

May 27, 2025 BOE Work Session

Agenda with supporting documentation and presentations: [May 27, 2025 Meeting](#) The meeting is held at the Central Office.

Superintendent Reports:

City of STL Collaborative Efforts with SLPS
Finance - Proposed Budget for FY2025-26
Technology Audit Update

Approval of Agenda – The agenda is approved.

Approval of Minutes – May 13, 2025 meeting minutes are approved.

Dr. Borishade states several SLPS school buildings were heavily damaged in the May 16, 2025 tornado. Many of our families and staff members experienced deep personal loss, homes destroyed, vehicles totaled, lives disrupted, and schools heavily damaged. The impact has been devastating but our response was immediate. Our SIT team, school leaders, and community partners stepped in right away helping with emergency shelter, food, clothing, transportation, and mental health resources.

Recovery is ongoing. We are taking it in phases. During Phase I, we ensured staff and student safety. We've assessed damages. Watson will speak to that shortly. We relocated staff and students from buildings that were damaged to buildings that were safe. We identified staff and student needs and contractors to begin stabilizing our buildings to prevent further damage. We organized a resource fair. We connected with community organizations. We visited impacted schools and partner schools. We've received emergency contracts. We've submitted claims.

We have also been partnering with the City, Mayor Spencer, and her team. They have been really gracious with reaching out and asking about the things we need. Dr. Borishade shares what the City would like to do in terms of sites for debris collection. Casey Millberg and Jonathan Strong from the Mayor's office will present tonight.

In Phase 2, we are going to identify families' needs, which is very intentional. We are going to ask each and every family what they need so that when we partner with our community partners, we intentional about what we provide. We've responded to partnership requests. Today, we visited five sites with the potential for four sites to be used for tornado debris removal location/hubs. We are gathering proposals for repair work.

City of STL Collaborative Efforts with SLPS – Casey Millberg & Jonathan Strong

Watson says since the tornado, they have assessed 28 buildings and facilities. Some had power outages, debris cleanup (trees/shrubbery), and some had severe roof damage, primarily in the central corridor between Natural Bridge to Page to Newstead. We are still assessing buildings. Our emergency response team immediately boarded up buildings and tarped roofs to stabilize the facilities. He estimated we've spent \$1.1M in the stabilization process up to \$1.8M for contingencies with weather. We want our buildings intact and secure. Because some facilities had no power, they were unable to assess the HVAC systems and other electrical damage. Overall, the

response was quick, and they were able to “button up” our properties before the storm the following Monday.

Dr. Borishade notes even though some of our buildings have green stickers on them, we are still being extremely cautious for sending anyone back into those buildings. Dr. Collins-Adams asks to explain what green stickers mean. Dr. Borishade explains there are green, yellow, and red stickers being placed on buildings indicating the level of safety. Prior to us inviting staff and students back into the buildings, we need to look at it more.

Strong and Millberg introduce themselves. Millberg’s current role is policy in the Mayor’s office. She served as policy director under Mayor Jones also. Millberg and Strong thank the BOE for allowing them to come speak in the spirit of gratitude and partnership. There has been a tremendous amount of debris created by the tornado. Debris removal is a critical, foundational step for recovery, along with building stabilization, rebuilding other critical missions. When working with the governor and National Guard, this was the critical mission they identified. A critical step is figuring out a place where residents and their communities can bring debris so that it can be sorted and treated appropriately by environmental standards so the National Guard can eventually take it from the City. The National Guard reviewed potential locations and identified some vacant school buildings that would fit the bill. The National Guard asked the City if it would be willing to reach out to the BOE and SLPS leadership to assess willingness or availability, which is why they are here tonight. Millberg wants to make it clear the National Guard is here to assist the City, not direct the City in any way. The City is in control of this mission, and the National Guard is here at our invitation and request. The National Guard support period is for two weeks, at which time debris support operations will transition either to the City or the Missouri State Emergency Management Agency for further long-term removal operations and treatment operations. Millberg stresses the National Guard will not be armed. This is a strictly humanitarian mission. We are very mindful of some communities’ experience with the National Guard.

