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SCHOOL CHOICE SEASON
2013-14 Lottery Results
Lottery Facts

- Completed March 20, 2013
- **9,231 on-time** participated
- 739 late applications (300 + placed)
- 90 seconds
  - Multi-task oriented
Kindergarten Lottery Results

- 2,074 participated
- 97% of students were placed
- 89% received their first choice
- Only 71 students need follow-up
1st-12th Grade Lottery Results

- 5,631 students participated
- 69% placed 1st or 2nd choice
Pre-Kindergarten

- 1,526 students
- 74% placed
- 443 students on waiting list
- 22 more classrooms needed
## Schools with Waiting List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>K-8</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Anthony Park</td>
<td>Capitol Hill</td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(468)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Farnsworth</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(540)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflecting St. Paul

- 549 choices
- 69% received 1st choice
- 23% of seats filled

Capitol Hill, Chelsea Heights, Expo, Groveland, Highland Park, Horace Mann, JJ Hill, L’Etoile du Nord, Randolph Heights, St. Antony Park
What’s Next

- 700 + late applications
- School Site Training
- Phone Calls- Emails
- Site-based Outreach
- April 12, 2013
- Waiting List
Site-based Outreach

- 69% provided email addresses
Site-based Outreach
Questions/Comments
Talent Development and Accelerated Services Update

Committee of the Board
April 2, 2013

Mr. Matthew Mohs
Interim Chief Academic Officer

Dr. Darlene Fry, Director
Office of College and Career Readiness
Objectives of the Presentation

- Share an overview of Talent Development and Acceleration Services (TDAS) approach
- Review the initial administration of the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT7) and results.
- Highlight program planning for 2013-14
Talent Development and Acceleration Services (formerly Gifted Services)

- The Department formerly known as Gifted Services is now the Department of Talent Development and Acceleration Services.

- The name change represents a more inclusive approach - All SPPS children have talents to be nurtured and cultivated

- TDAS is aligned with the Strong Schools Strong Communities Plan and supports the district’s commitment to equity and excellence
Equity Vision Card: Gifted and Talented Identification and Advanced Courses

- White students have been G/T identified at a rate of:
  - 4 to 1 compared to African American
  - 3 to 1 compared to Latino
  - 3 to 1 compared to Asian
  - 2 to 1 compared to American Indian

- White students compared to their peers in advanced courses
  - 37% gap between white and African American students taking AP classes
  - The percent of White students earning 3 or higher on AP exams is 49% higher than African American students
  - The percentage of White students who score a 4 or higher on IB exams is 28% higher than other racial groups
TDAS 2012-2013

- Created Articulation Specialist position for the Capitol Hill to Highland Park Senior transition.
- Assisted with the coordination of the PYP and MYP International Baccalaureate Program at Hazel Park Preparatory Academy and MYP coordination at Harding High School
- Adopted a new student learner and G/T identification assessment (CogAT7)
- Revised portfolio review process (standards and performance based)
Equitable Learner Opportunities

Moving from
Gifted & Talented Identification
to
Student Learner Profiles
& Gifted Identification
Naglieri Non-Verbal Assessment Test (NNAT)

- SPPS used the NNAT and NNAT2 assessment from 2001-2011
  - Yearly discrepancies in G/T identification rates for students along racial, ethnic, and linguistic lines were apparent each year.
- During the 2011-2012 year, TDAS staff researched various assessments and their impact in school districts nationally
- TDAS proposed using the latest Cognitive Skills and Abilities Test, Seventh Edition (CogAT7)
  - Approved by the School Board on September 18, 2012
## NNAT& NNAT2 Trend Data
### 2001-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>(K) Identified</th>
<th>(2) Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison of NNAT2 and CogAT7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NNAT 2</th>
<th>CogAT7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures one type of learning (visual/spatial)</td>
<td>Three batteries measuring three learning styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language free (non-verbal)</td>
<td>Language free (picture analogies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on a cut score</td>
<td>Provides ability profile with interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of National norms</td>
<td>Use of Local norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No instructional support</td>
<td>Ability profile provides instructional support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CogAT7 assesses multiple dimensions for each child

