

04 - 0417

Minnesota
Department
of **Education**

**Staff Development
Report of District
and Site Results and
Expenditures for
2002-2003**

July 2004

**Report
To the
Legislature**

**As required by
Minn. Stat. §
122A.60**



**Report to the
Legislature**

Staff
Development
Report of District
& Site Results
and Expenditures
for 2002-2003

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

**Beth Aune, Director
Academic Standards &
Professional Development
651.582.8751
beth.aune@state.mn.us**

**As required by
Minnesota
Statutes MS
122A.60**

July 2004

**Minnesota Department of Education
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113-4266
TTY: (800) 627-3529 OR (651) 582-8201**

Upon request, this report can be made available in alternative formats.

**FY 2003 LEGISLATIVE REPORT
ON
STAFF DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURES AND RESULTS**

Estimated Cost of Preparing This Report

This report provides information that is maintained and published as Minnesota Rules by the Office of Revisor of Statutes as a part of its normal business functions. Therefore, the cost information reported below does not include the cost of gathering the data but rather is limited to the estimated cost of actually analyzing the data, determining recommendations and preparing this report document.

Special funding was not appropriated for the costs of preparing this report.

The estimated cost incurred by the Minnesota Department of Education in preparing this report is \$3,470.00.

Staff Development Report of District and Site Results and Expenditures

The 2002 –2003 Staff Development Report has been prepared as required by Minnesota Statutes, 122A.60, subdivision 1. Subdivision 1 includes requirements for using revenue as authorized for in-service education programs (MS 124A.29 and MS 120B.22, subdivision 2), establishing a staff development committee (roles and composition of committee) and reporting requirements for districts (staff development results and expenditures). This report describes the processes used to collect and report staff development results and expenditure information; identifies the frequency of staff development activities as related to the six staff development legislative goals (MS, section 122A.60, subdivision 3); analysis of district reports; and expenditure data.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	Page 3
Part I: Staff Development Program Report	Page 5
Part II: Staff Development Expenditure Report	Page 11

Appendices

A. Staff Development Unfunded Reserve Balances	Page 16
B. Unit-By-Unit Staff Development Account Chart	Page 17
C. Program Report Format	Page 27

(See http://education.state.mn.us/html/intro_prof_report_info.htm if using electronic version of full report)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2003-2004 Legislative Report

High quality staff development in every school is the goal for Minnesota. Our journey is reflected in a question by Carl Glickman, Chair of the Program for School Improvement at the University of Georgia, "How do teaching and learning improve?" For him the answer is no mystery. It's as simple as this: I cannot improve my craft in isolation from others. To improve, I must have formats, structures, and plans for reflecting on, changing, and assessing my practice [which ...] must be continually tested and upgraded with my colleagues." (Glickman, Leadership for Learning, p 4)¹

The 2002-2003 Staff Development Report provides information regarding the process for collecting and reporting staff development expenditures and reported results; findings from data submitted on staff development expenditures; implementation of legislative goals; and conclusions regarding staff development goals, design/structure, evaluation; and expenditures.

Expenditure information for the fiscal year 2003 report indicated that staff development expenditures were *\$100,300,423*. This includes the staff development set aside of 2% from basic revenue, whether it's new set-aside money or from reserves, and other funds available from the general fund. The data in this report is taken from all data submitted to the Department of Education (MDE) by March 19, 2004. Of that amount:

- 36.37% of staff development expenditures were distributed to sites;
- 12.14% of staff development expenditures were awarded as exemplary grants;
- 18.84% of staff development expenditures were utilized for district-wide initiatives;
- 21.59% of staff development expenditures were for curriculum development; and
- 11.18% of staff development expenditures were for other staff development activities.

The staff development report was submitted by 92% (315) of school districts. Of the 343 districts in Minnesota, 19% (65) reported that their licensed teachers and the school board had agreed to set aside less than the 2% allowed in MS, section 122A.61. Districts spent 32.7 million dollars outside the parameters of the 2% set-aside funds.

The 2002-2003 report reflects site and district goals, staff development content, designs and structures used, and results. In addition, districts reported which of the six legislative goals were being addressed in their district goals.

Conclusions that can be drawn from the reports include:

- Improving student achievement continues to be the highest staff development priority.
- Many districts reported staff development goals aligned with the districts' improvement goals. 20% more districts this year than the previous year reported district improvement goals. Additionally, more goals were written in specific measurable language.
- Workshops/conferences continue to be a popular design for delivery of staff development. However, there continues to be a movement to on-the-job (embedded) learning in the form of study groups, action research, and looking at student work.

- Most districts reported that they evaluate their staff development program. Reported data sources and findings indicate there is a need for continued training on evaluation tools and processes.

The goal of staff development is to improve the quality of teaching so that the quality of student learning improves. This means that schools must be able to identify areas in student performance that need improvement, choose interventions and teaching techniques that are likely to have a positive effect, assist educators in learning to use the interventions and techniques, and measure improvements in student achievement. Statewide initiatives conducted by MDE continue to provide training and support to staff developers to improve their practices, which ultimately impact student learning.

¹ Phi Delta Kappan (February 2004). Glickman, *Leadership for Learning*, 4.
From <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k0402sch.htm>

PART I

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM REPORT

Process for Reporting and Collecting Staff Development Program Results

Districts and site staff development results are reported to the commissioner and were collected by the Professional Development staff in the division of Academic Standards and Professional Development. To provide a systematic collection process, districts were provided with a reporting format (See Appendix B) that addressed staff development efforts at the district and site levels. The report format included (1) a statement of assurances certifying that the district was in compliance with legislative stipulations and (2) forms reporting district and site goals and activities. To assist district reporting using the state form, the form is posted as a downloadable Microsoft Word document at http://education.state.mn.us/html/intro_staff_dev.htm. At the time of the printing of this report, 92% (316) out of 343 school districts had filed a report. Six reports were received from charter schools even though they are not required to file a staff development report. Eight percent of schools districts did not submit a report:

Benson, Campbell-Tintah, Carlton, Columbia Heights, Cook County, Evansville, Franconia, Greenway, Goodridge, Hendricks, Henning, Hills-Beaver Creek, Ivanhoe, Janesville-Waldorf-Pemberton, Lakeview, Long Prairie-Grey Eagle, Mountain Iron-Buhl, Naswauk-Keewatin, Nicollet, Orono, Park Rapids, Prinsburg, Rockford, Sibley East, Staples-Motley, Verndale, and Willow River.

2002-2003 Reporting Format

For 2002-2003 the reporting format clearly reflects site and district goals, staff development content, designs/structures used, and results.

The reporting forms that districts submitted to the Minnesota Department of Education were:

- Statement of Assurances
- Committee Membership
- District Level Staff Development form (one form per goal)
- Site Level Staff Development form (one form per goal)

Districts were asked to report district level staff development as well as the staff development that occurred at each site. District and site goals were reported on a separate form. In order to gather more relevant information, the following were collected:

- School Board Improvement Outcomes
- Staff Development Goals
- Staff Development Content and Designs/Structures
- Evaluation Information

Two copies of the districts' reports were collected and recorded by the Professional Development staff by September 30, 2003 and filed at MDE. Tracking the receipt of staff development reports was accomplished by establishing a database that included demographic

information and the date the report was received. Districts not meeting the deadline were contacted and encouraged to submit reports.

Addressing Legislative Goals

Districts recorded which of the six Legislative goals were addressed in their district goals. The staff development goals listed in Minnesota Statutes, Section 122A.60, division 3 are as follows:

“The plan shall include ongoing staff development activities that contribute toward continuous improvement in achievement of the following goals:

1. improve student achievement of state and local education standards in all areas of the curriculum by using best practices methods;
2. effectively meet the needs of a diverse student population, including at-risk children, children with disabilities, and gifted children, within the regular classroom and other settings;
3. provide an inclusive curriculum for a racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse student population that is consistent with the state education diversity rule and the district’s education diversity plan;
4. improve staff ability to collaborate and consult with one another and to resolve conflicts;
5. effectively teach and model violence prevention policy and curriculum that address issues of harassment and teach nonviolent alternatives for conflict resolution; and provide teachers and other members of site-based management teams with appropriate management and financial management skills.”

Report Form Analysis

District and Site Goal Setting

Districts and sites can indicate on the form if they are working on a single-year or a multi-year goal. An improvement target can take more than a single year to show growth and change.

Goals should be aligned within the system. The report asks for:

1. School Board Improvement Outcomes. At the time the Staff Development Reports were submitted several districts indicated that their school boards had not set improvement goals for the 2002-2003 school year. As a part of the statewide training sponsored by the Department of Education during the fall of 2002, focus was on developing measurable goals. Since that training, several school districts indicated that their districts were now setting up a process that would show alignment between the School Board, district and site goals.
2. Data and Reasons for Selecting the Staff Development Goal. Several districts indicated that statewide testing results were the most frequently used data source to establish a focus for their goals. For example, several districts used the results from the MCA assessments at grades 3 and 5. However, districts reported that they also used other sources such as surveys, focus groups, and classroom assessments to evidence need.
3. District or Site Staff Development Goal. Following are some examples of goals from District Staff Development Reports:
 - Collaboration between regular and special education staff;

- Research and develop a working research-based middle level curriculum and implementation;
- Review reading scope and sequence and make appropriate adjustments to the curriculum;

For the most part, reported goals were not specific or measurable. District staff who attended the regional staff development workshops during the 2002-2003 school year practiced writing SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound) goals and indicated that this would improve goals developed and submitted in the future.