When the City reviewed site locations, with gratitude and sincere appreciation, they identified Bunch, Marshall Branch, Stevens, and Farragut schools. These sites would allow many residents to bring their debris for sorting and transfer. They can accommodate a large flow of traffic so as not to impede neighborhoods. There is substantial fencing or we can easily provide for substantial fencing. The fencing will be wrapped to prevent outside view of debris so the community does not have to look at the debris and as a security measure. This can be a symbol of community unity and partnership between the City and SLPS. The operational start would begin May 28, debris being collected started on May 29, with daily hours of 8a-7p, with staff working from 7:30a-8:30p split across two shifts. National Guard staff and roles will include 41 members from the engineering division. They will provide supervisors, truck drivers, and equipment operators who will be responsible for removing debris from these temporary locations to offsite locations. Debris will be removed daily, multiple times per day, to ensure there is no accumulation. Eighteen City personnel will also be involved. A City staff supervisor will be named for each shift and be onsite along with the Health Division and Building Stabilization personnel. They will count the number of vehicles served, distribute information and PPE to residents to help empower them in debris removal. The City will also offer the option to complete the community needs assessment post-tornado to help identify individuals, who wish to be identified, when they bring debris to the site.

The Health Department will pass out PPE as needed. There will be information about environmental handling of debris. Each site will be locked and gated overnight. There will be unarmed safety officers at each location. SLMPD will support onsite security with directed patrols. The fencing would have co-branded wrapping with SLPS and the City to demonstrate a message of community unity and recovery. The City will work with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to ensure the highest environmental processing standards on each site for all debris. If there is any need for site remediation at the conclusion of this operation, the City will facilitate that.

Each site will have one front loader and two dump trucks. There will sanitation equipment, porta-potties, handwashing etc. The City will also communicate to the communities this is a humanitarian mission and provide contact information should issues arise. These sites are designed to be so accessible that if someone came with a wheelbarrow, they can use it. There is a mobilized network of private contractors who are out in the community doing a grid-by-grid approach coordinated through the Urban League, which will continue.

Strong notes we actually want to remove Stevens and add in Turner instead as a new text arrived.

Jones appreciates the City addressing the hazardous waste portion because she is very concerned about the public having the proper gear to deliver the debris. When debris is removed from the site, people are concerned about the valuable brick disappearing from the City. How will the City address that: Strong says they are focused on debris the community by dropping off. They have heard stories of brick disappearance and are discussing way to prevent this internally now. They are trying to assess where and when this is occurring. Millberg says there is a facility in the City, which predated this event, that is positioned to serve as a “brick bank” for lack of a better term in the Mark Twain Industrial Complex. They are working to get information about that for interested residents. They know the DNR has a machine where you can put bricks into it and it removes the mortar efficiently to preserve the bricks. With broken bricks, they are doing research on how to repurpose them for future rebuilding, such a brick façade. These conversations are happening, it is a tremendous asset.

Hykes clarifies he can load up his truck, go to that site and dump the truck: Yes. They want to meet the community where they are at no matter where they are. You can come with a wheelbarrow, a clothing basket, a truck, a car, etc. Strong says this is also to alleviate City residents having to go down to the City dump/landfill. There are fines and fees attached with dumping normally so they want to avoid that.

Conover notes we have historically struggled to collaborate between the City and SLPS, so he is excited to see these efforts under these unfortunate circumstances, but he hopes this is something we can build on for the next four years. Conover mentions the special legislative session. How can we use our legislative committee to work with the City to ensure SLPS is prioritized or at the forefront of those conversations as our families have suffered a lot of damage: Millberg says the City truly wants a strong partnership with SLPS. Millberg says to speak directly to her as the policy director with the legislative coordination and collaboration. They are in very close contact with local, state, and federal delegations on this matter. Strong notes he’s been serving as a liaison between the City and SLPS, and he has communicated with several people sitting this table. Once we get settled, they want to strengthen these ties and communications.

