



**Staff Development
Report of District
and Site Results and
Expenditures for
2009-10**

February 2011

**Report
to the
Legislature**

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

COMMISSIONER:
Dr. Brenda Cassellius

Deputy Commissioner:
Jessie Montano

**Staff
Development
Report of
District and
Site Results
and
Expenditures
for 2009-10**

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Steve Dibb
Acting Director
School Improvement Division
T: (651) 582-8693
E-MAIL: steve.dibb@state.mn.us

February 2011

Deborah Luedtke
Teacher Quality Supervisor
School Improvement Division
T: (651) 582-8440
E-MAIL: deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us

**Report
to the
Legislature**

Minnesota Department of Education
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113-4266
TTY: (800) 627-3529 OR (651) 582-8200

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

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

**FY 2010 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 the 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 the 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 \$5,917.00.

Staff Development Report of District and Site Results and Expenditures

The 2009-10 Staff Development Report to the Legislature has been prepared as required by Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.60, and addresses requirements for using revenue in Minnesota Statutes section 122A.61 (see Appendix B). District and site actions related to authorized in-service education programs (Minnesota Statutes, section 24A.29 and Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.22, subdivision 2), establishing a staff development committee (roles and composition of committee) and reporting requirements for districts (staff development results and expenditures) are reviewed. This report describes the electronic reporting processes used to collect and report staff development results and expenditures and provides an analysis of staff development activities and related information in district reports and expenditure data reports.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	4
Part I: Staff Development Program Report	8
Reporting Staff Development Program Results	8
Statewide Efforts that Support Staff Development	8
2009-10 Staff Development Data Analysis	12
Electronic Staff Development Reporting Format	26
Part II: Staff Development Expenditure Report	29
System for Collecting and Reporting Expenditure Data	29
Findings from Data Submitted on Staff Development Expenditures	31
Appendices	
A. Unit-By-Unit Staff Development Account Chart	34
B. Online Staff Development Report Template for 2009-10	46
C. Minnesota Statutory References	64

An electronic version of this report is available on the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) Website: <http://education.state.mn.us>.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2009-10 Legislative Report

In order to close the student achievement gap in Minnesota, districts and schools across the nation are making it a priority to support teachers in every classroom to perform at an even higher level. Research shows that highly effective teachers matter more than any other in-school variable in improving results in student learning. Professional development has become the means to improve teacher quality by moving teachers from beginning or basic to highly effective or exemplary levels of teaching. School efforts have focused on collaborative professional learning that requires everyone in the school working in teams and as a whole to simultaneously improve the school and student learning. This shift in professional development efforts reflects the Minnesota trend in moving from building teacher quality one teacher at a time to developing skills of teachers through a schoolwide approach to promote the success of all students.

The 2011 Staff Development Report provides evidence of districts and schools shifting practice towards collaborative professional development aimed at improving student achievement results at the classroom, school, and district level. Killion and Roy's book, *Becoming a Learning School* (NSDC, 2009, p. 5) states that "effective collaboration promotes success for all educators within a school, not just some, as teachers work in grade or subject-level, cross grade-level, and cross-school teams to focus on and increase their knowledge of their content and pedagogy. Because the school's whole staff is engaged in learning, this form of professional learning is sustainable and has greater impact on teaching." Data collected and analyzed for this report will show increased use of collaboration through job-embedded professional development approaches that is results-driven, content-rich, and focused on student learning.

Legislation requires that local school boards establish district staff development advisory committees to create a district staff development plan that is aligned with the student achievement goals defined by the district and school. Educators examine student achievement data to determine learning needs. Based on student needs, learning for staff within the district and school is designed and implemented to use resources effectively and efficiently. Districts and schools are required to submit an annual online report to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) on their staff development plan's impact on student results. Staff development plans may include one or all of the following structures or activities: learning teams with instructional focus, examining student data, classroom coaching, reviewing curriculum, and offsite training designed to promote staff learning and improve student achievement.

Recent legislation allows a school district or charter school to temporarily suspend the requirement to reserve revenue for staff development for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 only. In this year's report, readers will note a decrease in staff development expenditures to the 2006-07 level. Also, in 2010, 15.29 percent of districts utilized the 0 percent option, up from 8.06 percent in 2009.

The 2009-10 Staff Development Report to the Legislature addresses the process for collecting and reporting staff development expenditures and reported results directed toward teacher development and improved student learning. Using an online reporting system, districts self-report staff development information, activities and results. For 2010, a total of 312 public school districts and seven charter schools submitted staff development reports. Charter schools are not required to provide staff development reports stipulated in Minnesota Statutes, section

126C.10, subdivision 2 and Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61. MDE School Improvement Division staff members contact districts to remind them of reporting requirements and offer assistance.

Districts and schools submitted their 2009-10 staff development report using the MDE Online Staff Development Reporting site. In March, district and school reports for the previous school year are made available for public review on the MDE School Report Card web page: <http://education.state.mn.us/ReportCard2005/index.do>. The report card lists staff development goals, staff development activities, and student achievement goals by district and school.

District expenditures are reported to MDE using the Uniform Financial Accounting and Reporting Standards (UFARS) system. Specific codes are assigned staff development to allow tracking and reporting sources of funds and how they are expended. Refer to Part II of the report to review information concerning the UFARS system and UFARS codes specific to staff development.

Expenditure information for the fiscal year 2010 report indicated that staff development expenditures were \$136,011,175. This includes staff development set aside from basic revenue, either new set-aside money or reserves, and other funds available from the general fund. The data in this report is taken from all data submitted to MDE by December 17, 2010.


The following is included in that amount:

- 22.02 percent distributed to sites
- 6.12 percent awarded as exemplary grants
- 15.21 percent for district-wide initiatives
- 38.48 percent for curriculum development
- 18.17 percent designated for other staff development activities

The FY 2010 expenditures allocated toward other staff development activities are specifically reported in staff development UFARS 640 code.

A comparison of a total of all districts expenditures distributed by sites, exemplary grants, district-wide activities, curriculum development and other staff development activities over the past five years is provided in Figure A.

Figure A. Staff Development Expenditure Trends



Program information and analysis is derived from all district reports received by December 17, 2010. The analysis of the program information includes the amount of basic revenue reserves used; types of high-quality staff development offered and numbers of teachers engaged; district and site goals and legislative goals addressed; and staff development content, designs/structures and evaluation results.

Among the highlights of the reported data are:

- Staff development expenditures in 2009-10 were \$136,011,175, compared to \$155,202,310 in 2008-09.
- The largest percentage of staff development expenditures (38.48 percent) went to curriculum consultant and development activities and the second largest percent (22.02) went to school sites.
- Statewide data for FY 2010 identified a total of 48.62 percent of districts expending 2 percent or more of their basic revenue on staff development, a 23.62 percent decrease from the previous year.
- A total of 15.29 percent of districts waived the use of staff development funds, a 7.23 percent increase from the previous year. This increase may partly be due to recent legislation that allows a school district or charter school to temporarily suspend the requirement to reserve revenue for staff development if they choose.
- For FY 2010, the percent of surveyed districts giving one or more exemplary grants was 39.76 percent, a 19.34 percent decrease from the previous year.
- District student achievement goals were reported across the following academic subject areas: Art/Music, Career and Technical Education, Language Arts/Writing, Mathematics, Reading, Science, Social Studies, and World Languages.
- The high-quality staff development component need most frequently reported (N=846) was activities related to high-quality staff development as an integral part of school board, district-wide, and school-wide educational improvement plans.

- High-quality staff development was delivered to the following categories of staff: 98 percent of teachers, 91 percent of non-instructional staff, and 91 percent of paraprofessionals.
- In FY 2010, districts self-reported staff development teacher induction activities in five areas: induction activities for new teachers, new teacher seminars or workshops, formative assessments used with new teachers, mentor training, and evaluation measures.
- Arts education was surveyed for district-level arts standards implementation at the secondary level and for visual art, theater, music, media art, and dance at the elementary level.
- Gifted and Talented practices were surveyed on an individual site basis and data was collected related to gifted and talented identification, availability of services, staff development and compliance with the acceleration procedure mandate.

The 2009-10 Staff Development Report to the Legislature includes a description of the electronic staff development reporting format delivered through MDE's website. The School Improvement Division monitors the online reporting system (see Appendix B for sample pages) and is responsible for implementation, training, assistance, and reporting to the Legislature. The use of technology improves capabilities for gathering and analyzing larger amounts of data for staff development reports to the Minnesota Legislature and the U.S. Department of Education.

PART I STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM REPORT

Reporting Staff Development Program Results

Districts and schools submitted staff development goals and staff development activities using the MDE Online Staff Development Report. In March, district and school reports for the previous school year are made available for public review on the MDE School Report Card web page: <http://education.state.mn.us/ReportCard2005/index.do>.

Staff development reports are due annually on October 15, with districts and schools reporting information from the previous school year. This year, 312 public school districts reported. In addition, seven charter schools submitted staff development reports. Charter schools are not required to report as specified in Minnesota Statutes, section 126C.10, subdivision 2, and Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61.

As of December 17, 2010, 23 school districts did not submit a 2009-2010 staff development report. An asterisk (*) indicates districts that have failed to submit a report for two or more years.

Brandon Public School District	M.A.C.C.R.A.Y. Public School District*
Brewster Public School District	Martin County West Public School District
Carlton Public School District	Montgomery-Lonsdale School District
Cass Lake-Bena Public School District	Nett Lake Public School District *
Chokio-Alberta Public School District*	Northland Community Schools
Duluth Public School District	Orono Public School District
Eagle Valley Public School District	Ortonville Public School District
Evansville Public School District	Owatonna Public School District*
Goodhue Public School District	Pine Island Public School District
Granada-Huntley-East Chain Public School District	Pine Point Public School District
Kingsland Public School District*	Round Lake Public School District
	Southland Public School District

Statewide Efforts that Support Staff Development

The vision of the School Improvement Division of the Minnesota Department of Education is:

- To build the capacity of public school districts and charter schools to meet their mission
- To increase the level of academic knowledge, mastery of 21st century skills and human development in order to minimize the achievement gap across all student groups
- To partner effectively with district and charter school leadership in carrying out the statutory responsibilities, programs, and services of the School Improvement Division

The School Improvement Division provided assistance to Minnesota districts and schools in their improvement efforts to increase the academic achievement needs of students. Developing goal-oriented and results-driven staff development plans are critical in ensuring teachers have

the knowledge, skills, and support to meet the diverse academic needs of their students. Division staff provided guidance and support to districts and schools in developing staff development plans that are aligned with district and school improvement goals.

Minnesota Staff Development Statutes, section 122A.60 require districts to establish staff development committees, develop staff development plans, implement effective staff development activities, and report annually the results of their plans. School Improvement staff provided assistance in these areas and used the National Staff Development Council Standards for Staff Development as a tool in developing staff development plans.

During FY 2010, the School Improvement Division provided statewide programs, services, and technical assistance based on a continuous improvement model. Staff development support was provided through a regional delivery system, customized technical assistance, and use of technology. Initiatives and programs addressed included:

- Quality Compensation for Teachers (Q Comp)
- Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)
- High-Quality Professional Development
- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Statewide System of Support (SSOS)
- Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG)
- Mathematics and Science Teacher Academy (MSTA)- United States Department of Education Math and Science Teacher Partnership (MSP)
- Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
- Gifted and Talented Education Services
- Enhancing Education Through Technology (E2T2) Grants - Title II Part D
- Education Technology American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Grants (Ed Tech ARRA)

Quality Compensation for Teachers (Q Comp) is Minnesota's alternative teacher compensation initiative. Q Comp requires districts, teachers, and communities to organize and focus around a common agenda – improving instructional quality and teacher efficacy to increase student achievement. The Q Comp program has five components: (1) career ladder/advancement options for teachers; (2) job-embedded professional development; (3) teacher observation/evaluation; (4) performance pay; and, (5) an alternative teacher salary schedule. A total of 76 school districts participated in Q Comp in the 2009-10 school year. Of the 76 participating schools, 32 were Charter Schools and 44 were Independent School Districts.

The School Improvement Division staff provides Q Comp schools a variety of professional development offerings, technical assistance, and consultation regarding job-embedded professional development. Monthly network sessions were provided to allow participating Q-Comp schools to come together and examine program practices that improve instruction to increase student achievement. Sessions focused on Job-embedded Professional Development, Connecting Teacher Observation to Student Achievement, Teacher Leaders, and the structures needed to increase student achievement. In addition to the monthly network sessions, Q Comp staff also hosted a one-day conference in January 2010. The conference theme, Blueprint for Teacher and Student Success, focused on increasing the ability of both districts and schools to carry out effective program implementation, organizational change, and systems transformation.

Upon request, division staff provided workshops to schools or customizes workshop materials, including web-based presentations, for Q Comp schools to deliver on their own.

MDE provides ongoing support to schools implementing the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). TAP is a comprehensive, systemic reform that aims to improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement. TAP provides all teachers with opportunities to advance in their profession and aims to improve student achievement by providing better-prepared and more highly motivated teachers in the classroom. Implementation of the TAP includes ongoing applied professional growth with each teacher working in cooperation with his or her mentor and master teachers to develop an Individual Growth Plan (IGP). As well, each teacher belongs to a professional learning group called a cluster. Master and mentor teachers within the school lead these cluster sessions, which focus on teacher collaboration for instructional improvement and sharing of “best practices” with colleagues. The School Improvement Division provides support to TAP schools through delivery of workshops, monthly master-mentor meetings, on-site technical assistance and leadership coaching, and program review to ensure fidelity of TAP implementation.

Within the School Improvement Division, content specialists in the areas of Language Arts, Mathematics, Reading, Science, Gifted and Talented, and STEM provided content-specific staff development in academic standards implementation, assessment, curriculum development, and best practices in instruction. Pertinent content data, state and federal legislation, and research was identified, analyzed, and disseminated to Minnesota teachers and administrators. Customized technical assistance was designed to support district and school-specific identified needs based on goals defined in AYP, Q Comp, staff development plans, curriculum review cycles, and grants connected to state and federal grant initiatives.

The School Improvement Division also provided oversight and technical assistance related to NCLB legislation and staff development practices. NCLB identifies schools and districts as *In Need of Improvement* if students are not meeting proficiency, participation, attendance, or graduation targets. While this report does not include expenditures from federal sources, it is clear that federal directives regarding staff development impact decisions at both the district and school level. Increasingly, MDE is unifying the assistance it offers on development and delivery of high-quality professional development, per state and federal initiatives.