Designs/Structures Used to Deliver District Staff Development Programs

During 2002-2003, many Minnesota school district staff developers have become familiar with new ideas and strategies to improve learning in schools. Despite years of research and best practice, many schools and districts have offered staff development that is one-shot, front-end development of knowledge and skill with insufficient long term follow-up, resources, or structures to promote deep change. Staff development that produces results for students requires extensive opportunities for ongoing learning, collaborative dialogue, shared work, deep reflection and practices with continued support.

Minnesota school districts were introduced to a wide range of powerful designs for delivering staff development during the 2002-2003 statewide workshops sponsored by the Department of Education and the Systems Integration Project at Intermediate District 287 and delivered by Professional Development staff. These designs are aligned with the National Staff Development Council's Revised Standards (2002) and are highlighted in *The Journal of Staff Development*, Vol. 20, Number 3 (Summer 1999). These designs/structures are a reportable category on the State Staff Development Program Report Form. The designs/structures hold great promise for improving adult learning and, ultimately, for improving student achievement.

Evaluation Information

Districts and sites were asked to report evaluation of their staff development programs at five distinctive levels. The levels, defined by Thomas Guskey in his book, *Evaluating Professional Development*, are:

1. Participants' Reaction/Awareness (Did they like it? Was it worthwhile?)
2. Participants' Learning (Did the participants acquire the intended learning goal? Did they learn the content?)
3. Organization Support and Learning (Are teachers supported at the site level with any of the following: resources, a culture of openness and risk-taking, administrative support, collegial support, recognition of success, provisions of time?)
4. Participants' Use of Knowledge and Skills (Did the participants incorporate the new learning in teaching practice: Are you able to see the learning in the new practice?)
5. Student Learning Outcomes (Did the implementation of the teacher learning from the staff development activity have an impact on student learning and achievement? Are students more confident as learners as a result?)

While most districts reported that they gathered evaluation information for all five levels, examination of the reported data sources and findings indicate that little intentional effort was

made to ensure that evidence was gathered and analyzed from all levels. When asked for specific data sources and findings, districts described information from only level one, participant reaction, and level five, student outcomes as evidenced on statewide tests. This leads to a generalization that districts do not know if participants understand new content/skills or if the newly acquired knowledge and skills are being applied in classrooms.

Samples of Reported Findings

- Most teachers improved professional practice in areas of instruction and assessment.
- Teachers reported learning new strategies and teaching methods.
- MCA's in grade 3 indicate significant gain from 1378 to 1451 during 1998-2001.
- Student achievement is directly affected by staff collaboration.
- Identified opportunities for integration or overlap in curriculum.
- The enGauge survey (district selected instrument) results indicated that technology use is sufficient, but its use in communicating to the public could be improved.

Best Practice Grants to Sites

The financial expenditures listed under Finance Code 307 – Best Practice Grants to Sites (\$12,180,028) reflects 12.14% of staff development expenditures, a slight increase from the 10.58% reported the previous year. Nevertheless, the 12.14% figure is less than half of the expected 25%. Although districts were asked to describe the criteria used to select those grants on the program report submitted in September, most districts did not include this information in their reports. Districts continue to struggle with processes for identifying and awarding best practice grants.

Current Challenges

A continuing concern with reporting staff development expenditures and results is that data is collected and reported in two separate formats (UFARS data and program report) by different departments within the school district. The Minnesota Staff Development Plan Checklist requests districts and sites to link expenditures with staff development activities and outcomes. In spite of this limitation, the financial expenditures and the staff development reports have provided information identifying what is happening in school districts across the state. This information is guiding continuing technical assistance and the types of information requested.

Budget reductions at state and local levels pose significant threats to enhancing the quality of staff development. This is at a time when there is increased accountability for high quality professional development and student achievement as evidenced in the federal “No Child Left Behind” legislation.

Statewide Collaborative Efforts to Support Staff Development

A State Staff Development Advisory Committee, appointed by the commissioner of the Department of Education, advises the commissioner about staff development policy including recommendations for revision of current legislation. In addition, the committee serves in an advisory and coordinating capacity for MDE, Education Minnesota, and other statewide organizations. This group, representing the Minnesota School Boards Association, Minnesota

Elementary School Principals' Association, Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, Minnesota Rural Education Association, Education Minnesota, Minnesota Association of School Administrators, Minnesota Staff Development Council, and the Minnesota Department of Education, have collected questions regarding implementation of staff development statutes and disseminated two documents with agreed-upon responses to those "Frequently Asked Questions."

MDE organized and conducted a series of three workshops during the 2002-2003 school year. The workshops focused on recent research and tools to support planning, implementing and evaluating staff development. The workshops were designed to infuse the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) Standards for Staff Development into district staff development efforts. In addition, tools for gathering and analyzing data, selecting appropriate interventions, using a variety of designs and structures, and evaluating staff development programs were introduced.

The three one-year best practice grants awarded to Education Minnesota have been instrumental in creating better understanding about quality professional development. The project, Teachers as Learners and Leaders (TALL), promotes teachers as Professional Development Activists (PDAs) who advocate for high quality professional development experiences. Training for the PDAs focused on curriculum areas of leadership (characteristics and skills needed for teacher leaders, Change (effective models to use with their action plan), and Data Driven Decision-Making (useful school data for staff development planning and action research). During this year the PDAs were responsible for conducting an action research project based on their previous year's action plan.

As a result of these collaborative efforts, teachers and administrators indicate that they are receiving consistent messages and training about staff development from various groups and organizations. They also indicate that training and tools developed and disseminated by the various groups is focusing and supporting effective use of staff development resources of time and dollars. Staff development teams are becoming more purposeful in gathering multiple sources of information to determine direction.

The newly created guidelines from the federal government regarding the definition of "high quality professional development" give a clearer understanding to districts of where they ought to target their scarce resources. Change and maintenance continue to be problematic at the district and site level, with evaluation of staff development efforts really in the incubation stages across the state.

Doing more with less is always the challenge. Whether it be dollars or time, the stakes are higher and the numbers of challenges are increasing. Continued state level support in terms of training and technical assistance about research in professional development is vital if we want to demonstrate a link between professional development and student achievement.

The Challenge Ahead

One fundamental lesson learned in the past decade of professional development reform efforts is that far more time is required for professional development and cooperative work than is now available. In fact, continues to be a key issue in every analysis of school change appearing in the

the last decade (Fullan & Miles, 1992)². Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform must address the additional challenges of implementing educational standards, working with diverse populations, and understanding a variety of student assessments, including Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments. Clearly, teachers need more time to work with colleagues, to examine the new standards being proposed, and to revise curriculum. They need opportunities to develop, master, and reflect on new approaches to working with children." (Corcoran, 1995)²

² North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (1997). *Critical Issue: Finding Time for Professional Development*

<http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/profdevl/pd300.htm>

PART II

STAFF DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE REPORT-FY03

System for Collecting and Reporting Expenditure Data

District expenditures are reported to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) using the Uniform Financial Accounting and Reporting Standards (UFARS) system. The UFARS coding system requires districts to track and report sources of funds and how they were expended. This report utilized data reported by specific finance, program, and object dimensions of the UFARS system that impacted requirements of staff development legislation. The UFARS system contains seventeen (17) digits arranged by six dimensions.

Finance Dimension of UFARS

The finance dimension is used to track the relationship between the source of certain funds and their use, and/or to track the relationship between the source of certain funds and a reserve account. Since the statute required a district to set aside 2% of its basic revenue (except in specific situations) for use in staff development activities (reserved for only that type of activity), it was necessary to track the particular use of those monies and track unspent funds to a reserve account for staff development. The finance dimension codes 306, 307 and 308 were used to capture those relationships. See **Figure 1** for a description of the finance dimension codes used in this report.

Code	Title and Definition
000	District-wide: Record revenue and expenditures when a specific finance code is not required
306	50% Site: Staff development expenditures at the site
307	25% Grants: Staff development expenditures for best practices at the sites
308	25% District-Wide: Staff development expenditures for district-wide activities

Figure 1: Selected UFARS Finance Dimension Codes

The 2003 legislative session removed the 2% set-aside mandate for FY 2004. It was still in effect for FY 2003.

Program Dimension of UFARS

The finance codes can be used with particular program codes to designate funds used for staff development. Program code 640 is the designation for staff development. Program code 610 is the designation for curriculum development which is an activity that could also receive staff development fund support. Districts may also use these program codes to designate that funds are used for staff development, but noting that those funds were not part of the 2% set aside. In those cases, the finance code 000 would be used with program codes 640 or 610, instead of the finance codes 306,307 and 308. However, a finance code of 451 must be used in the case of

federal charter development grant funds. See **Figure 2** for a brief description of the program dimension codes used in this report.

Code	Title and Definition
610	Curriculum Consultant and Development: Professional and technical assistance in curriculum consultation and development. This includes preparing and utilizing curriculum materials, training in the various techniques of motivating pupils, and instruction-related research and evaluation done by consultants.
640	Staff Development: Activities designed to contribute to professional growth of instructional staff members during their service to the school districts. This includes costs associated with workshops, in-service training, and travel.

Figure 2: Selected UFARS Program Dimension Codes

Object Dimension of UFARS

The object dimension codes are used to provide the most detail of all the reported UFARS dimensions. This dimension defines the specific object of the purchase including salaries, benefits, travel and dues. See **Figure 3** for a brief definition of the object dimension codes used.

