

## Board Questions RE: January 28, 2021 BoardBook materials

### Virtual Academy Presentation

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Page 13 - I believe there is an error in dates (September 2021 - May 2021).</p>  | <p>This has been corrected to May 2022</p>  |
| <p>2. Page 15 - Recognizing that this is larger than the VA application, and also that it is appropriate as a call-out to the powers that be...<br/>As a district, we need to be clear on whether we are a Prek-12 Pathways district or a K-12 Pathways district. Here we talk about K-12. In other discussions, Prek-12. Wherever leadership decides to land, we need to be consistent.</p> | <p>MDE Online Learning applies only to K-12. There is no pre-K option.</p> <p>124D.095 ONLINE LEARNING OPTION. Subd. 2 (e) "Student" is a Minnesota resident enrolled in a school under section 120A.22, subdivision 4, in kindergarten through grade 12.</p>   |
| <p>3. Page 24 - Call-out on equity... as VA continues to develop, we will need to continue to be cognizant of equity and access as it relates to support/counseling and guidance counseling supports, ensuring that have equitable access in both in-person and VA.</p>  |   |
| <p>4. How do you envision addressing increased tech costs with the introduction of VA? Funding stream could be General Fund, could be Tech Levy. How to balance? Where does Peter borrow from Paul in this scenario, if enrollment lags?</p>   | <p>Online students will receive the same technology equipment as in-person students. Costs will be the same. We may have some shipping costs if students participate from areas of Minnesota outside the immediate area. These costs could be covered by multiple budget areas including the technology levy or the general fund. We would anticipate that students who are not bringing their devices back and forth to school each day will also have less repair needs and these costs may zero out.</p> |
| <p>5. In the board workshop earlier this month, there had been general consensus among board members about having board representation (in some form) on the One91</p>   | <p>To provide for greater flexibility as we continue to develop the online school, language has been updated to read: Online Academy Advisory Committee</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Virtual Academy Advisory Committee, and I see that this is not included in the changes detailed in the recommendation. Please elaborate.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members may include parents, students, staff, board members, and/or community members. The purpose of the advisory committee will be to provide feedback for continuous improvement.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

**FY21 Revised Budget**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Slide #6<br/>This isn't just technology, it is technology and technology staff, yes?</p>   | <p>Yes, Technology expenditures both personnel and equipment.</p>   |
| <p>2. Slide #8<br/>- It might be helpful to call out the distinction on who is included in "admin" on slide #9, as this often creates confusion. Among community, and potentially among new board members. While it is noted in budget links later on, verbal call out might be informative.</p>                                       | <p>Administration would be the same for the online school as it is for an in-person school. The VA is a stand alone school, but it is still a school that will be staffed as any of our other schools. Enrollment considerations will be used to make sure that the model is efficient as possible and meets the programming needs of our students.</p> <p>For the purposes of this slide, Admin refers to the Building Principal and offices, Board of Education, Superintendent office, and Assistant Superintendent offices.</p> |
| <p>3. Slide #11<br/>The last two bullet points are confusing. e.g. if we are looking at \$5 mil due to declining enrollment now, why would we only be looking at \$5 mil in adjustments (if enrollment was stable) due to lack of State funding? It seems all said and done, this year, we are looking at \$10 mil in adjustments.</p> | <p>The second from the last bullet is providing an example of what the loss in enrollment can mean for revenues. The last bullet is referencing the impact to budget when expenditures trend at 3.5% and revenues do not keep pace even if the revenues. It is too soon to determine what our projections will show. These points are simply to inform that there are many factors dependent upon enrollment. They are not meant as predictors of our projections.</p>  |
| <p>4. Slide #12<br/>- If Federal funding is not included in this budget, then I am led to believe that this is</p>   | <p>ESSER I funds that have been made available to us as well as the Coronavirus Relief Funds</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>not an accurate assessment of our budget reality. Why would these funds be excluded?<br/>- Why would we not include known and received Federal funds to date in this budget?</p>  | <p>(CRF) funds which have been spent and reimbursed, are included in the budget. We have included. We have not included the ESSER II funds as they have not been made available to us yet with the guidelines of how the funds may be spent.<br/>This report is for the Revised Budget and not FY22. The expectation is that all of the ESSER I funds will be used in the FY21 year with the possible use of the ESSER II funds for needs in the summer and into next year as possible. Until it is communicated what the funds may be used for, we will not be able to say for certain if future cuts may be avoided through the use of federal funds.</p> |
| <p>5. Slide #4 should also include a comparative look-back at FY21 enrollment assumptions. FY22 enrollment assumptions can be contextualized to help them understand our reality.<br/>Slide 8 - Per board planning document, please clarify on bullet #4 that this is March 11, as this is noted elsewhere in documentation/links.</p> <p>6. What is current enrollment in comparison to the adopted budget? Is some of the revision based on this comparison?</p> | <p>Adding to the talking points.<br/>Added "March 11" to slide 8.</p> <p>Our K-12 enrollment as of Monday 1/25/21 was 7595 compared to 7606 budgeted. These numbers do not reflect the anticipated drop after the semester break. Adopted Budget FY21 used 7606 ADM K-12. Revised Budget FY21 is using 7642 ADM K-12.</p>   |