Marston was in Fountain Park most of Saturday and Monday helping clean debris. The tree lawns are getting very full. One bottleneck is getting debris from there to the vacant school sites. Most residents don't have the means to transport so they are waiting for someone to come pick it up. We've tried to keep piles separated between yard waste and building materials, but people are dropping off mixed loads so someone at the school sites may need to separate it. He notes he spent a lot of time with a chainsaw on Monday creating stacks of logs that aren't as valuable as bricks, but could be used for firewood: Millberg thanks him for showing up for the community as everyone in the room has. She will check with Forestry about the logs and possible mulch options. She acknowledges many residents don't have a way to move the debris which is the intention for partnering with contractors to use big equipment to move the debris. Please reach out to our office for areas that may need extra support. There will be environmental personnel on site to facilitate sorting.

Foster says she is excited to work with the City to support our families. She asks about more information about the needs survey that will be sent out to residents. SLPS is also sending out a similar survey. Can we collaborate on that data information and sharing, such as asking how many students do they have and what school do they attend: Dr. Borishade says when we have all of the things we need, the City could supply those needs. Strong agrees there are opportunities to collaborate on the data because all are City families being served. We also can collaborate on the solutions to meet the families' needs. They are not that deep into the planning, but there is value in having SLPS in the communications.

Conover asks if when we receive the bricks if there is a commitment to keep them within the site and with the site runners: Millberg says they are figuring out the process to handle that. They are definitely aware of the need to preserve the bricks. The National Guard is aware of the importance of keeping our assets within the community, and they will direct them on that.

Dr. Collins-Adams asks if the National Guard is in the community assisting families are just at the collection sites: Millberg explains the National Guard request process. First, you identify the needs, such as staff or equipment, and see if you can get those needs met from a regional partner. If that happens, the National Guard is not called in. Debris removal was a significant area where they do not have that regional ability or support. The mission is just debris removal at this point. They can reassess again for another need that does not have regional support.

Jones mentions the firewood and how it is important that when winter comes, we need an ample supply of free firewood given the trees we've lost: Strong says right now, the City provides firewood and some of it will end up in Sherman Park and Carondelet Park.

Dr. Borishade then asks if there is a desire to collaborate with the City as it relates to the four sites: Marshall, Farragut, Turner, and Bunch for debris removal. If so, we would draft an MOU. Conover notes our SLPS staff has been doing amazing work for the last several days working around the clock to support the needs of the district and the City. He thanks them. The BOE votes unanimously to draft the MOU. Strong thanks them. He says they look forward to strengthening their communication and collaboration. This is a disaster and the City and SLPS will need to rebuild our own City.

Financial Update – Kimberly Johnson, Chief Financial Officer

[Proposed Budget FY2025-26](#)

Dr. Borishade notes at the May 13 meeting, there were three questions asked: (1) are football helmets insured; (2) are the reconditioned helmets insurable; and (3) what is the size of the Zum mobile app. Those answers were shared with the BOE (*but she does not share them publicly*).

The CFO will present the FY25-26 budget. There are several things Dr. Borishade wants to bring to their attention. At the end of the 2024 school year, there was \$22M that was realized, but you won't see it in the way you understand it in the FY25-26 budget. The bond issuance of \$25M is reflected as revenue for the FY24-25 school year, but we are using it in the FY25-26 school year. She reminds them of when they did the exercise about how to respond to an emergency, we did not know an emergency was going to happen, but everyone spent their fund balance. Here we are, in an emergency. Dr. Collins-Adams jokes they will not have that type of exercise again.