Code	Title and Definitions
100 series	Salaries
200 series	Personnel benefits
300 series	Purchased services, consulting fees, travel and conventions
400 series	Supplies and materials
500 series	Capital expenditures including leases
800 series	Other expenditures including dues and memberships

Figure 3: Selected UFARS Object Dimension Codes

The data contained on the next pages is taken from all data submitted to MDE by March 19, 2004. The statutory deadline for reporting final UFARS data was November 30, 2003. However, a large number of districts continued to load data after that date. The data also reflects the current balance sheet codes for specific reserve accounts.

Findings from Data Submitted on Staff Development Expenditures

The following three tables contain summary information on staff development expenditures and balances for 341 regular school districts, two (2) common school districts, 87 charter schools and three (3) intermediate units. The data is arranged by Finance and Program Codes in **Table 1** and by Object Codes in **Table 2**. **Table 3** contains summary information on balances in reserved staff development accounts. **Table 3** also contains a comparison of balances from FY02 to FY03.

Expenditures by Finance and Program Dimension

The statute on staff development required specific percentages of allocation of the 2% set aside basic revenue. The table below contains summary information on the amount of money spent by the set-aside categories of site, grant and district, whether it was new set-aside money or from reserves. There were other funds available to districts from the general fund. Those expenditures are reported under Program Dimension Code 610 (curriculum) and Program Dimension Code 640 (staff development) with Finance Dimension Code 000. The percents in FY 2003 are almost identical to the percents of total spent by code in FY2002.

Table One: Summary Data of Staff Development Expenditures by Finance Dimension and Program Dimension for FY03

Finance/Program Codes	Total Funds Spent	Percent of Total Spent
Finance 306 (50% site)	\$36,478,460	36.37%
Finance 307 (25% grant)	\$12,180,028	12.14%
Finance 308 (25% district)	\$18,941,338	18.84%
Program 610 (curriculum)	\$21,542,786	21.59%
Program 640 (staff development)	\$11,157,811	11.18%
TOTAL	\$100,300,423	100%

Conclusions from **Table 1** include:

1. The majority of funds, 36% of reported expenditures, was expended through the 50% site set-aside codes.
2. Districts spent 32.7 million dollars outside the parameters of the 2% set aside funds.

Expenditures by Object Dimension

Data reported by object is summarized by four (4) categories: salaries and benefits, purchased services, materials and equipment, and other.

Table Two: Summary Data of Staff Development Expenditures by Object Dimension for FY03

Object Codes	Total Funds Spent	Percent of Total Spent
100-200 Salaries/benefits	\$74,405,784	74.18%
300 Purchased services	\$18,734,428	18.68%
400-500 Materials/equipment	\$6,156,667	6.14%
600-899 All Other	\$1,003,544	1.00%
TOTAL	\$100,300,423	100%

Conclusions that can be drawn from **Table 2** include:

1. The majority of the expenditures for staff development went to salaries and benefits of employees in the reporting units.
2. There were additional personnel dollars spent through the 300 code-purchased services that included consultant fees.

Table Three: Summary Data of Staff Development Balances by Balance Sheet Codes for FY 2 And FY03

Balance Sheet Name	Balances FY02	Balances FY03
403 Regular-Staff Development	\$13,646,971	\$17,722,479
437 Phase out-Staff Development	\$ 397,595	\$ 73,864
438 Phase out-Gifted/Talented	\$ 82,229	\$ 35,952
439 Phase out-Standards	\$1,359,165	\$ 1,108,397
TOTAL	\$15,631,262	\$18,940,692

Conclusions that can be drawn from **Table 3** include:

1. Regular staff development reserves increased by \$4M.
2. The phase out accounts of 437, 438, and 439 were reduced by slightly more than \$1/2M.
3. One district accounted for nearly 80% of the phase-out balances. See **Appendix A**.

Waivers on the 2% Set-Aside Requirement

Districts had the option not to reserve 2% of their basic revenue if one of the following conditions was met through FY 2003:

1. A district may annually waive the requirement to reserve their basic revenue if a majority vote of the licensed teachers in the district and a majority vote of the school board agree to a resolution to waive the requirement. The amount to be waived may be as small or as large as the parties agree.
2. A district in statutory operating debt is exempt from reserving basic revenue for staff development. It may still choose to set aside all or part of the 2% calculation through a unilateral vote of the school board.

During the 2002-2003 school year, 65 of 343 school districts completed a staff development set aside report that declared a degree of variation from the 2% set aside. At the conclusion of FY 2002, there were 33 districts and 6 charter schools in statutory operating debt, qualifying them to be exempt from the set-aside requirement. Most of those units set aside much less than the 2% requirement for staff development.

District by District Statistics

The information contained in **Appendix A** is displayed unit-by-unit and contains the names of the reporting units with positive balances in the phase out staff development reserve accounts. This data was run in March 2004. The staff development reserve accounts of 437, 438, and 439 are no longer funded and cannot go negative. Units were encouraged to spend those funds for regular staff development.

The information contained in **Appendix B** is displayed unit-by-unit. It is the same UFARS information that was aggregated to create **Tables 1, 2** and parts of **Table 3**. Minor differences may occur when comparing data from **Appendix B** and the tables due to round off.

APPENDIX A

Staff Development Unfunded Reserve Balances – FY 2003

This appendix contains the balances of those unfunded reserve accounts by reporting unit. Unit balances of \$200.00 or less were removed from the list. There were 26 reporting units on this list in FY 2002. It has been reduced to 17 units this year.

District Number	District Name	#437 Graduation Standards		#438 Gifted Grad Standards		#439 Graduation Standards	
		Begin Balance	End Balance	Begin Balance	End Balance	Begin Balance	End Balance
11	Anoka-Hennepin	46,924	14,619	14,972	443	1,023,588	942,927
22	Detroit Lakes			6,192	5,912		
173	Mountain Lake			3,263	3,059	26,572	00
284	Wayzata	44,716	21,488	14,419	3,894		
318	Grand Rapids	19,232	14,070			68,734	34,345
330	Heron Lake- Okabena	1,911	00			5,125	1,870
345	New London- Spicer					25,258	2,728
415	Lynd			1,026	1,026	6,417	6,417
466	Dassel-Cokato			12,464	11,811	46,792	46,792
549	Perham			8,088	3,059		
584	Ruthton					10,489	10,207
698	Floodwood	2,605	00	9,014	3,285		
709	Duluth	29,805	14,366				
837	Madelia	6,471	5,713				
2215	Norman County East					41,972	41,972
2689	Pipestone-Jasper					37,390	21,139
2884	Red Rock Central	3,780	3,608	3,463	3,463		
	TOTALS		73,864		35,952		1,108,397

APPENDIX B

Unit By Unit Staff Development Account Chart - FY 2003

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403
1 1 AITKIN	46,186.80	32,682.28	3,500.39	12,424.79	806.89	71,527.48
1 3 MINNEAPOLIS	1,985,429.06	69,460.11	1,664,082.28	141,567.99	1,848,247.76	0
2 1 HILL CITY	32,431.50	19,394.82	17,334.30	414.13	0	0
4 1 MCGREGOR	31,451.35	6,791.47	14,621.68	3,755.78	0	360.99
6 3 SOUTH ST. PAUL	202,348.39	79,142.93	94,123.04	85,740.09	0	14,978.00
11 1 ANOKA-HENNEPIN	1,328,187.68	82,744.60	577,154.07	1,531,613.92	190,046.07	2,738,748.00
12 1 CENTENNIAL	436,457.50	38,258.58	223,874.83	215,976.14	0	99,105.06
13 1 COLUMBIA HEIGHTS	7,891.26		8,585.10	85,351.09	2,298.50	40,269.90
14 1 FRIDLEY	325,673.77		0	24,704.69	0	0
15 1 ST. FRANCIS	215,432.97	131,786.11	142,484.32	72,621.11	10,553.90	122,346.60
16 1 SPRING LAKE PARK	180,419.78	91,538.67	90,598.11	247,673.69	1,308.65	0
22 1 DETROIT LAKES	76,278.58	22,702.59	123,841.12	45	0	53,448.57
23 1 FRAZEE	62,620.98	20,346.93	32,402.77	78,645.94	0	45,495.62
25 1 PINE POINT	2,792.35	1,396.17	1,396.17	0	18,118.00	0
31 1 BEMIDJI	97,924.43	61,891.72	50,277.93	15,782.22	0	185,706.58
32 1 BLACKDUCK	46,370.84	1,288.62	2,034.80	0	0	31,311.16
36 1 KELLIHER	5,321.23		7,470.26	0	32,596.03	16,482.93
38 1 RED LAKE	49,053.04	28,891.67	9,269.95	0	281,310.02	141,675.94
47 1 SAUK RAPIDS	318,973.42		54,200.27	156,489.85	17,892.86	0
51 1 FOLEY	96,360.39	34,223.52	33,789.51	22,856.36	5,900.68	57,574.76
62 1 ORTONVILLE	29,498.88	14,428.35	13,260.76	0	0	0.41
75 1 ST. CLAIR	37,172.45	19,237.60	18,082.81	0	0	0
77 1 MANKATO	138,944.34	22,200.95	71,628.48	314,822.28	53,512.25	33,406.71
81 1 COMFREY	14,122.77	3,018.63	1,109.92	0	202.37	0
84 1 SLEEPY EYE	29,299.55	9,360.51	16,570.31	0	0	12,269.63
85 1 SPRINGFIELD	37,221.76	18,611.00	18,611.30	0	0	0
88 1 NEW ULM	87,381.07	30,431.29	64,222.55	61,068.76	11,350.47	220,327.38
91 1 BARNUM	24,782.32	17,067.31	10,546.52	0	0	35,857.20
93 1 CARLTON	4,322.26	46.94	2,877.56	20,752.74	0	10,320.42
94 1 CLOQUET	134,268.60	15,481.16	53,311.15	65,987.76	0	0
95 1 CROMWELL	9,913.29	4,956.66	4,953.14	0	0	0
97 1 MOOSE LAKE	32,848.23	28,737.47	20,762.70	0	29,100.92	54,717.14
99 1 ESKO	57,271.08	29,579.00	28,624.00	0	0	0
100 1 WRENSHALL	2,142.49	20,573.57	12,203.00	0	0	14,784.15
108 1 NORWOOD	45,191.88	27,843.44	15,002.09	0	0	23,333.92
110 1 WACONIA	100,440.83	66,660.68	67,040.65	0	0	42,497.49
111 1 WATERTOWN-MAYER	55,279.91	22,824.75	39,782.17	0	0	37,788.08
112 1 CHASKA	450,283.93	217,321.09	213,361.14	452,804.85	0	0
113 1 WALKER-AKELEY	53,772.97	23,987.33	50,537.77	0	0	0
115 1 CASS LAKE	68,582.53	12,031.80	37,154.74	0	17,253.08	10,496.93
116 1 PILLAGER	42,415.64	23,829.94	21,573.00	0	0	0
118 1 NORTHLAND COMMUNITY	29,781.91	4,745.46	25,036.22	1,190.38	0	22,152.13
129 1 MONTEVIDEO	55,837.94	43,459.11	43,131.60	0	2,505.93	47,780.88
138 1 NORTH BRANCH	183,871.42	90,758.05	89,613.53	200,097.13	10,527.33	338,447.17
139 1 RUSH CITY	78,813.67	12,512.18	12,814.03	0	0	0

