

include: 1) Enhanced training for the department; 2) The Canine Unit being allowed to train in the buildings, 3) Initial training for Active Shooter training paid for by a SPPS grant, 4) Officers received training in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), Threat Assessment and Non-violent Crisis Intervention through the District, 5) The District held a full-scale emergency exercise at Hazel Park Middle School which included both the Police and Fire Departments, and 6) The District provides space for training such as use of computer training room for an officer in service.

Chief Harrington remarked the training allowed for all the SRO's and a large number of other officers to be trained in how to train parents to protect their kids better. He commented that this could not have been done if it was not for the school district's generosity and allowing the police department to use the space provided.

Chief Harrington listed and talked about the 2006 St. Paul Police Department (SPPD) financial contribution to the SRO program totaling \$587,228. Mr. Haria discussed the District's SRO financial contribution and costs. He remarked the Safe School Levy is very important because it does good things for the district, although it barely covers district costs in terms of providing safety and security. The presentation given was a financial picture of where the district is and how the district is moving forward. Mr. Haria stated contract discussions were held and the SRO contract had been signed for one more year (from January to June). He recommended bringing the contract to the July Board of Education meeting for approval. Chief Harrington added summer school is coming and the SRO's want to be ready and in the schools and it would be easier if there is a contract in place. He remarked a one year contract is better than a six year contract unless something changes financially.

Superintendent Carstarphen stated that at the end of May the Governor signed the E-12 Bill for Education. Mary Gilbert provided a legislative update noting the governor approved supports to education and one part was to increase the state school levy by \$3. She said there is not clear direction in that approval on who actually receives that money and how it is supposed to work. That would be a tiny increase for the 2007-08 school year that still needs to be discussed. Dr. Carstarphen meets with the Mayor and this is something she will put on the agenda to be sure they are on the same page about the increase to the state school levy. Dr. Carstarphen concluded the presentation.

Committee discussion: Mr. Brodrick asked for clarification if this change would put the district in considerably better financial situation. Superintendent Carstarphen commented it would not. She remarked Mary Gilbert, Legislative Liaison for SPPS, would look into this situation further and report back to the Superintendent on the scope of what the district can do and where the funds have been designated. Ms. Carroll expressed concern regarding the percentage paid by the district and SPPS (70/30), and asked what the proposed percentage is for 2007. Mr. Haria stated it would remain the same, 70/30, noting the 30% is a cash contribution from SPPD. Superintendent Carstarphen recommended a one year contract at minimum and commented the Office of Fund Development is looking for additional funding to bring in other resources to help in this area and would also provide leverage in discussing the possibility of a multiyear contract in the future.

There was further discussion by Committee members, the Chief of Police and administrative staff around the percentage split between the city and district, how it started out as a 50/50 split and changed over the years to a 70/30 split. Committee members questioned the fairness of the split. Chief Harrington explained the financial history of the city budget cuts that caused these changes and the school district levy. Another concern raised was the SRO's role in the schools and the district's responsibility. Ms. Kong-Thao remarked the Committee is not saying the SRO's are not needed but the Board looks at the budget and responsibilities needed to get there. She added it is critical to have this conversation to see what the next steps will be.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Conlon and seconded by Mr. Brodrick that the Committee of the Board direct Administration prepare a draft contract for a one (1) year period that incorporates a post order and a safety and security piece, for approval at the next regular Board meeting on June 19, 2007.

Superintendent Carstarphen stated Administrative staff would work on getting the contract ready for Board members to consider for approval at the June 19 Board of Education meeting. She remarked it would not be coming back to the Committee of the Board and the Board weekly update on June 14 would provide an update on where the administration is with the contract. Any changes, etc. would be e-mailed to Board members before the regular board meeting.

Continuation of the above stated motion:

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Conlon and seconded by Mr. Brodrick that the Committee of the Board direct Administration prepare a draft contract for a one (1) year period that incorporates a post order and a safety and security piece, for approval at the next regular Board meeting on June 19, 2007.

The motion passed.

Ms. Kong-Thao thanked Superintendent Carstarphen, Chief Harrington, Mr. Haria and other staff who assisted in this presentation.

2. School Year 2007-08 Transportation Contracts

Superintendent Carstarphen stated this is a departure from usual practice in that transportation bids are normally discussed at the Board of Education meeting. She remarked that practice had not changed but this was being done to be able to provide the additional information that was asked for. There were questions from individual board members coming to administration about driver turnover rates, utilization of the sick leave benefit under specifications of the bid. The details were outlined in a document prepared by the Transportation Department. Superintendent Carstarphen stated, in the future, a discussion regarding whether it is appropriate for board members to make this type of request and how it fits into this process needs to be held.