Johnson begins with Slide 3, the SLPS Chart of Accounts Structure, which aligns with standards set by DESE's Financial Accounting Manual. The chart functions as a structure and comprehensive listing of all financial accounts used by the district to categorize and track all monetary transactions. The slide defines each category. The "Fund" categorizes two types, the General Operating Budget (GOB) and Non-GOB. GOB funds primarily consist of local and state dollars that are allocated to fulfill the general operational needs of the district. Non-GOB funds are mainly federal funds utilized to support grants (such as Title Funds) and other funded programs. Non-GOB funds are typically subject to specific compliance mandates, regulations, and reporting requirements. The Function is the action, purpose, or program for which activities are performed. There is a four-digit code and it must have a location to track what program or activity is offered. Activities are classified into five broad categories: instruction, supporting services, operations of non-instructional services, facilities acquisition and construction, and debt service. Object code is four digits and represents the specific revenue or expenditure items, which are further categorized by specific types, such as the source of the revenue. Location is used to identify specific schools within a district, as well as different departments or areas such as administration, school services, maintenance, and operations. Project is used to identify GOB and grant expenditures by specific grant or activity. Fiscal Year (FY) represents the fiscal year the expenses occur. SLPS fiscal year is July 1 thru June 30. GOB fiscal year will always appear as "00." Grant budgets will always have a two-digit number to represent the fiscal year in which the grant funds were awarded.

Slide 4 contains the FY25-26 proposed district budget summary, with a table broken down by fund category, FY24 actual, FY25 BOE approved in June 2024, FY26 proposed, the dollar amount change, and the variance percentage. We are separating our restricted funds from our unrestricted funds. We have taken out debt service and Prop S funds because those funds can only be used for specific services. Revenue includes: general operation, local grants, food service, state & federal grants. Expenditures include: general operating, local grants, food service, state & federal grants. For FY25, none of the numbers have changed, adjusted, or updated from what was approved in June 2024 by the BOE. However, for FY24, we have actual numbers now, which were updated now that our audit is completed. Our proposals for the unrestricted funds show our revenue is estimated and these are projections. Our revenues are estimated at \$400M while expenditures are estimated at \$433M. How are we going to cover that? We'll talk about the fund balance shortly.

Slide 5 contains the FY25-26 proposed district budget summary for the restricted funds with debt service, Prop S, and Prop S 2025 with a table broken down by fund category, FY24 actual, FY25 BOE approved in June 2024, FY26 proposed, the dollar amount change, and the variance percentage. We have added a line showing \$25M in the Prop S 2025 line. This is one change to the FY25 budget because when we issued the \$25M bond issuance, all accounting rules require that revenue be recorded in the year received. We are showing FY25 revenue of \$25M. In FY26 proposed on that same line shows \$3.6M which is our expected interest premium. In FY26 proposed expenditures, you see the \$25M, as Dr. Borishade explained we are spending it next year. Separating the restricted funds from unrestricted funds provides more transparency.

Slide 6 show FY26 proposed GOB, which is our fund balance budget. In FY24 our revenues exceeded our expenditures, resulting in \$23M in extra revenue, which was an increase in our fund balance, along with additional grant money. FY25 projects our expenditures exceed our revenues by \$35M. We will a fund balance spend of \$35M. FY26 proposed projects our expenditures could exceed revenue by \$32M. How and when will we ensure we get to a balanced budget? We are working toward that. They will reimagine our budget by examining areas where there can be cost savings. For example, in FY26 we looked at proposed expenditures and decreased them from FY25, such as: eliminating vacant positions that have been on the books for more than three years and were not filled; new positions created to see if there was a need for them, such as under the Superintendent's Office, which had a deputy superintendent, chief of staff, etc. that is not needed; and cost of purchase services, such as staffing contracts, other contracts, supplies and materials. We will continue to look at these areas in FY26 and FY27 to work toward a balanced budget.

Slide 6 also discusses local grants. FY24 saw our expenditures exceed revenues by \$1.7M. Looking forward, there is a decrease of 36% in local grants. Our local grants are simply estimates because we do not know what the true allocation is going to be and/or the carryover amount of the grants. The amount listed for FY26 is an estimate. Local grants are down by 36.2% due to three reasons. First, we always look at historical data and the amount of the final awards that we receive. In FY24, we have \$1.8M. Second, we expect our YTD revenue will come in less than anticipated and we project it. Our projections are almost a year ahead so we don't know the true allocation. Third, based on the audit review, we found some of our revenue had to be re-coded in a different category.

