

May 14, 2026 Board Meeting

Board Members' Questions and Staff Responses regarding BoardBook materials

(BHS Presentation)

Board Member Question	Staff Response
<p>The 2025 graduation rates by race/ethnicity are different in the May 14th slide compared to the April 23rd presentation.</p> <p>For example, the April 23rd presentation reported that our Native/Indigenous students had a graduate percentage of 67%. This May 14th presentation lists zero (as in, zero total students). Our Asian students are listed here as having a grad rate of 87.9% whereas that number was 85% in April.</p> <p>Could you please comment on the difference - e.g. the May 14th percentages are BHS only and the April 23rd percentages included BAHS?</p> <p>For 9th Grade Academy: Please provide examples of how "Engage families in student learning" is different than it would be without the Academy model.</p> <p>On the slide for 9th Grade Core Content results: there is a consistent drop each year between 1st Semester and 2nd Semester for most subjects. What drives this decrease <u>within</u> the year?</p>	<p>Director Oftedahl and Dr. Lowe are engaged in a deep data dive around this discrepancy from April to May.</p> <p>Some conclusions they have arrived at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The slideshow for the May 14th Burnsville School Report is accurate and aligned with the public facing data.• The discrepancy in the April data is likely due to the timeline and methods for how/when the initial data was reported, initially, from the MN Department of Education (MDE) to the district.• They will continue to learn how/why that data was discrepant and adjust our systems, for the future, accordingly.• The graduation rate slide has been updated to reflect the most current data from MDE. <p>Examples include dedicated team time to engage families through phone calls, emails, and parent square.</p> <p>Our Fall and Spring conference time allows for regular dialogue with families and the whole grade 9 team.</p> <p>Trend data does signal that grade 9 students are less likely to be successful in semester 2 than semester 1. This trend is unacceptable and it should not continue.</p> <p>Some structural changes that we are working on to change this trajectory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Working with teachers to have strong scope and sequence for a guaranteed and viable Tier 1 instruction.• Looking at our student cohort groups and ensuring maximum amount of continuity amongst peer and teacher relationships.• Increasing rigorous learning procedures and commitments and supports throughout the school year, especially at the semesters.• Working with teachers, systematically, to assess their student performance and proactively intervene.

--	--

(OPEB Presentation)

Board Member Question	Staff Response
<p>Would it be possible to see an estimate of what the portfolio performance would have been if we had invested according to the proposed portfolio mix?</p> <p>For the current 30/70 portfolio mix - when was the last time the Board reviewed this specific allocation decision? I know we get updates on performance each year but when was the last time the Board made an allocation review/decision like what could come out of this work session?</p>	<p>If the District had invested 40% equity instead of 30%, returns last year would have been approximately 1% higher</p> <p>10 years ago the policy changed from a 30% equity maximum to a 31% maximum only because the account got just over 30% and it was too costly to reallocate. I can't find anything older than 2015 so it's likely the policy was adopted in 2005 with the 30% maximum. Each year we review the account performance and allocations with the investment advisors.</p>