- The CogAT7 consists of three batteries
  - Verbal ("picture smart")
  - Quantitative ("math smart")
  - Non-Verbal ("spatial reasoning smart")

- Assessment creator utilized experts from various areas in education to create an assessment that is as culturally fair as possible
Benefits of the CogAT7

- Ability profile provided gives teachers and parents recommended strategies to improve student performance

- Acknowledges multiple ways of learning and knowing of students

- Use of local norms comparing SPPS students to each other rather than a national sample

- Students identified in EVERY school for acceleration services
CogAT7 Student Ability Profile

**CogAT**

**PROFILE NARRATIVE FOR**
LibbyGrace Fry
Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT®)
Prepared by Office of Measurement Services - University of Minnesota

---

**Scores for LibbyGrace Fry:**

LibbyGrace recently took the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT). CogAT measures the development of verbal, mathematical, and spatial reasoning abilities that are essential for success in school. Students with different patterns of scores on CogAT have different learning styles. By knowing LibbyGrace’s learning preferences, teachers can help him achieve greater success in school.

LibbyGrace was tested in all three areas: verbal, quantitative, and nonverbal abilities.

A local percentile rank of 14 on verbal reasoning ability means that, compared to other students locally in the same grade, LibbyGrace scored higher than 14 percent. A local percentile rank of 1 on quantitative reasoning ability means that, compared to other students locally in the same grade, LibbyGrace scored higher than 1 percent. A local percentile rank of 1 on nonverbal reasoning ability means that, compared to other students locally in the same grade, LibbyGrace scored higher than 1 percent.

LibbyGrace’s composite score was derived from three subtests in the areas of verbal, quantitative, and nonverbal ability. The overall local percentile rank is a general statement of your child’s reasoning ability, relative to other students in the district in the same grade.

LibbyGrace’s scores on the three batteries do not differ significantly. Students who show this profile can learn effectively but often need guidance. The following steps may help LibbyGrace learn more readily in school:

- Whenever possible, build on LibbyGrace’s interests and accomplishments.
- Reduce the number of things LibbyGrace must attend to, remember, or do when solving problems.
- When attempting new tasks, provide LibbyGrace with structure in the form of specific directions and guidance.
- When working in groups, pair LibbyGrace with other students who can model the desired skills.

---

**Notes:**
CogAT7 Supports Strong Schools Strong Communities Plan

- **Achievement** – The CogAT7 allows students to demonstrate strengths across multiple learning styles; ability profiles to help with differentiation and student learning strategies.

- **Alignment** – The CogAT7 aligns with SSSC and district equity goals; the potential for use of CogAT7 data in school PLCs to impact differentiated instruction for students.

- **Sustainability** – Riverside Publishing has entered a partnership with SPPS over 3 years to provide materials at a flat rate and assist with the evaluation of data in the next three years (2012-2015)
Pathways to Identification for Acceleration Services

District Norms

- Top 10% in each battery district-wide
  - verbal, non-verbal, quantitative

Building/Community Norms

- Top 10% identified for each school

Portfolio Review Process
Talent Development and Acceleration Services Logic Model

Saint Paul Public Schools
Gifted and Talented
Identification Process
Using the CogAT7

District Level Norm Top 10%

Non-Verbal (figure matrices / paper folding)
Quantitative (number analogies)
Verbal (picture analogies / sentence completion)
Standard Age Score (Derived score)

Building Level Norm Top 10%

Saint Paul Public Schools Local Norms

District norms will be created by using all three batteries of the CogAT7 to assess students' individual strengths. All of the district's students' raw scores in each category will be rank-ordered. The top 10% from each category will be identified as gifted. This approach allows for both the asynchronies of many gifted learners and possible variables in learning styles that may be related to culture and ethnicity.