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403
146 1 BARNESVILLE	22,104.16	7,726.95	15,663.27	0	0	40,627.00
150 1 HAWLEY	39,839.04	28,598.00	29,542.32	0	0	18,000.00
152 1 MOORHEAD	168,006.43	38,095.90	59,178.55	6,356.32	277,703.57	0
162 1 BAGLEY	58,118.42	29,157.79	29,114.04	0	0	0
166 1 COOK COUNTY	43,447.18	18,372.38	20,612.77	0	0	0
173 1 MOUNTAIN LAKE	14,806.11	2,548.28	15,742.72	0	0	25,948.56
177 1 WINDOM	21,305.51	14,405.48	14,939.44	0	0	101,610.09
181 1 BRAINERD	338,702.78	74,580.73	177,036.90	0	99,381.67	682,468.61
182 1 CROSBY-IRONTON	38,756.79	37,392.37	97,492.75	0	0	88,660.07
186 1 PEQUOT LAKES	67,676.24	18,663.64	50,204.24	1,594.50	0	0
191 1 BURNSVILLE	0.00	108,703.68	208,607.34	119,161.53	882.66	0
192 1 FARMINGTON	274,247.88	174,077.13	193,535.79	38,537.80	10,918.09	0
194 1 LAKEVILLE	281,943.26	317,159.72	266,707.03	91,256.97	0	813,446.00
195 1 RANDOLPH	25,068.87	17,583.01	12,279.36	0	1,577.82	0
196 1 ROSEMOUNT-APPLE VALL	1,540,383.81	769,926.19	770,690.68	1,159,549.28	29,099.81	0
197 1 WEST ST. PAUL-MENDOT	191,335.25	76,317.76	151,529.70	364,826.84	23,884.72	141,284.00
199 1 INVER GROVE	1,443.59	1,311.67	15,100.66	0	0	0
200 1 HASTINGS	270,147.56	136,508.38	154,015.06	0	15,585.00	0
203 1 HAYFIELD	9,470.75	11,867.10	5,510.81	0	0	4,246.00
204 1 KASSON-MANTORVILLE	71,512.08	30,946.51	41,269.71	33,365.52	1,980.21	60,756.89
206 1 ALEXANDRIA	183,222.10	126,131.10	136,274.06	432,600.78	0	218,657.00
207 1 BRANDON	22,088.53	5,832.10	6,849.21	14,135.75	0	0
208 1 EVANSVILLE	13,437.41	5,165.84	3,134.07	0	0	3,986.09
213 1 OSAKIS	50,359.18	1,945.70	2,490.07	0	0	0
227 1 CHATFIELD	33,896.42	14,142.86	13,845.56	0	0	18,148.41
229 1 LANESBORO	18,036.98	11,070.35	8,364.51	0	0	0
238 1 MABEL-CANTON	45,734.20		1,222.88	0	0	49,610.62
239 1 RUSHFORD-PETERSON	352.9	484	3,391.64	0	0	0
241 1 ALBERT LEA	38,091.37	15,863.59	5,287.88	28,043.80	0	198,303.78
242 1 ALDEN	22,893.12	12,029.00	12,004.92	0	0	0
252 1 CANNON FALLS	78,343.26		38,226.68	75,077.42	17,538.31	24,001.43
253 1 GOODHUE	26,219.14	7,727.25	14,543.00	0	0	15,425.59
255 1 PINE ISLAND	65,709.71	32,904.25	32,835.76	0	0	0
256 1 RED WING	35,164.22	12,824.50	30,406.58	1,598.58	6,584.94	0
261 1 ASHBY	20,052.56	1,687.40	9,402.91	0	0	15,805.76
264 1 HERMAN-NORCROSS	12,852.07	1,824.18	2,165.53	6,135.81	0	0
270 1 HOPKINS	425,823.50	229,887.62	340,163.19	759,462.54	46,448.02	14,313.36
271 1 BLOOMINGTON	654,029.52	329,906.42	222,185.39	593,804.33	40,308.19	123,619.00
272 1 EDEN PRAIRIE	333,328.82	13.28	775,639.70	590,869.70	1,707.57	0
273 1 EDINA	417,769.00	223,884.50	216,971.50	797,292.84	6,086.72	0
276 1 MINNETONKA	333,453.04	155,628.58	185,596.55	382,584.39	0	459,050.01
277 1 WESTONKA	963	1,161.78	0	56,484.77	343	0
278 1 ORONO	0.00	14,623.71	17,861.78	84,746.92	18,249.91	0
279 1 OSSEO	2,564.63	17,873.06	439,798.04	438,594.87	385,578.59	0
280 1 RICHFIELD	31,624.29	16,611.30	9,859.48	20,619.87	181.65	0
281 1 ROBBINSDALE	928,528.69	395,244.50	423,582.89	930,355.34	3,617.42	0
282 1 ST. ANTHONY-NEW BRIG	92,081.18	816.76	2,014.77	170,762.63	0	29,075.60

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance	
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403	
283	1 ST. LOUIS PARK	205,194.04	177,143.29	154,203.66	287,607.81	161,073.63	0
284	1 WAYZATA	362,304.03	174,450.81	112,258.43	494,320.85	36,376.90	890,309.75
286	1 BROOKLYN CENTER	47,257.30	45,642.43	34,994.41	48,150.00	11,271.67	-12,936.75
287	6 INTERMEDIATE DST 287				152,522.02	1,636,118.29	0
294	1 HOUSTON	23,462.31	94.9	8,162.73	0	0	34,757.16
297	1 SPRING GROVE	6,717.28	3,794.88	5,976.78	0	0	8,173.54
299	1 CALEDONIA	193.24		11,328.80	0	0	0
300	1 LACRESCENT-HOKAH	90,083.70	25,053.40	20,186.19	45,798.92	5,864.44	79,655.13
306	1 LAPORTE	8,877.86	2,320.91	466.41	0	0	50,820.03
308	1 NEVIS	30,826.11	15,157.26	15,006.06	0	0	0
309	1 PARK RAPIDS	25,340.49	1,232.80	18,333.30	182,114.08	0	0
314	1 BRAHAM	12,683.83	4,491.14	9,095.81	0	0	0
316	1 GREENWAY	0.00	0.00	3,161.83	16,128.39	0	0
317	1 DEER RIVER	38,305.40	18,745.29	28,655.88	0	0	39,977.77
318	1 GRAND RAPIDS	341,820.28	59,783.60	53,778.27	9,086.80	969.76	36,566.77
319	1 NASHWAKU-KEEWATIN	35,647.01	23,705.18	19,585.58	0	0	0
323	2 FRANCONIA				0	0	0
330	1 HERON LAKE-OKABENA			0	0	20	0
332	1 MORA	156,921.66	26,503.41	21,026.27	517.44	0	0
333	1 OGILVIE	24,036.17	12,289.63	13,452.14	0	0	0
345	1 NEW LONDON-SPICER	32,184.13	4,220.58	15,590.67	0	0	26,947.55
347	1 WILLMAR	54,579.06	5,357.66	66,656.21	15,414.66	0	341,981.07
356	1 LANCASTER	15,095.66	5,887.96	4,000.00	0	0	0
361	1 INTERNATIONAL FALLS	52,861.77	7,047.49	66,159.16	0	0	219,560.74
362	1 LITTLEFORK-BIG FALLS	20,628.84		1,679.92	0	0	0
363	1 SOUTH KOOCHICHING	28,014.74	10,482.69	10,701.27	0	233.42	0
371	1 BELLINGHAM	6,895.66	3,208.60	3,094.78	0	0	0
378	1 DAWSON	33,784.78	15,239.97	16,038.86	0	4,589.24	23,363.09
381	1 LAKE SUPERIOR	52,095.36	108,814.33	31,397.51	11,047.55	0	42,452.80
390	1 LAKE OF THE WOODS	8,295.01	8,665.84	225	0	0	51,384.88
391	1 CLEVELAND	25,540.19	14,887.03	11,332.26	0	0	0
392	1 LECENTER	28,968.97	16,717.91	19,369.58	0	0	10,260.13
394	1 MONTGOMERY	42,256.19	28,428.17	3,735.46	0	3,257.77	42,430.86
402	1 HENDRICKS	9,298.26	4,649.13	4,649.12	0	0	1,461.09
403	1 IVANHOE	10,866.45	5,433.23	5,433.22	0	0	5,031.12
404	1 LAKE BENTON	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	27,381.47
409	1 TYLER	1,182.23	591.06	591.06	0	0	0
411	1 BALATON	4,153.51	2,076.76	2,076.75	0	0	9,102.38
413	1 MARSHALL	107,949.79	71,926.99	61,436.79	67,514.58	0	23,844.44
414	1 MINNEOTA	53,323.75		13,027.15	0	0	0
415	1 LYND	7,028.89	250	3,362.10	0	3,200.00	10,907.71
417	1 TRACY	28,632.56	23,271.85	18,186.92	0	4,036.98	41,017.91
418	1 RUSSELL	42.98	21.48	21.49	0	0	0
423	1 HUTCHINSON	232,137.80	52,967.90	77,679.78	177,381.78	0	27,517.22
424	1 LESTER PRAIRIE	8,774.50		10,125.06	0	0	33,727.60
432	1 MAHNOMEN	32,821.80	13,814.77	22,198.49	0	0	23,172.74
435	1 WAUBUN	28,450.17	11,654.82	6,974.99	0	0	40,617.00

