

**MINNETONKA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT #276**  
**District Service Center**  
**5621 County Road 101**  
**Minnetonka, Minnesota**

**Summary of May 19, 2022 Study Session**

The School Board of Minnetonka Independent School District #276 met in study session at 7:10 p.m. on Thursday, May 19, 2022 in the Community Room at the District Service Center, 5621 County Road 101, Minnetonka, Minnesota. Chairperson Chris Vitale presided. Other Board members present were Katie Becker, Patrick Lee-O'Halloran, John Odom, Meghan Selinger, Lisa Wagner and Superintendent Dennis Peterson, ex officio. Absent: Mark Ambrosen.

**CITIZEN INPUT**

Chairperson Vitale extended an invitation to members of the audience who wished to address the Board on any topic. He also read the guidelines for Citizen Input, for the benefit of those who wished to speak.

District parent Dania Schulman addressed the Board at this time, thanking them and Dr. Peterson for starting the current school year on the day after Rosh Hashanah. She noted that the Minnetonka Jewish community was positively impacted by this and thanked the Board for their openness to learning about and accepting different backgrounds and cultures. She also thanked Dr. Peterson for his leadership of the District for the past 21 years and wished him well on his upcoming retirement.

**REPORT FROM THE CAREI INSTITUTE ON MTSS PHASE II EVALUATION**

Associate Superintendent of Instruction Dr. Amy LaDue led the discussion. She noted that during the current school year, the District has made significant efforts to deepen implementation and system-wide alignment of the Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Framework processes and practices. These efforts continue to support advancement of the Board-established goals focused on Excellence in Student Well-being and Belonging and Excellence in Student Learning and Support.

The District is partnering with the University of Minnesota Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) to complete a comprehensive evaluation of the District's Multi-Tiered System of Supports systems work. This systemic framework is designed to address academics as well as social and emotional development. Further, this work addresses recommendations from Dr. William Dikel's *Evaluation of Student and Family Well-Being* completed in 2019-2020.

Dr. LaDue then turned things over to Dr. Kim Gibbons, Director, and Dr. Ellina Xiong, Research Associate, from CAREI who presented their findings from the evaluation. Highlights of their presentation included the following;

## What is MTSS?

MTSS is an integrated, comprehensive framework that focuses on the alignment of systems necessary for all students' academic, behavioral, and social success

Promotes **identifying and supporting systems** for alignment of resources at the district, school, and grade level.

Addresses **support for all students**, including gifted and high achievers.

Uses **evidence based practices** to support the whole child along a tiered continuum.

Uses a **data-based decision making model** to solve system, group, and individual problems.

Focuses on **removing barriers** to learning at all levels.

### 3 Key Ideas

## Multi-Tiered System of Support(MTSS)

Effective Instruction & Intervention Programs

Meaningful Assessment of Student Performance

Collaborative Teams Use **Data** to make Instructional Decisions

## Evaluation Questions: 2020-21 School Year

1. To what extent is Minnetonka Public Schools implementing an aligned (K-12) MTSS framework across all buildings?
2. To what extent do teachers and staff support implementation of a MTSS framework?
3. To what extent is staffing sufficient and equitable across tiers of service to support quality implementation of an MTSS framework?
4. What is the relationship between implementation of the MTSS framework on student achievement and behavioral outcomes?
5. To what extent is staffing efficient and responsive to appropriately address student needs?

## Evaluation Questions: 2021-22 School Year

6. What is the impact of the MTSS framework on special education child count?
7. To what extent is special education programming for mild disabilities consistent with best practice research

### **Ongoing**

8. How will the results of the MTSS audit be organized into a 3-year implementation plan for the district and each building?

## Phase 2 Review Process

### Role-Based Group Interviews

- School administrators, GenEd and SpEd teachers, related services, paraprofessionals

### Special Education Survey

- All staff

### Extant Data

- SpEd Student Achievement
- Child Count data
- Staff utilization

## Group Interview and Survey Domains

Curriculum and Instruction/Service Delivery	Academic and social-emotional learning (SEL) strategies, curricular materials and programming that support students with disabilities.
Assessments	The practices and tools used to assess students' strengths and needs, and monitor their progress.
Child Find/Student Evaluations	The use of systematic processes to identify and evaluate student needs and programming in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and other national policies.
Collaboration	Opportunities to apply team processes and communication strategies to support students and families.
Professional Development/ Resources/ Staffing	The professional learning opportunities offered to staff and allocation of material/physical resources, and staffing.

[CEC Professional Standards](#)

## MTSS Implementation and Child Count

### Question 1: What is the impact of the MTSS framework on special education child count?

11

## Strengths

- The district has a reasonable special education child count and rates are below the state average (11% vs 16%).
- The most prevalent disabilities categories identified in the district were speech/language impairment (SLI) and specific learning disability (SLD).
- A majority of staff reported that the child find process is as efficient as possible.
- Nearly 90% of GenEd teachers reported that the decisions evaluation teams make are accurate in identifying students with disabilities.

## Strengths

- Although staff reported concerns with high caseloads for special education teachers and related services professionals, caseloads in the district are appropriate and well below the ratio of 1:25 for the majority of service providers.
- The district provides a variety of courses and programming at the secondary level to support students at risk and students with disabilities (SWD).
  - Examples of these courses include Language Arts Workshop, Just Words, Wilson Reading, and math workshop at the middle level.
  - High school courses include Just Words, Fluency Builder, Wilson Reading, and social emotional learning (SEL) supplemental course (EmpowerU).

## Identified Needs

The district needs to refine and expand supplemental (Tier 2) and intensive interventions (Tier 3) in math and SEL to prevent large numbers of referrals for special education services.

Child count data may not fully reflect the number of students with a disability and who show a need for special education services. The district is experiencing a high volume of 504 Plans that is overwhelming staff in processing and implementing plans.

Some schools indicate concerns with current district guidelines that encourage delaying language immersion students English reading interventions until they are exposed to English instruction (i.e., 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and beyond), as opposed to providing reading interventions when a reading need is identified.

## Recommendations

- The district should consider conducting math and SEL intervention inventories across buildings and grade levels.
- Based on the inventory, re-evaluate staffing decisions and service delivery models to ensure sufficient allocations are made to support the implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in math and SEL, and that students receive support from staff who are trained in evidence-based strategies.
- Ensure that Tier 3 interventions are more intensive than Tier 2 interventions and adapted to address individual student needs through an iterative manner based on student data.
- Articulate the difference between Tier 2 and 3 in terms of the data required for decision making, groups size and dosage, instructional delivery methods, and interventionist expertise.
- Review 504 policies and practices to ensure accurate decisions are made regarding eligibility.
- Given staff concerns regarding current practices in delaying early reading intervention supports in English for language immersion students, the district may consider consulting language development research and conducting research to inform reading intervention guidelines for language immersion students.

Special  
Education Best  
Practice  
Research

### Question 2:

**To what extent is special education programming for mild disabilities consistent with best practice research?**

18



## Strengths

- According to focus group and survey results, staff reported that administrators are responsive to staff needs.
- Administrators are actively involved in meetings and teams that address students with the highest needs (i.e., individualized education program [IEP] teams).
- Survey results indicated over 90% of administrators reported that they know the process to follow when they have questions about special education procedures that requires a response from the district office, and they feel that communication between the district office and building administrators creates a culture of shared responsibility.
- Special education staff reported that the most common service delivery models used for providing services to students with high incidence disabilities (i.e., ASD, EBD, SLD, OHD, SLI) was a blend of pull-out and co-teaching. A blended model allows students with disabilities to receive services in the least restrictive environment.

## Identified Needs: Instruction

During the pandemic, most school districts across the country observed a decrease in achievement and an increase in mental health needs among students.

SY21 achievement indicated that the COVID-19 pandemic had a significant impact on student learning and well-being.

Staff report being overwhelmed by the number of students in interventions and needing special education referrals in the spring.

Teachers and support staff need support in delivering systematic and explicit instruction.



## Needs Identified

### **Explicit and Systematic Instruction:**

Instruction that consists of direct and systematic instruction, transparent teaching and logical sequencing of skills. Such practices include but are not limited to incorporating modeling, guided practice with immediate, specific corrective feedback, reinforcement of desired behaviors and independent practice.