Building norms will be created for each building. The building norms allow for each individual school to recognize the top 10% of their student population. Building norms will be developed by rank ordering the CogAT7's Standard Age Score (derived score) and identifying the top 10%.
## Impact of CogAT7 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Category</th>
<th>District Totals</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified for acceleration services (6,510 students tested across all grades)</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal battery total identified (all grades)</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative battery total identified (all grades)</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal battery total identified (all grades)</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

718 students identified for acceleration services that would not have been identified using NNAT2
Conclusions regarding CogAT7 Results

- The results of the CogAT7 gave SPPS staff a wealth of data for each student with a completed profile.

- Families received information from this assessment that can allow them to partner more closely in their child’s learning process.

- While the racial demographic outcomes did not vary greatly from our NNAT results in the nonverbal portion, students whose strengths lay in the quantitative and verbal areas were also identified for acceleration services.
Challenges during First Administration of CogAT7

- Longer amount of testing time needed (90 minutes to two hours or more) requiring schools to use additional resources (i.e. Staff, not G/T specialist)

- Very challenging for kindergarten students to stay focused/engaged

- More training necessary for teachers or those who administer the assessment for the first time

- Inconsistent use of testing practices and materials

- Administering the CogAT7 with fidelity
TDAS: Goals for the Future

- Support the alignment of accelerated services district-wide to provide foundational offerings with fidelity for all students.
- Continue to use multiple measurements to illustrate and enhance students’ talents and gifts through the talent development model.
- Encourage use of ability profiles during PLC meetings to inform differentiation needs for students.
- Address concerns raised around administration of CogAT7.
- Provide CogAT7 directions for students in Hmong, Somali, Karen, and Spanish.
TDAS: Goals for the Future (continued)

- Expand the technology scholars and student mentoring pilot programs to assist more students of color in their successful completion of advanced courses
- Deepen Elementary and Middle schools opportunity pathways to increase student preparation for honor and rigorous courses
- Engage communities in the development of culturally relevant practices to enhance students academic success
- Evaluate the use and impact of CogAT7 after second and third years of implementation
- Continue the quest for equity and excellence through increased access and ongoing review of systemic practices
Profile of English Learners in Saint Paul Public Schools

Report Prepared by
Departments of Multilingual Learners
Research, Evaluation and Assessment