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403
441 1 MARSHALL COUNTY CENT	14,786.72	3,832.40	3,092.10	2,868.16	0	24,940.00
447 1 GRYGLA	16,945.29	5,777.00	386.51	0	0	0
458 1 TRUMAN	2,698.71		3,478.09	0	0	6,768.87
463 1 EDEN VALLEY	58,687.55	22,929.78	14,008.43	0	0	11,217.59
465 1 LITCHFIELD	93,536.38	53,222.00	55,215.56	0	0	76,768.90
466 1 DASSEL-COKATO	80,378.54	33,987.92	18,557.49	121,914.09	0	128,570.59
473 1 ISLE	38,857.28		19,369.98	-382.95	0	0
477 1 PRINCETON	173,870.05	88,029.73	78,789.01	0	0	0
480 1 ONAMIA	46,742.16	22,978.45	12,267.45	0	0	0
482 1 LITTLE FALLS	6,640.28	5,265.54	3,305.65	184,521.67	5,036.72	0
484 1 PIERZ	54,048.56	27,002.45	27,006.54	38,225.98	0	0
485 1 ROYALTON	8,908.33		15,348.60	0	0	58,786.88
486 1 SWANVILLE	32,951.43	2,171.63	15,149.00	0	0	0
487 1 UPSALA	43,092.87		1,500.00	0	8,044.33	20,966.83
492 1 AUSTIN	184,217.26	127,850.51	105,490.39	0	0	151,222.06
495 1 GRAND MEADOW	6,057.40	3,028.70	3,028.68	0	0	0
497 1 LYLE	0.00	0.00	16,892.74	0	0	0
499 1 LEROY	24,065.85	18,080.00	3,050.42	0	0	0
500 1 SOUTHLAND	42,120.20	18,830.00	34,099.99	0	0	0
505 1 FULDA	58,018.05	4,233.73	2,702.99	0	0	20,879.46
507 1 NICOLLET	11,890.95	5,966.52	3,489.44	0	0	11,359.76
508 1 ST. PETER	77,931.25		6,373.13	3,763.18	3,966.88	0
511 1 ADRIAN	19,594.48	2,619.90	2,774.25	0	0	0
513 1 BREWSTER	6,218.86	894.65	10,287.54	0	0	19,099.62
514 1 ELLSWORTH	9,951.66	7,028.00	7,027.00	0	2,588.36	0
516 1 ROUND LAKE	7,979.43	1,182.91	1,068.06	0	1,125.78	19,759.93
518 1 WORTHINGTON	68,130.24	13,157.75	90,114.06	0	0	78,983.45
531 1 BYRON	55,848.55	18,344.94	16,880.95	0	0	67,460.38
533 1 DOVER-EYOTA	45,554.37	6,672.00	22,102.00	128,338.47	0	70,756.76
534 1 STEWARTVILLE	59,574.86	69,652.12	20,321.48	49,729.66	1,153.76	55,917.41
535 1 ROCHESTER	503,516.54	317,573.89	322,294.50	650,132.71	967,474.17	1,130,238.67
542 1 BATTLE LAKE	41,365.32	3,229.17	654.6	0	1,352.20	0
544 1 FERGUS FALLS	152,069.03	76,034.52	76,034.51	36,659.03	1,995.40	0
545 1 HENNING	8,065.33	1,620.00	3,574.42	0	621.51	0
547 1 PARKERS PRAIRIE	33,199.50	16,684.48	16,600.00	0	0	0
548 1 PELICAN RAPIDS	72,856.13	69,884.66	0	0	0	0
549 1 PERHAM	55,097.04	18,764.00	46,657.03	284.19	0	91,916.24
550 1 UNDERWOOD	25,067.64	12,878.26	12,414.48	5,902.15	0	0
553 1 NEW YORK MILLS	24,835.35	12,419.53	12,414.93	2,657.63	0	30,270.80
561 1 GOODRIDGE	13,644.82	4,735.00	560	0	0	0
564 1 THIEF RIVER FALLS	115,157.70	63,930.41	45,175.00	67,597.21	0	36,703.00
577 1 WILLOW RIVER	31,283.49	4,817.30	11,429.47	0	0	0
578 1 PINE CITY	95,357.75	36,014.13	51,738.56	91,247.35	0	0
581 1 EDGERTON	16,800.08	7,300.00	7,300.00	8,372.44	0	0
584 1 RUTHTON	159.11	79.54	79.55	0	0	0
592 1 CLIMAX	11,369.30	4,075.00	4,075.00	0	0	0
593 1 CROOKSTON	57,948.89	40,882.14	40,590.12	0	1,169.42	105,422.42

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403
595 1 EAST GRAND FORKS	90,912.25	43,477.24	47,789.21	775	4,011.85	8,978.13
599 1 FERTILE-BELTRAMI	31,000.00	15,500.00	18,870.28	0	0	0
600 1 FISHER	37,952.79	8,000.00	8,000.00	0	1,985.04	0
601 1 FOSSTON	39,852.45	18,874.36	11,523.27	0	0	0
611 1 CYRUS	8,121.43	2,159.11	734.5	0	0	5,075.57
621 1 MOUNDS VIEW	415,748.34	203,071.81	204,177.90	102,012.15	126	0
622 1 NORTH ST. PAUL-MAPLE	719,984.47	385,058.14	342,690.16	16,162.87	50,967.70	107,272.86
623 1 ROSEVILLE	143,987.55	4,979.31	125,564.17	305,074.63	165,052.26	0
624 1 WHITE BEAR LAKE	543,344.96	155,784.76	187,322.51	0	0	106,606.00
625 1 ST. PAUL	4,096,175.00	478,356.10	293,764.91	1,805,157.31	2,429,808.61	0
627 1 OKLEE	17,792.06	5,295.04	0	0	0	0
628 1 PLUMMER	9,070.58	6,534.81	2,544.66	0	0	0
630 1 RED LAKE FALLS	22,000.00	11,000.00	11,000.00	0	13,703.91	0
635 1 MILROY	320	0.00	448.6	66.6	69.27	0
640 1 WABASSO	23,170.00	11,585.00	11,585.00	0	3,651.39	0
656 1 FARIBAULT	250,154.26	108,208.85	116,019.68	403,883.91	55,449.97	9,602.00
659 1 NORTHFIELD	230,826.97	108,930.93	105,559.48	78,936.77	0	0
671 1 HILLS-BEAVER CREEK	31,981.14	8,025.75	1,070.87	7,423.16	0	2,062.38
676 1 BADGER	18,795.96	6,265.00	0	0	0	0
682 1 ROSEAU	86,628.90	39,200.00	31,083.41	0	0	0
690 1 WARROAD	30,430.34	15,946.00	24,037.29	0	1,498.76	0
695 1 CHISHOLM	0.00	0.00	0	0	3,936.92	0
696 1 ELY	41,868.13	19,134.16	13,764.72	0	0	0
698 1 FLOODWOOD	31,988.57	551.29	10,461.93	0	0	0
700 1 HERMANTOWN	178,446.61	66,851.05	94,984.28	0	1,397.44	0
701 1 HIBBING	243,707.49	16,542.35	63,460.86	22,950.29	0	0
704 1 PROCTOR	57,583.93	39,448.12	39,447.76	500	196.24	0
706 1 VIRGINIA	94,578.33	18,778.58	20,217.61	0	0	139,800.29
707 1 NETT LAKE	7,679.00		2,560.00	0	0	0
709 1 DULUTH	31,913.77		0	524,326.52	619,591.34	40,506.00
712 1 MOUNTAIN IRON-BUHL	6,461.97		1,668.53	0	0	0
716 1 BELLE PLAINE	66,335.79	15,353.18	29,929.36	0	0	58,902.41
717 1 JORDAN	78,836.74	37,174.50	36,600.16	754.81	0	0
719 1 PRIOR LAKE	107,619.78	48,714.93	325,741.53	0	41,154.58	0
720 1 SHAKOPEE	77,165.53	14,234.46	258,957.19	196,175.83	17,392.73	229,454.48
721 1 NEW PRAGUE	147,677.20	75,711.42	74,298.98	319,266.08	101.39	0
726 1 BECKER	102,610.57	5,073.15	131,232.49	101,601.10	-195,155.36	15,204.41
727 1 BIG LAKE	62,628.98	79,139.92	86,220.32	99,989.34	0	126,194.20
728 1 ELK RIVER	178,565.00	44,171.07	246,772.82	275,777.19	16,167.25	307,153.00
738 1 HOLDINGFORD	25,549.10	5,710.54	14,882.41	0	0	0
739 1 KIMBALL	66,946.88	1,082.93	21,737.11	22,008.57	0	1,470.91
740 1 MELROSE	36,491.72	29,980.47	54,166.10	0	2,219.90	141,204.42
741 1 PAYNESVILLE	2,059.99		707.31	19,274.72	0	17,232.70
742 1 ST. CLOUD	62,688.59	32,892.57	69,944.85	518,851.57	7,257.08	0
743 1 SAUK CENTRE	106,513.37		26,176.04	2,667.37	529.92	36.56
745 1 ALBANY	152,724.58	4	25,682.59	160,448.61	0	0
748 1 SARTELL	6,737.08	86,371.79	88,484.58	0	0	25,925.52