Slide 7 discusses food service, state & federal grants, and debt service. For food service, expenditures exceeded revenues by \$2.6M for FY24. For FY25, there is a significantly less overage. We are unsure if we are going to meet that projection for FY25 based on collections. For FY26, the proposal has expenditures exceeding revenue by \$1.4M because we have a new food service vendor that has increased the cost. There is also increased costs for food as well. When looking at federal & state grants, our revenues in should be our expenditures out. That is a simplified formula. We do not know what our revenues will be. We have some idea with federal grants. We are expecting \$6M less in state revenue grants because we are no longer going to receive revenue based on the basic formula with most of that money going to charter schools. For debt service, this is the amount of money we owe. For FY24, revenue exceeded expenditures by \$6.7M. For FY26, revenue should be more than expenditures due to the bonds revenue.

Slide 9 shows revenue by all sources, broken down by local, county, federal, and state. We talked about local grants being decreased 36.2%. Johnson also notes we expect \$5.1M in carryover from grants, which means at the end of this FY, whatever remaining grant balance will carryover to the next FY. However, there are some grants which will expire (sunset) and that money will not carryover. The county category is tax revenue received from utilities, railroad taxes, highway tolls, fines, forfeitures, and any misdemeanor taxes, which is \$4.5M for FY26. The federal category has increased from FY25 to FY26 proposed. State and federal grants include Title grants, IDEA, Perkins, AEL Federal, and 21st Century to name a few. For the state category, there is a \$6M change, which is the \$6M we aren't receiving for the basic formula.

Slides 10-14 show revenue by budget category; object, object description, fund (with RP meaning Real Property). Johnson points out Taxes, Current – RP 310. The FY25 budget proposes \$23.4M while FY26 proposes \$26.1M, an 11.9% increase. We have exceeded the budget approved amount this year already. This is good. This is also reflected in the Taxes, Current – PP 310 with an increase of \$2M.

Johnson moves to Slide 15 which shows expenditures by category, expense object category (similar to the revenue slides) with GOB, local grants, food service, debt service, and state & federal grants. Under GOB, they are separated by category. When comparing FY26 to FY25 for certificated salaries, we have reduced that amount based on cost-savings from vacant positions and positions that aren't needed and reducing those. For capital outlay, FY26 is proposed to be 45.6% less than FY25 because we changed our capital outlay threshold from \$1,000 to be anything above \$5,000. Some items now will be captured under the supplies and materials category. For employee benefits, this has increased by \$6.9M because medical and pharmacy costs are increasing. For supplies & materials there is an increase because we are increasing our purchases of curriculum and instructional materials. The next slides provide more detail for each category. Johnson concludes her presentation at Slide 20.

Marston commends Johnson for answering all of the questions he submitted before the meeting both in writing and reiterating it today. His budget questions centered on the path to a balanced budget and the decrease in local grants. Marston asks if the BOE can share those questions and answers with the agenda for the next meeting so the general public can see them for people who are better at reading than listening: Johnson says yes, then says she defers to Dr. Borishade. Conover says we don't want to step on any legal issues. Dr. Collins-Adams is unsure if we can right now but will check. Dr. Borishade notes all of his questions were answered.

Marston is unsure if all of the other cabinet members are going to say tonight what they wrote in their responses before; otherwise, the general public may never hear or see the answers. Conover says Marston can ask questions. Marston agrees, but he does not want to prolong the meeting.

Dr. Collins-Adams also commends Johnson for answering all of Marston's questions. She also followed along to double check the math. The responses to many questions were addressed this evening so we may not need more information, but she will check with legal to see if we can.

Dr. Borishade wonders if the questions asked are for personal information or on behalf of others. Marston says a mix of reasons, but other people may have the same questions and wonder why no one asked questions or they may want a written response to review. The cabinet members also spent time answering the questions. He would like to see them shared as broadly as possible.