**FY22 Budget**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>FY 22 Budget - There is a slide that shows Fall Enrollment of 7,296. Is this based on a projected decline, how is it in comparison to current? Do we have more information on Kindergarten enrollment increasing due to</p> | <p>It does reflect a decline in enrollment of close to 300 students at the moment. It will be closer to 240-260 after 1st semester. Our trend for the last 4-6 years has been a steady decline of close to 320 students per year. We</p> |
|--|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>families delaying a year due to the pandemic?</p>  | <p>have been increasing in the K class all year. We are up to 631 and our average is 650. The seat count may continue to increase throughout the year, but our ADM will be impacted by the less than a full year enrollment. Plan is to use the 7,296 ADM K-12 for the development of the FY22 Budget.</p>   |
| <p>We speak a lot about our history of declining enrollment and we are not talking or sharing enough about our current tracking, especially as it relates to all the work we did in closing schools and redrawing boundaries, and the k-12 Pathways. Did all this work help our declining enrollment? I also realize it is difficult to really analyze because we have the pandemic factor too. Just wondering because I think our community would like to know the impact of past decisions as it relates to financial challenges.</p> | <p>This year it is very difficult to judge based on the pandemic. A year over year comparison for staffing (declining enrollment) is probably not "apples to apples" as we are not staffing just for our enrollment, we are staffing for the pandemic requirements.</p> <p>We have not seen an increase in any class cohort over the past 6 years. 12th grade is an exception, but ALC and students earning credits to graduate make up this difference.</p> |