Title I, Part A-funded schools identified in the AYP stages of School Choice or Supplemental Education Services are required to set aside 10 percent of their Title I building allocation for professional development. Title I, Part A-funded public school districts identified in any stage of *In Need of Improvement* are required to set aside 10 percent of their Title I district allocation for professional development. A required improvement plan process for AYP districts and schools outlines their needs assessment, teaching and learning needs, selected research-based strategies, and programs (including high-quality professional development) to support increased student achievement.

The 2009-2010 Title I School Improvement Grant was intended to leverage change through high-quality professional development and increase achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. It was available to low-performing Title I schools, districts (with a student population of 1000 or less), and charter schools identified in the corrective action or preparing for restructuring phase of Adequately Yearly Progress. Awardees hired a professional

development content specialist to help sites analyze reading and/or mathematics data and ensure direct alignment with state standards and assessments. The specialist provided research-based, job-embedded professional development by coaching content, instructional strategies, and assessments. To support this work, the regional service cooperatives partnered with awarded sites to provide professional development. MDE provided trainings and technical assistance in instructional coaching, formative assessment, and professional learning communities. Sustainability of grant work beyond the grant period was collaboratively planned by the MDE Program Manager and the 32 awardees.

The Mathematics and Science Teacher Academy (MSTA) consists of nine regional teacher centers through funds supported by United States Department of Education Math and Science Teacher Partnership (MSP). In 2009-10, the broad focus was on Mathematics and Science teacher knowledge in specific grade bands. The Regional Teacher Centers provided sustained and systemic professional development and technical assistance. The Teacher Centers assist teachers in improving teacher content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge to more effectively implement the Minnesota Mathematics and Science Academic Standards.

Science Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) is a statewide campaign that has been made possible through the support of state organizations including MDE. One of the key initiatives has been to connect schools with businesses to provide an authentic lens for STEM education. One of the key outcomes was businesses teaching educators what engineering looks like in the real world. Through this partnership, more than 1,000 users for getSTEM are now registered and almost 200 STEM connections were made in 2009-10.

The Minnesota Gifted and Talented Advisory Council, comprised of representatives of various stakeholder groups, met quarterly during the 2009-2010 school year providing valuable feedback and guidance to the department on current topics of importance. Council members help identify statewide staff development needs. A major focus of Gifted and Talented training during the 2009-2010 school year was the support and identification of at-risk highly able learners. These included regional workshops, conference presentations and customized professional development.

There are a number of technology funding opportunities for districts that are either managed by MDE or are directly funded to districts. The Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology (E2T2) program is part of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation passed by Congress in 2002 and administered by MDE. The purpose of the E2T2 program is to fund initiatives that promote integration of technology with instruction, development of information and technology literacy skills for students and teachers, application of technology to learning to increase student engagement and achievement, and staff development for teachers in the integration of technology with instructional practice.


The Enhancing Education Through Technology Program utilizes funds made available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The program provides an opportunity for schools to implement 21st century classrooms using innovative strategies that enhance instruction, facilitate teaching and learning, and improve student achievement. These additional resources will enable local entities to provide new and emerging technologies, create state-of-the-art learning environments, and offer additional training and support for teachers to help students achieve academically and acquire the skills needed to compete in a global economy.

2009-10 Staff Development Data Analysis

Basic Revenue

The FY 2010 staff development expenditures were \$136,011,175 (refer to Part II of this report). The total amount of funds devoted to staff development shows sizable and consistent annual growth from expenditures in 2004-05 to 2009-10 (Figure B).


**Figure B. Total Statewide Staff Development Expenditures Over Time
(Uniform Financial Accounting and Reporting Standards)**



Statewide Comparison Charts - Percent Reserved

Figure C compares FY 2009 and FY 2010 data regarding the percent of districts that reserved 0 percent, less than 2 percent, or 2 percent or more of basic revenue for staff development.

**Figure C. Percent of Basic Revenue Reserved Statewide
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**




“N” stands for number of districts

Statewide data for FY 2010 identified a total of 48.62 percent of districts expending 2 percent or more of their basic revenue on staff development. This is a 23.62 percent decrease compared to FY 2009. In FY 2010, the districts expending less than 2 percent totaled 36.09 percent, a 16.39 percent increase over FY 2009. In FY 2010, 15.29 percent of districts utilized the 0 percent option, a 7.23 percent increase from FY 2009.

Exemplary Grants

Districts that reserved funds may distribute up to 25 percent of staff development funds in the form of exemplary grants to sites. The percent of surveyed districts giving one or more exemplary grant(s) decreased 19.34 percent from FY 2009 to FY 2010. (Figure D).

**Figure D. Percent of Exemplary Grants
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**



“N” stands for the number of districts

Details on individual expenditures for exemplary grants are provided in Appendix A of this report under Finance Code 307. Finance Code 307 for FY 2010 stands at 6.12 percent of the \$136,011,175 awarded as exemplary grants.

High-Quality Staff Development

The School Improvement Division staff seeks ways to partner with school districts in offering high-quality professional development. In response to increasing requests from districts for workshops and trainings, more than 40 web-based presentations have been designed to increase teacher instructional quality. Moving to an internet platform has allowed districts several professional development options. Some district personnel use the web-based trainings “as is” without additional support from division staff. Upon request, staff customized a workshop session for their unique context and provided a workshop outline, script, and accompanying materials along with ongoing consultation to ensure training at the school meets with success. These on-demand professional development trainings are designed to accommodate a variety of school districts needs including: Professional Learning Communities; Teacher Observation; Q Comp; Academic Excellence that includes Reading, Language Arts, Mathematics, and Gifted and Talented Learners; SMART Goals; Staff Development Reporting; and Adequate Yearly Progress.

Table 1. The Number of Each Professional Group Across the State and those that have Received High-Quality Staff Development, as Reported by Sites (2009-10 Self-Reported Data)

	Teachers (N=114,098)	Paraprofessionals (N=43,435)	Licensed Non-Instructional Staff (N=21,311)
Number of staff members receiving high-quality staff development	102,915 (90%)	37,105 (85%)	18,294 (86%)

“N” indicates total number of staff members across all sites in the state.

As reported for FY 2010, most of the teachers (90 percent), paraprofessionals (85 percent) and licensed non-instructional staff (86 percent) received high-quality staff development.

District Student Achievement Goals

Goals reported related to specific subject areas listed in Table 2 were often written in broad terms. An overview of district staff development goals and school-site student achievement goals showed a strong correlation.

Table 2. Number of District Student Achievement Goals Reported for Each Subject Area (2009-10 Self-Reported Data)


Subject Area Focus Related to District Goals	Number
Art/Music	277
Career & TechEd	289
Health/PhyEd	279
Language Arts & Writing	434
Mathematics	595
Reading	599
Science	371
Social Studies	302
World Languages	257

The highest number of student achievement goals reported related to reading, mathematics, reading, language arts/writing, and science. These subject areas correspond with the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA-II). The MCAs are state tests that help districts measure student performance in mathematics, reading, and science. Assessments in the remaining subject areas are determined by the district. The MDE School Improvement staff is working with district and school personnel in using their assessment data to write goals that are specific, measurable, attainable, results-based, and time-bound (SMART).

Designs and Structures Used to Implement Goals

Designs and structures used to implement staff development activities are displayed in Figure E.

**Figure E. Number of Staff Development Activities Reported
for Each Design and Structure
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**



“N” stands for the number of districts

The district staff development activities engaged in at a high level by the reporting districts include: learning teams with an instructional focus (99 percent), examine student data (98 percent) and curriculum review (95 percent). Districts also provided activities in classroom coaching (94 percent) and offsite staff development (89 percent).

The activities were selected by the district staff development committee to support their staff development goal(s) and increase student achievement.

High-Quality Components

As required by state and federal guidelines, district respondents were asked to report on high-quality staff development components as identified on Table 3.

Table 3. Total Number of Activities for Each High-Quality Staff Development Component (2009-10 Self-Reported Data)

Each High-Quality Staff Development Component-Need 2010 Data	Number of Activities
Included teachers, principals, parents and administrators in planning sustainable classroom focused activities that were not one-day or short-term workshops.	691
An integral part of school board, districtwide, and schoolwide educational improvement plans.	846
Evaluated regularly to improve the quality of future professional development.	516
Helped all school personnel work effectively with parents.	434
Improved and increased teachers' knowledge of academic subjects and enabled teachers to become highly qualified.	428
Included the use of data and assessments to inform classroom practice.	750
Increased teachers' ability to effectively instruct all students including culturally diverse learners, learners with special needs, gifted and talented students, students with Limited English Proficiency, and at-risk students.	570
Increased teachers' and principals' knowledge and skills in providing appropriate curriculum, instruction, and assessment to help students meet and exceed state academic standards.	755
Increased teachers' knowledge of academic subjects and understanding of effective instructional strategies using scientifically based research.	712
Provided for professional learning communities that focus on student achievement.	543
Provided technology training to improve teaching and learning.	610

The high-quality staff development component need most frequently reported (N=846) was activities related to high-quality staff development as an integral part of school board, district-wide, and school-wide educational improvement plans. This replaced the highest rated need from the year before, which was increasing teachers' and principals' knowledge and skills in providing appropriate curriculum, instruction, and assessment to help students meet and exceed state academic standards. This need was the second most frequently reported need (N=755).

High-Quality Expectations

Respondents were also asked to identify the high-quality expectations for their staff development activities as summarized in Table 4.

**Table 4. Total Number of Each High-Quality Expectation
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**

Total for Each High-Quality Activity	Number of Activities (N=1188)	% of Total Activities
An integral part of school board, districtwide, and schoolwide educational improvement plans.	951	80.05%
Developed with extensive participation of teachers, principals, parents, and administrators.	666	56.14%
Evaluated regularly to improve the quality of future professional development.	687	57.83%
Sustained, intensive, and classroom focused; they were not one-day or short-term workshops.	731	61.70%

All four activities identified for the high-quality expectations for district staff development activities exceeded 50 percent. An integral part of school board, district, and school educational improvement plans (80.05 percent) had the highest ranking. The high level of activities that were sustained, intensive, and focused on the classroom (61.70 percent), and not one-day or short-term workshops, provided encouraging data as research has demonstrated the success of these types of activities.

Teacher Induction

Teacher induction or mentoring programs provide a formal support structure for teachers during their first years of teaching. Among the many activities that can be encompassed by a comprehensive induction program are an orientation to the school setting, professional development specific to the first years of teaching, mentoring, observation and feedback, professional development plans, and formative assessments.

Statewide Teacher Induction


Figures below show information about statewide staff development teacher induction; detailed for each of the five categories (A-E in Table 5).

**Table 5. Statewide Staff Development Teacher Induction
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**

	Statewide Count	% of Districts Reporting
A. Induction Activities for New Teachers		
Collaboration time expectations for new teacher and mentor	171	53%
Formative assessments to guide their professional growth (e.g., needs assessments, self-assessments using professional teaching standards, mentor logs, mentor observations, examining student work)	117	36%
New teacher observations of master teachers	113	35%
New teacher orientation to district, school and, classroom (typically conducted prior to the start of the school year)	213	66%
New teacher seminars/workshops	148	46%
Observations conducted by a mentor	146	45%
Program for first-year teachers	208	64%
Program for second-year teachers	86	26%
Program for third-year teachers	49	15%
B. New Teacher Seminars or Workshops		
Classroom management	166	51%
Content or program knowledge	126	39%
Curriculum and assessments	151	46%
Differentiated instruction	105	32%
Instructional strategies	161	50%
Lesson planning	121	37%
Needs assessments	71	22%
Using data to improve instruction	152	47%
C. Formative Assessments used with New Teachers		
Examining student work or student data	111	34%
Foundations (e.g., basic skills, mentor roles and mentoring responsibilities)	114	35%
Mentor logs focused on issues and results	89	27%
Mentor observations and feedback	167	51%
Self-assessments using professional teaching standards	111	34%
D. Mentor Training Activities		
Coaching skills	124	38%
Observation strategies	151	46%
Professional teaching standards	133	41%
Program model effectiveness	66	20%
Using formative assessments for professional growth	70	22%
E. Evaluation Measures		
Impact on student achievement	96	30%
Impact on teacher effectiveness (professional growth)	148	46%
Impact on teacher retention	86	26%
Knowledge and application of new teacher development	155	48%
New teacher-mentor relationship	148	46%
New teachers job satisfaction	150	46%


In Figure F, most respondents (66 percent) reported that they provided new teacher orientation to their respective districts and schools as an induction activity for new teachers. In addition, 64 percent provided programs for first-year teachers. Collaboration time expectations for new teachers and mentors were reportedly done 53 percent of the time. Although a large percentage of districts reported providing orientations for new teachers, only 35 percent of respondents provided new teacher observations of master teachers and 36 percent provided formative assessments to guide their professional growth. New teacher induction continued for second-year teachers in 26 percent of the reporting districts and 15 percent reported a program for third-year teachers.

Figure F. Percentage Distribution of the Frequency of Districts Providing Various Induction Activities for New Teachers (2009-10 Self-Reported Data)




Information reported in Figure G indicate that new teacher seminars or workshop topics included classroom management (51 percent), instructional strategies (50 percent), using data to improve instruction (47 percent), and curriculum and assessments (46 percent). Percentages of the respondents indicating content or program knowledge (39 percent), differentiated instruction (32 percent) and lesson planning (37 percent) were relatively small with needs assessments being the least frequent reported (22 percent).

**Figure G. Percentage Distribution of the Frequency of Districts Providing
New Teacher Seminars or Workshops
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**




Use of formative assessments with new teachers is indicated in Figure H. Programs frequently focused on mentor observations and feedback (51 percent) and foundations (35 percent). In addition examining student work or student data (34 percent), self-assessments using professional teaching standards (34 percent), and using mentor observations and feedback (27 percent) were identified.

**Figure H. Percentage Distribution of the Frequency of Districts Using
Formative Assessments with New Teachers
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**




Characteristics of mentor training activities are shown in Figure I. The highest ranking activities were: observation strategies (46 percent), professional teaching standards (41 percent) and coaching skills (38 percent). The smallest frequency of responses was for formative assessments for professional growth (22 percent) and program model effectiveness (20 percent).

Figure I. Percentage Distribution of the Frequency of Districts Providing Mentor Training Activities (2009-10 Self-Reported Data)



As seen in Figure J, a large percentage of the respondents reported that they used new teacher knowledge and application (48 percent), new teacher-mentor relationship (46 percent), new teacher's job satisfaction (46 percent) and impact on teacher effectiveness (46 percent) as evaluation measures. Respondents also indicated they evaluated program components such as impact on student achievement (30 percent) and impact on teacher retention (26 percent).