According to survey results,

- Fewer than half of general education teachers reported frequently implementing systematic and explicit reading instruction (48%), writing instruction (41%), and math instruction (44%) when providing instruction for students with high incidence disabilities.
- Fewer than half of special education teachers reported frequently implementing explicit writing instruction (48%), and explicit math instruction (45%) when providing instruction for students with high incidence disabilities. Only 70% of special education teachers reported frequently implementing explicit reading instruction.
  - These results correspond with moderately low scores on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process Rubric (CIMP), particularly for the Goals: Objectives Related to Goal, and Overall Quality: Link Between Goals and Services indicators.

## Recommendations: Instruction

- It is recommended that the district focus resources on strengthening Tier 1 instruction to more efficiently address the needs of large groups of students.
- It is recommended that Tier 1 strategies for academics and SEL/behavior be revisited across the district. Educators should be provided sufficient training and access to meaningful evidence-based strategies, resources, and skill sets to support and accommodate all students, especially those with special needs.
- Identify universal interventions and implement them in a manner that empowers all educators, especially general education teachers, when working with students who are at risk and those with disabilities.
- Provide staff with sufficient training and access to meaningful evidence-based strategies, resources, and skills to support and accommodate all students, especially those with special needs.
- Communicate that all staff accept shared ownership and responsibility for teaching all students, including those identified with behavioral and academic challenges.

## Identified Needs: Assessment

The district uses a facilitator model to conduct initial and re-evaluations for students with disabilities and is highly valued by staff, however there are some unintended consequences.

The district's positive behavior support plans (PBSP) template does not provide explicit areas to specify proactive strategies for modifying challenging behaviors and teaching socially appropriate replacement behaviors

Progress monitoring practices need to be refined to align with Best Practices. Data indicate that students with the most intense needs are not being monitored at least weekly, and data collected for monitoring are not consistently reliable or valid to use for progress monitoring (e.g., teacher reports).

A review of individualized education programs (IEP) also indicated a lack in baseline performance information, vague descriptions of progress monitoring methods, and frequently did not indicate specific assessment measures that would be used or the frequency to which data would be collected.

## Facilitator Model

Facilitators indicate that due to inconsistent pre-referral processes across buildings, facilitators' time and resources are not equitably allocated.

Many IEP team members indicate that they do not have sufficient skills to write high quality positive behavior support plans (PBSP). Teams are dependent on one or two individuals to support with developing positive behavior support plans (PBSP).

Since case managers are not actively involved in the evaluation process, they are experiencing difficulties understanding how to review and interpret the data and use this information to develop effective instructional strategies to support IEPs and positive behavior support plans (PBSP).

Focus group data and ratings from the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process Rubric (CIMP) and Technical Adequacy Tool for Evaluation (TATE) highlight these areas of concern.

## Recommendations: Assessment

- Provide professional learning experiences for staff to improve skills in developing Individualized Education Plans (IEP), functional behavior assessment (FBA) and positive behavior support plan (PBSP) evaluations.
- Conduct routine individualized education program (IEP), functional behavior assessment (FBA) and positive behavior support plan (PBSP) evaluations using the (CIMP) and Technical Adequacy Tool for Evaluation (TATE).
- Establish clear communication around the district's assessment framework that includes expectations in assessment practices for general and special education programming.
  - Weekly progress monitoring
  - Behavioral data reviewed regularly by teams

## Identified Needs: Collaboration

Focus group and survey data indicated a need for a more structured approach to support collaboration among general education teachers, special education teachers, and support staff.

Data for students with disabilities are primarily managed by special education teachers and providers with limited engagement from general education teachers.

Many paraprofessionals reported not having access to individualized education programs (IEP) and positive behavior support plans (PBSP) to support the students they serve. It is important to provide additional professional development and mentoring to ensure that paraprofessionals are well-informed and skilled to support students with disabilities.

There is a need for collaboration meetings at critical transition points for students.

## Recommendations: Collaboration

- Identify a structure to allow for regular collaboration between staff.
- Identify a process for sharing individualized education programs (IEP) and positive behavior support plans (PBSP) with support staff.
- Consider implementing transition meetings district-wide. Transition meetings should take place when students move from one grade level to the next grade level, and specifically for transition grades when students move from early childhood to elementary, elementary to middle and middle to high school.

### Identified Needs: Data-Based Decision-Making

The district uses the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile as a cut-score to identify students as meeting benchmark. In MN, students performing at the 72<sup>nd</sup> percentile on the MAP is predictive of meeting standards in math, and the 62<sup>nd</sup> percentile is predictive of meeting standards in reading.

The current cut-score of the 40th percentile may be too low and may overlook the needs of students with moderate needs. These moderate needs may develop into severe needs when students are exited prematurely from interventions during Winter and Spring screening.

Staff reported using several different databases to access data, but also reported lacking access to particular databases when they had a need to know the data (e.g., special education teachers and behavior data).

## Data-Based Decision-Making Recommendations

- The district should consider aligning their cut-scores to predict proficiency on the MCA's and level of risk for students and use local norms to identify students for intervention.
- Develop routines for the use of screening data to evaluate the effectiveness of tiers of service that include disaggregation of data.
- Minnetonka Public Schools' leadership is encouraged to identify a central, user-friendly data system that supports academic and SEL/behavior student data collection and allows access for all staff to review student data proactively.

Identified  
Needs:  
Professional  
Learning

The district should prioritize needs based on the review and make staff development mandatory for areas of highest need for all staff, including paraprofessionals.

## Recommendations: Professional Learning

Areas in need of additional professional learning include:

- MTSS core components and subcomponents
- Tier 2 and 3 interventions
- Data review process
- Social emotional learning
- Culturally and linguistically relevant and responsive instructional practices
- MTSS as a prevention framework
- Problem solving training for SSTs
- Implementing effective Tier 1 strategies for students at risk and students with disabilities (e.g., accommodations, differentiated instruction)

In the discussion that followed, Board members asked questions about the District's 504 process, the increased number of requests for 504 during COVID, the testing percentile cutoff of 40%, the timing of English intervention in the District's immersion programs, and the ability to compare outcomes. Board member Wagner said that the District needs to inject more supports into the Tier 1 level, so all students are covered. Board member Selinger said that she liked seeing that teachers in the general teaching population are prepared to implement these supports, and noted that would help all students in the District.

### **UPDATE ON MTSS THREE-YEAR ACTION PLAN**

Dr. LaDue and Executive Director of Special Education Christine Breen led the discussion. They explained that tonight's presentation would update the Board on the three-year implementation plan that has been developed. The action plan for Year 1 contains a detailed plan based on priorities for the 2022-23 school year and Year 2 and Year 3 provides an outline for future steps. The plan will be updated and revised throughout the 3-year process to ensure we are responsive to our ongoing learning along with building and District needs.

The plan is organized by three key elements: Infrastructure and Support, Assessment and Decision Making, and Multi-level Instruction. Within each element areas of need and action steps are outlined.