**2021 Adopted Budget by Budget Unit**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. 01010 General Elementary Instruction Personnel - Why did FTE increase from 136 to 141? Runs counter to budget efforts and open facilities last Spring.</p> | <p>Staffing adjustments are made based on enrollment and program needs. Adopted budget numbers are not final but merely targets because enrollment changes after the adopted budget (<u>Also, this response applies to questions #2, #6-8 and #10-14</u>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Requirements for staffing the in-person learning for hybrid were increased due to the need to maintain 6 feet between students. Instead of having classrooms with the typical 25-30 kids, classes were closer to 14-17 in hybrid rooms.</li> <li>● Note that we were also able to support 4 days of in-person learning</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>per week while in hybrid for our youngest learners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the large populations and class sizes in VA, we tried to shift some sections of teachers from smaller groups into VA, but that wasn't entirely enough to keep class sizes. We know that continued to be a concern even after adding some help. This happened in late September/early October.</li> <li>• A year over year comparison for staffing (declining enrollment) is probably not "apples to apples" as we are not staffing just for our enrollment, we are staffing for the pandemic requirements.</li> </ul> <p>We are continuing to report the FTE's under the codes they were originally coded to, even though they may be covered in cost by the Federal Coronavirus Relief Funds or ESSER funds. The additional FTE's are reflective of the additional staff needed this year due to COVID and covered through December by Coronavirus Relief Funds (CRF) and anticipated to be covered the remainder of the year by ESSER I funds. The reduction efforts expected in the adopted budget carried forward as intended.</p> |
| <p>2. 02010 General Middle School Instruction - Why did FTE increase 45.92 to 48.62? What funding pays for this, if not standard State revenue streams. Runs counter to budget efforts and open facilities last Spring.</p> | <p>Same response as 1. Above- CARES funding.</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>3. 03010 General High School Instruction - Why did FTE increase from 56.47 to 57.28? What funding pays for this, if not standard State revenue stream?</p>   | <p>Same response as 1. Above- CARES funding.</p>  |
| <p>4. 09010 Special Ed Salaries/Benefits - Despite FTE increases in instruction it is notable that Special Ed cut FTE from 309.85 to 302.49. These are our students with typically the greatest need, and are reimbursed in theory by Feds. In this context the increase in FTE elsewhere is stark.</p> | <p>Child Count and the needs of students based on their disabilities impact the number of staff required to support students.</p>   |
| <p>5. 10010 - ALC Same comment as in #4, but for ALC. FTE was reduced from 32.12 to 28.03. Was there decreased need at ALC?</p>   | <p>Staffing adjustments are made based on enrollment and program needs. Adopted budget numbers are not final but merely targets because enrollment changes after the adopted budget.</p>  |
| <p>6. 10030 - Nursing - This increase makes sense, given pandemic. Increase in FTE from 7.17 to 12.06. Where did Peter borrow from Paul to accomplish this?</p>   | <p>ESSER funds will need to be used to cover these costs.</p>   |
| <p>7. 11011 is new. With a concomitant increase in 11010 Co-Curricular activities, it is unclear where this additional \$200,000 is coming from.</p>  | <p>This new budget unit is the student activities that under GASB 84 must now be part of the General Fund; but we wanted to keep separate. In a normal year the amount of Rev and Exp budget would be 600,000 but due to COVID the activities of the student activity funds have been very limited. Reduced to \$200,000.</p> |
| <p>8. 14010 Technology. FTE increased from 8 to 10. Where did Peter borrow from Paul to accomplish this?</p>  | <p>Staffing adjustments are made based on enrollment and program needs. Adopted budget numbers are not final but merely targets because enrollment changes after the adopted budget. These staff included in the 14010 are DLS staff within our elementary buildings.</p>   |
| <p>9. 16042 Flexible Savings - Guessing that this new item contains funds moved from another BU.</p>  | <p>Moved from another Fund - Fund 08 previously under Trust and Agency. Another result of GASB 84.</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>10. 17013 EAs - FTE decreased from 12.16 to 10.25. How does this fit into the larger picture of FTE districtwide?</p>                          | <p>Staffing adjustments are made based on enrollment and program needs. Adopted budget numbers are not final but merely targets because enrollment changes after the adopted budget.<br/>We need more clarity about the question. The report reflects the known FTE positions of EAs.</p>   |
| <p>11. 17011 Elem Admin - Where is the FTE increase of 1 coming from between adopted and revised? Funding stream?</p>                             | <p>We have 8 Elementary Schools. The adopted budget did not reflect the 8th position at the time the data was pulled. Revised Budget reflects all of the 8 positions. Funding stream is the General fund.</p>   |
| <p>12. 17027 - DEC clerical. Please elaborate on what appears to be the reduction of 1 FTE between adopted and revised.</p>                       | <p>Staffing adjustments are made based on enrollment and program needs. Adopted budget numbers are not final but merely targets because enrollment changes after the adopted budget.<br/>17027 did not show an FTE in Adopted yet the dollars were included. Revised does include the FTE as the individual is on leave and a sub is in the position in the meantime.</p> |
| <p>13. 19010 - Custodial - Why the FTE decrease from 70.40 to 68.4?</p>   | <p>As Adopted was completed, the transition and domino effect was still occurring with the Custodial positions from the Director on down. The Revised Budget is reflective of the proper FTEs.</p>  |
| <p>14. 19041 Facility Rental - Why during a pandemic did we add one FTE to this BU? It was 0 at Adopted. Where was this FTE previously coded?</p> | <p>The position was not added, it has existed since the current person was hired. However, it appears the HR report did not identify the account code under 19041 as it correctly does for the Revised Budget.<br/>In the 2020-21 Adopted budget book, on page 166 it was indicated, but on page 37 it was not. So, that is the correction.</p>                           |
| <p>15. 19060 - Utilities - Why during a pandemic are utilities flat?</p>  | <p>The anticipated 3% increase in costs for utilities offset by a lesser use of utilities, the</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>budget needed is estimated to be fairly flat. FY20 audited expenditures were 1,859,494.</p> |
|--|--|

School Resource Officer (SRO) presentation

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Interview/selection process - includes One91 student, admin, and select staff</p>  | <p>We don't have too many details other than to say BHS admin would be part of the hiring process once we do it. With COVID creating some different priorities, we mutually agreed with BPD to delay replacing the second SRO until spring so we will have more firm details about this process in the near future. New language in the contract will hit this by stating that school officials get to have "input" and will lay out some basic qualifications for an SRO. We have also advocated to include a student and that has been shared with the BPD team as well, so I anticipate that will also happen.</p> |
| <p>2. Negotiating contract language to address decreased need for SRO during pandemic or other disaster. Is this needed? If it is, is it in the works?</p> | <p>It is not expected we would have or necessarily need language specific to pandemic. BPD have been great partners in adjusting to what we need. The major shift in the contract language, which should help in future events too, is to be more deliberate about the purpose and goals for the SRO program. With a more formalized written version/vision of the program, it should help ensure that we flex how we partner based on how needs shift. I think once we have a contract version for you to see, it will make sense.</p>   |
| <p>3. One91 decides salary increase on our half of this contract, based on our budget cycle.</p>   | <p>So noted. Not sure what our half would mean or look like. Brian Gersich is currently working with Captain Stenger on the contract language and Lisa Rider will be coming in to work on the financial side of the contract.</p>   |
| <p>4. Defining and quantifying PD and success for this position.</p>   | <p>We will have language in the new contract about ensuring an SRO completes the basic SRO training offered through the state. Not entirely sure about our "measures of success" yet.</p>   |