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403
750 1 COLD SPRING	199,337.77	23,397.08	30,363.70	0	0	25,379.31
756 1 BLOOMING PRAIRIE	31,717.98	7,616.67	7,423.07	3,349.46	4,398.59	0
761 1 OWATONNA	126,247.65	87,230.37	98,357.72	288,732.56	0	0
763 1 MEDFORD	12,583.61	805	3,415.46	0	994.06	116,906.90
768 1 HANCOCK	24,430.13	10,100.00	0	0	0	0
769 1 MORRIS	60,046.92	19,722.09	29,603.92	0	0	24,914.10
771 1 CHOKIO-ALBERTA	23,031.98	6,075.16	6,075.16	0	0	0
775 1 KERKHOVEN-MURDOCK-SU	27,515.18	4,179.00	24,092.08	0	0	41,609.74
777 1 BENSON	52,939.03	26,514.00	26,514.30	0	0	31,500.73
786 1 BERTHA-HEWITT	25,848.30	12,887.40	13,051.61	0	0	2,103.28
787 1 BROWERVILLE	53,062.56	717.49	6,161.03	0	0	0
801 1 BROWNS VALLEY	9,698.54	2,925.00	6,797.77	0	0	5,608.03
803 1 WHEATON	42,085.02	7,000.79	2,095.13	0	0	0
806 1 ELGIN-MILLVILLE	7,845.47	2,000.00	3,094.88	0	0	0
810 1 PLAINVIEW	125,028.24	8,411.53	40,532.59	3,980.63	0	46,835.64
811 1 WABASHA-KELLOGG	38,336.91	19,534.78	19,750.00	0	3,244.97	0
813 1 LAKE CITY	109,346.98	13,786.95	20,314.43	64,818.51	0	69,557.54
815 2 PRINSBURG	450	0.00	0	0	0	0
818 1 VERNDALE	24,425.94	12,214.00	12,213.33	0	0	18,634.05
820 1 SEBEKA	33,395.43	16,326.13	16,642.10	0	0	0
821 1 MENAUGA	39,922.02	21,699.30	19,961.05	0	0	0
829 1 WASECA	49,498.95		8,208.76	0	8,819.73	49,777.00
831 1 FOREST LAKE	65.55		362,617.91	151,206.21	447,100.81	0
832 1 MAHTOMEDI	197,300.09	1,888.01	183,684.29	0	1,806.00	0
833 1 SOUTH WASHINGTON COU	1,003,809.75	620,256.09	263,892.08	110,553.66	178,585.36	452,947.00
834 1 STILLWATER	916,468.39	35,447.31	126,743.14	268,378.30	598.17	371,210.00
836 1 BUTTERFIELD	1,551.40		60	0	0	0
837 1 MADELIA	29,952.10		7,693.37	0	140	48,731.10
840 1 ST. JAMES	4,584.94		6,170.65	0	0	0
846 1 BRECKENRIDGE	49,470.62	24,416.42	24,393.73	0	0	0
850 1 ROTHSAY	19,339.79	10,500.00	0	0	0	0
852 1 CAMPBELL-TINTAH	8,200.00	4,100.00	6,523.49	0	222.04	0
857 1 LEWISTON	25,391.38	4,635.43	10,237.72	0	494.89	0
858 1 ST. CHARLES	56,358.57	28,179.28	28,179.29	2,714.88	0	0
861 1 WINONA	102,842.17	10,563.73	110,298.62	0	1,860.03	401,268.64
876 1 ANNANDALE	115,268.55	64,704.93	43,962.69	40,701.31	0	33,903.70
877 1 BUFFALO	268,890.14	133,861.20	134,104.66	112,742.25	0	0
879 1 DELANO	69,024.35		4,907.59	15,431.15	0	8,314.65
881 1 MAPLE LAKE	49,712.70	24,796.93	24,618.94	12,976.54	0	0
882 1 MONTICELLO	116,343.97		37,246.19	0	0	249,720.62
883 1 ROCKFORD	92,712.81	44,673.35	48,038.94	33,826.31	1,126.30	22,216.83
885 1 ST. MICHAEL-ALBERTVI	136,995.73	70,750.87	212,461.65	0	6,651.34	96,307.34
891 1 CANBY	43,008.60	27,576.87	3,087.19	0	525.49	27,026.86
911 1 CAMBRIDGE-ISANTI	136,478.63	76,656.58	385,983.89	360,316.97	2,336.67	387,439.46
912 1 MILACA	108,129.00	35,213.28	80,239.82	0	7,626.06	6,187.34
914 1 ULEN-HITTERDAL	14,500.00	7,250.00	7,250.00	0	0	0
916 6 N.E. METRO INTERMEDI				0	409,338.78	0

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site FIN 306	Grants FIN 307	District FIN 308	Program 610 FIN 000	Program 640 FIN 000	Balance Reserve 403
917 6 INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL				8,613.98	102,741.87	0
2071 1 LAKE CRYSTAL-WELLCOM	23,042.39	1,074.33	5,551.67	0	0	0
2125 1 TRITON	66,781.31	27,210.03	35,694.29	22,698.95	0	0
2134 1 UNITED SOUTH CENTRAL	82,630.53	17,967.60	35,156.08	0	0	17,630.67
2135 1 MAPLE RIVER	46,814.86	34,862.32	35,510.84	3,619.81	0	67,085.93
2137 1 KINGSLAND	48,790.91	24,581.68	26,212.54	52,948.72	0	10,104.78
2142 1 ST. LOUIS COUNTY	61,152.48	20,915.67	50,291.89	0	0	128,464.21
2143 1 WATERVILLE-ELYSIAN-M	49,022.16	21,389.02	19,371.46	0	0	53,983.22
2144 1 CHISAGO LAKES	84,730.79	3,813.16	36,479.50	63,235.11	0	209,980.41
2149 1 MINNEWASKA	77,476.51	42,584.78	44,389.41	82,207.03	2,300.00	41,869.44
2154 1 EVELETH-GILBERT	74,582.27	0.00	18,328.47	0	0	16,856.16
2155 1 WADENA-DEER CREEK	73,485.55	37,000.00	38,289.86	0	0	0
2159 1 BUFFALO LAKE-HECTOR	30,792.66	15,396.33	15,396.33	0	0	0
2164 1 DILWORTH-GLYNDON-FEL	88,057.62	9,371.75	17,591.78	24,017.98	0	0
2165 1 HINCKLEY-FINLAYSON	74,501.97	24,383.43	32,585.64	0	0	0
2167 1 LAKEVIEW	34,609.52	14,000.00	14,234.13	0	0	0
2168 1 N.R.H.E.G.	82,085.28	4,937.61	22,590.59	0	0	0
2169 1 MURRAY COUNTY	23,786.08	13,996.45	26,468.97	0	0	74,172.73
2170 1 STAPLES-MOTLEY	29,463.48	17,238.79	36,549.48	0	0	59,239.78
2171 1 KITTSOON CENTRAL	11,748.45	5,750.00	10,420.92	0	890.26	0
2172 1 KENYON-WANAMINGO	22,320.89	8,234.77	9,690.12	0	0	65,326.95
2174 1 PINE RIVER-BACKUS	68,189.06	20,259.65	43,773.27	46	23,261.33	24,331.57
2176 1 WARREN-ALVARADO-OSLO	24,418.06		11,479.27	19,558.02	0	25,396.27
2180 1 M A C C R A Y	33,136.99	33,137.00	66,273.99	0	0	0
2184 1 LUVERNE	60,915.44	36,910.26	22,009.68	0	0	97,692.58
2190 1 YELLOW MEDICINE EAST	94,374.09	61,081.65	70,085.98	0	-15,500.00	0
2198 1 FILLMORE CENTRAL	24,878.04	6,447.28	8,480.91	0	0	0
2215 1 NORMAN COUNTY EAST	11,091.13	1,270.28	7,967.31	3,541.45	1,689.77	62,825.00
2310 1 SIBLEY EAST	72,758.44	1,860.82	46,765.65	0	0	52,575.24
2311 1 CLEARBROOK-GONVICK	30,037.13	17,863.20	10,214.14	0	617.67	0
2342 1 WEST CENTRAL AREA	54,023.25	23,175.72	15,503.93	3,143.21	0	0
2358 1 TRI-COUNTY	24,378.53	8,081.34	0	0	0	0
2364 1 BELGRADE-BROOTEN	0.00	0.00	0	0	82,840.00	0
2365 1 G.F.W.	36,944.10	10,414.24	25,536.77	0	0	58,351.39
2396 1 A.C.G.C.	69,427.29	338.4	923.72	0	0	30,958.64
2397 1 LESUEUR-HENDERSON	26,542.40	19,133.19	75,995.26	36,832.00	0	9,134.00
2448 1 MARTIN COUNTY WEST	62,047.56	8,281.82	15,328.30	0	2,469.73	107,905.48
2527 1 HALSTAD-HENDRUM	19,000.00	9,500.00	9,498.95	0	0	0
2534 1 BIRD ISLAND-OLIVIA-L	7,610.41	6,185.52	7,308.19	0	3,555.30	0
2536 1 GRANADA HUNTLEY-EAST	22,721.30	11,087.20	1,149.07	0	1,706.90	0
2580 1 EAST CENTRAL	16,356.84	9,730.30	15,227.93	0	0	21,354.48
2609 1 WIN-E-MAC	26,210.97	17,790.36	14,000.00	0	0	0
2683 1 GREENBUSH-MIDDLE RIV	40,226.48	13,551.00	12,500.00	0	0	0
2687 1 HOWARD LAKE-WAVERLY-	38,057.34		0	30,464.60	0	0
2689 1 PIPESTONE-JASPER	32,422.74	76,061.20	40,048.36	0	0	36,188.52
2711 1 MESABI EAST	18,851.53	6,596.74	27,315.34	0	167.09	84,832.22
2752 1 FAIRMONT AREA SCHOOL	128,735.50	41,636.84	41,512.40	9,949.37	11,712.30	155,376.35

