussion

Mr. Conlon asked if the figures presented represent the 12 SROs currently in the school and what the cost would be if officers were added for the middle schools as well. Dr. Harvey indicated the figures were only for the current level; administration has not looked at any figures beyond that at this point in time. She reminded the board that when conversations on this subject began, they were focused on insuring that the high schools and middle schools have similar coverage. What became evident was that high schools were disadvantaged when their SRO had to leave the building to teach DARE courses. It was also important that the middle schools have the services of SROs. The administration and S.P.P.D. looked at ways in which the same opportunities, or similar opportunities, could be achieved for officers to network with kids so that they would have the pulse of the community. Dr. Harvey indicated she felt a partnership that accomplished this had been built; one that stayed attentive to students knowing the potential harm of drugs and that provided schools with the continuity of services from the police officers. It is recognized that more officers in the schools could be beneficial, but under the current structure it was felt the students were as safe now as they had been in the past, recognizing that the past was different for everyone when the original partnership was developed.

Mr. Conlon inquired about the “Steps to Respect” program Raymond Yu, Director of Student Services, was working on and its status. Dr. Harvey indicated she would like to update the board on this program at a future time.

Mr. Oertwig stated he had no real question in terms of the services provided. His concern is if the city is paying its fair share for the services. He supported the logic for maintaining a positive working relationship between police officers and students in the buildings but disagreed with the district paying the greater costs. Mr. Oertwig stated the board is aware of what the city says it will pay now but lacks a history of how much the city has been contributing and that is key information needed for discussion. Mr. Oertwig stated in the discussion last summer with Chief Harrington it was clear it was not within the authority of the police chief but was the mayor’s decision as to how funds are allocated for SROs. Mr. Oertwig inquired what current discussion Dr. Harvey has had with the mayor in regard to this subject.

Dr. Harvey indicated she had had no conversation with the mayor since the board’s January meeting. Conversations have occurred previously but she felt she could not influence the mayor to change his point of view since she had presented the facts and needs to him previously and it was clear that his position was firm on this issue. She indicated administration has had in depth conversations with two police chiefs and they have done what they can and should do to keep the kids safe. From their perspective, they thought the increase in the crime levy was going to enhance their ability to provide for safety in the schools as they understood the district’s need to do even more; but to Dr. Harvey’s knowledge there has never been joint conversation involving both sides to explore how more can be done.

Mr. Oertwig expressed, in view of this discussion, one of the best things that could come from this meeting would be that each board member use their avenues of influence to try to have those conversations in the next week with the mayor to try to influence where he is coming from so that he understands that the district is not simply going to pick up the extra cost without at least having discussion on it.

Ms. Carter indicated the discussion needed to be narrowed to what needed to be done today and why. Three issues need to be addressed: 1) the greatest concern should be that the kids are safe in the schools, 2) then, that we are able to do that within the limits of the budgetary constraints that exist and 3) that the city does its "fair share" in this. In looking at the information put before the board it becomes clearer that over time, as the district has received more dollars from the levy, they have picked up more of the costs involved. However, there is no record of discussions having occurred between the district and the police or the city as to how the costs would continue to be shared. She asked Dr. Harvey if there are ways in which the district would choose to use the safety levy dollars for purposes other than to provide for police officers, greeters, security and other staff.

Dr. Harvey stated the district was starting from the right point with the current strong partnership with the police department and that this was the main reason the schools have remained safe. There is the option to provide an "internal" security department but it is her belief that in the end the police department is the one that would be called to keep the kids safe and they need to have the internal relationships, not only with administration but with school sites and the kids, to meet this end. If additional resources were available she would expand SROs to the middle schools with the right kind of sensitivity and training so they are even more understanding of the role schools play in place of parents. So as to using resources differently, she would add more but she would not change the current partnership.

Ms. Carter stated the police department had been presented with a revised contract, which they have rejected, so the board needs to decide how to continue with what are considered priority safety and security measures within the context of what we have and also at how we would look at improving those services in the future. Ms. Carter stated from her perspective the first priority that needs to be addressed is how the district continues school security, then a second priority is how "fair share" issues are addressed. She requested board members comment on their view of priorities.

Ms. Carroll asked for clarification of the motion approved in January. Ms. Street-Stewart responded the approved motion was for SRO services through the end of June, that the city would fund their portion of the contract at \$100,000 and the district would consider an amount not to exceed \$400,000. Ms. Carroll stated one of the problems appeared to be that the district is operating on a school fiscal year while the city is operating on a calendar year. She then went on to clarify the crime levy goes only to SPPS to pay for security issues and to confirm that the city had not received a comparable bump in their funding which would apply to this area. Ms. Carroll then asked if there are other reasonable ways of providing comparable services in the schools other than contracting with the City of St. Paul.

Dr. Harvey responded that assuming the current formula was correct, having a uniformed presence in the high schools and the same in middle schools, there is the possibility of partnering with the sheriff's department or with another provider, or choose to have an internal security organization that would not have the authority of the police officers but would be a presence.

Dr. Harvey indicated that no in-depth discussion has occurred to consider other options. A careful examination on whether others could provide adequate, reliable services, what would be lost with the change, what negotiations would be needed with the police department in order to develop a recommendation that would ensure the safety of the children would need to be implemented. She indicated such a study would take at least a year.

Ms. Carroll indicated she was unhappy with the “bullying” tone that comes from the mayor but that is really not the issue, there are some things which can be changed and some that can’t and her concern was how much political capital would be spent on this issue only to lose. Knowing the chief of police, Ms. Carroll indicated this was not a game on the part of the police department and, in view of the growth in the levy of which the district is the beneficiary, when more resources are available more can be contributed. The district is the one needing the police services, the district is asking for special, particular treatment (exclusive attention for our kids, staff and facilities) from the city and thus is subject to some other power and authority without a point of negotiation. The issue of more policing rather than education is a bigger picture and a subject for longer term discussion.