April 2013
English Learners (EL) Definition

• Identifying EL students
  – Students whose home language is not English.
  – These students are assessed with W-APT and meet criteria for EL services.
• Exiting EL students
  – EL students who scored proficient in ACCESS, MCA Reading, or GRAD.
• SPPS identification for EL services is not limited to those eligible for EL funding.
• 36% of SPPS students are EL
• SPPS accounts for 18% of the entire EL population in Minnesota
• This year, the EL population dropped to 30%
  • This is largely due to a change in exit criteria
• SPPS saw a large increase in its EL population in the late 1990’s due to a better identification process.
• The last three years SPPS experienced a decrease in the number of EL students it served.
• In later slides we will see how that has changed.
• 130 languages are spoken by SPPS students. However, the 5 most common languages are spoken by 90% of the EL students.
• Hmong continues to be the most common primary language spoken in the homes of SPPS EL students.
• Spanish, Karen, Somali and Vietnamese are the next 4 most common languages spoken by EL students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL Level</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5 - Bridging** | - specialized or technical language of the content areas  
- a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in extended oral or written discourse, including stories, essays, or reports  
- oral or written language approaching comparability to that of English-proficient peers when presented with grade-level material |
| **4 - Expanding** | - specific and some technical language of the content areas  
- a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in oral discourse or multiple, related sentences or paragraphs  
- oral or written language with minimal phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that do not impede the overall meaning of the communication when presented with oral or written connected discourse with sensory, graphic, or interactive support |
| **3 - Developing** | - general and some specific language of the content areas  
- expanded sentences in oral interaction or written paragraphs  
- oral or written language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that may impede the communication, but retain much of its meaning, when presented with oral or written, narrative, or expository descriptions with sensory, graphic, or interactive support |
| **2 - Beginning** | - general language related to the content areas  
- phrases or short sentences  
- oral or written language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that often impede the meaning of the communication when presented with one to multiple-step commands, directions, questions, or a series of statements with sensory, graphic, or interactive support |
| **1 - Entering** | - pictorial or graphic representation of the language of the content areas  
- words, phrases, or chunks of language when presented with one-step commands, directions, WH-, choice, or yes/no questions, or statements with sensory, graphic, or interactive support  
- oral language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that often impede meaning when presented with basic oral commands, direct questions, or simple statement with sensory, graphic or interactive support |
• Over the last 4 years SPPS has seen a dramatic increase in the percent of students receiving level 1 and 5 services.
  – The spike in level one is due to the closing of the Karen refugee camps in Thailand.
  – The spike in level five is due to including years in the US schools in the level calculation so that students who have been here longer will not be placed in lower levels (e.g. students who have been in US schools more than 3 years cannot be placed in level 1)
• The percent of EL students that are Karen has gone up 211% since 2008.
  – This is due to the closing of the refugee camps in Thailand
• The percent of EL students speaking other languages has decreased over the last 5 years.
• Approximately 87% of EL students are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch.
• EL students are highly likely to come from low income families.
• 13% of the EL population receives Special Ed services
  – The most common disability codes for EL students are LD and Speech/Language which make up 60% of EL students who are also Special Ed.
• This is lower than the SPPS placement rate of 20% for all students.
• The number of years participating in EL services increases with age as older students require longer time to acquire academic English language proficiency.
In nearly all grades we see increase in results as the level increases. This suggests that students are being correctly placed in levels and teachers with help from EL staff are differentiating to meet the needs of the students. This clearly shows that as EL students approach level 5 they are either catching up with or exceeding non-EL students. After one year of exiting the EL program exited students are on par with their non-EL peers.
• Older EL students take longer to achieve grade level mastery.
  – This is demonstrated in the MAP Reading RIT.
• After one year of exiting the EL program, exited students in grades 7 and 8 are on par with their non-EL peers.
• Grade 9 exited EL students are very close to their non-EL peers.
• The EL graduation rate for SPPS students is 13 points higher than the state EL graduation rate.
• The SPPS EL graduation rate is slightly higher than the total SPPS rate.
Level 4 and 5 EL students are passing the GRAD writing test at a higher rate than Non-EL students.

- EL students are progressing and moving out of EL services.

A surprising number of level 1 and 2 students pass the GRAD writing test
Level 4 and 5 students are passing the GRAD Reading at a higher rate than level 1-3 students.
• EL students have very low pass rates on the GRAD math test.
  – Level 4 and 5 students pass the test at higher rates than lower level students.
  – The EL support for level 1-3 EL students is focused on language acquisition.
In nearly every grade SPPS EL students outperform state EL students on the MCA Reading.

The gap between the state and SPPS increases in the higher grades.
• In grades 5-8, SPPS EL students are either equal or exceed the state EL performance.
• Math performance decreases as the grade level increases.
• In grades 6 and 7, the performance of SPPS EL students exceeds the performance of the state EL population.
Currently, a majority of LA enrollment are in grades 1 and 2. The numbers for this year (Fall 2012) are from fall enrollment (not a full year). – The number of students will increase by Spring 2013.
• SPPS exited 40% of LA students in the Fall of 2012 due to test results and the 2 year cap.
  – The majority of LA exited students continue to receive EL services
SPPS exited 25% of its EL students in the Fall of 2012.
Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) Report

• 3 Objectives
  1. Progress toward English Language Proficiency
  2. Attainment of English Language Proficiency
  3. Academic Achievement and Success (in Reading and Math)

• SPPS made AMAO for FY12
  – This is the first time SPPS made AMAO in 5 years
• In all but grade 12, the attendance rate of EL students is higher than or equal to the attendance rate of non-EL students.
• ELs make up 36% of the SPPS population yet only 13% of given suspensions.
The highest rates of suspension of EL students are in grades 5, 9 and 10. In grades KG, 1, 3, 4 and 12 EL students account for less than 10% of the suspensions in each grade.
Conclusion