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance	
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403	
2753 1	LONG PRAIRIE-GREY EA	140,635.82	55,660.34	27,323.16	20,401.89	0	0
2754 1	CEDAR MOUNTAIN	22,212.07	11,196.93	11,200.00	0	0	0
2759 1	EAGLE VALLEY	32,916.07	11,155.02	1,037.87	0	0	0
2805 1	ZUMBROTA-MAZEPPA	59,226.75	21,160.82	18,585.90	0	0	63,664.29
2835 1	JANESVILLE-WALDORF-P	22,488.90	15,019.34	11,172.11	0	0	0
2853 1	LAC QUI PARLE VALLEY	71,806.96	27,501.54	32,082.27	9,122.59	0	0
2854 1	ADA-BORUP	29,107.71	14,880.47	14,550.48	0	0	0
2856 1	STEPHEN-ARGYLE CENTR	22,816.15	11,000.00	10,000.00	0	0	0
2859 1	GLENCOE-SILVER LAKE	45,870.27		19,693.12	0	0	0
2860 1	BLUE EARTH AREA PUBL	57,656.90	38,493.00	74,799.80	28,521.84	5,601.84	21,391.00
2884 1	RED ROCK CENTRAL	26,602.82	6,626.75	2,641.16	0	0	44,821.29
2886 1	GLENVILLE-EMMONS	18,281.13		18,534.74	0	0	224.27
2887 1	MCLEOD WEST SCHOOLS	4,286.27	450	5,099.09	4,931.96	0	27,546.68
2888 1	CLINTON-GRACEVILLE-B	20,004.53	4,944.69	8,650.61	0	0	21,346.23
2889 1	LAKE PARK AUDUBON DI	21,565.33	10,042.56	10,042.55	0	400	0
2890 1	RENVILLE COUNTY	0.00	0.00	1,500.00	6,572.26	0	0
2895 1	JACKSON COUNTY CENTR	49,823.91	12,577.79	18,304.99	0	0	105,319.23
2897 1	REDWOOD FALLS AREA S	125,566.89	203.27	849.32	0	9,899.23	0
2898 1	WESTBROOK-WALNUT GRO	41,625.03	3,172.38	19,469.90	0	0	0
4000 7	CITY ACADEMY	0.00	0.00	0	0	10,135.00	0
4001 7	BLUFFVIEW MONTESSORI	8,982.49	8,820.93	15	0	9,121.20	0
4003 7	NEW HEIGHTS	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4004 7	CEDAR RIVERSIDE COMM	8,172.00		1,727.00	0	650	0
4005 7	METRO DEAF SCHOOL	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4006 7	SKILLS FOR TOMORROW	0.00	0.00	12,825.00	0	5,845.50	0
4007 7	MN NEW COUNTRY SCHOO	1,956.69	15	516.22	0	1,311.50	0
4008 7	PACT CHARTER SCHOOL	200	34.8	849.95	0	1,800.90	0
4011 7	NEW VISIONS SCHOOL	1,040.97	334.98	335.99	594,445.13	1,196.91	0
4012 7	EMILY CHARTER SCHOOL	3,143.01	2,355.81	1,602.95	415	0	0
4015 7	COMMUNITY OF PEACE A	0.00	0.00	0	0	12,388.96	0
4016 7	WORLD LEARNER CHARTE	820		0	0	0	0
4017 7	MINNESOTA TRANSITION	0.00	0.00	0	14,114.98	12,184.11	0
4018 7	ACORN DUAL LANGUAGE	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4019 7	ST. PAUL FAMILY LEAR	0.00	0.00	1,701.00	10,073.11	10,073.11	0
4020 7	EDISON CHARTER SCHOO	30,028.93	214.79	4,174.89	0	0	0
4021 7	VILLAGE SCHOOL OF NO	0.00	0.00	0	0	790	0
4025 7	CYBER VILLAGE ACADEM	7,213.23	3,606.62	3,606.61	70,969.00	2,240.64	0
4026 7	E.C.H.O. CHARTER SCH	7,039.38		2,147.60	0	-216.51	8,223.83
4027 7	HIGHER GROUND ACADEM	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4028 7	ECI' NOMPA WOONSPE	7,449.63		663.5	49	0	0
4029 7	NEW SPIRIT SCHOOL	27,826.71		0	0	0	0
4030 7	ODYSSEY CHARTER SCHO	3,427.85		0	0	0	0
4031 7	JENNINGS EXPERIENTIA	6,305.38		0	5,000.00	0	0
4032 7	HARVEST PREP SCHOOL/	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4035 7	EARLY LEARNING CHART	367		0	8,427.18	8,427.18	0
4036 7	FACE TO FACE ACADEMY	0.00	0.00	17	3,345.63	0	0
4038 7	HIGH SCHOOL FOR RECO	50,522.73		0	0	0	0