Figure J. Percentage Distribution of Districts Providing Evaluation Measures (2009-10 Self-Reported Data)




Arts Education

Survey questions developed with assistance from the Perpich Center for Arts Education have resulted in a statewide picture of growth in the implementation of the Minnesota Academic Standards in the Arts since 2009. Data is based on district implementation of the 2003 Minnesota Academic Standards in the Arts. Implementation of the 2008 Revised Minnesota Academic Standards in the Arts will be available in the 2011-2012 school year report.

2010 Arts Standards Implementation
Reported at the District Level for Elementary and Secondary Levels



Growth of Arts Implementation Since 2009



Arts learning at the elementary and secondary levels were assessed and districts were asked if they had a dedicated arts curriculum coordinator. Only 9 percent of reporting sites had a district level arts coordinator, 25 percent fewer than in 2009. Arts specialists were more likely to assess arts learning at the high school level (83 percent, up from 80 percent in 2009). Assessment of student learning in the arts remained at 2009 levels among classroom teachers. However, assessment of arts learning by non-arts elementary specialists increased by 7 percent and by non-arts secondary specialists by 6 percent.

The quantity of staff development goals focused on the Arts increased by 15.36 percent from the 2009 total of 29.39 percent to 44.75 percent of reporting districts in 2010. The Perpich Center for Arts Education continues to work with districts in areas of staff development indicated by the survey to be of high interest. Demand for Perpich Center assistance rose to 89 percent of all districts, representing 94 percent of all Minnesota students, up from 85 percent in 2009.

**Table 6. District Requested Assistance from the Perpich Center for Arts Education
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**


Professional Learning Areas	% of Districts Requesting Perpich Center Services	% of Students Impacted
Implementing Arts Standards	55%	66%
Designing Effective Arts and Arts Integrated Curriculum	65%	73%
Designing Assessments Aligned with Standards	57%	73%
Building a System to Report Individual Student Achievement in the Arts	31%	37%

Gifted and Talented Education

Minnesota public schools were surveyed on the FY 2010 online Staff Development Report school/site level to gather data regarding practices related to gifted and talented education. Survey items were developed with assistance from the Minnesota Department of Education Gifted and Talented Advisory Council. Each question included a drop-down menu of options or choices (see Appendix B for questions and options). Data was collected by individual school site rather than by district level to ensure the most accurate picture of program design and availability. Results from 1,144 school sites were reported regarding gifted and talented education which was used to identify the needs of schools and assist them in addressing those needs.

Of the 1,144 sites who responded, 1,082 reported the number of hours of staff development teachers received for meeting the needs of gifted and talented learners. The number of schools and hours devoted to staff development and corresponding percentage are provided on Figure L.

**Figure L. Staff Development Hours by Sites and Percentage (N =1,082)
(2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**



“N” indicates the number of schools

When compared with the previous year, the 2009-10 data showed a decrease in the number of schools who reported no staff development in gifted and talented education for the year.

**Table 7. Comparison of Staff Development Hours by Year and Percentage Change
(2008-2009 and 2009-10 Self-Reported Data)**

Hours by Site	2008-09	2009-10	Change
5+	25%	23%	-2%
3-4	12%	13%	-1%
1-2	29%	31%	-2%
<1	20%	21%	+1%
None	14%	12%	-2%

Best practice and Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.15(b) provide guidance for the use of multiple measures for identification of gifted and talented learners. The number and percentage of sites using the most common tools to identify gifted and talented students are listed in Table 7.

Table 8. Most Common Identification Tools, Number of Sites, and Percentage (2009-10 Self-Reported Data)

Tool	Number of Sites	Percentage
Teacher nomination	770	67%
Northwest Evaluation Association Data (NWEA)	659	58%
Parent nomination	509	45%
Group or grade-level achievement test	444	39%
Individual achievement test	403	35%
Gifted screening surveys (teacher and/or parent)	337	29%

More than half, 67 percent, of the respondents used teacher nomination and 58 percent used Northwest Evaluation Association data, an overall increase of 4 percent and 5 percent as reported in the previous year. Parent nomination, the third most common tool used in the identification of gifted and talented learners, showed an increase of 9 percent. A review of respondents' grade levels served indicated students were most likely to be identified for gifted and talented services in grades 2-5, and least likely to be identified in grades 9-12, consistent with the previous year's data.

Electronic Staff Development Reporting Format

The electronic format required for submitting staff development reports facilitates the use of resulting data. The online reporting system offers districts a uniform systematic reporting process (see sample pages in Appendix B) to address staff development efforts at the district and site levels. The School Improvement Division has the responsibility for the online system implementation, training, assistance, and reporting to the Legislature.

Authorized district and school personnel register a user ID and password to access the site, where information on district and school levels can be entered and edited. Throughout the electronic reporting site, users are assisted with:

- Directions
- Statutory references
- Forms tailored to pertinent information
- Drop-down lists
- Links to definitions of words and phrases
- Staffing information pulled from other state reports

The table of contents is displayed online as a menu bar (refer to the screen shot in Appendix B) and provides access to electronic pages categorized in three sections: district report, site report, and final reports.

District-Level Information

The district section includes the following information:

- Contact information for district staff development chairs
- Members of the district staff development advisory committees
- District student achievement goals and related subject areas
- District staff development goals
- Activities or strategies used to implement the staff development goals
- Designs or structures used to implement the staff development goals
- High-quality components encompassed by this activity
- Characteristics of the staff development activity (relation to improvement plans, length and intensity, level of participation, and evaluation)
- Evaluative findings regarding staff development goals (whether goal was met, impact on student learning, impact on teacher learning, and identification of which goals will and will not be continued into the following year)
- Revenue details (waiver of reserve requirement, Statutory Operating Debt (SOD) status, exemplary grants, Q Comp participation, and set-aside of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) funds for professional development)
- Information about new teacher induction programs and their evaluation
- Identification of the numbers of district staff, broken out by category, who received high-quality staff development
- K-12 Arts Education Information– a district reporting component as of 2008-09

The electronic format guides the user to report: (1) student achievement goal(s); (2) staff development goal(s); (3) activities and strategies tied to each specific goal; and, (4) evaluative findings tied to goals and activities. The findings are reported through a narrative describing the impact on student learning and teacher learning.

The final page of the district section covers staff information. Numbers of staff, categorized as teachers, paraprofessionals, and licensed non-instructional staff, are pre-populated with data submitted earlier to MDE on the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) and Staff Automated Reporting System (STAR). Users report how many of those staff members have received high-quality staff development. A link to the U.S. Department of Education's list of high-quality staff development characteristics is provided.

School-Level Information

School-level planning and reporting is carried out on electronic pages that replicate the district-level pages in relation to goals, activities, evaluative findings and, engagement in high-quality staff development.

The school site section includes the following information for each of the district's school site(s):

- School site staff development goals
- School site student achievement goals and related subject areas
- Related district staff development goals
- Activities or strategies used to implement the staff development goals
- Designs or structures used to implement the staff development goals

- The high-quality components encompassed by this activity
- Characteristics of the staff development activity (relation to improvement plans, length and intensity, level of participation, and evaluation)
- Evaluative findings regarding staff development goals (whether goal was met, impact on student learning, impact on teacher learning, and identification of which goals will and will not be continued into the following year)
- Identification of the numbers of school staff, broken out by category, who received high-quality staff development
- Gifted and Talented program data– a school site reporting component as of 2008-09

The school site report parallels the district report in terms of goals, activities, and findings. Once entered in the district section of the report, district goals automatically appear on the school site pages to connect district and school site goals. This section also includes the number of staff members receiving high-quality staff development. The Gifted and Talented Program data is only gathered at the school-site level.

Final Report

The third section includes the options to view Error Reports, a Preview Final Reports, and the Submit process. Error Reports provide specific details about which information in the report is incomplete. The Preview Final Reports offers printable collections of six types of district-level information and two collections of district-wide information entered by the user up to that time. The final page, entitled “Submit Final Report,” gives the user a Statement of Assurances that, after being signed, must be returned to MDE by mail, fax, or email.

Technical Assistance

The MDE School Improvement Division staff provides assistance by phone and email for district and school personnel responsible for meeting their program’s reporting requirements. A WebEx tutorial, a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document, and an instructional document with screen shots were developed to answer questions.

Reporting Timeline

Each year, feedback from users of the online staff development reporting system is used to improve the system. MDE continues to make adjustments as needed. District and school site personnel were able to access the reporting site in March 2010 to begin entering staff development information for the 2009–2010 school year. School and district personnel responsible for staff development planning, implementation, and reporting had the opportunity to edit and review information for accuracy up to the final submission. Final electronic staff development reports are due by October 15 each year. Districts experiencing difficulty meeting the timeline were contacted by MDE staff and provided assistance. Data from the reports is aggregated and analyzed for annual reports to the Minnesota Legislature and the U.S. Department of Education.

PART II

STAFF DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE REPORT-FY10

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 Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, subd. 1, required a district to set aside 2 percent 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 some of the finance dimension codes used in this report.

Figure 1: Selected UFARS Finance Dimension Codes

Finance Code Number	Finance Code Name and Definition
306	50% Site: Staff development expenditures at the site.
307	25% Grants: Staff development expenditures for effective practices at the sites.
308	25% District-Wide: Staff development expenditures for district-wide activities.

The 2003 legislative session released units from the 2 percent set-aside mandate for FY 2004 and FY 2005 only. There was little effect on the amount and type of spending from year to year. Subsequent to that change, the Laws 2009, Chapter 96, Article 2, Section 64, changed the reserve revenue for staff development to read:

Sec. 64. RESERVED REVENUE FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT; TEMPORARY SUSPENSION.

Notwithstanding Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, subdivision 1, for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 only, a school district or charter school may use revenue reserved for staff development under Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, subdivision 1, according to the requirements of general education revenue under Minnesota

*Statutes, section 126C.13, subdivision 5. **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This section is effective July 1, 2009.*

This change did not affect the reporting of expenditure data on Fiscal Year 2010.

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 percent set aside. In those cases, the finance code 000 could be used with program codes 640 or 610, instead of the finance codes 306, 307, and 308. Districts could also use a finance code of 451, as in the case of federal charter development grant funds or a host of other finance codes. See Figure 2 for a brief description of the program dimension codes used in this report.

Figure 2: Selected UFARS Program Dimension Codes

Program Code Number	Program Code Name 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.

Again, the program code of 640 can be used with one of the set-aside finance codes, a federal charter code, a 000 code, or a host of other codes. In this report, Program Code 640 captures all expenditures for staff development that did not get funded with set-aside revenue.

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.

Figure 3: Selected UFARS Object Dimension Codes

Object Code Number	Object Code Name 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

Findings from Data Submitted on Staff Development Expenditures

The following three tables contain summary information on staff development expenditures and balances for 340 regular school districts, two common school districts, and 158 charter schools. Other units including cooperatives, educational districts, and special education districts were not included. The data is arranged by Finance and Program Codes in Table One and by Object Codes in Table Two. Table Three contains summary information on balances in reserved staff development accounts. Table Three also contains a comparison of balances from FY09 to FY10.

The data are taken from all data submitted to MDE by January 3, 2011. The statutory deadline for reporting final UFARS data was November 30, 2010.

Expenditures by Finance and Program Dimension

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), whether the Finance Dimension Code was 000, 451, or a host of other numbers.

Table 1: Summary Data of Staff Development Expenditures by Finance Dimension and Program Dimension for FY10

Finance/Program Codes	Total Funds Spent	Percent of Total Spent
Finance 306 (50% site)	29,958,840	22.02%
Finance 307 (25% grant)	8,323,350	6.12%
Finance 308 (25% district)	20,684,050	15.21%
Program 610 (curriculum)	52,333,148	38.48%
Program 640 (staff development)	24,711,787	18.17%
TOTAL	\$136,011,175	100.00%

Conclusions from Table 1 include:

1. Finance Code 306 (site) recorded the largest percentage of expenditures of the three set-aside finance codes. This has been a consistent finding over time.
2. Program Code 610 (curriculum) recorded the highest amount of total funds spent compared to FY09.

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 2: Summary Data of Staff Development Expenditures by Object Dimension for FY10

Object Codes	Total Funds Spent	Percent of Total Spent
100-299 Salaries/benefits	96,108,449	70.66%
300 -399 Purchased services	22,209,145	16.33%
400-599 Materials/equipment	16,616,336	12.22%
600-899 All Other	1,075,073	0.79%
TOTAL	\$136,009,003	100.00%

Conclusions that can be drawn from Table 2:

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

Balance Sheet Accounts

Legislation required that some expenditures funded by specific revenues be used for only specific purposes. Those revenues were called ‘restricted’ or ‘reserved.’ Any remaining (unspent) revenue at the end of a fiscal year would be recorded in a reserve balance sheet account. All set-aside staff development revenue balances went to the balance sheet code 403. There were other reserve staff development accounts that were no longer funded and were phased out.

Summary Data of Staff Development Balances

Initially, there were several pages of district names that had positive balances in the phased out staff development reserve accounts. Each year the number of districts was reduced until they were all removed by FY07. The FY10 total for the staff development reserve account is contained in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary Data of Staff Development Balances by Balance Sheet Code for FY09 and FY10

Balance Sheet Name	Balances FY09	Balances FY10
403 Regular-Staff Development	\$22,208,911	\$15,186,372

Conclusions or comments directed to Table 3:

1. Staff development balances decreased over seven million dollars from the prior year.
2. All other staff development accounts that were discontinued have been removed.

Appendices

Appendix A Unit-by-Unit Data

The information contained in Appendix A is displayed unit-by-unit. It is the same UFARS information that was aggregated to create Table 1. Due to rounding of numbers, minor differences may occur when comparing data from Appendix A to the table.

Appendix B provides sample pages of the 2009-2010 online staff development reporting form.

Appendix C contains a copy of Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, Reserved revenue for staff development.

Contact Karen Dykoski at the address or number below for inquiries on the data.

