

- The process was legitimately open in looking at candidates and it was worth having the meetings to achieve this
- As a point of perspective, all five candidates are stronger than whole pot of candidates in the '98 search
- The process is worthwhile as there were legitimate, serious, credible candidates being considered
- Got good cross section of community and feedback from community and staff
- Covered as many areas as realistic in existing time frame
- Disappointed in turnout at reception; thought more might come because of the significance of the decision being made (Request: If possible, find out why not as many came)
- Thank you to Anne for due diligence work
- Thanks to Ms. Street-Stewart for work in shepherding the entire process through
- A robust event though insanely busy, especially for the candidates
- Community participants were not overwhelmed as they were involved in slices of the event; but rather grueling for candidates
- Many participants stated they appreciated the chance to be part of the event
- Open style at reception and accessibility of the candidates to the community was very much appreciated
- Candidates liked chance to meet each other
- Repeat of thanks to all involved
- The process was helped along because there was a person in place who had been through it before (actually 2), knowing what expectations were and putting people in place to meet them was critical.
- The forum - it was critical that as many stakeholders were engaged as possible because of the importance of the decision for a new leader who will commit and take the District to next level.
- Automated phone call did succeeded in getting some of community out (Hmong)

Ms. Street-Stewart called on Mr. St. Sauver, staff liaison for the search process, to discuss some details.

- He stated there were over 200 people at the forum
- People felt satisfied (noted, if St. Paul is in good shape not many come out for events such as this)
- There were five interview groups in the morning: corporate, advisory, students, parents and educators each with about 20 people participating
- Senior staff met with the candidates and almost all senior staff were present from 8 to noon.
- Each group asked the candidates 4-10 questions
- African American groups of about 42 provided input at a forum in early March which was forwarded to the Board.
- There were many opportunities for engagement by the community: 50 responses on website for questions to be asked of the candidates, 25-30 questions were offered for consideration at the reception. Over 350 surveys were received during the profile development process and a large number of people participated in the focus groups/forums and in direct phone calls from the consultant in the early development process.

Ms. Street-Stewart went on to note there were some particulars which need to be initiated now.

- Issue of compensation will need to be addressed. Mr. Lalla, General Council, and Teresa Rogers, Executive Director, Human Resources and Employee Relations, will need to be consulted to work through this. Meeting will need to be scheduled to discuss compensation. Mr. Lalla noted the superintendent contract is not covered under a collective bargaining agreement and therefore cannot be

addressed at a closed meeting. Mr. Oertwig stated historically the terms of a contract for Superintendent have been delegated to the Chair for negotiation on behalf of the Board with an understanding of where they are coming from. Therefore most of the work is behind the scenes through the Chair.

- The details of the search process and the community engagement piece need to be gathered and placed in a binder to become part of Board history.
- There has been interest in looking at “character assessments” for the individual
- Credentialing will need to be accomplished through MBSA (Minnesota Board of School Administrators) who examine applicants and determine what additional work is needed in order to be licensed in Minnesota. These include an understanding of MN law, MN financing around school education as well as special education finance and policies. Work will need to be accomplished in order to get information to MBSA prior to their May meeting.

NOTE: Next MBSA monthly meeting is April 5. To meet this, the agenda item must be submitted one week prior to the next meeting. May meeting is May 5 (Submission date by April 27).

Ms. Street-Stewart stated the Board feels a need to take some time for deliberation and study of the mass of materials and information/observations gathered over the past two days. She noted all Board members have been introduced to the candidates, had a grand opportunity to look at them from various perspectives and she stated there seems to be ample information to move toward a selection.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the committee recess to return at 4:15 p.m. Seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion approved.

The meeting recessed at 3:45 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 4:45 p.m.

2. **School Choice**

Patrick Quinn, Executive Director of Operations, stated that in a discussion at a November COB, administration asked the Board for a sense of direction on where they wanted to go with Choice. A survey was prepared to gather Board input/priorities and completed by Board members. The outcomes are reflected in the COB School Choice Survey Results, January 2006. (The rankings were arrived at by taking all of the scores for each item and dividing it by 7.)

From the survey, Academic achievement was ranked as first priority. It is the business SPPS is in and if it is the direction in which the Board would like to move it could result in the replication of the most successful programs to give students more access to those programs and discontinuance of programs that do not appear to be successful.

Further rankings were: 2) Equity for students; 3) Economic desegregation or economic integration [means schools are balanced in terms of economic disparity]; 4) Equity for schools [all schools are looked at and absolutely no school gets favoritism in terms of distribution of resources, especially money, unless there is an overriding reason such as compensatory, etc.]; 5) Racial desegregation or racial integration [guarantee at the end all schools are racially balanced]; 6) Maximum choice for families; 7) Cost savings [deliver package that saves the most amount of money] and 8) The lowest ranked item was status quo [keep things as they are].

Equity for students and maximum choice for families have a very fine difference between them as far as definition goes. Maximum choice for families tries to keep families

together even though equity for students also respects sibling preference. Equity for students means students are allowed access to any program as long as no student is given preference in acceptance except for overriding factors. Maximum choice for families offers the parent/guardian any school program they prefer assuming there is adequate room.

Questions were raised and addressed for further attempts at clarification. The question was raised as to what to do with the information now. Mr. Quinn stated the survey was conducted to resolve a stalemate because staff didn't really know where the Board stands on choice issues and significantly different outcomes are probable depending upon where the Board wants to go. Therefore staff needed clarification before investing any additional time in trying to move to the next step. Clearly academic achievement is the top of the list followed fairly closely by the equity question and economic desegregation. Previously the School Choice system was founded on racial desegregation exclusively

Ms. Kong-Thao noted the purpose of having school choice on the agenda for this evening was simply to receive the survey results with intention to discuss the results at a later time.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved that the Committee of the Board recommend that the Board of Education receive the School Choice Survey Result Report, January 2006 for purposes of future discussion.