Mr. Haria and Harold Turnquist, Supervisor, Transportation Department, presented three documents for review, discussion and recommendation: 1) Bid No. A-9140C Pupil Transportation for 2007-2008 School Year, and a bid tabulation showing the bid rates submitted by the various bidders and the recommendation award of service under the bid; 2) Driver turnover rates and utilization of the sick leave benefit required under the specifications for bid and 3) Recruitment and Retention Plans.

Committee discussion: Ms. Carroll thanked staff for the excellent reports and information on driver turnover rates and utilization of the sick leave benefit by the bus contractors. She said this is helpful information the contractors would not readily bring to the Board. Superintendent Carstarphen stated a discussion on "request for information" process is needed. Ms. Street-Stewart agreed the board should have a process that everyone follows to make it easier for staff to comply with a request for information from a board member.

After further discussion the following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Conlon tha the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent

(designee) to award basic routes to the indicated low available bidders conforming to the Specifications for Bid and accept the rates for Additional Services, Hourly Rate Service, and Field Trip Service and include driver turnover rates and utilization of sick leave benefit.

Mr. Conlon provided a friendly amendment to include another line stating "sick leave or without sick leave." The amendment died due to lack of a second.

Mr. Conlon expressed concern that this would be micro-managing private businesses and the district should not get involved in their day to day management of the companies who do the job the District wants done.

After further discussion a vote was taken on the above stated motion:

Continuation of above stated motion:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Conlon that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to award basic routes to the indicated low available bidders conforming to the Specifications for Bid and accept the rates for Additional Services, Hourly Rate Service, and Field Trip Service and include driver turnover rates and utilization of sick leave benefit.

The above stated motion passed on a 5 to 1 vote. Mr. Conlon voted "No."

Mr. Conlon moved that future transportation bids have a second line "with or without sick leave." Motion died for lack of a second.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Street-Stewart and seconded by Ms. Carroll that the Committee of the Board recommends the Board of Education approve bringing Transportation Bids to the Board meeting for awarding of routes.

Motion passed.

Ms. Kong-Thao asked committee members for the scheduling on the discussion regarding board requests. Ms. Street-Stewart remarked this was referred to a future executive committee meeting for discussion.

3. Charter School

Superintendent Carstarphen provided background information on the All Star Academy (ASA) who submitted an application for SPPS district sponsorship. She stated the recommendation by administration is that the Board not approve this request because administration did not see anything different or unique in its programming. She remarked SPPS does similar work.

Yusef Mgeni, in the role of Review Team Facilitator and SPPS Charter School Liaison, made the presentation. He provided the time line from when the application was received in early April to May of this year. The Charter School Application Review Team met to review the materials and prepared a report regarding the All Star Academy's application. After an extensive review it was the consensus of the team to decline sponsorship for All Star Academy as they would not provide anything different from what SPPS already provides its students.

Superintendent Carstarphen discussed her respect for what charter schools bring to this community stating the application was carefully reviewed and the idea is to support them as much as possible unless they would be taking away services already provided to SPPS students. She

stated the Board could choose to do otherwise and administration would carry out the Board's direction. Mr. Mgeni added that SPPS offers more school choice than any other school in the state. He remarked the Department of Education changed some rules that say charter schools must have a \$2 million balance in their bank at all times which will limit the field of charter school sponsors. Also, State law was changed eliminating the right of charter schools to appeal when their request for sponsorship is declined.

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 decline sponsorship for All Star Academy. The sponsorship application request as proposed does not make a compelling or specific case that they could offer any clearly different instructional options (than SPPS currently provides), incentive or benefits to students of St. Paul. Further, their key objectives, to improve pupil learning and to increase learning opportunities, were not fully or specifically demonstrated by their application.

After further discussion, a vote was taken on the above stated motion.

Continuation of above stated motion:

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Conlon that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education decline sponsorship for All Star Academy. The sponsorship application request as proposed does not make a compelling or specific case that they could offer any clearly different instructional options (than SPPS currently provides), incentive or benefits to students of St. Paul. Further, their key objectives, to improve pupil learning and to increase learning opportunities, were not fully or specifically demonstrated by their application.

The motion passed.

Ms. Street-Stewart requested staff include the change in the U.S. Department of Education laws in the Thursday Board packets.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m. by Ms. Kong-Thao, Committee Chair.

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