Karen Dykoski
Financial Management Section
Program Finance Division
651-582-8766 or Karen.Dykoski@state.mn.us

APPENDIX A

Unit-By-Unit Staff Development Account Chart

NUM	TYPE	NAME	FINANCE CODE			PROGRAM CODE	
			306	307	308	610	640
1	1	AITKIN PUBLIC SC	41,693.44	-	2,897.71	6,779.47	-
1	3	MINNEAPOLIS PUBL	3,417,992.23	-	4,281,330.72	3,199.60	4,686,729.17
2	1	HILL CITY PUBLIC	-	-	-	192.23	-
4	1	MCGREGOR PUBLIC	5,691.52	-	1,409.55	-	-
6	3	SOUTH ST. PAUL P	93,374.53	39,817.48	11,850.24	370,092.83	-
11	1	ANOKA-HENNEPIN P	-	-	132,945.16	4,569,129.56	3,444,482.17
12	1	CENTENNIAL PUBLI	629,178.31	44,462.40	189,168.40	97,080.37	77,668.13
13	1	COLUMBIA HEIGHTS	47,234.73	18,866.06	19,295.07	114,276.56	13,321.68
14	1	FRIDLEY PUBLIC S	53,648.40	36,867.66	-	440,758.12	85,641.58
15	1	ST. FRANCIS PUBL	317,676.00	158,838.00	158,838.00	230,648.96	770,053.84
16	1	SPRING LAKE PARK	354,023.63	76,751.78	136,282.71	878,746.64	187,095.37
22	1	DETROIT LAKES PU	81,682.48	28,668.95	35,707.91	-	-
23	1	FRAZEE-VERGAS PU	2,427.52	2,244.68	831.60	-	4,014.79
25	1	PINE POINT PUBLI	200.00	150.00	4,452.75	-	-
31	1	BEMIDJI PUBLIC S	71,644.48	20,878.95	9,383.28	11,642.05	-
32	1	BLACKDUCK PUBLIC	18,428.68	101.58	96.12	-	-
36	1	KELLIHER PUBLIC	9,542.11	1,254.30	3,152.89	-	88.78
38	1	RED LAKE PUBLIC	38,450.80	2,636.53	17,100.66	-	111,450.62
47	1	SAUK RAPIDS PUBL	1,889.00	63,706.68	3,753.59	21,399.24	32,324.67
51	1	FOLEY PUBLIC SCH	70,505.14	9,891.65	32,716.40	248,725.69	7,756.68
75	1	ST. CLAIR PUBLIC	16,138.81	-	15,624.67	5,436.85	-
77	1	MANKATO PUBLIC S	271,961.45	11,876.72	587,021.98	655,361.57	11,925.56
81	1	COMFREY PUBLIC S	5,937.20	1,276.57	-	-	3,898.61
84	1	SLEEPY EYE PUBLI	62,014.48	12,863.98	4,798.44	5,063.34	-
85	1	SPRINGFIELD PUBL	26,798.98	-	5,271.64	-	-
88	1	NEW ULM PUBLIC S	58,549.22	30,125.41	25,220.98	65,943.57	7,106.70
91	1	BARNUM PUBLIC SC	18,274.49	10,361.48	9,841.30	-	12,131.40
93	1	CARLTON PUBLIC S	120.40	469.20	8,064.00	78,547.27	-
94	1	CLOQUET PUBLIC S	80,148.79	22,296.32	65,335.94	32,333.11	-
95	1	CROMWELL-WRIGHT	-	-	21,112.02	-	653.61
97	1	MOOSE LAKE PUBLI	10,193.70	17,393.29	-	-	6,328.20
99	1	ESKO PUBLIC SCHO	-	-	-	294.12	23,464.08
100	1	WRENSHALL PUBLIC	3,948.79	799.00	3,967.09	-	-
108	1	CENTRAL PUBLIC S	37,671.32	641.00	2,998.33	-	-
110	1	WACONIA PUBLIC S	-	-	-	201,480.85	207,748.72
111	1	WATERTOWN-MAYER	66,735.32	-	-	-	1,483.71
112	1	EASTERN CARVER C	1,094,368.86	5,347.48	105,385.52	686,273.38	104.88
113	1	WALKER-HACKENSAC	2,349.77	1,794.15	5,577.55	-	110,000.00
115	1	CASS LAKE-BENA P	73,976.29	38,626.89	30,541.10	209,143.53	487.19

116	1	PILLAGER PUBLIC	17,628.41	565.75	2,646.68	-	-
118	1	NORTHLAND COMMUN	-	-	-	10,294.16	221,510.76
129	1	MONTEVIDEO PUBLI	17,878.93	7,500.00	4,841.83	18,120.35	-
138	1	NORTH BRANCH PUB	97,990.58	95,116.03	101,332.51	154,363.41	319,093.34
139	1	RUSH CITY PUBLIC	47,059.66	7,113.59	15,751.07	-	-
146	1	BARNESVILLE PUBL	27,594.21	17,025.55	12,170.75	-	-
150	1	HAWLEY PUBLIC SC	14,174.28	7,954.38	16,090.41	-	-
152	1	MOORHEAD PUBLIC	73,169.68	4,707.36	57,201.34	8,395.93	182,928.36
162	1	BAGLEY PUBLIC SC	3,843.84	891.24	16.77	-	2,820.38
166	1	COOK COUNTY PUBL	6,744.43	147.89	10,062.62	-	-
173	1	MOUNTAIN LAKE PU	12,758.87	11,327.44	18,267.29	-	-
177	1	WINDOM PUBLIC SC	6,729.26	1,015.73	12,086.21	19,601.55	-
181	1	BRAINERD PUBLIC	114,104.07	126,586.40	143,587.56	225,902.72	370,204.69
182	1	CROSBY-IRONTON P	42,531.23	11,929.46	12,652.07	-	-
186	1	PEQUOT LAKES PUB	39,534.27	6,562.90	42,353.58	90,552.00	-
191	1	BURNSVILLE PUBLI	-	46,264.53	149,385.61	1,837,185.54	2,111,523.93
192	1	FARMINGTON PUBLI	333,240.26	210,303.49	201,024.62	685,526.79	432.19
194	1	LAKEVILLE PUBLIC	232,777.38	327,365.85	192,503.01	319,281.58	26,092.11
195	1	RANDOLPH PUBLIC	3,208.34	8,321.48	6,259.60	-	1,238.96
196	1	ROSEMOUNT-APPLE	222,609.10	316,248.94	318,133.33	1,944,401.16	2,920,695.53
197	1	WEST ST. PAUL-ME	107,277.57	77,483.66	153,788.25	1,214,548.70	-
199	1	INVER GROVE HEIG	93,674.07	54,525.23	53,478.36	-	48,724.31
200	1	HASTINGS PUBLIC	54,052.12	19,269.39	178,744.39	-	8,596.14
203	1	HAYFIELD PUBLIC	13,263.86	-	-	-	583.70
204	1	KASSON-MANTORVIL	34,021.55	37,074.05	10,441.10	133,814.93	119,643.88
206	1	ALEXANDRIA PUBLI	71,524.28	67,628.44	48,122.68	267,683.50	-
207	1	BRANDON PUBLIC S	1,157.53	1,019.29	611.74	6,886.12	-
208	1	EVANSVILLE PUBLI	15,643.11	814.00	1,439.58	-	-
213	1	OSAKIS PUBLIC SC	28,126.52	8,883.08	14,449.15	-	-
227	1	CHATFIELD PUBLIC	5,836.14	1,036.10	1,480.18	-	24,418.56
229	1	LANESBORO PUBLIC	5,828.26	1,200.65	3,876.88	-	-
238	1	MABEL-CANTON PUB	15,597.97	18.82	2,234.98	-	201.25
239	1	RUSHFORD-PETERSO	15,179.10	4,839.14	2,671.31	-	-
241	1	ALBERT LEA PUBLI	-	-	-	179,723.76	44,818.23
242	1	ALDEN-CONGER PUB	19,526.60	825.61	-	-	-
252	1	CANNON FALLS PUB	28,298.18	17,260.66	31,497.04	-	-
253	1	GOODHUE PUBLIC S	37,356.91	3,289.34	26,696.61	-	-
255	1	PINE ISLAND PUBL	17,310.79	27,584.54	5,259.07	-	-
256	1	RED WING PUBLIC	38,962.16	15,491.20	10,851.97	14,682.36	-
261	1	ASHBY PUBLIC SCH	5,823.36	3,200.00	3,912.22	-	-
264	1	HERMAN-NORCROSS	1,204.23	-	930.00	-	-
270	1	HOPKINS PUBLIC S	140,627.27	74,011.54	117,852.38	788,700.20	321,437.14
271	1	BLOOMINGTON PUBL	786,669.91	226,909.94	147,532.02	726,019.61	232,172.75
272	1	EDEN PRAIRIE PUB	337,122.80	18,320.36	747,910.89	1,362,882.62	-

273	1	EDINA PUBLIC SCH	436,207.00	218,103.00	218,102.00	866,405.43	(6,133.24)
276	1	MINNETONKA PUBLI	563,577.71	51,393.00	296,418.64	819,374.71	-
277	1	WESTONKA PUBLIC	7,166.17	13,670.20	7,357.76	244,883.89	199.00
278	1	ORONO PUBLIC SCH	-	27,706.88	156,336.91	390,348.18	22,466.26
279	1	OSSEO PUBLIC SCH	2,034,259.11	29,938.69	1,684,203.51	1,513,403.86	(3,384,117.50)
280	1	RICHFIELD PUBLIC	30,751.74	18,653.05	16,145.07	47,555.96	-
281	1	ROBBINSDALE PUBL	1,257,991.82	361,575.00	87,490.74	1,609,141.11	50,084.62
282	1	ST. ANTHONY-NEW	96,250.97	26,684.53	18,132.51	84,010.96	-
283	1	ST. LOUIS PARK P	126,022.54	6,211.04	142,511.63	420,337.16	15,095.81
284	1	WAYZATA PUBLIC S	440,747.48	320,785.84	302,261.52	473,716.25	724,572.51
286	1	BROOKLYN CENTER	26,666.88	7,458.30	32,297.03	163,347.84	104,345.71
294	1	HOUSTON PUBLIC S	40,016.44	42,461.04	39,016.79	8,225.11	-
297	1	SPRING GROVE SCH	2,961.29	-	7,316.81	-	-
299	1	CALEDONIA PUBLIC	824.51	12,878.91	7,333.12	-	1,000.00
300	1	LACRESCENT-HOKAH	11,166.10	7,428.12	5,309.12	47,431.58	27,525.70
306	1	LAPORTE PUBLIC S	3,972.47	1,986.00	1,986.42	-	-
308	1	NEVIS PUBLIC SCH	-	-	-	-	-
309	1	PARK RAPIDS PUBL	21,354.37	9,994.31	12,934.03	172,321.75	-
314	1	BRAHAM PUBLIC SC	5,262.88	6,426.96	9,599.40	-	-
316	1	GREENWAY PUBLIC	5,192.07	899.14	584.75	-	-
317	1	DEER RIVER PUBLI	51,071.89	13,538.36	43,406.79	3,881.00	-
318	1	GRAND RAPIDS PUB	114,779.78	15,381.08	73,074.31	15,048.00	-
319	1	NASHWAUK-KEEWATI	2,123.83	2,211.77	500.00	-	-
323	2	FRANCONIA PUBLIC	-	-	-	-	-
330	1	HERON LAKE-OKABE	1,851.07	448.55	3,880.86	-	-
332	1	MORA PUBLIC SCHO	56,681.02	30,716.25	33,470.50	-	2,927.72
333	1	OGILVIE PUBLIC S	4,183.15	64.94	6,126.48	-	1,236.36
345	1	NEW LONDON-SPICE	446.28	225.09	18,351.00	-	-
347	1	WILLMAR PUBLIC S	81,308.95	50,191.97	59,089.64	48,871.20	20,927.53
356	1	LANCASTER PUBLIC	2,377.06	-	394.90	-	-
361	1	INTERNATIONAL FA	46,880.11	17,972.50	21,808.70	-	-
362	1	LITTLEFORK-BIG F	10,138.24	-	4,868.81	-	-
363	1	SOUTH KOOCHICHIN	20,844.25	2,027.24	4,676.78	-	-
378	1	DAWSON-BOYD PUBL	29,933.96	16,534.66	15,590.94	-	6,087.93
381	1	LAKE SUPERIOR PU	3,520.07	282.60	2,444.23	14,062.45	-
390	1	LAKE OF THE WOOD	40,458.84	6,412.56	-	-	-
391	1	CLEVELAND PUBLIC	32,291.12	4,553.62	8,470.15	1,500.00	-
392	1	LECENTER PUBLIC	11,184.53	179.44	4,883.33	-	-
394	1	MONTGOMERY-LONSD	12,992.42	-	14,047.38	-	1,708.17
402	1	HENDRICKS PUBLIC	5,402.10	-	-	-	-
403	1	IVANHOE PUBLIC S	7,930.01	-	-	-	-
404	1	LAKE BENTON PUBL	3,208.64	295.81	1,891.05	-	-
413	1	MARSHALL PUBLIC	32,002.73	41,923.77	28,375.35	146,197.03	-
414	1	MINNEOTA PUBLIC	16,008.79	-	-	-	-