<b>YEAR 1 PLAN</b>	
<b>Infrastructure and Support</b>	
<p><b>Teams:</b> The district needs four levels of MTSS teams including: (a) District MTSS team, (b) Building MTSS teams, (c) Grade Level Teams, and (d) Building Level Problem Solving Teams.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District MTSS Team, Building Level MTSS Teams, Grade Level/Content area teams meet regularly</li> <li>• Teams Implement a proactive data review process that does not rely heavily on teacher or parent referrals and instead relies on systematic review of universal screening data</li> <li>• District and building teams implement a process for continuously disaggregating data by student groups and evaluate the extent to which gaps are closing</li> <li>• CAREI will provide professional development and support for continued implementation</li> </ul>
<p><b>MTSS Process Guide:</b> The district needs to develop a comprehensive MTSS process guide that provides: (a) clear definition of tiers, (b) decision-making rules for movement between tiers, (c) procedures for screening and progress monitoring in academic and social emotional domains, (d) procedures matching intervention to student need, (e) procedures for evaluating intervention effects, (f) procedures for assessing fidelity, and (g) procedures for documentation of problem-solving efforts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement and support initial version of the process guide with building and teacher teams</li> <li>• Continue development and revision of process guide sections</li> <li>• Implement the decision-making model and standard treatment approach within building level teams</li> </ul>
<p><b>Social and Emotional Learning (SEL):</b> The district will examine SEL needs more closely and adopt a Tier 1 SEL curriculum focused on mental health promotion and bully prevention given the increasing and concerning trends observed on the MN Student Survey with students experiencing mental distress and bullying.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to identify and evaluate district level, instructional level, and content specific expertise to support teams</li> <li>• Refine definition of SEL and why it matters for Minnetonka students and execute messaging for all stakeholder groups</li> <li>• Need to identify current supports, resources, and tools for each level; provide menu of supports; and identify curriculum connections</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify infrastructure for time and place to deliver Tier 1 instruction and support at each instructional level</li> <li>● Infrastructure for data collection and analysis</li> <li>● Further analyze staffing</li> </ul>
<p><b>Professional Learning (PD):</b> Professional learning will be institutionalized and structured so that all teachers continually examine, reflect upon, and improve instructional practice, data-based decision-making, and delivery of instruction and interventions. The district will ensure that professional development is job-embedded, matched to district and building needs, and includes follow-up coaching and support.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify key areas, staff presenters, scheduling, and scope and sequence for PD</li> <li>● Continue to educate staff and deepen understanding about MTSS core components and subcomponents as prioritized by the District leadership team</li> <li>● Ensure that PD is an agenda item on all district team meetings</li> <li>● Educate staff on identified tools and resources</li> <li>● Ensure all staff develop an understanding of data for data-based decision making</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment and Decision-Making</b>	
<p><b>Tier 1 Assessment &amp; Decision-Making:</b> The district needs to (a) implement Universal SEL screening, (b) revise academic target scores to predict proficiency on MCA's, (c) calculate risk ratios for attendance and disciplinary infractions for student subgroups, and (d) consider evaluating and streamlining data systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implement and monitor Universal SEL Screening Tools</li> <li>● Revise academic target scores to predict proficiency on MCA</li> <li>● Determine how to prepare teachers on the change in target scores.</li> <li>● Calculate risk ratios for attendance and disciplinary subgroups</li> <li>● Evaluate current data systems and make recommendations to streamline.</li> <li>● Identify and implement an Early Warning System utilizing data from multiple sources</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tier 2/3 Assessment &amp; Decision-Making:</b> Align progress monitoring processes with best practices; improve data literacy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Develop a consistent Tier 2 and Tier 3 progress monitoring system to align with best practice</li> <li>● Continue to identify and implement supplemental instruments for SEL and Math</li> <li>● Reinstate progress monitoring at the secondary level</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a common understanding among special education teachers on reviewing and interpreting data to support IEPs and Positive Behavior Support Plans (PBSPs)</li> </ul>
<b>Multi-Level Instruction</b>	
<p><b>Tier 1 Instruction:</b>  Reading:  Reading Curriculum, Evidence-Based Instructional Strategies</p> <p>Social and Emotional Learning (SEL):  Systematic Tier I social, emotional and mental health education to be incorporated into core instruction for students at each level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate Tier I reading curriculum at the elementary level and alignment to the Science of Reading</li> <li>• Develop a common differentiation framework</li> <li>• Provide guidance to help teams articulate and understand the alignment between interventions and core instruction, particularly at the secondary level</li> <li>• Help teams understanding the connections between foundational skills and higher order skills ensure that interventions accelerate learning to close achievement gaps</li> <li>• Continue identification and implementation of Tier I curriculum, programs, and resources for Social, Emotional and Behavioral (SEB) instruction</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tier 2 Instruction:</b>  Align Tier 2 instruction with best practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct an intervention inventory across the district in areas of reading, math, SEB</li> <li>• Evaluate whether current interventions are evidence-based</li> <li>• Ensure that Tier 2 interventions need to be standardized, delivered by staff trained in the intervention, and group size and dosage needs to be optimal for the age and needs of the students (Fidelity)</li> <li>• Identify math interventions.</li> <li>• Identify SEB resources at the secondary level</li> <li>• Evaluate reading intervention guidelines for language immersion students</li> </ul>

<b>Tier 3 Instruction:</b> Social, Emotional, Behavioral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure special education staff understand the systematic process to assess and match student needs to evidence based intervention</li> <li>• Ensure paraprofessionals have tools and resources to use IEPs and Positive Behavior Support Plans (PBSPs) to support students</li> </ul>
---	--

<b>YEAR 2 PLAN</b>	
<b>Infrastructure and Support</b>	
<b>Teams:</b> The district needs four levels of MTSS teams including: (a) District MTSS team, (b) Building MTSS teams, (c) Grade Level Teams, and (d) Building Level Problem Solving Teams.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate fidelity checks into team meeting structures</li> <li>• Develop system and timelines for evaluating implementation plans</li> <li>• Continue to review District-wide, building-wide and progress monitoring data at timely intervals to evaluate the effectiveness of core instruction, identify students at risk of poor outcomes and evaluate students' responsiveness to interventions</li> </ul>
<b>MTSS Process Guide</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement updated process guide content following established timeline</li> <li>• Provide ongoing updates to staff</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Learning (PD)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to educate staff and deepen understanding about MTSS core components and subcomponents as prioritized by the District leadership team</li> <li>• Identify an ongoing coaching structure to support professional growth in MTSS</li> <li>• Engage teachers in Tier I explicit literacy instruction</li> <li>• Provide learning and support on the differentiation framework</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment and Decision-Making</b>	
<b>Assessment &amp; Decision-Making:</b> Improving identification for high potential programs; Examine 504 plan processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine enrollment data to ensure the process used to identify students for high potential programs do not exclude students</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to identify high achieving students to participate in enrichment opportunities utilizing multiple data points</li> <li>Review and revision to District 504 procedures</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 3 Decision-Making:</b> Address exclusionary discipline for students with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD), Identification of Specific Learning Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish a process to ensure that IEPs and PBSPs for students are matched to student needs and implemented with fidelity prior to OSS decisions for students with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD)</li> <li>Plan for the transition from the specific learning disability (SLD) IQ/ACH requirement</li> </ul>
<b>Multi-Level Instruction</b>	
<b>Tier 1 Instruction:</b> Math	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate Tier 1 math instruction and curriculum and its alignment to standards</li> </ul>

<b>YEAR 3 PLAN</b>	
<b>Infrastructure and Support</b>	
<b>Teams:</b> Transition meetings should take place when students move from one grade level to the next grade level, and specifically for transition grades when students move from early childhood to elementary, elementary to middle and middle to high school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement transition meetings to a) communicate students' educational history, b) review student intervention history, and c) develop support plans for the following school year for students receiving interventions</li> </ul>
<b>Early Childhood MTSS:</b> Early childhood students would also benefit from a system-wide implementation of MTSS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a E-12 aligned MTSS framework to include early childhood and develop a multi-year implementation plan to support early learners</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Learning (PD)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to educate staff and deepen understanding about MTSS core components and subcomponents as prioritized by the District leadership team</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment and Decision-Making</b>	
<b>Early Childhood Assessment &amp; Decision-Making:</b> The district should consider supplementing the TS Gold with a direct reliable and valid assessment tool.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplement TS Gold with a reliable and valid direct assessment measure</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 3:</b> Data-Based Decision-Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition away from SLD IQ/ACH discrepancy</li> </ul>
<b>Fidelity and Evaluation</b>	
<b>Fidelity and Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure measures of fidelity exist for all implementation areas</li> </ul>

In conclusion, Dr. LaDue noted that the District will continue to work with CAREI, who will provide continued support to the District and building leadership teams, during the coming school year in the implementation of Year 1 of the plan and the ongoing refinement of the overall 3-year plan.

Board members were enthusiastic about the implementation of the plan. Chairperson Vitale noted that this was meant to be a multi-year goal when it was originally put in place, and he thanked Dr. LaDue, Ms. Breen and members of their teams for their incredible amount of work thus far. Dr. LaDue said that the partnership on this work between Teaching and Learning and Special Education had been very empowering.

### **UPDATE ON 2021-22 MTSS ACTION PLAN**

Dr. LaDue and Ms. Breen also led this discussion. Highlights included the following:

#### **District Priorities**

Following the initial CAREI evaluation a district team was convened to respond to the recommendations. Five areas were identified as priorities to deepen the implementation of the MTSS framework and processes currently in place in the District. These included the following:

- MTSS Teams
- MTSS Process Guide
- Social Emotional Learning
- Professional Development
- Implementation Fidelity

Each of the five identified priorities has an action plan and a sub-group led by the District leadership team members. These work teams meet monthly and report progress and

garner feedback from the full District leadership team, building administrators, and building leadership teams.

## **Team Structure**

The first priority was to develop and implement four levels of teams and to define team structures and practices. These teams include a District team, a building team at each school, grade level teams, and a building student support team (SST). The District team is conducting monthly meetings to implement the 2021-2022 District action plan. Building teams were established and participated in professional learning focused on developing a common foundation for MTSS, initiative braiding and effective teaming practices. Additionally, building teams provided feedback on District priorities, developed initial site goals and plans and have continued to provide feedback on sections of the process guide. Building teams will receive additional training in order to provide leadership in building-wide implementation during the coming school year.