Hubbard asks if we can refer this to the governance committee: Dr. Collins-Adams says yes, but we cannot respond to that right now. We will get back to everyone.

Hubbard refers to the locations that are the 7000s that are not our schools. What is going on there: Those are considered our non-public entities, programs we support, other schools we support, mainly through grants. But we need to properly record revenues and expenses for them.

In what way do we support them: Teachers can use those grants to support activities or special initiatives for those specific grants, but they aren't part of SLPS. She will provide more information about that category.

Conover notes are we are potentially planning on increasing expenditures on part-time or interim staff for SPED. We reviewed a line item today where we are decreasing our staff expenditures for certified staff. He is not as concerned about next year, but is wondering what the long-term plan is. There is a crisis in SPED hiring. What is our long-term plan around long-term SPED expenses: Dr. Borishade says the goal is to always hire certified staff. We have to be mindful that as IEPs are written, depending on when they are written, certain services are asked at any time throughout the year which we must provide. This increases our spending. Ultimately, the goal is to hire certified staff who can work with students with IEPs.

There were some discussions in the legislative committee a while ago about this, so we want to support this due to the national crisis in SPED.

Foster asks Johnson to go back over Slide 8 about Prop S FY26 proposed budget: Johnson says we recorded Prop S in two different ways. The Prop S 2025 was specifically outlined to show the revenue of the second sell of bonds completed in March, which was \$25M. This must be recorded in the year the revenue is actually received. We are recording that \$25M this FY, but we are not expecting to see any expenditures or costs against that \$25M until FY26. The \$3.6M proposed revenue is the interest we are expected to earn on the \$25M. Keep in mind, interest is market variable and fluctuates. This is a proposal based on historical amounts we have earned. This is a very conservative number.

Conover wants to note every year when we do the budget. This year we will have our expenditures higher than our revenues, around \$32M. The audit we just approved shows TIFs and tax abatements take about \$39M from this district each year. Is there anything the BOE can do to support trying to close that gap to fund more services: Johnson says those are based on property and real property taxes. We just received information that, based on the tornado, they are going to give extensions for people to pay their property taxes. With delinquent taxes, if they are not caught up in 3 years, those are then sold. The overall expectation is not to expect an increase.

We have more work to do collaborating with the City on this issue. Please repeat we are in good financial shape as a district: Yes, we are.

Dr. Collins-Adams notes Johnson did the absolute best she could in presenting this information. The concern over staff is a nationwide issue, especially with SPED and related services. This eats up a major portion of the budget. Anything the BOE can do, even if it's to come up with its own campaign to get people to pay their taxes, we have done it in the past.

Technology Audit Update – Dr. Katrina Hubbard

[Technology Audit Review](#)

Dr. Hubbard discusses a summary of the 2020 and 2022 Technology Audit observations, audit recommendations, and status on corrective actions. Brown Smith Wallace conducted a Cybersecurity Assessment in 2020. In 2022, RubinBrown included findings for Technology in the year-end audit. All of the information—observation, recommendation, and corrective action—will be on the same slide. *(Dr. Hubbard reads verbatim from most slides, so I will not retype her reading here. I'll list the observations/findings, and you can reference the deck for recommendations and actions taken.)*

Brown Smith Wallace Cybersecurity Assessment in 2020: Dr. Hubbard notes all of this is very technology focused and she does not have a background in technology. We have resources in the room if there are questions she cannot answer. Several slides address “low-hanging fruit” which is easily corrected. Slide 7 discusses the issue of password policies not set to CIS best practices. Slide 8 discusses how local administrator passwords are shared and reused across many systems. Slide 9 discusses how virus signatures were not consistently updated. Slide 10 discusses how group policy was not completely configured to disable auto-run content. Slide 11 discusses how no host-based firewall is used to protect workstations.