415	1	LYND PUBLIC SCHO	16,827.77	3,504.89	-	-	14,526.48
423	1	HUTCHINSON PUBLI	211,435.69	14,326.82	175,982.31	222,019.67	1,653.28
424	1	LESTER PRAIRIE P	6,738.27	5,885.53	5,260.72	-	-
432	1	MAHNOMEN PUBLIC	7,520.82	3,027.59	22,965.75	-	-
435	1	WAUBUN PUBLIC SC	13,593.98	12,451.25	9,036.37	-	176.61
441	1	MARSHALL COUNTY	13,218.03	4,004.73	4,013.93	-	-
447	1	GRYGLA PUBLIC SC	-	-	-	-	-
458	1	TRUMAN PUBLIC SC	1,031.50	-	446.16	-	699.90
463	1	EDEN VALLEY-WATK	55,388.80	27,694.40	27,694.40	-	-
465	1	LITCHFIELD PUBLI	494.83	-	1,837.84	-	-
466	1	DASSEL-COKATO PU	50,333.43	-	21,557.29	233,305.50	11,205.96
473	1	ISLE PUBLIC SCHO	15,917.10	-	7,660.44	-	-
477	1	PRINCETON PUBLIC	68,699.76	-	52,864.14	197,408.58	106,559.51
480	1	ONAMIA PUBLIC SC	-	-	-	-	34,611.92
482	1	LITTLE FALLS PUB	7,749.94	600.00	24,090.87	224,043.08	3,718.44
484	1	PIERZ PUBLIC SCH	84,158.61	32,160.09	33,773.56	28,544.34	-
485	1	ROYALTON PUBLIC	16,785.11	8,614.18	20,678.81	-	-
486	1	SWANVILLE PUBLIC	3,933.32	4,918.61	-	-	-
487	1	UPSALA PUBLIC SC	15,329.90	-	-	-	-
492	1	AUSTIN PUBLIC SC	120,045.37	64,253.05	65,849.25	-	322,306.14
495	1	GRAND MEADOW PUB	2,015.01	1,241.51	16,454.15	-	-
497	1	LYLE PUBLIC SCHO	1,622.20	811.11	811.10	-	-
499	1	LEROY PUBLIC SCH	2,819.63	-	4,798.90	-	-
500	1	SOUTHLAND PUBLIC	16,143.80	4,671.92	13,886.56	-	-
505	1	FULDA PUBLIC SCH	17,301.97	12,225.31	1,886.94	-	-
507	1	NICOLLET PUBLIC	8,475.49	497.02	5,511.75	-	-
508	1	ST. PETER PUBLIC	96,159.94	-	-	3,044.06	1,172.12
511	1	ADRIAN PUBLIC SC	11,520.60	906.37	906.90	-	-
513	1	BREWSTER PUBLIC	687.59	25.00	2,091.33	-	-
514	1	ELLSWORTH PUBLIC	17,091.81	8,546.02	8,545.92	-	-
516	1	ROUND LAKE PUBLI	1,373.03	-	1,284.09	-	-
518	1	WORTHINGTON PUBL	54,329.08	22,028.49	3,586.97	28,923.95	194,669.08
531	1	BYRON PUBLIC SCH	46,187.27	23,032.44	24,236.80	1,939.51	-
533	1	DOVER-EYOTA PUBL	51,762.84	20,535.99	23,038.35	117,723.51	958.56
534	1	STEWARTVILLE PUB	70,119.51	25,790.33	93,046.94	89,944.89	2,079.05
535	1	ROCHESTER PUBLIC	632,124.52	324,601.22	220,620.57	876,018.90	807,942.58
542	1	BATTLE LAKE PUBL	33,744.42	3,499.98	2,926.99	-	1,215.96
544	1	FERGUS FALLS PUB	120,143.34	11,821.36	12,521.99	138,865.37	30,986.92
545	1	HENNING PUBLIC S	12,392.28	229.30	5,039.69	-	478.87
547	1	PARKERS PRAIRIE	6,990.05	-	2,437.83	-	-
548	1	PELICAN RAPIDS P	15,948.30	12,924.02	5,778.34	-	-
549	1	PERHAM PUBLIC SC	-	-	-	-	-
550	1	UNDERWOOD PUBLIC	19,307.34	10,654.03	1,788.92	-	-
553	1	NEW YORK MILLS P	19,915.92	3,200.64	4,000.00	-	-

561	1	GOODRIDGE PUBLIC	-	-	600.00	-	-
564	1	THIEF RIVER FALL	50,054.70	23,468.14	30,995.08	124,921.90	-
577	1	WILLOW RIVER PUB	-	-	-	148.41	29,814.32
578	1	PINE CITY PUBLIC	3,309.32	3,750.88	9,580.46	109,044.02	-
581	1	EDGERTON PUBLIC	3,643.59	-	8,150.53	11,212.86	-
592	1	CLIMAX PUBLIC SC	2,340.39	-	-	-	-
593	1	CROOKSTON PUBLIC	11,709.78	17,300.93	2,514.22	21,686.41	51,380.89
595	1	EAST GRAND FORKS	38,889.97	1,527.22	27,992.81	38,549.23	-
599	1	FERTILE-BELTRAMI	-	-	27,411.21	-	-
600	1	FISHER PUBLIC SC	9,385.20	4,692.61	4,692.61	-	-
601	1	FOSSTON PUBLIC S	8,413.75	4,207.00	4,207.09	-	944.23
611	1	CYRUS PUBLIC SCH	471.58	328.00	287.00	-	-
621	1	MOUNDS VIEW PUBL	24,736.74	-	197,295.79	867,871.29	1,128,596.09
622	1	NORTH ST PAUL-MA	563,590.91	169,990.20	290,254.20	3,690,199.90	136,174.02
623	1	ROSEVILLE PUBLIC	133,515.30	229,069.01	176,035.21	304,653.86	922,395.94
624	1	WHITE BEAR LAKE	810,255.99	90,294.08	258,318.58	560.97	-
625	1	ST. PAUL PUBLIC	2,368,704.15	190,996.28	726,446.29	6,246,926.83	2,511,872.21
627	1	OKLEE PUBLIC SCH	8,514.36	-	-	-	-
628	1	PLUMMER PUBLIC S	3,764.76	-	767.04	-	-
630	1	RED LAKE FALLS P	8,713.90	4,356.94	4,356.95	-	-
635	1	MILROY PUBLIC SC	3,088.67	-	448.00	-	-
640	1	WABASSO PUBLIC S	-	-	-	-	20,471.96
656	1	FARIBAULT PUBLIC	54,774.70	28,777.85	459,253.36	731,119.78	6,437.13
659	1	NORTHFIELD PUBLI	39,146.76	33,145.25	6,338.20	147,009.42	-
671	1	HILLS-BEAYER CRE	15,265.69	8,026.42	1,235.82	8,015.93	-
676	1	BADGER PUBLIC SC	12,842.03	1,558.10	-	-	933.06
682	1	ROSEAU PUBLIC SC	24,930.98	13,195.00	42,465.00	-	-
690	1	WARROAD PUBLIC S	6,325.67	4,424.98	6,747.39	-	704.87
695	1	CHISHOLM PUBLIC	14,538.62	-	1,130.01	-	-
696	1	ELY PUBLIC SCHOO	4,779.04	2,997.87	27,309.59	-	-
698	1	FLOODWOOD PUBLIC	6,802.44	-	7,520.15	-	-
700	1	HERMANTOWN PUBLI	33,044.01	34,263.99	12,069.55	-	-
701	1	HIBBING PUBLIC S	326,645.81	23,695.77	128,779.46	-	-
704	1	PROCTOR PUBLIC S	54,769.40	24,532.30	21,883.84	1,684.69	457,643.94
706	1	VIRGINIA PUBLIC	6,731.45	16,233.12	35,126.68	-	-
707	1	NETT LAKE PUBLIC	15,941.06	-	-	-	-
709	1	DULUTH PUBLIC SC	116,596.99	25,322.83	9.06	20,653.15	67,263.04
712	1	MOUNTAIN IRON-BU	75,600.38	1,072.97	2,855.81	-	-
716	1	BELLE PLAINE PUB	24,408.46	18,383.97	25,720.32	55,468.57	-
717	1	JORDAN PUBLIC SC	118,204.27	-	6,606.97	412.50	-
719	1	PRIOR LAKE-SAVAG	370,558.63	127,068.95	204,774.63	735,630.64	-
720	1	SHAKOPEE PUBLIC	176,468.12	280,875.49	542,626.25	267,168.34	33.00
721	1	NEW PRAGUE AREA	222,092.38	35,115.44	130,889.66	445,456.86	48.13
726	1	BECKER PUBLIC SC	54,571.98	19,667.48	80,750.03	439,766.39	(70,723.98)

727	1	BIG LAKE PUBLIC	213,429.72	92,880.30	94,885.47	89,547.59	8,735.64
728	1	ELK RIVER PUBLIC	441,691.98	239,699.15	298,258.54	1,697,465.00	32,513.49
738	1	HOLDINGFORD PUBL	10,879.47	-	5,547.79	-	21,440.92
739	1	KIMBALL PUBLIC S	11,125.18	232.57	3,355.64	-	1,365.16
740	1	MELROSE PUBLIC S	38,304.47	6,674.79	23,717.13	26,500.00	16,372.79
741	1	PAYNESVILLE PUBL	11,734.03	3,801.56	3,954.83	27,000.00	-
742	1	ST. CLOUD PUBLIC	8,986.91	10,749.96	115,980.12	797,394.71	-
743	1	SAUK CENTRE PUBL	1,921.55	-	20,546.75	26,500.00	503.52
745	1	ALBANY PUBLIC SC	167,404.19	1,700.00	29,482.93	102,281.90	-
748	1	SARTELL-ST. STEP	5,015.45	90,473.13	90,571.88	-	-
750	1	ROCORI PUBLIC SC	27,297.51	12,469.70	22,744.61	210,255.14	169.56
756	1	BLOOMING PRAIRIE	38,134.07	3,598.80	3,020.08	-	-
761	1	OWATONNA PUBLIC	88,052.27	-	-	345,137.04	713,222.56
763	1	MEDFORD PUBLIC S	16,081.68	3,374.80	3,669.53	-	-
768	1	HANCOCK PUBLIC S	13,539.78	3,592.67	-	-	-
769	1	MORRIS PUBLIC SC	17,544.82	8,400.52	11,148.26	-	-
771	1	CHOKIO-ALBERTA P	2,350.88	-	-	-	-
775	1	KERKHOVEN-MURDOC	9,152.53	247.50	4,044.84	-	-
777	1	BENSON PUBLIC SC	29,096.63	21,952.00	58,604.20	-	-
786	1	BERTHA-HEWITT PU	13,252.71	6,278.31	6,626.36	-	-
787	1	BROWERVILLE PUBL	39,754.30	-	20,501.83	-	-
801	1	BROWNS VALLEY PU	11,131.70	3,244.52	3,278.22	-	-
803	1	WHEATON AREA PUB	15,501.03	7,694.26	6,799.54	-	-
811	1	WABASHA-KELLOGG	30,324.15	-	-	-	-
813	1	LAKE CITY PUBLIC	158,326.11	14,255.18	25,880.10	20,768.95	995.47
815	2	PRINSBURG PUBLIC	-	-	-	-	-
818	1	VERNDAL PUBLIC	16,392.33	-	5,369.70	-	-
820	1	SEBEKA PUBLIC SC	12,474.47	14,570.36	5,667.18	12,405.00	-
821	1	MENAHGA PUBLIC S	8,243.64	13,550.78	12,233.79	-	-
829	1	WASECA PUBLIC SC	6,816.25	-	13,223.19	-	12,238.15
831	1	FOREST LAKE PUBL	-	-	313,217.82	303,457.71	-
832	1	MAHTOMEDI PUBLIC	214,580.32	97,140.37	90,983.55	-	18,930.30
833	1	SOUTH WASHINGTON	1,001,453.61	506,245.00	536,726.53	993,340.44	487,682.83
834	1	STILLWATER AREA	144,535.06	45,066.16	70,866.11	1,454,316.21	112,499.91
836	1	BUTTERFIELD PUBL	4,285.30	-	2,087.72	27,948.84	-
837	1	MADELIA PUBLIC S	8,434.04	1,734.66	7,426.80	-	-
840	1	ST. JAMES PUBLIC	10,008.08	17,463.18	2,854.26	-	-
846	1	BRECKENRIDGE PUB	15,737.48	182.09	4,249.28	27,673.05	-
850	1	ROTHSAY PUBLIC S	18,183.68	-	-	-	-
852	1	CAMPBELL-TINTAH	3,202.46	1,601.23	4,284.42	-	-
857	1	LEWISTON-ALTURA	22,500.88	11,250.14	11,250.25	-	248.93
858	1	ST. CHARLES PUBL	-	-	-	-	92,748.77
861	1	WINONA AREA PUBL	68,763.86	31,332.06	123,882.11	-	224.10
876	1	ANNANDALE PUBLIC	88,954.44	3,011.35	2,832.73	66,822.09	82,307.03

877	1	BUFFALO PUBLIC S	-	166,947.08	180,267.71	506,078.06	452.50
879	1	DELANO PUBLIC SC	122,676.42	2,668.75	63,475.03	-	-
881	1	MAPLE LAKE PUBLI	38,219.58	1,383.10	8,835.74	13,115.28	-
882	1	MONTICELLO PUBLI	102,903.04	17,708.00	7,104.91	455,491.88	254,604.92
883	1	ROCKFORD PUBLIC	78,203.40	5,473.72	23,737.82	120,277.36	892.99
885	1	ST. MICHAEL-ALBE	185,087.94	81,233.39	257,525.87	72,372.00	5,335.74
891	1	CANBY PUBLIC SCH	32,650.01	41,692.08	3,888.68	-	-
911	1	CAMBRIDGE-ISANTI	5,917.36	41,260.51	282,095.97	302,428.21	3,688.43
912	1	MILACA PUBLIC SC	128,078.64	37,331.34	1,898.20	26,602.57	-
914	1	ULEN-HITTERDAL P	11,261.00	5,630.49	6,499.48	-	-
2071	1	LAKE CRYSTAL-WEL	22,837.00	8,545.38	11,870.17	-	-
2125	1	TRITON SCHOOL DI	70,491.05	35,248.00	35,256.06	-	-
2134	1	UNITED SOUTH CEN	15,799.93	2,996.95	11,093.82	-	-
2135	1	MAPLE RIVER SCHO	59,090.66	26,163.47	6,578.33	-	6,796.77
2137	1	KINGSLAND PUBLIC	24,281.01	4,848.82	6,855.93	-	-
2142	1	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	4,263.01	37,226.93	35,315.51	-	-
2143	1	WATERVILLE-ELYSI	3,226.94	812.90	2,432.86	-	-
2144	1	CHISAGO LAKES SC	3,220.99	5,015.90	59,091.83	197,663.04	30,894.94
2149	1	MINNEWASKA SCHOO	8,805.22	3,303.66	4,795.96	-	-
2154	1	EVELETH-GILBERT	38,919.41	4,576.85	15,514.23	-	-
2155	1	WADENA-DEER CREE	6,093.88	10,000.00	140.00	-	594.29
2159	1	BUFFALO LAKE-HEC	11,576.81	-	6,231.13	-	-
2164	1	DILWORTH-GLYNDON	41,172.51	4,307.19	15,435.87	30,884.46	-
2165	1	HINCKLEY-FINLAYS	17,714.74	7,061.96	15,633.73	-	-
2167	1	LAKEVIEW SCHOOL	65,214.49	-	2,855.60	-	-
2168	1	NRHEG SCHOOL DIS	17,910.69	3.47	6,468.46	-	-
2169	1	MURRAY COUNTY CE	17,656.38	5,221.24	4,460.23	-	-
2170	1	STAPLES-MOTLEY S	828.10	5,165.55	7,576.95	-	44,731.72
2171	1	KITTSOON CENTRAL	11,294.48	-	11,237.07	-	1,050.91
2172	1	KENYON-WANAMINGO	7,796.82	1,859.13	23,621.94	-	-
2174	1	PINE RIVER-BACKU	20,617.54	27,200.48	12,514.09	127,068.97	1,063.87
2176	1	WARREN-ALVARADO-	16,594.29	316.82	15,103.35	-	-
2180	1	M.A.C.C.R.A.Y. S	12,809.81	6,404.94	6,404.92	73,048.00	-
2184	1	LUVERNE PUBLIC S	43,623.90	1,409.10	24,437.04	19,750.00	-
2190	1	YELLOW MEDICINE	10,196.80	5,698.59	101,529.78	(11,500.00)	12,181.79
2198	1	FILLMORE CENTRAL	10,445.76	-	7,231.46	-	-
2215	1	NORMAN COUNTY EA	2,271.29	175.00	3,855.66	-	-
2310	1	SIBLEY EAST SCHO	52,939.86	6,428.23	30,437.50	-	36,705.53
2311	1	CLEARBROOK-GONVI	8,380.74	8,260.75	16,521.49	-	398.00
2342	1	WEST CENTRAL ARE	16,805.08	8,402.54	8,402.54	6,277.71	-
2358	1	TRI-COUNTY SCHOO	34,505.57	-	-	-	-
2364	1	BELGRADE-BROOTEN	-	-	-	-	79,000.00
2365	1	G.F.W.	17,061.75	8,140.44	68,662.53	-	5,109.75
2396	1	A.C.G.C.	4,716.02	1,707.28	9,467.09	85,319.32	-