## **Process Guide**

The second priority is development of a comprehensive MTSS process guide that provides clear processes and practices. This guide will include: a clear definition of each tier, decision making rules, procedures and tools for universal screening for academics and social emotional domains, procedures to identify interventions aligned to needs, procedures for evaluation effectiveness and fidelity, and procedures to document instructional practices and efforts.

This year a process guide committee completed work to address the CAREI recommendation to create a Minnetonka MTSS process guide. According to the CAREI MTSS Action Plan recommendations, *the District needs to develop a comprehensive MTSS process guide that provides:*

- (a) Clear definition of tiers*
- (b) Decision-making rules for movement between tiers*
- (c) Procedures for screening and progress monitoring in academic and social emotional domains*
- (d) Procedures matching intervention to student need*
- (e) Procedures for evaluating intervention effects*
- (f) Procedures for assessing fidelity*
- (g) Procedures for documentation of problem solving*

As a result of the CAREI recommendations, a process guide committee was formed facilitated by the Director of Assessment working alongside the Minnewashta principal, the Director of Curriculum, a CAREI representative, and a representative from Minnetonka's Student Support Services. The committee involved all principals and building MTSS teams in this collaborative process by sharing excerpts from the process guide for review and comment. Using feedback from principals and the building MTSS teams, the process

guide committee met once per month to make updates to the guide and report the updates to the MTSS District Leadership Team at each monthly meeting.

A first draft process guide will be completed by June with a timeline to revise and add information to the guide over the next three years.

In its first year, the process guide will contain the following sections:

- Rationale
- Mission
- Beliefs
- Connection to State and Federal Law
- Professional Learning
- Infrastructure and Support Mechanisms
- Building Schedules
- Allocation and Alignment of Resources
- Excellence and Belonging
- Assessment and Screening
- Tier 1: Universal Instruction, Differentiation, and Accommodations
- Tier 2: Supplemental Instruction
- Tier 3: Individualized and Intensive Instruction

Additional sections will be added in the Fall of 2023 with on-going revisions in future years. The Process Guide Committee will work in collaboration with the Professional Learning Committee to ensure staff District-wide have a clear understanding of Minnetonka's MTSS process and expectations.

### **Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)**

The third priority is the examination of social and emotional needs (SEL), the implementation of a universal screener for all grade levels, and the subsequent implementation of Tier I social, emotional, and mental health education to be incorporated into core instruction for students at each level.

An SEL subcommittee was formed at the start of the 2021-2022 school year and has convened on a monthly basis to address recommendations. Led by the Director of Health Services, subcommittee members include school psychologists, school social workers, counselors, assistant principals, and Teaching and Learning directors. This year the subcommittee focused on the recommendations of the Dikel Report, the findings of the CAREI report, and School Board goals, which included establishing a common definition that focuses on social, emotional, behavioral, and academics.

Understanding that a universal screener is essential to identifying and responding to student needs, the subcommittee reviewed multiple screeners and surveyed other districts regarding effective tools, particularly at the secondary level. Screener considerations included the following:



- Alignment to research-based standards
- Alignment to effective screening practices
- Inclusion of behavioral and mental health concerns
- Teacher and student reporting features
- Alignment with current data management system

After a comprehensive review, the subcommittee identified SAEBRS and MySAEBRS as the most promising screening tools. SAEBRS is one of the only SEB universal screening tools built to align with a dual-factor model of student social and emotional functioning, which asserts that mental health should be defined by both the absence of problem behaviors and symptomatology (e.g., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) and the presence of well-being and competencies (e.g., social and emotional skills). mySAEBRS (my Social, Academic, and Emotional Behavior Risk Screener) is a brief, norm-referenced tool for screening all students to identify those who are at risk for social-emotional behavior (SEB) problems. Currently SAEBRS is used at the elementary level, and teachers complete the screening.

This spring both SAEBRS and mySAEBRS were introduced as pilots at the middle school and high school levels. Results of the pilots will inform potential implementation in 2022-23, including professional development and SEL Tier I intervention. Although SEL Tier I essential learnings have been identified at every grade level as part of the health curriculum, additional interventions will be implemented based on screening results, as well as data such as attendance, behavior referrals, and academics.

This year the committee began the resource mapping process and the analysis of current staffing to determine existing infrastructure and supports. The resource mapping process identified existing programs, intervention models, schedules, staff members responsible for instruction and intervention, and the number of students served. The analysis of staffing identifies what is currently in place at each building, the function of each staff person, and potential staffing adjustments for the future.

The subcommittee will continue the work that began this year surrounding resource mapping, staffing analysis, and screening tools. Future work will include expanding use of the universal screener, introducing progress monitoring, and using the results to inform instruction and intervention at all Tier levels. The results will also inform the needs assessment for the health curriculum review, as well as the implementation of future instructional resources.

## **Professional Learning**

The next priority is to institutionalize and structure professional learning to develop a common foundation and shared understanding of MTSS that promotes continuous improvement of core instructional practice, data-based decision making, and delivery of intervention and enrichment. Professional learning should be job-embedded, aligned to identified needs, and should include follow-up coaching and support. Clear Springs

Elementary Principal Curt Carpenter, Special Education Director Kristin Laughlin, and Director of Teacher Development Sara White led this work. The team was charged with several action steps for 2021-2022:

- Identify and plan for professional learning for each recommendation
- Identify an ongoing coaching structure after the delivery of PD
- Identify key areas, staff presenters, scheduling, scope, and sequence of PD
- Identify creative solutions for delivering PD
- Ensure that PD is an agenda item on all District team meetings

The MTSS Professional Learning Team met monthly throughout the year to review progress made in the MTSS Process Guide and discuss how professional learning could support the next steps. They were intentional about waiting for the specific elements in the process guide to be finalized. As the Process Guide is finalized, professional learning will be developed.

Using the backward design process that Minnetonka teachers use when developing their curriculum, the team began by identifying the MTSS essential learnings.

Administrators and teachers will understand and be able to explain:

- The difference between MTSS and RTI
- The difference between the MTSS team and SST
- Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3
- The role of special education in MTSS
- Criteria used to move from one tier to the next

Administrators and teachers will be able to identify the purposes and appropriate use of assessment tools:

- Screening
- Diagnostic
- Progress Monitoring

To address these learnings, the team agreed that the professional learning experiences to be developed would need to be (1) consistent District-wide, (2) embedded into the workday when the vast majority of teachers are available, and (3) shorter and more frequent versus a single, longer session. Potential solutions to these parameters include synchronous virtual instruction (e.g., webinars), in-person seminars, self-paced, asynchronous online modules via Schoology, a video series to support learning at staff meetings, and early releases or late starts designated for professional learning.

Looking forward to 2022-2023, the team will likely leverage several of these solutions to support the MTSS work. The series of videos is likely the most viable solution for future learning. Depending on the nature of the video, it could be shared at the start of a staff meeting or within a PLC meeting. For example, a video articulating the difference between

the different MTSS teams is most appropriate at a staff meeting. A video on progress monitoring of essential learnings would be appropriate within a PLC meeting. In-person, in-depth learning could occur during late starts or early releases. Currently, there are four early release/late starts designated for professional learning. Of the four, by contract, two must be teacher-directed. In 2021-2022, the District-directed/site-directed professional learning focused on Developmental Relationships as a part of the School Board goal on Excellence in Student Well-being and Belonging. Leveraging these two District/site-directed professional learning opportunities may be a possibility for future years.

A priority for the team was to identify who might be content experts in the various MTSS topics while the team would support with the process. For example, school psychologist Mandy Mattke would be an expert in MTSS and special education. Academic Strategist Anelise Peterson might be an expert in progress monitoring. MHS math teacher Matt Breen could guide teachers in analyzing teacher and PLC level data and school psychologist Jonna Hirsch may provide insight in analyzing MTSS level data. The District may also continue to consult with CAREI facilitators for professional learning, particularly for principals. Ideally, the faces and voices of the video series will represent a wide range of educational professionals: school psychologists, general education teachers, special education teachers, social workers, and administrators.

The subcommittee shared progress at all MTSS District Leadership meetings. Additionally, the committee shared updates and requested input at every principal meeting. This purpose was to keep principals informed, hear their perspectives, identify their learning needs, and identify potential professional learning leaders.