• The characteristics and needs of the SPPS EL population are changing.
• The EL picture is nuanced with ranging needs from language acquisition to academic support to special education services.
• SPPS EL students are making the gains needed to be successful academically once they exit EL services.
• On most EL indicators, SPPS EL students are leading statewide EL students.
• There is still work to be done to narrow the gap between EL and non-EL populations.
• The data show the EL program is heading in the right direction.
FY14 General Fund Budget for Schools

“Funding Strong Schools Strong Communities – Year Three”

Marie Schrul
Controller
April 2, 2013
Purpose

To provide overview/information on the FY14 General Fund budget to the COB in preparation of releasing general fund budget allocations to schools.
Agenda

• General Fund FY14 Big Picture
• Fund Balance
• Budget Direction
• Staffing the Schools
• Other Influencing Factors
### FY14 General Fund Big Picture - Revenue (Includes $9.0M Referendum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>$483,711,915</td>
<td>$494,776,150</td>
<td>$11,064,235</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Fund
### Factors Impacting Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>$483.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Increase (364 PU)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss in Integration Revenue</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEB Levy Reduction</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Referendum Increase</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Revenue Trend</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party Billing Trend</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated FY14 Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$494.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY14 General Fund
### Big Picture - Expenditure
(Includes $9.0M Referendum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>$237,132,479</td>
<td>$242,766,252</td>
<td>$5,633,774</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Service Support</td>
<td>162,923,621</td>
<td>178,475,029</td>
<td>15,551,408</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-wide Support</td>
<td>86,071,657</td>
<td>87,483,446</td>
<td>1,411,789</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>4,484,159</td>
<td>4,212,106</td>
<td>-272,053</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$490,611,916</td>
<td>$512,936,833</td>
<td>$22,324,918</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# General Fund
## Factors Impacting Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted FY13 Budget</td>
<td>$490.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Rollover &amp; Adjustment Cost</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add New Additional Support for SSSC</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add New Referendum</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed FY14 Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$512.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Additional Support for SSSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Opening New Buildings</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Prep Time</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Period Day Implementation</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# General Fund FY14 Fund Balance Recap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Revenue</td>
<td>$494.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Expenditure</td>
<td>(512.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Use of Fund Balance</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Unassigned Fund Balance</td>
<td>$29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Unassigned Fund Balance</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fund Balance Explanation

• Fund Balance is a residual, assets over liabilities (think of it as equity).
• Fund balance can be part restricted and part unrestricted.
• Additional revenue will increase fund balance while additional expenditure will decrease it.
• It plays an essential role to mitigate current and future risks.
• Unrestricted balance level is crucial in the long term financial planning.
• Credit agencies monitor unassigned fund balance to determine creditworthiness. They favor increased level of fund balance.
• It is highly recommended by the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) to establish a formal fund balance policy.
Fund Balance Explanation – Cont.

- SPPS Board policy sets unassigned fund balance at 5% of GF expenditure.
- GFOA recommends minimum of 2 months of regular operating expense. This translates to $85.6M, or 16.6% of GF.
Budget Direction/Impacts

• Racial equity lens applied to budget process. Embedded in staffing criteria
• FY14 budget focuses foremost on funding to implement SSSC
• Additional support to schools
• Embedded Professional Development (PD)
• Enhanced staffing in certain areas
• Additional money for SSSC initiatives
Staffing the Schools

Year 3 Funding for SSSC
## SSSC Class Size Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Target Ranges</th>
<th>FY14 Projected Average Class Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG – 1</td>
<td>24 - 27</td>
<td>23.9 – 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>24 - 28</td>
<td>24.0 – 25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>25.0 – 28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>29.5 – 32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 12</td>
<td>32 - 35</td>
<td>31.9 – 35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY14 Staffing Criteria

Site Configurations

- PreK – 5
- K – 8
- Dual Campus
- 6 – 8
- 6 – 12
- 9 - 12

Staffing Categories

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Administrative Intern
- Clerk
  - Minimum
  - Additional 10 month
  - Mobility
  - Attendance
- Learning Support
- Intervention Specialist
Other Influencing Factors