2397	1	LESUEUR-HENDERSO	18,979.21	42,755.26	48,558.80	41,182.14	7,421.49
2448	1	MARTIN COUNTY WE	37,303.36	10,272.25	6,875.77	-	1,780.00
2527	1	NORMAN COUNTY WE	37,124.13	1,057.28	1,437.79	-	-
2534	1	BIRD ISLAND-OLIV	14,862.03	1,029.66	6,405.79	-	-
2536	1	GRANADA HUNTLEY-	1,261.96	369.44	2,760.06	-	700.00
2580	1	EAST CENTRAL SCH	15,548.20	1,034.37	32,355.42	-	-
2609	1	WIN-E-MAC SCHOOL	34,568.77	1,134.35	6,918.87	-	1,890.85
2683	1	GREENBUSH-MIDDLE	31,734.49	13,500.00	13,500.00	-	-
2687	1	HOWARD LAKE-WAVE	14,395.91	41,025.70	62,043.42	(604.79)	-
2689	1	PIPESTONE AREA S	26,874.68	2,455.46	3,632.86	-	-
2711	1	MESABI EAST SCHO	12,775.51	10,708.62	229.66	-	86.08
2752	1	FAIRMONT AREA SC	73,038.68	41,207.67	35,000.56	12,264.00	10,386.91
2753	1	LONG PRAIRIE-GRE	70,330.82	34,305.70	36,455.78	1,002.44	1,128.67
2754	1	CEDAR MOUNTAIN S	10,946.42	-	2,541.15	-	-
2759	1	EAGLE VALLEY PUB	24,176.99	11,018.06	3,392.16	-	-
2805	1	ZUMBROTA-MAZEPPA	24,374.50	17,263.14	14,181.84	-	21,943.05
2835	1	JANESVILLE-WALDO	5,760.49	6,824.21	3,503.43	-	-
2853	1	LAC QUI PARLE VA	61,503.88	23,956.89	22,458.80	25,870.88	105,295.53
2854	1	ADA-BORUP PUBLIC	6,543.86	4,257.80	31,061.86	-	-
2856	1	STEPHEN-ARGYLE C	18,800.88	-	-	-	-
2859	1	GLENCOE-SILVER L	76,366.49	30,332.86	24,063.39	18,715.35	-
2860	1	BLUE EARTH AREA	22,355.85	-	41,479.51	-	3,266.93
2884	1	RED ROCK CENTRAL	2,595.10	2,917.35	-	-	2,917.35
2886	1	GLENVILLE-EMMONS	19,243.57	-	3,547.60	-	-
2888	1	CLINTON-GRACEVIL	7,181.30	4,482.50	8,949.84	-	-
2889	1	LAKE PARK AUDUBO	37,115.84	8,495.69	10,627.17	-	-
2890	1	RENVILLE COUNTY	17,818.97	34,648.99	493.02	-	-
2895	1	JACKSON COUNTY C	16,408.54	3,339.53	18,414.81	-	-
2897	1	REDWOOD AREA SCH	35,203.30	-	4,918.37	-	2,729.83
2898	1	WESTBROOK-WALNUT	24,685.49	8,831.35	10,190.09	-	-
2899	1	PLAINVIEW-ELGIN-	44,290.86	25,255.19	26,021.89	69,235.30	-
2902	1	RTR PUBLIC SCHOO	16,496.99	-	-	-	-
2903	1	ORTONVILLE PUBLI	1,019.30	2,133.09	3,232.83	-	-
2904	1	TRACY AREA PUBLI	-	-	-	-	88,003.28
4000	7	CITY ACADEMY	15,508.34	-	29,583.13	-	498.38
4001	7	BLUFFVIEW MONTES	-	-	-	-	5,549.46
4003	7	NEW HEIGHTS SCHO	-	-	-	-	-
4004	7	CEDAR RIVERSIDE	1,721.52	-	-	-	95.00
4005	7	METRO DEAF SCH &	-	-	-	-	-
4006	7	SKILLS FOR TOMOR	-	-	-	-	-
4007	7	MINNESOTA NEW CO	-	-	-	-	12,343.92
4008	7	PACT CHARTER SCH	10,286.99	-	-	58,277.50	-
4011	7	NEW VISIONS CHAR	-	-	-	991.10	-
4012	7	EMILY CHARTER SC	-	194.60	779.70	-	255.00

4015	7	COMMUNITY OF PEA	24,469.01	-	-	-	15,266.42
4016	7	WORLD LEARNER CH	1,057.43	-	-	-	-
4017	7	MINNESOTA TRANSI	2,318.99	-	9,831.49	24,518.36	-
4018	7	ACHIEVE LANGUAGE	-	-	-	22,902.06	-
4020	7	DULUTH PUBLIC SC	-	-	-	16,328.71	30,289.52
4025	7	CYBER VILLAGE AC	7,597.60	-	-	-	-
4026	7	E.C.H.O. CHARTER	3,083.19	15.00	1,491.45	-	33,307.79
4027	7	HIGHER GROUND AC	12,327.50	-	-	-	52,978.92
4028	7	ECI' NOMPA WOONS	-	-	75.00	-	-
4029	7	NEW SPIRIT SCHOO	6,735.11	-	-	-	-
4030	7	ODYSSEY ACADEMY	750.00	-	97.00	-	-
4031	7	JENNINGS COMMUNI	-	-	-	-	-
4032	7	HARVEST PREP SCH	2,604.63	-	-	-	1,735.00
4035	7	CONCORDIA CREATI	8,878.09	-	-	38.25	-
4036	7	FACE TO FACE ACA	-	-	-	-	96.49
4038	7	SOJOURNER TRUTH	5,603.58	-	-	-	-
4039	7	HIGH SCHOOL FOR	-	-	-	-	662.00
4042	7	TWIN CITIES ACAD	4,406.46	-	-	15,724.70	-
4043	7	MATH & SCIENCE A	18,886.39	-	-	-	-
4045	7	LAKES AREA CHART	630.22	-	-	-	-
4046	7	LAKE SUPERIOR HI	4,728.51	-	-	-	-
4048	7	GREAT RIVER EDUC	482.88	-	-	-	-
4049	7	NORTHWEST PASSAG	23,113.41	-	-	-	-
4050	7	LAFAYETTE PUBLIC	-	-	1,121.68	-	-
4052	7	FOUR DIRECTIONS	4,807.26	-	-	-	1,199.79
4053	7	NORTH LAKES ACAD	-	-	1,329.10	-	-
4054	7	LACRESCENT MONTE	-	-	-	-	-
4055	7	NERSTRAND CHARTE	-	-	-	-	1,500.30
4056	7	ROCHESTER OFF-CA	7,762.06	4,475.95	3,528.71	-	-
4057	7	EL COLEGIO CHART	12,734.91	-	-	-	-
4058	7	SCHOOLCRAFT LEAR	17,902.87	2,872.76	1,036.07	-	-
4059	7	CROSSLAKE COMMUN	6,197.65	-	-	-	27,922.43
4061	7	STUDIO ACADEMY C	70.00	-	-	-	-
4064	7	RIVERWAY LEARNIN	271.25	-	52.18	-	120.00
4066	7	RIVERBEND ACADEM	-	-	-	-	-
4067	7	AURORA CHARTER S	-	-	-	465.25	15,896.69
4068	7	EXCELL ACADEMY C	26,610.36	-	-	8,071.44	477.27
4070	7	HOPE COMMUNITY A	12,847.50	-	-	-	0.01
4073	7	ACADEMIA CESAR C	597.01	-	-	24,719.67	625.58
4074	7	AFSA HIGH SCHOOL	-	-	-	-	45,969.02
4075	7	AVALON SCHOOL	799.00	-	-	-	2,450.00
4077	7	TWIN CITIES INTE	-	-	-	28,500.00	14,135.62
4078	7	MN INTERNATIONAL	-	-	-	-	32,056.46
4079	7	FRIENDSHIP ACDMY	520.00	-	-	-	-

4080	7	PILLAGER AREA CH	-	-	-	-	-
4081	7	DISCOVERY PUBLIC	-	-	-	-	-
4082	7	BLUESKY CHARTER	76,666.72	-	-	590.00	-
4083	7	RIDGEWAY COMMUNI	1,095.72	-	-	-	2,214.17
4084	7	NORTH SHORE COMM	6,128.04	-	-	-	-
4085	7	HARBOR CITY INTE	4,982.19	-	-	-	-
4086	7	WOODSON INSTITUT	9,221.00	-	-	30,091.22	8,289.96
4087	7	SAGE ACADEMY CHA	-	-	-	-	433.11
4088	7	URBAN ACADEMY CH	-	-	-	317.45	57,804.94
4089	7	NEW CITY SCHOOL	-	-	-	-	4,959.69
4090	7	PRAIRIE CREEK CO	-	-	-	-	4,318.84
4091	7	ARTECH	1,182.59	-	-	-	8,500.00
4092	7	WATERSHED HIGH S	-	-	-	-	215.00
4093	7	NEW CENTURY CHAR	2,598.88	-	-	-	-
4095	7	TRIO WOLF CREEK	14,573.46	-	-	-	-
4097	7	PARTNERSHIP ACAD	26,030.90	-	-	76,011.33	-
4098	7	NOVA CLASSICAL A	31,760.12	-	-	-	17,586.13
4099	7	TAREK IBN ZIYAD	89,662.20	-	-	-	95,278.82
4100	7	GREAT EXPECTATIO	-	-	-	-	1,523.52
4102	7	MINNESOTA INTERN	85.00	-	-	-	50.00
4103	7	HMONG COLLEGE PR	-	-	-	17,182.14	26,022.76
4104	7	PALADIN ACADEMY	-	-	-	-	7,470.52
4105	7	GREAT RIVER SCHO	3,286.46	-	-	2,550.00	13,315.03
4106	7	TREKNORTH HIGH S	22,474.65	11,237.32	11,237.32	-	-
4107	7	VOYAGEURS EXPEDI	5,297.03	3,492.71	-	-	-
4108	7	GENERAL JOHN VES	-	-	-	-	(1,307.23)
4109	7	SOBRIETY HIGH	666.00	-	-	5,654.59	-
4110	7	MAIN STREET SCHO	-	-	-	-	3,553.00
4111	7	AUGSBURG FAIRVIE	2,357.71	-	-	-	-
4112	7	ST PAUL CONSERVA	2,310.00	-	-	-	-
4113	7	FRASER ACADEMY	1,999.00	-	-	-	-
4114	7	PRESTIGE ACADEMY	252.99	-	-	1,750.00	372.64
4115	7	MINNEAPOLIS ACAD	2,379.55	-	1,362.04	-	-
4116	7	LAKES INTERNATIO	31,185.69	-	-	154,815.65	16,380.28
4118	7	KALEIDOSCOPE CHA	-	-	-	4,366.78	13,436.11
4119	7	RIVER HEIGHTS CH	-	-	-	-	180.00
4120	7	ST. CROIX PREPAR	-	-	-	-	22,314.72
4121	7	UBAH MEDICAL ACA	-	-	-	60,229.00	1,939.45
4122	7	EAGLE RIDGE ACAD	-	-	-	-	2,514.00
4123	7	DAKOTA AREA COMM	96.67	-	-	-	-
4124	7	BEACON ACADEMY	-	-	-	-	25,301.83
4125	7	WORTHINGTON AREA	1,308.77	-	-	-	-
4126	7	PRAIRIE SEEDS AC	426.06	-	-	-	87.14
4127	7	TEAM ACADEMY	9,085.37	2,859.99	-	-	432.59