As a pilot, Principal Carpenter, Ms. Laughlin, and Ms. White led a professional learning session at Clear Springs Elementary in early April. The focus was on understanding MTSS, how it relates to Response to Intervention (RtI), and the role of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) in the system. Feedback from the session was quite positive and productive. The questions that were asked as part of this feedback will guide the team in refining this session for the fall of 2022.

## **Fidelity**

The final priority is to develop a system and measures to monitor fidelity of implementation of core, supplemental and intensive interventions and extensions. Fidelity measures are being incorporated into all processes as they are developed and implemented.

In the discussion that followed, Board members praised the work of both the Teaching and Learning and Special Education teams. Questions were raised regarding the pace of the work, the possibility of students opting out of the screening, communication with parents regarding the screening, the importance of professional development that includes all staff, and the need for consistency across all buildings.

## **COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE**

Executive Director of Communications Dr. JacQui Getty presented on the communications efforts and results in support of the Board's desire to keep the community informed and involved. She also presented an overview of some of the District's broader communications and outreach projects from the past several months. Highlights included the following:

### **Event Updates on School Board Goals**

- School Board Meetings and Study Sessions (Nov 2021-May 2022)
  - Announcement of School Board Goals (Nov 2021)
  - Update on Goals by Dr. Amy LaDue (Jan 2022-May 2022)
  - Middle and High School updates of Goals work (Jan-May 2022)
  - Principals' School Reports on Goals (Sept. 2021-June 2022)
  - Safe Learning Plan survey results - Dr. Amy LaDue (Jan 2022)
  - Updates on Safe Learning Plan (August 2021-March 2022)

### **Email Updates on School Board Goals**

- School Board News emails (monthly, following Board mtgs)
  - Announcement of School Board Goals (Nov 2021)
  - Updates on Goals (January-May 2022)
- Emails from Superintendent to students, parents and staff with Safe Learning Plan updates (ongoing throughout school year)
- Emails from Principals to families and staff on SLP changes, updates, specifics by school (ongoing throughout school year)

### **Surveys**

- Safe Learning Plan survey to parents, students and Grades 4-12 students regarding the plan's impact on mental health, connections (Dec 2021)
- Search Institute survey administered to students and teachers (Dec 2021)
- Search Institute survey overview presented by Dr. LaDue (March 2022)
- Tonka Online survey of parents to gain mid-year feedback about program. Dr. LaDue presented results at School Board meeting (Jan 2022)
- Surveys sent to Tonka Online parents to determine enrollment for the 2022-23 school year (April 2022)
- 2022 Annual Parent Survey (distributed mid-May 2022, closes mid-June 2022)
  - Questions on Safe Learning Plan, Student Well-being, and Belonging

### **Mailings**

- School News Postcard (Feb 2022)
  - Mid-year update on 2021-22 School Board Goals

- Postcard to Tonka Online families- highlights new features of the program for the 2022-23 school year (May 2022)
- School News Postcard (June 2022)  
-Will include School Board goals progress

#### Opportunities to Engage with the Board on Goals

- School Board Meetings - Agenda Items and Community Comments (ongoing)
- School Board Study Sessions - Agenda Items and Citizen Input (ongoing)
- PTO/PTA meetings
- In-person meetings, phone calls, emails (ongoing)

#### Feature Storytelling: Media, Social Media, Video, Publications and More

- Feature stories for website, media, social media and video storytelling that reflect aspects demonstrating commitment to the goals. Recent examples: MOMENTUM expansion, S.A.I.L., Black History Month features, Tonka Online (ongoing)
- Publications (*Annual Report*, *Alumni Magazine*, *District Wall Calendar*, *Our Vision for the Future* document)
- I am a Skipper, Skipper Showcase and Beyond 140 video series – all highlighting aspects of the Goals – shared on social media channels (ongoing)
- Poster update with MHS students to publicize TIPS276 Confidential Reporting
- Let's Talk interactions (ongoing)
- Emails, calls and in-person meetings with Dr. Peterson, Principals, Dr. LaDue and Communications Team (ongoing)

#### Current and Upcoming Communications Efforts

- Annual Parent Survey (administered mid-May through mid-June 2022, with results presented at August 2022 School Board meeting)
- School Board's *Our Vision for the Future* document finalized and published
- *Minnetonka Alumni Magazine* articles will reflect Goals work (July 2022)
- *Minnetonka Schools Annual Report* will recap 2021-22 school year, including work done in support of Goals (October 2022)
- End-of-school-year feature website article update on School Board Goals- which will also be shared across social media (June 2022)
- Feature articles on MHS' new Tonka Prep program

#### **UPDATE ON WILSON READING**

Dr. LaDue and Director of Curriculum Steve Urbanski led the discussion. They noted that the Wilson Reading System had been introduced in the District during the 2016-17 school year. Tonight's report updated the Board on the status of the programs.

Wilson provides research-based reading and spelling programs using a multisensory, structured curricula. Wilson Foundations supports prevention and early intervention for K-3 students, Wilson Just Words provides intervention for older students, and Wilson Reading System provides intensive intervention. The District has implemented all three of these programs over the past five years and continues to expand these resources to meet the needs of students.

### **Wilson Foundations**

The Foundations reading program focuses on foundational reading, spelling and handwriting skills, and provides a systematic approach to literacy instruction. The program has been implemented at the Kindergarten and First Grade levels as a core instructional resource as a component of the district's comprehensive language arts program. Students receive approximately 30 minutes of Foundations instruction each day within the 90-120 minute core (Tier I) literacy block at these grade levels. In addition, Foundations serves as an early intervention (Tier II) program for elementary students who need additional support beyond the core program. Reading interventionists typically deliver this supplemental instruction. Wilson provides a one-day training session for all teachers implementing the Foundations program.

### **Wilson Just Words**

Just Words is an explicit multisensory decoding and spelling program designed for students in Grades 4-12 who have mild to moderate gaps in their decoding and spelling proficiency, but do not require intensive intervention. Reading specialists and special education teachers are using this program at every elementary and secondary school. At the elementary level, reading specialists build groups that may include a larger number of students, ranging from 3 to 15 students per group. At the secondary level, students who qualify for reading support are given a pull-out section that is scheduled into the student day. All Just Words teachers take part in one to two days of implementation training.

### **Wilson Reading System (Intensive)**

The Wilson Reading System is designed for students in Grades 2-12 who require more intensive instruction due to a language-based learning disability, as well as those who are not making sufficient progress in intervention. This comprehensive intervention program provides multisensory, structured instruction in all five areas of reading (phonemic awareness, word structure/phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) plus spelling. Reading specialists and special education teachers are using this program at every elementary school and secondary school. District Wilson Reading System teachers take part in a comprehensive certification program that included a year-long online course and a practicum experience with students throughout the year, equivalent to 60-90 hours of college level coursework.

## **Implementation**

During the 2021-22 school year approximately 650 elementary school students received Tier Two or Tier Three intervention in the Wilson Reading System, Just Words, or Foundations programs. At the middle school level, 135 middle students received intervention. At the high school level, 14 students received intervention. In addition, approximately 935 students received Foundations Tier One instruction at the elementary level.

The District continues to hire and train staff in Wilson reading strategies and programs. As part of the American Rescue Plan (ARP)/Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund (ESSER), the District applied for and received funding to further expand staffing to meet the reading intervention needs of students and to ensure sustained support for programming. From SY19-20 to SY20-21, the District increased reading intervention support by adding 0.47 FTE Reading Interventionist teachers, for a total of 21.09 FTEs in SY20-21. From SY20-21 to SY21-22, the District increased reading intervention support by adding 3.29 FTE Reading Interventionist teachers, for a total of 24.38 FTEs in SY21-22.

### **Wilson Reading System Level I Certification**

Throughout the 2021-22 school year, a cohort of eight Minnetonka teachers have taken part in the intensive Wilson Reading System Level I Certification. This certification requires participants to attend a three-day introductory workshop, complete 90 hours of online professional development and assessment, conduct over 65 lessons with a student, engage in five graded observations, and take part in five implementation meetings with a Wilson certified trainer.

This cohort has received comprehensive training and instruction from Wilson credentialed trainer Shari Barr and Minnetonka teacher Bart Meath, who is currently completing his Wilson training certification. Both trainers have expressed confidence in the cohort, highlighting the level of dedication and expertise exhibited by the teachers throughout the year. Once this cohort finalizes the certification process, thirty-five Minnetonka teachers will have completed Wilson Reading System Level I Certification.