Minnesota Department of Education

	Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance
	FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403
4039 7 HIGH SCHOOL FOR RECO	0.00	0.00	0	0	3,995.25	0
4042 7 TWIN CITIES ACADEMY	6,147.44		0	5,982.57	0	0
4043 7 MATH & SCIENCE ACADE	15,958.02		0	0	0	0
4044 7 HEART OF THE EARTH C	1,628.00		2,775.00	0	0	0
4045 7 LAKES AREA CHARTER	820.46	820.45	1,640.92	0	0	0
4046 7 LAKE SUPERIOR HIGH S	4,366.43	2,619.40	2,619.40	0	0	0
4048 7 GREAT RIVER EDUCATN	1,643.38		0	0	0	0
4049 7 COON RAPIDS LEARNING	5,157.57		1,500.00	0	0	0
4050 7 LAFAYETTE PUBLIC CHA	6,301.67	2,500.00	3,189.19	0	0	0
4051 7 HANSKA CHARTER SCHOO	1,038.76		0	0	0	0
4052 7 FOUR DIRECTIONS CHAR	21,003.42		0	0	0	0
4053 7 NORTH LAKES CHARTER	1,765.71		0	0	0	0
4054 7 LA CRESCENT MONTESSO	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4055 7 NERSTRAND CHARTER SC	0.00	0.00	0	0	3,059.95	0
4056 7 ROCHESTER OFF CAMPUS	6,366.58	3,183.28	3,183.29	0	0	0
4057 7 EL COLEGIO CHARTER S	4,343.13		0	412.5	0	0
4058 7 SCHOOLCRAFT LEARNING	3,972.27	3,701.91	4,218.59	0	0	0
4059 7 CROSSLAKE COMMUNITY	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4061 7 STUDIO ACADEMY CHART	0.00	0.00	0	0	9,899.12	4,254.68
4062 7 FAMILY ACADEMY CHART	10,730.99	5,365.49	5,365.49	0	0	0
4064 7 RIVERWAY LEARNING CO	1,576.54		342.8	0	885.95	10,973.59
4065 7 MINNESOTA BUSINESS A	9,520.99		489.81	2,295.00	1,734.32	0
4066 7 RIVERBEND ACADEMY CH	7,318.58	943.93	3,721.87	0	16,289.38	0
4067 7 AURORA CHARTER SCHOO	0.00	0.00	4,595.09	22,206.62	0	0
4068 7 EXCELL CHARTER	0.00	0.00	0	0	1,621.13	0
4069 7 MN INSTITUTE OF TECH	8,650.99		0	0	0	0
4070 7 HOPE ACADEMY CHARTER	40		0	0	0	0
4071 7 NATIVE ARTS CHARTER	170		0	0	0	0
4072 7 YANKTON COUNTRY CHAR	4,558.96		0	0	0	4,545.98
4073 7 ACADEMIA CHARTER	13,556.79		4,482.80	0	0	0
4074 7 AGRICULTURAL FOOD SC	30,036.66		0	0	69,207.20	0
4075 7 AVALON SCHOOL	182		0	0	7,561.15	0
4076 7 MN ACADEMY OF TECHNO	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
4077 7 TWIN CITIES INTERNAT	0.00	0	0	-1,136.08	276.24	0
4078 7 MN INTERNATIONAL MID	0.00	0	0	1,741.09	27.08	0
4079 7 FRIENDSHIP CHARTER	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
4080 7 PILLAGER AREA CHARTE	2,602.21	1,190.90	0	0	0	0
4081 7 COVENANT ACADEMY OF	0.00	0.00	0	0	32,462.91	0
4082 7 BLUESKY CHARTER	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4083 7 RIDGEWAY COMMUNITY S	219		135	0	0	0
4084 7 NORTH SHORE COMMUNIT	2,568.78		0	7,427.53	0	0
4085 7 HARBOR CITY INTERNAT	2,406.62		0	2,664.00	0	0
4086 7 WOODSON INST.STUDENT	0.00	0.00	0	47.36	0	0
4087 7 SAGE ACADEMY	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4088 7 URBAN ACADEMY	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
4089 7 NEW CITY SCHOOL	0.00	0.00	0	425	0	0
4090 7 PRAIRIE CREEK COMMUN	4,381.34	2,190.68	2,190.68	0	180.97	0

Minnesota Department of Education

Site	Grants	District	Program 610	Program 640	Balance	
FIN 306	FIN 307	FIN 308	FIN 000	FIN 000	Reserve 403	
4091 7 SE MN SCHOOL ARTS &	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4092 7 WATERSHED HIGH SCHOO	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4093 7 NEW CENTURY CHARTER	5,587.11	0.00	0	0	0	
4095 7 TRIO WOLF CREEK DIST	6,266.45	0.00	0	0	0	
4096 7 CHIRON CHARTER SCHOO	0.00	0.00	587.26	0	595	
4097 7 PARTNERSHIP ACADEMY,	12,788.46	0.00	0	0	0	
4098 7 NOVA CLASSICAL CHART	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4099 7 TAREK IBN ZIYAD ACAD	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4100 7 GREAT EXPECTATIONS	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4101 7 MN NORTH STAR ACADEM	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4102 7 MN INTERNSHIP CHARTE	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4104 7 LIBERTY HIGH CHARTER	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
4106 7 TREK NORTH	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
REPORT TOTAL	36,478,459.91	12,180,028.48	18,941,338.31	21,542,786.17	11,157,811.13	17,722,478.71

APPENDIX C

Program Report Format

Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (CFL)
Annual Staff Development Report

GENERAL INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS: School districts using state staff development revenue under MS 126C.10 subdivision 2, and MS122A.61 must complete these forms and submit two copies to Staff Development at CFL by September 30, 2003. A program report must be completed by all districts including those not reserving funds.

IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

District Name: District Number:
Address:
City: Zip:
District Staff Development Chair: E:mail:

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

On behalf of the school district identified above, we assure the Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning, that the district is in compliance with the stipulations for Staff Development allocations; two percent reserved revenue and any additional funding legislation related to the following:

- 1. Revenue Expenditures
2. Staff Development Planning
3. Staff Development Outcomes

We hereby certify that the program information provided is complete and accurate, that the district identified above will abide by the statement of assurances, and that records will be maintained at the district to verify program development, participation and expenditures.

Our District Outcomes (Goals) for Improving Student Achievement for 2002-2003 are:

Number of Exemplary Grants awarded by the district:
(25% of Staff Development Revenue)

According to MS 122A.61 "a district may annually waive the requirement to reserve their basic revenue under this section if": (check one)
[] Does not apply
[] "A majority vote of the licensed teachers in the district and a majority vote of the school board agree to a resolution to waive the requirement to reserve the 2% of basic revenue."
[] Reserved 2% [] Reserved a portion of 2% Identify %
[] "A district in statutory operating debt is exempt from reserving basic revenue according to this section."
[] Reserved 2% [] Reserved a portion of 2% Identify %

Superintendent's Signature Date
Board of Education Chair Date
District Staff Development Chair Date

REPORTING OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM RESULTS

General Information And Instructions: School districts using state staff development revenue under MS 126C.10 subdivision 2, and MS122A.61 must complete these forms and **submit two copies to CFL Staff Development by September 30, 2003. A program report must be completed by all districts including those not reserving funds.**

Please complete and submit the following (This form has been prepared in Microsoft Word. The form is locked and allows users to enter data only in the designated areas. To unlock the form for editing, please select the forms toolbar under the view menu.)

1. Statement of Assurances page including a completed Waivers Check Box and the number of grants for best practice awarded.
2. A grid for each **DISTRICT** staff development goal, one form per goal, that relate to achievement in the legislative outcome areas (attached). (Twenty-five percent of staff development revenue may be used for district-wide staff development efforts).
See Grid I.
3. A grid for each **SITE** goal. If your district is a single district building then you need to only fill in Grid I. (Fifty percent of revenue shall be allocated to each school site in the district on a per teacher basis and shall be retained by the school site until used).
See Grid II.

GRID I. DISTRICT LEVEL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Use a Separate Page for Each Staff Development Goal

DISTRICT #: NAME:

School Board Improvement Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> Single year goal <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-year goal Year of a year goal												
Data and Reasons for Selecting Staff Development Focus:	Legislative Goals												
	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1	2	3	4	5	6								
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								

District Staff Development Goal:

Summary of SD Content Used to Achieve the SD Goal	Staff Development Designs/Structures	Evaluation Levels	Evaluation Results
	Check all that apply <input type="checkbox"/> Examining Data and/or Student Work <input type="checkbox"/> Study Groups <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing Training/Development <input type="checkbox"/> Action Research <input type="checkbox"/> Workshops/Conferences <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration/Modeling <input type="checkbox"/> Individual Guided Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Practice with Reflection <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum Development <input type="checkbox"/> Observation/Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Coaching/Mentoring <input type="checkbox"/> Other (identify) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (identify)	* Check all for which you have evaluation data <input type="checkbox"/> Participants' Reaction/Awareness <input type="checkbox"/> Participants' Learning <input type="checkbox"/> Organization Support and Learning <input type="checkbox"/> Participants' Use of New Knowledge and <input type="checkbox"/> Student Learning Outcomes * adapted from <i>Evaluating Professional Development</i> by Thomas R. Guskey	List Data Sources Describe Findings

Who was involved in professional learning? Check all that apply:

- Certified
 Non-certified
 Administrators
 Parent/Community

Expenditures are reported through UFARS. To view the UFARS report see <http://cfl.state.mn.us/FIN/reports.html>

GRID II. SITE LEVEL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Use a Separate Page for Each Staff Development Goal

DISTRICT #: **SITE NAME:**

Data and Reasons for Selecting Staff Development Goal:	<input type="checkbox"/> Single year goal <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-year goal Year of a year goal																		
Site Staff Development Goal:	<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr> <th colspan="6">Legislative Goals</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Legislative Goals						1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legislative Goals																			
1	2	3	4	5	6														
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>														

Is this goal a Site Specific Goal? No Yes
 Is this goal aligned with a District Staff Development Goal? No Yes. If yes, which goal?

Summary of SD Content Used to Achieve the SD Goal	Staff Development Designs/Structures	Evaluation Levels	Evaluation Results
	Check all that apply <input type="checkbox"/> Examining Data and/or Student Work <input type="checkbox"/> Study Groups <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing Training/Development <input type="checkbox"/> Action Research <input type="checkbox"/> Workshops/Conferences <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration/Modeling <input type="checkbox"/> Individual Guided Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Practice with Reflection <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum Development <input type="checkbox"/> Observation/Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Coaching/Mentoring <input type="checkbox"/> Other (identify) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (identify)	*Check all levels for which you have evaluation data <input type="checkbox"/> Participants' Reaction/Awareness <input type="checkbox"/> Participants' Learning <input type="checkbox"/> Organization Support and Learning <input type="checkbox"/> Participants' Use of New Knowledge and Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Student Learning *adapted from <i>Evaluating Professional Development</i> by Thomas R. Guskey	List Data Sources Describe Findings

Who was involved in professional learning? Check all that apply:

<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Certified Staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Total Staff
<input type="checkbox"/> Principal	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade Level or Department
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Administrators	<input type="checkbox"/> Title 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Multi Sites
<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Community	<input type="checkbox"/> Title 2 or 3	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> ELL	

Expenditures are reported through UFARS. To view the UFARS report see <http://cfl.state.mn.us/FIN/reports.html>