4131	7	LIGHTHOUSE ACADE	-	-	-	-	2,778.98
4132	7	TWIN CITIES ACAD	5,448.16	-	-	14,924.27	1,982.70
4133	7	BEACON PREPARATO	-	-	-	3,589.11	155.40
4135	7	ROCHESTER MATH &	13,793.88	-	-	-	3,200.00
4137	7	SWAN RIVER MONTE	8,082.01	-	-	-	-
4138	7	MILROY AREA CHAR	1,719.24	-	-	-	180.00
4139	7	LOVEWORKS ACADEM	-	-	-	-	9,960.59
4140	7	YINGHUA ACADEMY	7,832.57	-	-	124,244.80	37,324.01
4141	7	PAIDEIA ACADEMY	-	-	-	-	14,958.62
4142	7	STRIDE ACADEMY C	11,631.32	-	-	-	-
4143	7	NEW MILLENNIUM A	12,480.26	-	-	-	-
4144	7	GREEN ISLE COMMU	-	-	-	-	13,718.34
4145	7	BIRCH GROVE COMM	-	-	-	-	7,623.66
4146	7	NORTHERN LIGHTS	17,721.71	-	-	-	-
4149	7	CYGNUS ACADEMY	128.10	-	412.48	-	-
4150	7	MINNESOTA ONLINE	3,023.48	-	-	31,257.01	1,890.87
4151	7	EDVISIONS OFF CA	-	-	-	-	12,407.57
4152	7	TWIN CITIES GERM	6,269.50	-	-	39,964.40	4,855.65
4153	7	DUGSI ACADEMY	16,966.44	-	-	-	3,443.50
4154	7	RECOVERY SCHOOL	-	-	-	-	-
4155	7	NAYTAHWAUSH COMM	14,177.30	-	-	-	-
4159	7	SEVEN HILLS CLAS	-	-	-	-	18,397.52
4160	7	SPECTRUM HIGH SC	-	-	-	-	1,613.19
4161	7	NEW DISCOVERIES	11,428.44	-	-	-	-
4162	7	SOUTHSIDE FAMILY	26,469.90	-	-	-	-
4163	7	LEARNING FOR LEA	1,988.03	-	-	-	804.03
4164	7	LAURA JEFFREY AC	123.74	-	-	89,039.88	11,454.29
4166	7	EAST RANGE ACADE	-	-	-	-	3,028.39
4167	7	INTERNATIONAL SP	-	-	6,811.63	-	6,049.17
4168	7	GLACIAL HILLS EL	17,237.65	107.65	100.00	-	-
4169	7	STONEBRIDGE COMM	-	-	-	66,408.05	10,187.11
4170	7	HIAWATHA LEADERS	12,393.65	-	-	-	36,076.52
4171	7	NOBLE ACADEMY	36,864.27	-	-	72,900.62	51,337.94
4172	7	CLARKFIELD CHART	221.18	-	-	-	2,125.00
4173	7	DUNWOODY ACADEMY	1,093.06	-	-	2,144.58	-
4174	7	PINE GROVE LEADE	-	-	-	21,647.97	11,015.65
4175	7	LONG TIENG ACADE	227.41	-	-	-	3,203.39
4177	7	MINISINAAKWAANG	-	-	-	10,469.80	8,015.35
4178	7	LINCOLN INTERNAT	186.26	-	-	29,335.24	5,776.47
4180	7	EMILY O. GOODRID	-	-	1,335.70	-	1,522.04
4181	7	COMMUNITY SCHOOL	35,573.71	-	-	64,678.58	70,822.61
4182	7	QUEST ACADEMY	-	-	-	23,742.51	6,861.64
4183	7	LIONSGATE ACADEM	509.36	-	-	-	1,478.12
4184	7	ASPEN ACADEMY	98.92	-	-	8,781.45	1,092.57

4185	7	DAVINCI ACADEMY	-	-	-	68,370.65	5,506.40
4186	7	GLOBAL ACADEMY	-	-	-	76,604.90	23,446.70
4187	7	MICHAEL FROME AC	5,174.00	-	-	-	43,133.29
4188	7	COLOGNE ACADEMY	-	-	-	28,153.33	24,165.35
4189	7	BRIGHT WATER ELE	-	-	-	5,988.34	23,918.14
4190	7	RIVER'S EDGE ACA	65.00	-	-	10,064.31	48,640.97
4191	7	KIPP MINNESOTA C	-	-	-	-	17,080.67
4192	7	BEST ACADEMY	-	-	-	-	-
4193	7	COLLEGE PREPARAT	-	-	-	5,000.00	2,016.20
4194	7	CANNON RIVER STE	75.00	-	-	60,402.49	14,598.85
4195	7	OSHKI OGIMAAG CH	-	-	-	15,778.98	22,545.60
4196	7	RICHARD ALLEN MA	-	-	-	22,473.12	8,911.18
		STATE TOTALS	29,958,839.80	8,323,350.25	20,684,049.51	52,333,148.12	24,711,786.74

APPENDIX B

Online Staff Development Report Template for 2009-10

District Report: Add or Edit Goals

Enter the student achievement goal and indicate the content focus. Then enter a district staff development goal. The goals that were entered into the previous year's report are carried over into the new report. You can add and edit goals. Remember to **save** after adding or editing information on this page.

1. The student achievement goal should answer the question, "How do we want to see our students' academic achievement improve?" The goal should be student-centered and linked to the district staff development goal.

District Student Achievement Goal

**800 characters maximum*

2. Indicate the focus of this goal.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Art/Music | <input type="checkbox"/> Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Career & Technical Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Science |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health/Physical Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Language Arts/Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> World Languages |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics | |

3. The district staff development goal should answer the question, "How did we prepare staff to accomplish the student achievement goal above?"

District Staff Development Goal

**800 characters maximum*

District Report: Add or Edit Designs and Strategies

For the staff development goal shown below, check the designs and strategies used to implement the goal during the school year. You may check more than one box. If necessary, check "none of the above" and enter designs and strategies in the box provided. Also, indicate in #2 which high-quality components were included. Remember to **save** after adding or editing information on this page.

Staff Development
Goal: (automatically populates)

1. Check each of the **designs or strategies** used to implement the goal during the reporting year (check at least one).

Learning Teams with Instructional Focus

- ☐ Professional learning communities
- ☐ Study groups
- ☐ Lesson study
- ☐ Team meetings
- ☐ Case studies

Examine Student Data

- ☐ Examine state assessment data
- ☐ Examine district/school selected assessment data
- ☐ Examine classroom assessment data
- ☐ Examine student work
- ☐ Action research

Classroom Coaching

- ☐ Demonstration teaching
- ☐ Instructional strategy modeling
- ☐ Individual guided practice
- ☐ Content/instructional coaching
- ☐ Coaching for continuing contract teachers
- ☐ Mentoring for probationary teachers
- ☐ Observation by trained observers


Curriculum

- ☐ Curriculum alignment/mapping
- ☐ Curriculum development
- ☐ Assessment development

Off-site Staff Development

- ☐ Attend a workshop
- ☐ Attend a conference
- ☐ Graduate or continuing education course

- ☐ **None of the Above** (If you checked "None of the Above" enter the designs and strategies in the box.)



**800 characters maximum*

2. Designs and strategies encompassed the following high-quality components as required by state and federal guidelines (check one or more):


- ☐ An integral part of school board, districtwide and schoolwide educational improvement plans.
- ☐ Included teachers, principals, parents and administrators in planning sustainable classroom focused activities that were not one-day or short-term workshops.
- ☐ Increased teachers' knowledge of academic subjects and understanding of effective instructional strategies using scientifically based research.
- ☐ Increased teachers' and principals' knowledge and skills in providing appropriate curriculum, instruction and assessment to help students meet and exceed state academic standards.
- ☐ Provided for professional learning communities that focus on student achievement.
- ☐ Included the use of data and assessments to inform classroom practice.
- ☐ Provided technology training to improve teaching and learning.
- ☐ Increased teachers' ability to effectively instruct all students including culturally diverse learners, learners with special needs, gifted and talented students, students with Limited English Proficiency and at-risk students.
- ☐ Improved teachers' classroom-management skills.
- ☐ Helped all school personnel work effectively with students and their parents.
- ☐ Evaluated designs and strategies for impact on teacher effectiveness to increase student academic achievement and improve the quality of future professional development.

District Report: Add or Edit Findings


For each district staff development goal and corresponding designs and strategies shown below, enter the findings, impact on student learning and impact on teacher learning. Remember to **save** after editing or adding information to this page.

Staff Development (automatically populates)
Goal:


1. What were the findings of this goal?

A large rectangular text input area with a light beige background. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom. The text "*800 characters maximum" is displayed in a small font at the bottom right of the input area.

2. What was the impact on student learning?

A large rectangular text input area with a light beige background. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom. The text "*800 characters maximum" is displayed in a small font at the bottom right of the input area.

3. What was the impact on teacher learning?

A large rectangular text input area with a light beige background. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom. The text "*800 characters maximum" is displayed in a small font at the bottom right of the input area.

4. Will your district continue working on this goal next year?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Revenue Information

Statutory Reference

Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, Sec. 64. RESERVED REVENUE FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT; TEMPORARY SUSPENSION.

For Fiscal Year 2010 and FY 2011 only, school district or charter schools may use revenue reserved for staff development under Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, subdivision 1, according to the requirements of general education revenue under Minnesota Statutes, section 126C.13, subdivision 5.

1. Did your district fund staff development?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2. If you answered Yes to question 1, select the box that indicates the percentage of the general fund that was used for staff development:

- ☐ Up to 1%
- ☐ Between 1% and 2%
- ☐ 2% or more

Exemplary Grants

3. If your district funded staff development, were funds used for exemplary grants?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

4. If you answered Yes to question 3, how many exemplary grants were awarded by the district?

- ☐ One to three
- ☐ Four to six
- ☐ Seven to nine
- ☐ Ten or more

Q Comp

5. Does your district participate in Q Comp?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

District Report: Add or Edit District Teacher Induction Information

Minnesota Statutes, section 122A:40, subdivision 6 and Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.41, subdivision 3:

Mentoring for probationary teachers. A school board and an exclusive representative of the teachers in the district must develop a probationary teacher peer review process through joint agreement. The process may include having trained observers serve as mentors or coaches or having teachers participate in professional learning communities. Remember to **save** after entering or editing information on this page.

1. Did the district provide a Teacher Induction/Mentorship Program for new teachers?

- ☐ Yes. Answer questions 2-8 below then save.
- ☐ No. Save then proceed to the next section.

2. What types of induction activities were provided for new teachers?

- ☐ Program for first-year teachers
- ☐ Program for second-year teachers
- ☐ Program for third-year teachers
- ☐ New teacher orientation to district, school and classroom
- ☐ Collaboration time expectations for new teacher and mentor
- ☐ New teacher seminars/workshops
- ☐ Observations conducted by a mentor
- ☐ New teacher observations of master teachers
- ☐ Formative assessments to guide their professional growth (e.g., needs assessments, self-assessments using professional teaching standards, mentor logs, mentor observations, examining student work)

3. What types of new teacher seminars/workshops were provided?

- ☐ Classroom management
- ☐ Lesson planning
- ☐ Instructional strategies
- ☐ Content or program knowledge
- ☐ Curriculum and assessments
- ☐ Differentiated instruction
- ☐ Using data to improve instruction
- ☐ Needs assessments

4. What types of formative assessments were used with new teachers?
- ☐ Self-assessments using professional teaching standards
 - ☐ Mentor logs focused on issues and results
 - ☐ Mentor observations and feedback
 - ☐ Examining student work or student data
 - ☐ Foundations (e.g., basic skills, mentor roles and mentoring responsibilities)
5. What activities were provided in mentor training?
- ☐ Knowledge and application of new teacher development
 - ☐ Professional teaching standards
 - ☐ Coaching skills
 - ☐ Using formative assessments for professional growth
 - ☐ Observation strategies
 - ☐ Program model effectiveness
6. What was measured when you evaluated the program?
- ☐ Impact on teacher retention
 - ☐ Impact on teacher effectiveness (professional growth)
 - ☐ Impact on student achievement
 - ☐ New teacher-mentor relationship
 - ☐ New teachers' job satisfaction
7. During the school year, how much time are new teachers required to participate in formal induction program activities not including mentoring support (e.g., new teacher seminars, workshops, network meetings)?
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 0-8 hours | <input type="radio"/> 9-16 hours |
| <input type="radio"/> 17-32 hours | <input type="radio"/> 33-40 hours |
| <input type="radio"/> 41-48 hours | <input type="radio"/> 49 or more |
8. During the school year, how much time are mentors required to meet with new teachers to provide ongoing professional and instructional support?
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> less than 1 hour per month | <input type="radio"/> 3 hours per month |
| <input type="radio"/> 1 hour per month | <input type="radio"/> 4 hours per month |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 hours per month | <input type="radio"/> 5 hours or more per month |
-

Staff Information

The tables below show the number of teachers, paraprofessionals and administrative staff submitted by your district through STAR (Staff Automated Reporting). Please indicate the number in each category who have received high-quality staff development. Information for individual sites must be entered on the school-level page. Remember to **save** after entering or editing information on this page.

Teachers			
Total number of teachers in the district.			
Total who received high-quality staff development training.			

Paraprofessionals			
Total number of paraprofessionals in the district.			
Total who received high-quality staff development training.			

Licensed Non-Instructional Staff			
Total number of licensed non-instructional staff in the district.			
Total who received high-quality staff development training.			

Add or Edit K-12 Arts Education Information

The Perpich Center for Arts Education is the state agency that provides resources for arts education. Provide information below regarding the district's implementation of the Minnesota Arts Standards and areas of service you would access for professional development in the arts. Remember to **save** after entering or editing information on this page.

1. Do you have specific professional development activities related to arts standards implementation and assessment in your district?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

2. Indicate areas in which you are currently implementing the arts standards.

Dance

- ☐ Elementary
☐ Secondary

Media

- ☐ Elementary
☐ Secondary

Music

- ☐ Elementary
☐ Secondary

Theater

- ☐ Elementary
☐ Secondary

Visual Arts

- ☐ Elementary
☐ Secondary

3. Indicate the individuals who assess the arts standards in your district.

Arts Specialist

- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Secondary

Classroom Teachers

- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Secondary

Other specialists (e.g., physical education, career and technical education)

- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Secondary

4. Do you have a district-level arts coordinator?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

5. Perpich Center for Arts Education provides resources for professional learning. In which of the following areas would you access services in the future?


- ☐ Implementing arts standards
- ☐ Designing effective arts and arts integrated curriculum
- ☐ Designing assessment aligned with standards
- ☐ Building a system to report individual student achievement in the arts

School Site Report: Add or Edit Goals

Enter the student achievement goal and indicate the content focus. Select the student achievement goal that relates to a district staff development goal (select goal from the drop-down menu). Enter a school site staff development goal. The goals that were entered into the previous year's report are carried over into the new report. You can add and edit goals. Remember to **save** after adding or editing information on this page.

1. The student achievement goal should answer the question, "How do we want to see our students' academic achievement improve?" The goal should be student-centered and linked to the district staff development goal.

School Site Student Achievement Goal



**800 characters maximum*

2. Indicate the focus of this goal.


- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Art/Music | <input type="checkbox"/> Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Career & Technical Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Science |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health/Physical Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Language Arts/Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> World Languages |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics | |

3. Please select the district staff development goal that relates to the school student achievement goal above.



4. The school staff development goal should answer the question, "How did we prepare staff to accomplish the student achievement goal above?"

School Site Staff Development Goal



**800 characters maximum*

School Site Report: Add or Edit Designs and Strategies

For the staff development goal shown below, check the designs and strategies used to implement the goal during the school year. You may check more than one box. If necessary, check "none of the above" and enter designs and strategies in the box provided. Also, indicate in #2 which high-quality components were included. Remember to **save** after adding or editing information on this page.