### **Wilson Reading System Level II Certification**

Wilson Reading System Level II Certification provides in-depth strategies to expand knowledge and practice of the Wilson Reading System and allows participants to earn the professional credential of Wilson Dyslexia Therapist. The Level II Certification requires participants to complete the Advanced Strategies for Multisensory Structured Language Group Instruction Course, the Group Mastery Practicum, the Advanced Word Study Online Course, and the Steps 7-12 Practicum. Participants engage in over 245 hours of coursework. During the 2021-22 school year a second Minnetonka teacher completed Level II Certification and two additional teachers began the process.



## **Wilson Reading System Trainer**

Although Wilson provides online and in-person training for interventionists, long-term sustainability relies on building teacher capacity within the District. Only Wilson Certified Trainers can conduct and certify staff in the Wilson Reading programs. Prospective Wilson trainers must have extensive instructional experience and must take part in intensive coursework, practicums, and observations. During the 2021-22 school year Minnetonka teacher Bart Meath engaged in the final phase of this process, supporting five teachers in this year's Level I cohort. He will complete this program and become a Wilson Reading System Certified Trainer this summer.

The addition of a Wilson Reading System Certified Trainer will allow Minnetonka Schools to provide future training locally and to sustain effective programming by providing ongoing support for teachers and students. The District will also continue to support Wilson certification to sustain future programming.

In the discussion that followed, Board members expressed their enthusiasm for the growth of the program. Board member Becker asked Mr. Urbanski to convey the Board's thanks to Bart Meath for completing the program to become a certified trainer. Dr. Peterson noted that the District's teachers have really jumped on board with this program and have championed it from the beginning.

## **UPDATE ON SUMMER LEARNING**

Dr. LaDue and Ms. Breen led the discussion. Ms. Breen noted that summer learning programs are designed to provide additional learning opportunities for students who will significantly benefit from additional time and support. Students have been identified by a teacher or an IEP team recommendation along with district benchmark and common classroom assessment data.

The three summer learning programs include:

- Extended School Year (ESY) for students receiving special education
- English learner (EL) for students who would benefit from continued English Language exposure and development
- General education opportunities for rising first through eighth graders

## **Extended School Year (ESY)**

Students participating in ESY are identified based on state criteria within three areas of eligibility: regression/recoupment, self-sufficiency, and unique need. Decisions around eligibility involved IEP teams reviewing individual student data collected during the school year in order to determine whether or not ESY services are necessary for a student to receive a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE). Historical numbers indicate Minnetonka traditionally serves roughly 75 students annually in ESY programming. Following the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school

years, special education saw an increase in students qualifying for ESY services. Last summer, our program served 115 students from early childhood through 12th grade. This year, we will serve 172 students in ESY, the highest number we have ever seen. We are currently hiring to support these growing needs and feel grateful that our own Minnetonka teachers and paraprofessionals are wanting to work during the summer to support our students.

Early childhood programming will be held at Minnetonka Community Education Center, current kindergarteners through rising fifth grade will be held at Clear Springs Elementary, rising sixth graders through current 8th graders will be held at Minnetonka Middle School East and rising ninth through twelfth grade students' ESY programming will be held at Minnetonka High School. New this year, students in our SAIL program will attend ESY at our SAIL building. If students are in a transition year, they will attend the building they will attend in the Fall. This is a change to past practice in order to ensure a smooth transition for the student in the Fall.

Students attending ESY range from federal setting I to federal setting III students with needs crossing all categories of eligibility. Students focus on academics, functional skills, social and emotional learning, independence and much more. If and when IEP teams determine a student requires services that look different than the traditional offering of 180 minutes three days a week for four weeks, unique and creative programming is designed to meet their individual needs. Decisions as to frequency and duration are determined on an individual basis by IEP teams.

In addition to traditional eligibility, districts were and continue to be charged with identifying students who might require recovery services due to learning loss during the COVID-19 pandemic. Minnetonka identified five students in need of recovery services and offered those services during our traditional ESY time period during the 2020-2021 school year. For this upcoming summer ESY program, Minnetonka has identified 4 students in need of recovery services. We have identified 38 additional students who were in need of recovery services, however, IEP teams were able to meet these needs during the school year.

### **English Learner (EL) Summer Learning Program**

Minnetonka Public Schools serves roughly 200 English Learner (EL) students each year. EL students are identified for services through entrance criteria set forth by the State of Minnesota. Districts serving EL students receive Title III funding, which requires a portion of these grant monies to be spent on extended year programming.

Minnetonka spends roughly one third of its annual Title III budget on supporting this population of students throughout six weeks of the summer. In partnership with the Excelsior PTA and Excelsior United Methodist Church, Minnetonka is able to offer a robust summer educational enrichment program for these students. This program is held off-site at Excelsior United Methodist Church due to proximity to many of our students and families given that transportation is not provided for this program. Students are able to attend up to six hours per day, three days a week, for six weeks in total. Students work on reading,

writing, math and speaking the English language throughout. This summer, following review of student ACCESS, NWEA, and classroom data, students in kindergarten through third grade will be the focus of this program. This will include roughly 30 students whose needs are a fit for the summer programming.

In the Fall and Spring, NWEA, MCA, and ACCESS standardized assessment data are utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of this programming on students' progress toward becoming proficient in the English language and exiting the EL program, following criteria set forth by the State.

## **Summer Learning Program**

Minnetonka Public Schools will offer for the second year a Summer Learning Program for rising first through eighth grade students. The elementary program will provide opportunities for English, Spanish Immersion or Chinese Immersion programs. Middle school programs will focus on the English program. Last year this program served 171 elementary students and 43 middle school students. While we are continuing to enroll students, currently, we have 203 students registered for the elementary level and 16 students registered for the middle school level.

For this program, teachers identified students who would most benefit from additional time and support to develop essential skills to be ready for instruction at the next grade level. Students were identified using a combination of teacher recommendation and assessment results. Nearly 600 students were identified as potential participants.

The program is designed to focus on core academics, reading, writing and math, with additional opportunities for social and emotional learning, peer interaction and engagement in a variety of activities. This summer we are fortunate to have the program staffed primarily with Minnetonka teachers.

This in-person program will be offered 4-days per week over a five-week period with students having an opportunity for 18 days of instruction. The Summer Learning Program school day will be three hours long. This is a District-wide program with all Elementary students attending Groveland Elementary and all Middle School students attending Minnetonka Middle School East. Transportation will be provided for any district resident student who requests it.

## **REPORT ON ELEMENTARY STAMP RESULTS**

Director of Assessment Dr. Matt Rega led the discussion. Highlights of his presentation included the following:

- Chinese Immersion students saw 73.4 percent reach the Intermediate-Mid and High levels on the Listening Test, well surpassing national targets by two sub-levels, with an additional 3.8 percent (7 students) reaching the Advanced-Low level for the first time.

- Spanish Immersion students saw 77.4 percent reach the Intermediate-Mid and High levels on the Listening Test, surpassing national targets by two sub-levels with an additional 4.4 percent (25 students) reaching the Advanced-Low level for the first time.
- On the Reading Test, Third and Fifth Graders at Excelsior experienced an increase in average score with Fifth Graders seeing a statistically significant increase of 0.4 points improving their proficiency level by one sub-level to Intermediate-Low.
- On the Listening Test, for the second year in a row, Minnetonka Spanish Immersion students well out-paced the national targets by two sub-levels reaching the Intermediate-High range by the end of Fifth Grade and the Intermediate-Mid range by the end of Third Grade.