The next set of slides address “primary initiatives.” Slide 12 discusses how Microsoft System Center Configuration Manager (SCCM) discovers and manages some systems on the SLPS network. They performed an independent discovery scan and found that not every system is managed inside of SCCM. Because not every system was managed in SCCM, they identified that system patching is not performed consistently or completely. Slide 13 discusses there is not a formal policy to define authorized software or a mechanism to detect and remove it from systems. Slide 14 discusses how 5,329 unsupported operating systems were identified, which represents 33% of all servers and workstations on the SLPS network. Unsupported systems no longer receive security patches and, therefore, become more vulnerable after their “end of life” date. Slide 15 discusses CIS Critical Security Control was not up to par.

The next set of slides discuss “secondary initiatives.” Slide 16 discusses how there is a server image used to deploy new servers, which helps achieve consistent security configurations. This image is not hardened to an industry-accepted standard. Slide 17 discusses how SLPS generally has informal policies and procedures. Many security functions are performed informally and inconsistently. The development of Information Security Policies (ISP) on a variety of issues will be published and shared by July 2025. Slide 18 discusses applicable CIS Critical Security Controls.

2022 RubinBrown Year-End Audit: These slides address findings, recommendations, and actions taken. Slide 19 lists the “Finding 2022-003 Significant Deficiency: Equipment and Real Property Management – Control Finding; Special Test and Provisions: Restricted Purpose - Control Finding ALN 32.009 – Emergency Connectivity Fund (ECF).” Slide 20 lists the “Finding 2022-004 Significant Deficiency: Special Tests and Provisions: Restricted Purpose – Control and Compliance Finding - ALN 32.009 – Emergency Connectivity Fund.” Slide 21 lists “Finding 2022-005 Significant Deficiency: Period of Performance – Control and Compliance Finding - ALN 32.009 – Emergency Connectivity Fund.”

The technology team has implemented changes to their processes to meet current industry standards. Several actions are continuous and remain ongoing. There are two items still pending.

Foster asks about the ISP recommendations and which ones we are strongly considering: Natasha Mitchell notes she is at her 90 days. Her department is conducting its own internal technology and cybersecurity assessment. Dr. Hubbard referenced the July 2025 date because Mitchell’s team, in collaboration with a robust team of stakeholders, is developing a comprehensive cybersecurity plan that is aligned with the US Department of Homeland Security’s Cybersecurity recommendations. Mitchell asks if she can speak to it more at that time when they have a better understanding. She is well aware there were several recommendations, findings, and a lot of work to do. They are working every day to strengthen our cybersecurity system and our network.

Consent Agenda

-Item 11.27 All Risk Property, Casualty, and Liability Insurance: Conover notes this is a renewal. When reviewing the budget, he noted a \$3M increase in settlement costs. He is confused about the settlement cost and renewal cost: They are different costs.

-Item 11.1 Purchasing Back to School Supplies: Marston notes the Urban Expo also provides backpacks with supplies. He assumes the Urban League is paying for those and we pay separate ones here. Is there a way to share costs there to distribute the supplies at the schools: Dr. Borishade says our families are welcome to attend the Urban Expo to obtain supplies. If we wanted to participate in the Urban Expo, then that is typically a cost for us when we have our own way of distributing supplies.

Can we approach the Urban League to say we are grateful they are providing these materials, but if they could share some of that budget with us, it would cost us less: Hykes says we moved away from them because it was cheaper for us to do it ourselves even though we appreciate the Urban League greatly. Jones says when we did participate, we always ran out of backpacks. There was never enough. Urban League may have other things they are dedicated to at that particular time. We took up the slack. The money SLPS spent on the Urban Expo was well-spent.

Dr. Collins-Adams says our students are welcome to attend the Urban Expo. But, the backpacks we are paying for will guarantee every student in SLPS will get a backpack with supplies: Yes.

Jones notes the backpacks we provide are nice and not branded as being donated.

Marston understands not every child attends the Urban Expo and we provide supplies across the board. He was just wondering if the Urban League would be willing to reallocate its budget for those supplies to help reduce our costs.

