

## **2011 Monitoring Report R: Providing Secure and Stable Resources Presented to the School Board on February 14, 2012**

The Resource strategic direction has six assessments. Each of them measures in some way the district's ability to use its resources effectively and efficiently.

### **1. Annual Variation from Established Budgets**

This is a measure of the percentage that the final General Fund budget approved by the School Board varied from the final revenues and expenses recorded for the year. It excludes fundraising revenues and related expenses for student activities recorded in the General Fund, and also excludes two sets of transactions not available at the time the revised budget was approved.

2010-2011 General Fund revenues exceeded the final budgeted amount by \$4,468,557, or 6.29%. Expenditures exceeded the amount of the final approved budgeted amount by \$2,207,245 or 3.0%. Most of the expense variance and an equal amount of the revenue variance (\$1,800,000) were related to the flow through of aid and tuition for resident students of ISD 622 attending EMID schools. Roseville Schools serves as fiscal host for EMID. Until April, these revenue and expenses had been reported by MDE as attributable to St. Paul Schools. Special Education aid for the 2009-10 school year was finalized in April 2011, and resulted in additional unbudgeted revenue of more than \$700,000. After excluding the \$508,000 in student activities, the fiscal host variance and the special education aid from the previous year, the net variance, calculated by subtracting the variance in expenses from those of the revenue results in a positive net variance of 2.12%.

#### **Insight Statements**

- The positive variance of the revenue budget is an indication of the use of conservative revenue projection models that protect the district should enrollment and revenue projections fall short.
- The modest variation in expenses (after factoring out the fiscal host expenses and the student activity fundraising expenses) from established budgets is an indication of the judicious use of available funding to best educate the community's children.

- The variation from established budget at the baseline level gives evidence of competent management of funds, but offers opportunity for improvement in refining projection models.
- A positive net variance is an indication that the ending fund balance is greater than what was projected. This will provide the district with additional resources to face the next several years of uncertain revenue.

## **2. General Fund Unreserved, Unrestricted Balance**

Current General Fund unreserved, unrestricted balance at June 30, 2011 is \$4,107,993 or 5.45% which is at level 5 vision. This is the measure used by the Minnesota Department of Education in determining if districts are in statutory operating debt.

### **Insight Statements**

- Our general fund balance at vision level demonstrates competence in financial management for a district that had a negative fund balance only three years previously.
- Our general fund balance at vision level provides the district with a financial cushion for the 2012-2013 school year should the Legislature fail to increase the funding formula.
- Given that the Legislature has increased funding of the basic formula only a modest \$50 per pupil unit this year and no increase for the four years preceding 2011-2012 school year, a larger fund balance allows Roseville Area Schools to maintain programs and better control class size in the short term.

## **3. Overall Return on Spending Index**

This index is a measure of the return, in terms of student proficiency, based on 2011 MDE average proficiency in Reading and Mathematics, of all students, compared to the money spent as reported in MDE Profiles for 2010 of average pupil operating expenditures for ten comparative districts. The index was computed by dividing the average reading and mathematics proficiency percent reported by MDE in 2011 by the per-pupil operating expenditures in 2010 as reported by MDE multiplied by 1000.

Example: Roseville School District. MDE reported that 55.5% of our students were proficient in mathematics and 74.4% were proficient in Reading giving RaMP (Reading and Mathematics Percent) of **64.95%** ( $55.5+74.4/ 2= 64.95\%$ ).

Roseville’s MDE reported per pupil Operating Expenditure for 2010 was **\$10,072**.

2011 RaMP/2010 per pupil Operating Expenditure x 1000 = Return on Spending Index

$$64.95\% / \$10072 \times 1,000 = 6.45$$

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Index</b>
1	Shakopee	8.14
2	Spring Lake Park	7.16
3	Bloomington	6.81
4	North St. Paul/Maplewood/Oakdale	6.61
<b>5</b>	<b>Roseville</b>	<b>6.45</b>
6	West St. Paul/Mendota Heights	6.22
7	Osseo	6.04
8	Burnsville	5.95
9	South St. Paul	5.63
10	Robbinsdale	5.32

Roseville ranks 5<sup>th</sup> of the 10 comparative school districts, which is in the third quintile. This is an improvement from our ranking of 6<sup>th</sup> in 2010.

### **Insight Statement**

- Roseville’s ranking in the middle quintile (or baseline) of the selected regional cohort indicates the need to continue to examine the allocation of resources to better increase performance for all students, and to close the achievement gap.

#### 4. Adjusted Return on Spending Index

This index is a measure of the return, in terms of student proficiency, on the money spent by school districts on core activities, adjusted for the differences in student needs, that is, the percentage of students eligible to receive free and reduced lunches. The index was computed by dividing the average reading and mathematics proficiency percent reported by MDE in 2011 for students eligible for free or reduced lunches by the per-pupil operating expenditures in 2010 multiplied by 1000.