**National K-12 Language Immersion Proficiency Targets**

Grade Level	Chinese			Spanish		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Novice High	Novice High	Novice Mid	Novice High	Novice High	Novice High
5	Interm Low	Interm Low	Novice High	Interm Low	Interm Low	Interm Low

**Spring 2021-22 Grades 3 and 5 STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for Chinese and Spanish Interpretive Reading**

Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
2021				2021			
Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
3	97	2.9	Nov High	3	297	4.7	Int Mid
5	107	3.6	Int Low	5	286	5.7	Int High

Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
2022				2022			
Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
3	94	3.0	Nov High	3	300	4.6	Int Mid
5	90	3.9	Int Low	5	271	5.6	Int High

3

### National K-12 Language Immersion Proficiency Targets

Grade Level	Chinese			Spanish		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Novice High	Novice High	Novice Mid	Novice High	Novice High	Novice High
5	<u>Interm</u> Low	<u>Interm</u> Low	Novice High	<u>Interm</u> Low	<u>Interm</u> Low	<u>Interm</u> Low

### Spring 2021-22 Grades 3 and 5 STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for Chinese and Spanish Interpersonal Listening and Speaking

Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
2021				2021			
Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
3	97	3.6	Int Low	3	297	3.6	Int Low
5	107	3.8	Int Low	5	286	4.5	Int Mid

Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
2022				2022			
Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
3	94	3.4	Nov High	3	300	3.5	Int Low
5	90	3.9	Int Low	5	271	4.3	Int Low

4

### National K-12 Language Immersion Proficiency Targets

Grade Level	Chinese			Spanish		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Novice High	Novice High	Novice Mid	Novice High	Novice High	Novice High
5	<u>Interm</u> Low	<u>Interm</u> Low	Novice High	<u>Interm</u> Low	<u>Interm</u> Low	<u>Interm</u> Low

### Spring 2021-22 Grades 3 and 5 STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for Chinese and Spanish Interpretive Listening

Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
2021				2021			
Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
3	97	5.0	Int Mid	3	297	5.0	Int Mid
5	107	5.4	Int Mid	5	286	5.7	Int High

Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
2022				2022			
Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	Grade	N	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
3	94	4.9	Int Mid	3	300	5.0	Int Mid
5	90	5.4	Int Mid	5	271	5.6	Int High

5

**Spring 2022 ALL STAMP 4Se Sub-Tests Chinese and Spanish Immersion Gender  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels (Grades 3-5)**

Mode of Communication	Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
	Males (N=92) (50%)		Females (N=92) (50%)		Males (N=264) (46.2%)		Females (N=307) (53.8%)	
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Interpretive Reading	3.2	Nov High	3.7	Int Low	4.9	Int Mid	5.3	Int Mid
Interpersonal Listening/Speaking	3.5	Int Low	3.8	Int Low	4.1	Int Low	4.2	Int Low
Interpretive Listening	5.1	Int Mid	5.3	Int Mid	5.6	Int High	5.4	Int Mid

**Spring 2021 ALL STAMP 4Se Sub-Tests Chinese and Spanish Immersion Gender  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels (Grades 3-5)**

Mode of Communication	Chinese Immersion				Spanish Immersion			
	Males (N=89) (43.6%)		Females (N=115) (56.4%)		Males (N=281) (48.2%)		Females (N=302) (51.8%)	
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Interpretive Reading	3.0	Nov High	3.5	Int Low	5.1	Int Mid	5.4	Int Mid
Interpersonal Listening/Speaking	3.6	Int Low	3.8	Int Low	3.8	Int Low	4.3	Int Low
Interpretive Listening	5.2	Int Mid	5.3	Int Mid	5.3	Int Mid	5.5	Int High

6

### Chinese Immersion School Comparisons – Interpretive Reading

Grade Level	Chinese		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Nov High	Nov High	Nov Mid
5	Int Low	Int Low	Nov High

**Spring 2021 STAMP 4Se Chinese Immersion Building  
Comparison by  
STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for  
Interpretive Reading**

School	Chinese Interpretive Reading			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	EX (N=42)	SH (N=55)	EX (N=50)	SH (N=57)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Excelsior (N=92)	2.7	Nov High	3.3	Nov High
Scenic Heights (N=112)	3.1	Nov High	3.8	Int Low

**Spring 2022 STAMP 4Se Chinese Immersion  
Building Comparison by  
STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for  
Interpretive Reading**

School	Chinese Interpretive Reading			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	EX (N=44)	SH (N=50)	EX (N=31)	SH (N=55)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Excelsior (N=75)	2.9	Nov High	3.7	Int Low
Scenic Heights (N=105)	3.0	Nov High	4.0	Int Low

7

## Chinese Immersion School Comparisons – Interpersonal Listening and Speaking

Spring 2021 STAMP 4Se Chinese Immersion Building  
Comparison by  
STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for  
Interpersonal Listening and Speaking

	Chinese Interpersonal Listening and Speaking			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	<i>EX</i> (N=42)	<i>SH</i> (N=55)	<i>EX</i> (N=50)	<i>SH</i> (N=57)
School	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Excelsior (N=92)	3.5	Int Low	3.7	Int Low
Scenic Heights (N=112)	3.6	Int Low	4.0	Int Low

Grade Level	Chinese		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Nov High	Nov High	Nov Mid
5	Int Low	Int Low	Nov High

Spring 2022 STAMP 4Se Chinese Immersion  
Building Comparison by  
STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for  
Interpersonal Listening and Speaking

	Chinese Interpersonal Listening and Speaking			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	<i>EX</i> (N=44)	<i>SH</i> (N=50)	<i>EX</i> (N=31)	<i>SH</i> (N=55)
School	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Excelsior (N=75)	3.5	Int Low	3.6	Int Low
Scenic Heights (N=105)	3.4	Nov High	4.0	Int Low

8

## Chinese Immersion School Comparisons – Interpretive Reading

Spring 2021 STAMP 4Se Chinese Immersion Building  
Comparison by  
STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for  
Interpretive Listening

	Chinese Interpretive Listening			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	<i>EX</i> (N=42)	<i>SH</i> (N=55)	<i>EX</i> (N=50)	<i>SH</i> (N=57)
School	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Excelsior (N=92)	4.9	Int Mid	5.3	Int Mid
Scenic Heights (N=112)	5.1	Int Mid	5.6	Int High

Grade Level	Chinese		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Nov High	Nov High	Nov Mid
5	Int Low	Int Low	Nov High

Spring 2022 STAMP 4Se Chinese Immersion  
Building Comparison by  
STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency Levels for  
Interpretive Listening

	Chinese Interpretive Listening			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	<i>EX</i> (N=44)	<i>SH</i> (N=50)	<i>EX</i> (N=31)	<i>SH</i> (N=55)
School	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Excelsior (N=75)	4.9	Int Mid	5.1	Int Mid
Scenic Heights (N=105)	5.0	Int Mid	5.6	Int High

9



## Spanish Immersion School Comparisons – Interpretive Reading

**Spring 2021 STAMP 4Se Spanish Immersion Building  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and  
Proficiency Levels for Interpretive Reading**

School	Spanish Interpretive Reading			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	CS (N=80)	DH (N=64)	CS (N=70)	DH (N=58)
	GR (N=66)	MW (N=75)	GR (N=74)	MW (N=80)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Clear Springs (N=150)	4.8	Int Mid	5.4	Int Mid
Deephaven (N=122)	4.5	Int Mid	5.7	Int High
Groveland (N=140)	4.4	Int Low	5.7	Int High
Minnewashta (N=155)	4.9	Int Mid	5.9	Int High

Grade Level	Spanish		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Nov High	Nov High	Nov High
5	Int Low	Int Low	Int Low

**Spring 2022 STAMP 4Se Spanish Immersion Building  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency  
Levels for Interpretive Reading**

School	Spanish Interpretive Reading			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	CS (N=82)	DH (N=53)	CS (N=84)	DH (N=55)
	GR (N=76)	MW (N=89)	GR (N=52)	MW (N=77)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Clear Springs (N=166)	4.5	Int Mid	5.5	Int High
Deephaven (N=108)	4.2	Int Low	5.4	Int Mid
Groveland (N=128)	4.6	Int Mid	5.6	Int High
Minnewashta (N=166)	4.8	Int Mid	5.7	Int High

10

## Spanish Immersion School Comparisons – Interpersonal Listening and Speaking

**Spring 2021 STAMP 4Se Spanish Immersion Building  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency  
Levels for Interpersonal Listening and Speaking**

School	Spanish Interpersonal Listening and Speaking			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	CS (N=80)	DH (N=64)	CS (N=70)	DH (N=58)
	GR (N=66)	MW (N=75)	GR (N=74)	MW (N=80)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Clear Springs (N=150)	3.8	Int Low	4.2	Int Low
Deephaven (N=122)	3.2	Nov High	4.3	Int Low
Groveland (N=140)	3.5	Int Low	4.8	Int Mid
Minnewashta (N=155)	3.8	Int Low	4.4	Int Low

Grade Level	Spanish		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Nov High	Nov High	Nov High
5	Int Low	Int Low	Int Low

**Spring 2022 STAMP 4Se Spanish Immersion Building  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency  
Levels for Interpersonal Listening and Speaking**