• Governor’s proposal
• Legislature
• Sequestration
• 3rd quarter projections
## FY14 Budget Adoption Proposed Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26FEB</td>
<td>Presentation of Schedule to District leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05MAR</td>
<td>Presentation of macro budget picture to Committee of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02APR</td>
<td><strong>FY14 Budget Update II to Committee of the Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05APR</td>
<td>Distribute school budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08APR – 24APR</td>
<td>Presentations to principals, teachers’ union, DPAC, community –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information will be forthcoming on the schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12APR</td>
<td>Distribute tools and worksheet to General Fund programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25APR</td>
<td>School budgets returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29APR</td>
<td>General Fund budgets returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07MAY</td>
<td><strong>FY14 Budget Presentation to Committee of the Board (including Budget Book)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18JUN</td>
<td>Budget adopted by Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>02APR13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
## Saint Paul Public Schools
### BOARD REPRESENTATION AT GRADUATIONS 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE/SCHOOL</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>GREETINGS &amp; DIPLOMAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, May 31</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Bridge View Gym</td>
<td>Anne Carroll (Tentatively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, June 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Aldrich Arena</td>
<td>Louise Seeba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Parks/AGAPE</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Roy Wilkins Auditorium</td>
<td>Keith Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Roy Wilkins Auditorium</td>
<td>Elona Street-Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, June 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Roy Wilkins Auditorium</td>
<td>Jean O'Connell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Secondary</td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Washington Tech Great Hall</td>
<td>Anne Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Roy Wilkins Auditorium</td>
<td>Mary Doran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, June 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>School Site Café</td>
<td>Elona Street-Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Roy Wilkins Auditorium</td>
<td>John Brodrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open World</td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>School Site Café</td>
<td>Anne Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Como Park</td>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Roy Wilkins Auditorium</td>
<td>Mary Doran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, June 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>LEAP (Wilson Gym)</td>
<td>Mary Doran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbs</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Highland Park Senior High</td>
<td>Anne Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri, May 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somali, Latino &amp; Karen Seniors Washington Great Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri, May 17</td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>African American Seniors DS Event Center 415 Pascal Street North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun, May 19</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Celebration of Excellence University of St. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs, May 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat, August 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Graduation Ceremony University of St. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER JUNIOR & SENIOR HIGH RECOGNITION EVENTS**
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625  
Saint Paul, Minnesota  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Administration Building  
360 Colborne Street  

January 1, 2014  
5:45 PM  

A G E N D A  

I. CALL TO ORDER  
II. ROLL CALL  
III. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA  
   A. Order of the Consent Agenda  
   B. Order of the Main Agenda  
IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES  
   A. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of ___, 2013  
V. COMMITTEE REPORTS  
   A. Committee of the Board Meeting of ___, 2013  
VI. RECOGNITIONS  
   (Time Certain 6:30 p.m.)  
   A. Acknowledgement of Good Work Provided by Outstanding District Employees and Departments  
   B. Acknowledgement of Good Work Provided by Outstanding District Schools  
   C. Acknowledgement of Accomplishments of SPPS Students  
VII. PUBLIC COMMENT  
   (Time Certain 7:00 p.m.)  
VIII. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT  
   A. Human Resource Transactions  
IX. CONSENT AGENDA  
   The Consent Agenda Items below fall under one or more of the following Strategic Plan Goals: 1) Achievement, 2) Alignment and 3) Sustainability.  
   A. Gifts  
   B. Grants  
   C. Contracts  
   D. Agreements  
   E. Administrative Items  
      1. Recommendations for Exclusion of Students in Non-Compliance with Minnesota Statute 123.70 Health Standards: Immunizations  
      2. Monthly Operating Authority  
   F. Bids  
X. OLD BUSINESS  
XI. NEW BUSINESS  
XII. BOARD OF EDUCATION  
   A. Information Requests & Responses  
   B. Items for Future Agendas  
   C. Board of Education Reports/Communications  
XIII. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE  
   A. Board of Education Meetings (5:45 unless otherwise noted)  
   B. Committee of the Board Meetings (4:30 unless otherwise noted)  
XIV. ADJOURNMENT