Reading and Mathematics Percentage (RaMP) of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch rank in the middle quintile of the selected regional cohort, while our per pupil expenditures ranked in the top quintile.

#### Insight Statement:

- Our ranking in the third quintile of the adjusted return on spending index is an improvement from the fourth quintile and an improved ranking of 5<sup>th</sup> from 7<sup>th</sup> in 2009-2010. Yet these results are an indication of the need to continue to monitor and adjust the allocation of resources to ensure we are receiving the best possible results for the dollars expended.

<b>Index Ranking</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Index</b>
1	Shakopee	5.89
2	Spring Lake Park	5.328
3	North St. Paul/Maplewood/Oakdale	5.26
4	Bloomington	4.92
<b>5</b>	<b>Roseville</b>	<b>4.47</b>
6	West St. Paul/Mendota Heights	4.41
7	South St. Paul	4.30
8	Burnsville	4.21
9	Osseo	4.11
10	Robbinsdale	3.66

## **5. Percentage of Approved Projects in the 10 Year Plan: Completed On-Time and Within Budget**

Completion of 100% of approved projects prior to the start of the school year and all projects completed within budgeted amounts places the district's actions at the vision level.

### **Insight Statements**

- These results indicate the ability of the District to manage resources and implement plans to maintain a comfortable, effective and safe learning environment for students and staff.
- Annually providing the public with an updated Ten Year Plan is an indication of foresight in maintaining the district's facilities.

## **6. Teacher Employment Stability**

Teacher turnover was at 2.6%, placing this measurement at the vision level.

### **Insight Statements:**

- Turnover rates at this level are a strong indication that the district has created a working environment that is desired by our educators.
- Keeping the turnover rates low for the past two years helps maintain a highly qualified instructional staff and instructional leaders who will be dedicated to continually improving student learning and closing the achievement gap.
- As strategies and interventions are implemented the efforts are more likely to be maintained and improved in that less training is required to bring new staff up to standard.

### **Weighted Score**

The weighted score of 3.90 for 2011 Vision Card R: Providing secure and stable resources indicates performance exceeding the baseline, but shows room for improvement. The index of adjusted return on investment spending was improved to baseline, but the measure provides a guidepost as to where our resources should be focused.

### 2011 VisionCard R: Providing secure and stable resources

Measures	WT (%)	Level 01 Intervene (1.0 – 1.9)	Level 02 High Concern (2.0 – 2.9)	Level 03 Baseline (3.0 – 3.9)	Level 04 Progressing (4.0-4.9)	Level 05 Vision (5.0)	Score 2011	Score 2010
<b>R 1: Annual Variance from established budgets: Net General Funds revenues &amp; expenses</b>	20%	- 1.5 % or greater or +5% or greater	- 1.25 % or +4%	-1.0 % or +3%	- .75 % or +2%	- .5 % or +1%	03 +2.12%	04 +1.39%
<b>R 2: General Fund Balance Unreserved, Unrestricted</b>	15 %	Negative or > 15% General Fund Balance	0 % or > 13% of General Fund	1 % + or > 11% of General Fund	2 % + or > 9% of General Fund	3 % - 9% + of General Fund	05 +5.45%	05 +6.82%
<b>R 3: Overall Return on Spending Index (RaMP/MDE Profiles Spending)</b>	20 %	Lowest quintile of selected regional cohort	Fourth quintile of selected regional cohort	Third quintile of selected regional cohort	Second quintile of selected regional cohort	Highest quintile of selected regional cohort	03 5 of 10	03 6 of 10
<b>R 4: Adjusted for Student Needs Return on Spending Index (RaMP/MDE Profiles Spending for free/reduced)</b>	15 %	Lowest quintile of selected regional cohort	Fourth quintile of selected regional cohort	Third quintile of selected regional cohort	Second quintile of selected regional cohort	Highest quintile of selected regional cohort	03 5 of 10	02 7 <sup>th</sup> of 10
<b>R 5: % of approved projects in the 10 Year Plan: completed on-time and within budget</b>	15 %	85 % or less of authorized projects	86 - 88 % of authorized projects	89 - 91 % of authorized projects	92 - 94 % of authorized projects	95 % + of authorized projects	05 100%	05 100%
<b>R 6: Teacher Employment Stability</b>	15%	25 – 29.99% Teacher Turnover	20 – 24.99% Teacher Turnover	15 – 19.99% Teacher Turnover	10 – 14.99% Teacher Turnover	Less than 10% Teacher Turnover	05 2.6%	05 1.8%
<b>Weighted Score 3.90</b>								<b>3.95</b>