Motion approved.

Further clarification was made that the Board needs to understand what each of the items mean and the implications to the system if the Board buys into any particular model. Therefore it would be valuable to have a Board and staff (major players) discussion on choice to help clarify the Board's thinking.

Mr. Mgeni, Director of Educational Equity, stated desegregation (and a report to the State) has been the principal reason for School Choice and a substantial amount of money is connected to this. So, discussion by the Board should include the degree to which racial integration is still a priority and is a function of the choice system.

Ms. Street-Stewart requested that two things occur 1) the Board needs a clarified communication response on the status of the Board's discussion on School Choice and 2) Principals need to provide to their school communities an appropriate, accurate response on the status of the Board's discussions.

Ms. Yeager and Communications were instructed to draft a clarification letter for Board consideration. Additionally, a short explanatory phrase on the purpose of items is to be added to the Board update sheet for clarification on what is being addressed and if action is expected.

Continuation of Superintendent Selection Process discussion.

Ms. Street-Stewart asked that Board members refer to candidates with the alphabetic code without particular name.

- Tremendously qualified people in pool from which to select a person to lead in the direction the community and board want to be led
- All comments that came in, beginning to see people rise to top for 2 reasons: 1) because people aligned with work being done in the district and 2) some are more knowledgeable and speak the same language and can transition into work in leadership role in powerful ways

- Why not more sitting superintendents were attracted. In researching, there was a wave of brilliant superintendents which are now past St. Paul in their career paths and are now aging out of systems, moving into university settings or retirement. What is out there nationally is a next tier of tremendously talented and capable people but hidden from view
- In research it was stated St. Paul has some tremendously capable people in its applicants
- The District is in good shape so it can select a person with a lot of talent and shape to do what is wanted
- All five candidates are much stronger than 1998 pool – have candidates who are credible nationally, District should be looking for the rising stars, those moving up, demonstrating growing competence
- Sitting superintendents already have other choices, suburban superintendents won't consider as pay is too little and challenges too big and the District wants someone with urban experience
- Wanted to hear in forums some talk of bridging between work done in past and ability to apply that experience to what could be done in St. Paul; the ability to address issue of taking policy and procedures and making selections and setting priorities. Work experience that someone has also addresses the issues of policy (national, state, local) and there were only a few instances where candidates addressed the issue of working with Boards. Two candidates talked about urban policy as it applies to issues needing to be address in St. Paul.
- Wanted some notion of moving beyond what they are doing now and on to next level, A & I both gave a sense of professional development and awareness of the need to move to the next steps; examples of "and then what". U & E had some of it too.
- Seeing in action was helpful, how they present themselves in public, how stakeholders perceive them is critical. With the referendum around the corner someone is needed who can move people forward, someone able to work with board to bring together and do policy governance – move forward and do the work, professionalism to work collaboratively to take to next level
- Someone who can work with the Board, manage the process and do the work
- Superlative candidates with tremendous skill set, demonstrated leadership, understands collaboration, creative ways of using dollars
- Board needs to serve people and come up with solutions so look for innovative thinkers, creativity to push against existing systems and bureaucracies; to challenge staff and solve issues, work together to get solutions. Someone who accepts kids where they are and dealing with them, providing customer service, work collaboratively, visioning, creative ways to work with budgets. Experience closely aligned with demographics in St. Paul.
- Someone who can work with diversity of community and student population; someone living and engaging with community, who is culturally competent, respectful of diversities.
- Stakeholders' input has been beneficial and feedback from community very helpful.
- Listening for issues of where we go next; policy and board relations, will they be receptive to working with board and staff and community in determining destination.
- Grooming and mentoring will be necessary -- it was stated that four nationally recognized superintendents have offered to mentor any candidate chosen.
- Collaborative, willingness to go the extra step, clearly understanding Board's role
- Having lost Chief Academic Officer due to health issues now it becomes a greater issue to have experience and know how to provide additional levels of support in that area
- Looking for a team player someone to come in a build successful leadership team
- Referendum one of most important things coming up this year need someone who can help win it

- Board has to formulate amount, duration and focus on referendum, this can be pulled together, the community engaged and the new superintendent brought into it
- Never want to be in position of getting referendum passed without active support from a Superintendent but any candidate picked can be gotten far enough along to provide active support but need to look at what can be accomplish after the referendum.
- Good choices, good group, each brings different strengths -- Two candidates seen as visionaries, good strategic thinkers, good in interpersonal skills, see the big picture. A St. Paul connection is a plus; community likes to have local candidates.
- Legislative and government experience, three very strong and have all three levels (national state local) – the candidate pool generated is deep in this area, legislative role is a key role and person needs to be proficient. Strategic, vision, understanding national picture, regional picture and willing to learn about local picture.

Mr. Mgeni expressed appreciation on the behalf of senior staff at having been given the opportunity to interview candidates and provide feedback to the Board.

MOTION: Mr. Goldstein moved the Committee of the Board meeting recess until 7:00 p.m. Seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion passed.

Mr. Lalla responded to a press question about the Board eating together and there being a quorum. He stated if no business is discussed, if it is only social chit chat, the open meeting law does not apply.

The meeting recessed at 6:05 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

MOTION: Tom Conlon moved that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education nominate candidate A for the position of Superintendent of Schools for Saint Paul Public Schools. Seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion approved

MOTION: Ms. Carroll move the meeting adjourn, seconded by Mr. Oertwig.

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25.

Respectfully submitted,
 Marilyn Polsfuss
 Assistant Clerk
 Saint Paul Board of Education