School	Spanish Interpersonal Listening and Speaking			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	CS (N=82)	DH (N=53)	CS (N=84)	DH (N=55)
	GR (N=76)	MW (N=89)	GR (N=52)	MW (N=77)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Clear Springs (N=166)	3.2	Nov High	4.1	Int Low
Deephaven (N=108)	3.5	Int Low	4.0	Int Low
Groveland (N=128)	3.5	Int Low	4.7	Int Mid
Minnewashta (N=166)	3.8	Int Low	4.5	Int Mid

## Spanish Immersion School Comparisons – Interpretive Listening

Grade Level	Spanish		
	Speaking	Listening	Reading
3	Nov High	Nov High	Nov High
5	Int Low	Int Low	Int Low

**Spring 2021 STAMP 4Se Spanish Immersion Building  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency  
Levels for Interpretive Listening**

School	Spanish Interpretive Listening			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	CS (N=80)	DH (N=64)	CS (N=70)	DH (N=58)
	GR (N=66)	MW (N=75)	GR (N=74)	MW (N=80)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Clear Springs (N=150)	5.1	Int Mid	5.6	Int High
Deephaven (N=122)	4.9	Int Mid	5.8	Int High
Groveland (N=140)	4.9	Int Mid	5.8	Int High
Minnewashta (N=155)	5.1	Int Mid	5.8	Int High

**Spring 2022 STAMP 4Se Spanish Immersion Building  
Comparison by STAMP 4Se Mean Score and Proficiency  
Levels for Interpretive Listening**

School	Spanish Interpretive Listening			
	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	CS (N=82)	DH (N=53)	CS (N=84)	DH (N=55)
	GR (N=76)	MW (N=89)	GR (N=52)	MW (N=77)
	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level	STAMP 4Se Score	Prof. Level
Clear Springs (N=166)	4.9	Int Mid	5.6	Int High
Deephaven (N=108)	4.8	Int Mid	5.5	Int High
Groveland (N=128)	5.0	Int Mid	5.6	Int High
Minnewashta (N=166)	5.1	Int Mid	5.7	Int High

Proficiency Levels and Sublevels		Functions	Corresponding Jobs/Professions	Who has this proficiency in Chinese and Spanish?
Advanced (Limited Work Proficiency)	Advanced High	Narrate and describe in past, present, and future and deal effectively with an unanticipated complication	<b>Finance:</b> Account Executives, Financial Advisors <b>Health Science:</b> Doctors <b>Law, Public Safety, Corrections, &amp; Security:</b> Military Linguists or Translation Officers	Students with graduate degrees in language
	Advanced Mid		<b>Health Science:</b> Medical Interpreters, Patient Advocates <b>Finance:</b> Bankers, Insurance Customer Service Specialists <b>Human Services:</b> Benefits Specialists <b>Marketing:</b> Sales Representatives	Native/Heritage speakers who learned language in the home environment
	Advanced Low		<b>Education &amp; Training:</b> K-12 Teachers <b>Health Science:</b> Nurses <b>Hospitality &amp; Tourism:</b> Hotel Receptionists <b>Human Services:</b> Social Workers, 911 Dispatchers, Customer Service Representatives, Billing Clerks <b>Law, Public Safety, Corrections, &amp; Security:</b> Legal Secretaries or Receptionists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduates with language degrees who have lived in target language-speaking countries</li> <li>Immersion students at high school graduation</li> <li>Secondary students after Level VIII in some skill areas</li> </ul>
Intermediate (The Survivor)	Intermediate High	Create with language, initiate, maintain and bring to a close simple conversations by asking and responding to simple questions	<b>Hospitality &amp; Tourism:</b> Tour Guides <b>Human Services:</b> Receptionists <b>Information Technology:</b> Telephone Operators, Utilities Installers <b>Law, Public Safety, Corrections, &amp; Security:</b> Police and Fire Officers <b>Transportation, Distribution, &amp; Logistics:</b> Aviation Personnel, Auto Inspectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduates with language degrees who have not lived in target language-speaking countries</li> <li>Immersion students continuing into high school</li> <li>Secondary students after Level VI or VII</li> </ul>
	Intermediate Mid		<b>Human Services:</b> Cashiers, Sales Clerks	Immersion students after 5 <sup>th</sup> or 6 <sup>th</sup> grade
	Intermediate Low		<b>Human Services:</b> Housekeeping Staff	Secondary students after Level IV (logographic) K-8 after 5-6 years of study

## Recommendations

- Chinese Immersion Third and Fifth Grades
  - Focus on Interpretive Reading and Interpersonal Listening and Speaking
- Spanish Immersion Third and Fifth Grades
  - Focus on Interpretive Reading
  - Clear Springs Grade 3 and 4 and Deephaven Grade 5 focus on Interpersonal Listening and Speaking
- Utilize IPA to increase student engagement around Interpretive Reading and Interpersonal Listening and Speaking

## **REVIEW OF FY23 BUDGET**

Executive Director of Finance and Operations Paul Bourgeois presented the proposed FY23 Budget to the Board. He thanked the members of his team for their extensive work on the budget in the past few months, noting that they have been working on developing FY23 budgets for all funds since the FY22 Amended Budget was adopted this past winter. Mr. Bourgeois explained that the FY23 budget is still a work in progress, and several important revenue factors could change at the State level.

Mr. Bourgeois then walked the Board through the preliminary budgets for all funds. He explained that the final submission for the FY23 Budget will be presented to the Board for adoption at its regular meeting on June 2. Highlights of his presentation included the following:

- The General Fund Operating Fund that includes Transportation and Activities is projected to operate at a surplus of \$414,024 of ongoing revenues to ongoing expenses.
- An increase in the Basic Revenue Formula of \$135 per Adjusted Pupil Unit from the State of Minnesota is the major component of increased revenue per pupil projected for FY2023. This amount equates to a 2.00% increase in the Basic Formula.
- Targeted enrollment includes 11,100 students K-12 plus the 272 students that were enrolled in Tonka Online Comprehensive in FY2022. Those 272 students are assumed to be continuing in enrollment either in Tonka Online Comprehensive or as in-person students. Maintaining the enrollment from FY2022 results in a General Fund Budget that is just slightly over being balanced. The Unassigned Fund Balance at the end of FY2023 is projected to be \$24,141,930 which is 16.3% of projected FY2023 expenditures.
- The combination of tightly monitored expense controls plus the additional revenue provided from enrollment growth in past years has allowed the District to continue to maintain very stable finances while maintaining and selectively expanding opportunities for students. Additional Operating Referendum Revenue, which is in place through the 2024 Pay 2025 levy to fund Fiscal Year 2026, gives the District

a stable base of revenue from which to maintain the high-quality programs that are being delivered to students.

In the discussion that followed, Board members discussed the possibility of raising the \$100 transportation fee for families within a two-mile radius of their school. Dr. Peterson noted that this fee has not been increased since 2004, and he said he would look into the matter further and report back to the Board.

## **REVIEW OF LONG-TERM FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS**

Mr. Bourgeois led the discussion. He presented the following five long-term projection scenarios for the Board to consider:

- \$1.5 Million Expenditure Reductions in FY24, FY25 and FY26
- \$1.0 Million Expenditure Reductions in FY24, FY25, FY26, FY27 and FY28
- 100 Additional K-12 Students in FY24, FY25 and FY26
- 200 Additional K-12 Students in FY24
- 200 Additional 9-12 Students in FY24 after the VANTAGE/MOMENTUM building opens

Mr. Bourgeois noted that the five scenarios all use the FY23 Proposed Adopted Budget as the base. He also said that looking forward, the District has three years left on the current voter-approved authority for both the Operating Referendum Revenue and Capital Projects (Technology) Revenue. It will be prudent to hold a referendum to renew both of those revenue sources sometime in the next three years prior to their expiration.

The District currently is at the Operating Referendum Revenue State Cap Per Pupil, so absent any change in State statutes that would increase the cap per pupil, a future Operating Referendum will only be able to request an extension for 10 years plus an annual inflation factor on the amount. The Capital Projects (Technology) Revenue does not have a set cap, so it would be possible to request both an extension and an increase in the annual amount at a future referendum if that is in place.

Strategically, it will be important for the District to continue to work with Legislators to increase the Operating Referendum cap, preferably prior to a future referendum for extension and renewal. It will also be beneficial for the District to continue to work with Legislators to increase the Lease Levy, which has been fixed at \$212 per pupil since July 1, 2015. Since that date, construction prices have escalated considerably. Additional Lease Levy capacity may also help the District respond to any future demand for Four-Year-Old Kindergarten should that materialize.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The Board adjourned to closed session to discuss the current status of negotiations with various employee groups at 10:30 p.m.