School Site Staff Development (automatically populates) **Goal:**

1. Check each of the **designs or strategies** used to implement the goal during the reporting year (Check all that apply).

Learning Teams With Instructional Focus

- ☐ Professional learning communities
- ☐ Study groups
- ☐ Lesson study
- ☐ Team meetings
- ☐ Case studies

Examine Student Data

- ☐ Examine state assessment data
- ☐ Examine district/school selected assessment data
- ☐ Examine classroom assessment data
- ☐ Examine student work
- ☐ Action research

Classroom Coaching

- ☐ Demonstration teaching
- ☐ Instructional strategy modeling
- ☐ Individual guided practice
- ☐ Content/instructional coaching
- ☐ Coaching for continuing contract teachers
- ☐ Mentoring for probationary teachers
- ☐ Observation by trained observers

Curriculum

- ☐ Curriculum alignment/mapping
- ☐ Curriculum development
- ☐ Assessment development

Off-site Staff Development

- ☐ Attend a workshop
- ☐ Attend a conference
- ☐ Graduate or continuing education course
- ☐ **None of the Above** (If you checked "None of the Above" enter the designs and strategies in the box.)

**800 characters maximum*

2. Designs and strategies encompassed the following high-quality components as required by state and federal guidelines (check one or more):


- ☐ An integral part of school board, districtwide and schoolwide educational improvement plans.
- ☐ Included teachers, principals, parents and administrators in planning sustainable classroom focused activities that were not one-day or short-term workshops.
- ☐ Increased teachers' knowledge of academic subjects and understanding of effective instructional strategies using scientifically based research.
- ☐ Increased teachers' and principals' knowledge and skills in providing appropriate curriculum, instruction and assessment to help students meet and exceed state academic standards.
- ☐ Provided for professional learning communities that focus on student achievement.
- ☐ Included the use of data and assessments to inform classroom practice.
- ☐ Provided technology training to improve teaching and learning.
- ☐ Increased teachers' ability to effectively instruct all students including culturally diverse learners, learners with special needs, gifted and talented students, students with Limited English Proficiency and at-risk students.
- ☐ Improved teachers' classroom-management skills.
- ☐ Helped all school personnel work effectively with students and their parents.
- ☐ Evaluated designs and strategies for impact on teacher effectiveness to increase student academic achievement and improve the quality of future professional development.

School Site Report: Add or Edit Findings

For each school staff development goal and corresponding designs and strategies shown below, enter the findings, impact on student learning and impact on teacher learning. Remember to **save** after editing or adding information to this page.

School Site Staff Development Goal: (automatically populates)


1. What were the findings of this goal?



A large rectangular text input area with a light beige background. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom. The text area is currently empty.

**800 characters maximum*


2. What was the impact on student learning?



A large rectangular text input area with a light beige background. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom. The text area is currently empty.

**800 characters maximum*

3. What was the impact on teacher learning?



A large rectangular text input area with a light beige background. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom. The text area is currently empty.

**800 characters maximum*

4. Will the school continue working on this goal next year?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

School Site Report: Add or Edit School Site Teacher Staffing Information

The tables below show the number of teachers, paraprofessionals and administrative staff submitted by your district through STAR (STaff Automated Reporting). Please indicate the number in each category who have received high-quality staff development. Information for individual sites must be entered on the school level page. Remember to **save** after entering or editing information on this page.

Teachers	
Total assigned to this site.	
Total who received high-quality staff development training.	<input type="text"/>

Paraprofessionals	
Total assigned to this site.	
Total who received high-quality staff development training.	<input type="text"/>

Licensed Non-Instructional Staff	
Total assigned to this site.	
Total who received high-quality staff development training.	<input type="text"/>

Gifted and Talented Program

Gifted and talented children and youth are those students with outstanding abilities, identified at preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. Students may be identified as gifted and talented using their district's criteria. Provide information on the gifted and talented education program at your site. Remember to **save** after entering or editing information on this page.

Please respond to the questions below if you have a gifted and talented program in your school.

[View the National Association for Gifted Children Glossary of Frequently Used Terms in Gifted Education](#)

1. At which grade levels were students identified for gifted and talented services at your site? (Check all that apply.)

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> K | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 9-12 |

2. There are multiple measures for identification of gifted and talented students. Which of the following tools were used to identify gifted and talented students at your site? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Group intelligence test (IQ)
- ☐ Individual intelligence test (IQ)
- ☐ Individual achievement test
- ☐ Group or grade-level achievement test
- ☐ Out-of-level achievement test
- ☐ Curriculum Based Assessments (CBA)
- ☐ Gifted Screening Surveys (teacher and/or parent)
- ☐ Divergent thinking or creativity test
- ☐ Non-verbal ability test
- ☐ Portfolio assessment
- ☐ NWEA data
- ☐ Self-nomination
- ☐ Parent nomination
- ☐ Teacher nomination
- ☐ Students were not identified

3. Best practice indicates a continuum of programming services for gifted and talented students. Which of the following were available at your site? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Full-time ability classes
- ☐ Pull-out gifted grouping
- ☐ Cross-grade grouping
- ☐ Regrouping for specific subject instruction
- ☐ Within class ability/achievement grouping
- ☐ Enrichment grouping within classroom
- ☐ School-within-a-school model
- ☐ Cluster classrooms
- ☐ Independent study
- ☐ Mentor program
- ☐ Advanced Placement (AP)
- ☐ International Baccalaureate (IB)
- ☐ College in the Schools (CIS)
- ☐ Enriched or honors classes
- ☐ Differentiated counseling services for gifted learners
- ☐ Services were unavailable

4. Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.15C requires schools to adopt procedures for the academic acceleration of gifted and talented students. What types of acceleration were available at your site? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Early admission to kindergarten
- ☐ Early admission to first grade
- ☐ Early entrance into middle school or high school
- ☐ Whole-grade acceleration
- ☐ Grade-skipping
- ☐ Self-paced instruction
- ☐ Independent study
- ☐ Continuous progress
- ☐ Subject-matter acceleration/partial acceleration
- ☐ Combined classes
- ☐ Curriculum compacting
- ☐ Telescoping curriculum
- ☐ Mentoring
- ☐ Advanced Placement (AP)

- ☐ International Baccalaureate (IB)
- ☐ College in the Schools (CIS)
- ☐ Credit by examination
- ☐ Extracurricular academic teams/programs
- ☐ Extracurricular arts education programs/performance
- ☐ Acceleration was unavailable

5. How many hours of staff development did teachers receive for meeting the needs of gifted and talented students?

- ☐ Less than 1
- ☐ 1-2
- ☐ 3-4
- ☐ 5 or more
- ☐ None

6. Which components of gifted and talented programming were available at your site? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Philosophy statement
- ☐ Clear, measurable objectives
- ☐ Articulated internal review process
- ☐ Articulated external review process
- ☐ Formal identification process which includes multiple measures
- ☐ Informal identification process (e.g, recommendation)
- ☐ Formal policies and or procedures for identification
- ☐ Gifted curriculum and instruction
- ☐ Staff development in gifted and talented (e.g, social/emotional and instructional needs)
- ☐ Support services
- ☐ Parent involvement
- ☐ Publication of gifted and talented policies and procedures with handbook
- ☐ Parent handbooks
- ☐ Website information
- ☐ Available upon request

APPENDIX C

Minnesota Statutory References

122A.60 STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Subdivision 1. **Staff development committee.** A school board must use the revenue authorized in section [122A.61](#) for in-service education for programs under section 120B.22, subdivision 2, or for staff development plans under this section. The board must establish an advisory staff development committee to develop the plan, assist site professional development teams in developing a site plan consistent with the goals of the plan, and evaluate staff development efforts at the site level. A majority of the advisory committee and the site professional development team must be teachers representing various grade levels, subject areas, and special education. The advisory committee must also include nonteaching staff, parents, and administrators.

Subd. 1a. **Effective staff development activities.** (a) Staff development activities must:

- (1) focus on the school classroom and research-based strategies that improve student learning;
- (2) provide opportunities for teachers to practice and improve their instructional skills over time;
- (3) provide opportunities for teachers to use student data as part of their daily work to increase student achievement;
- (4) enhance teacher content knowledge and instructional skills;
- (5) align with state and local academic standards;
- (6) provide opportunities to build professional relationships, foster collaboration among principals and staff who provide instruction, and provide opportunities for teacher-to-teacher mentoring; and
- (7) align with the plan of the district or site for an alternative teacher professional pay system.

Staff development activities may include curriculum development and curriculum training programs, and activities that provide teachers and other members of site-based teams training to enhance team performance. The school district also may implement other staff development activities required by law and activities associated with professional teacher compensation models.

(b) Release time provided for teachers to supervise students on field trips and school activities, or independent tasks not associated with enhancing the teacher's knowledge and instructional skills, such as preparing report cards, calculating grades, or organizing classroom materials, may not be counted as staff development time that is financed with staff development reserved revenue under section [122A.61](#).

Subd. 2. **Contents of the plan.** The plan must include the staff development outcomes under subdivision 3, the means to achieve the outcomes, and procedures for evaluating progress at each school site toward meeting education outcomes.

Subd. 3. **Staff development outcomes.** The advisory staff development committee must adopt a staff development plan for improving student achievement. The plan must be consistent with education outcomes that the school board determines. The plan must 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 collaboration and develop mentoring and peer coaching programs for teachers new to the school or district;
- (5) effectively teach and model violence prevention policy and curriculum that address early intervention alternatives, issues of harassment, and teach nonviolent alternatives for conflict resolution; and
- (6) provide teachers and other members of site-based management teams with appropriate management and financial management skills.

Subd. 4. Staff development report. (a) By October 15 of each year, the district and site staff development committees shall write and submit a report of staff development activities and expenditures for the previous year, in the form and manner determined by the commissioner. The report, signed by the district superintendent and staff development chair, must include assessment

and evaluation data indicating progress toward district and site staff development goals based on teaching and learning outcomes, including the percentage of teachers and other staff involved in instruction who participate in effective staff development activities under subdivision 3.

(b) The report must break down expenditures for:

- (1) curriculum development and curriculum training programs; and
- (2) staff development training models, workshops, and conferences, and the cost of releasing teachers or providing substitute teachers for staff development purposes.

The report also must indicate whether the expenditures were incurred at the district level or the school site level, and whether the school site expenditures were made possible by grants to school sites that demonstrate exemplary use of allocated staff development revenue. These expenditures must be reported using the uniform financial and accounting and reporting standards.

(c) The commissioner shall report the staff development progress and expenditure data to the house of representatives and senate committees having jurisdiction over education by February 15 each year.

History: *1Sp1985 c 12 art 8 s 23,61; 1987 c 398 art 8 s 27,28; 1Sp1987 c 4 art 1 s 3; 1988 c 486 s 73,74; 1990 c 562 art 4 s 8; 1991 c 265 art 7 s 30-32; 1992 c 499 art 1 s 19; 1992 c 571 art*

10 s 4,5; 1993 c 224 art 7 s 24; 1994 c 647 art 7 s 10,11; 1Sp1995 c 3 art 8 s 9; 1996 c 412 art 9 s

11; 1998 c 397 art 8 s 95,96,101; art 11 s 3; 1998 c 398 art 5 s 13; 1999 c 241 art 5 s 3; 1999 c 241 art 9 s 17; 1Sp2005 c 5 art 2 s 44-46

Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61 RESERVED REVENUE FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Subdivision 1. **Staff development revenue.** A district is required to reserve an amount equal to at least two percent of the basic revenue under section [126C.10, subdivision 2](#), for in-service education for programs under section [120B.22, subdivision 2](#), for staff development plans, including plans for challenging instructional activities and experiences under section [122A.60](#), and for curriculum development and programs, other in-service education, teachers' workshops, teacher conferences, the cost of substitute teachers staff development purposes, preservice and in-service education for special education professionals and paraprofessionals, and other related costs for staff development efforts. A district may annually waive the requirement to reserve

their basic revenue under this section 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. A district in statutory operating debt is exempt from reserving basic revenue according to this section. Districts may expend an additional amount of unreserved revenue for staff development based on their needs. With the exception of amounts reserved for staff development from revenues allocated directly to school sites, the board must initially allocate 50 percent of the reserved revenue to each school site in the district on a per teacher basis, which must be retained by the school site until used. The board may retain 25 percent to be used for district wide staff development efforts. The remaining 25 percent of the revenue must be used to make grants to school sites for best practices methods. A grant may be used for any purpose authorized under section [120B.22, subdivision 2](#), [122A.60](#), or for the costs of curriculum development and programs, other in-service education, teachers' workshops, teacher conferences, substitute teachers for staff development purposes, and other staff development efforts, and determined by the site professional development team. The site professional development team must demonstrate to the school board the extent to which staff at the site have met the outcomes of the program. The board may withhold a portion of initial allocation of revenue if the staff development outcomes are not being met.

122A.61.Subdivision 3. Coursework and training. A school district may use the revenue reserved under subdivision 1 for grants to the district's teachers to pay for coursework and training leading to certification as a college in the schools or concurrent enrollment teacher. In order to receive a grant, the teacher must be enrolled in a program that includes coursework and training focused on teaching a core subject.

History: 1987 c 398 art 1 s 18; 1989 c 329 art 7 s 6; 1991 c 130 s 37; 1991 c 265 art 1 s 25; 1992 c 499 art 1 s 18; art 7 s 31; art 12 s 29; 1992 c 571 art 10 s 3; 1993 c 224 art 4 s 33; art 7 s 14; 1994 c 647 art 7 s 3; 1Sp1995 c 3 art 1 s 49; 1998 c 397 art 8 s 4,101; art 11 s 3; 1998 c 398 art 1 s 36,39; 1Sp1998 c 3 s 19; 1999 c 241 art 1 s 54; art 5 s 4; 2000 c 489 art 2 s 1,28; 1Sp2001 c 5 art 3 s 82; 1Sp2001 c 6 art 1 s 42; art 3 s 3; 2007 c 146 art 2 s 13

Copyright © 2007 by the Office of Revisor of Statutes, State of Minnesota.

Laws 2009, Chapter 96, Article 2, Section 64, Reserved Revenue for Staff Development; Temporary Suspension.

Notwithstanding Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, subdivision 1, for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 only, a school district or charter school may use revenue reserved for staff development under Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.61, subdivision 1, according to the requirements of general education revenue under Minnesota Statutes, section 126C.13, subdivision 5. Effective Date. This section is effective July 1, 2009.