-Item 11.5 Increase AMN Contract from \$400K to \$900K: Jones asks for a brief explanation why this increase is happening: Dr. Deno explains there are several contracts that support students with IEPs. IEPs change over the course of the year, and there are more services needed for students. We also provide virtual services for students where we need one person to provide the actual service and one who stays in the room with the student while the service occurs. It is very difficult to find qualified SPED staff in a variety of roles, not just teachers. We did not anticipate when these contracts were first executed this would be a cost overall. Now looking at the next school year and Camp SLPS which extends the school year, this includes costs through the end of June. We don't know yet how many students next year will need these services because we aim to fill with SLPS staff first, and only if that is not possible do we turn to these agencies.

-Items 11.5-11.7 all which concern contract staffing: Marston says it was eye-opening to him how expensive these services are, which total \$12.9M just across these three items. Of course, we will honor it because it is the right thing to do morally and legally, but he was surprised at how much it was. There are several others for managed care therapy that are in addition. These are big numbers with very big increases. Item 11.5 is going from \$400K to \$900K. Item 11.6 is going from \$1.6M to \$3M. Item 11.7 is going from \$2.4 to \$9M. The forecasting for these items was way off. Also, with respect to timing, for Item 11.6 is go through June 30. Assuming we vote to approve this on June 10, is that entire amount spent in that short time frame or are we approving money that has already been spent: Dr. Deno says invoices trail. As Finance receives the invoices, we are tracking to ensure we are only paying for services we are actually receiving, which was why there was a delay. Not all of these expenses will be incurred during June.

Dr. Borishade elevates the comment "assuming we approve to pay this." If we don't pay these bills, we are sending a message to our families and students.

He agrees morally and legally we have to pay. He wants to understand how we are forecasting these costs. We would all rather have full-time SLPS SPED teachers rather than outsourced contractors in these positions not only due to the cost, but to have more consistency in those positions. Are the contractors covered by any union protection: If you are a contractor, you are not covered.

Dr. Collins-Adams says the contractors are not teachers. They are paraprofessionals, OT, speech pathologists, speech therapists, orientation mobility specialists, etc. These individuals are licensed in these specialty areas to work with our students. It is the basis of many lawsuits when we do not provide these services. Sometimes we have to go to these contractors to provide those services.

Dr. Borishade notes there are also instances at the end of the school year in which a student has to be moved to a more specialized location, which comes with more services we have

to pay for because our students deserve the services they need to be seen has a whole student.

Items 11.1-11.41 will move to the consent agenda for the June 10 meeting. Items 11.43-11.45 will not move on. Conover thanks them for moving the SLU-related items off of the agenda which helps at least two of them.

Foster confirms the consent agenda item related to Renaissance Learning was removed also due to a conflict.

Item 11.25 Contract with Gaggle: Foster asks how are we protecting our students' data and privacy. She appreciates Dr. Hubbard's discussion about what the district is doing internally to protect that data. This company uses AI. We have no AI usage policy within the contract provided to the district. There is no clear language about what they are going to with our students' data, specifically on p. 18. She is curious if we had any negotiated terms for PII use for students and staff. If we did have those conversations, what did they say about data breaches and bias toward our students. She recommends we add language if Gaggle is either sold or acquired by a third party that our student and staff data be completely scrubbed within at least 2-3 weeks of acquisition, which is based on best practices: Natasha Mitchell says she responded to some of that a bit ago. If we do approve, we can look to update the contract with those concerns.

Conover notes there is some information about PII on p. 17 and if that covers concerns. Foster says it does include what PII is collected but it does not detail what it will do with the PII that is collected. There is no clause that clearly spells out what happens if they are acquired or sold. Conover saw some information about selling and disclosing data, but recognizes the point about if the company were sold.

Items 11.42, 11.43, 11.44, and 11.45 are moved to Item for Action to be voted on separately due to conflicts of interest.

Items for Discussion

None

Items for Information

None

Items for Action

None

Adjournment

They are adjourned.