Ms. Kong-Thao indicated that from what has been discussed during the meeting she was in favor of moving ahead to accept the new contract to allow more time for in-depth considerations regarding other options in the future. At this point a relationship is established, funding is in place and the city is contributing so she would recommend moving ahead. She expressed concern as to how the budget and potential cuts might impact the program. Additionally, this is a very political year and perhaps not the right time to bring this to the fore. Once elections are over, conversations may be different if there is a change of office. She would look at future meetings to discuss options and expectations

Dr. Harvey indicated she is satisfied with the current arrangement and would only consider other providers if the board directed it. With regard to the budget and the deficit, every effort is being made to reduce it in every way possible but at this point everything is on the table and she can’t promise security won’t be reviewed.

Clarification was requested as to the contract situation. Mr. Quinn stated there is currently no existing contract, the revised contract SPPS submitted was rejected and the old contract expired on 12/31/04. A question was raised as to what PAL was as mentioned in the new contract from S.P.P.D. Mr. Quinn indicated PAL is the Police Athletic League, 3 SROs are “borrowed” for the summer to run the PAL program. This raised the questions as to what the remaining 9 SROs do through the summer. Mr. Quinn indicated they work summer school, after school programs and recreation center assignments and take their vacation time during the summer months.

Mr. Oertwig made several points 1) he has no concern about the service and at this point considering the deadline, the board has little option but to continue the contract. 2) the police benefit because they develop specific relationships with their sites and they know the kids, he felt the police department would pay as much if not more on a per call basis as they pay now; 3) when thinking about SPPS budget, consider that the monies invested from the general fund for security are taken away from other uses such as hiring teachers. 4) The board talks of having made a point, but to whom – the chief of police, not the mayor where the power lies, and, 5) city council members Mr. Oertwig has talked to are not aware of the issue and he urged at least taking time to talk to people who have the authority to make a decision to reconsider before authorizing the new contract.

Ms. Carroll stated the issue was one of public good, SPPS is responsible for the safety and security of its students, the police serve the public, SPPS serves the public and no benefit would accrue from shifting the balance. Additionally, the city budget has been approved and there is little likelihood that it would be reopened to address this issue, waiting to the last moment to renew the contact is simply gamesmanship. Ms. Carroll stated at this point in time the focus should be on funding education and fighting this issue now in a political and public way would detract from that goal.

<p>MOTION: Mr. Conlon moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education authorize the Chair and Clerk to execute an agreement with the City of Saint Paul Police Department to provide School Resource Officers for school resource liaison services to the Saint Paul Public Schools for the term of January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005 in accordance with all terms and provisions of said agreement.</p>

Discussion was called for.

MOTION: Mr. Oertwig moved an amendment to table the motion for seven days until the mayor and city council could be consulted.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Brodrick indicated he felt the problem is a perception of a lack of communication and respect between the city and the school board, particularly the mayor's office. He felt the board and the superintendent should work to improve relationships with the city and open lines of communication.

Dr. Harvey indicated that the mayor was involved initially in the formulation of the budgets, one meeting was held and in discussion at that time it was very clear there would be no increase from the mayor. She felt it was not likely that the budget would be reopened this year. She indicated she felt she had a good working relationship with the mayor and that he was very supportive in areas which coincided with his priorities.

Ms. Kong-Thao indicated support for improved communication and called the question, seconded by Mr. Conlon. Five voted in favor of ending debate, Mr. Brodrick & Mr. Oertwig voted no. Debate was ended.

Ms. Street- Stewart called for a vote on the motion made by Mr. Conlon.

RESTATEMENT OF THE

MOTION: Mr. Conlon moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education authorize the Chair and Clerk to execute an agreement with the City of Saint Paul Police Department to provide School Resource Officers for school resource liaison services to the Saint Paul Public Schools for the term of January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005 in accordance with all terms and provisions of said agreement.

Motion Passed with six voting Yes and Mr. Oertwig voting No.

(Ms. Kong-Thao left the meeting at this point.)

Clarification was made that the motion just approved was a COB recommendation until approved at the next board meeting. The recommendation will come before the board as a consent agenda item. Discussion was held as to how the action at the 1/18/05 meeting should be addressed because that contract was refused and not signed. An action will need to be taken at the 3/22/05 board of education meeting to rescind the motion of 1/18/05.

Dr. Harvey asked approval to contact the Chief of Police to indicate the board would be taking action to approve the new contract and request he not remove the SROs from the schools as of 3/11/05. Mr. Quinn indicated he would have a contract ready to execute immediately following the formal board approval of the motion on 3/22/05.

MOTION: Mr. Conlon moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, that the Committee of the Board recommend that the Board of Directors instruct administration to proceed to issue the contract and invite dialogue with appropriate city officials regarding long-term safety issues and come back to the board with the next steps.

Motion passed with five in favor, Mr. Oertwig abstaining and one absent.

Mr. Brodrick suggested the subject of communication with the city and lack of respect for the board be a topic for consideration at a retreat.

Ms. Carroll suggested that discussion of the SRO issue can continue internally at any time but that it might be expedient to address the issue with the city between November, 2005 and January 1, 2006 as this should fall within their budget planning period and a strategy can be put in place once it is known who will be in the mayor's office..

Administration will measure police service in relation to the board's ends and report back to board between 11/05 and 1/06.

III. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m. by Ms. Street-Stewart, Chair.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk