

Crosswinds Long Range Planning Advisory Task Force

Summary Report and Recommendations

**Submitted to the East Metro Integration District
Joint Powers Board**

February 2010

A Crosswinds Long Range Planning Advisory Task Force was appointed in September, 2009 and met twice a month between October, 2009 and January, 2010 to address the long range planning charge put forth by the EMID Board and administration. This report outlines the process followed by the Task Force and, as stipulated, provides planning and implementation recommendations for EMID Board consideration.

Task Force Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the Crosswinds Long Range Planning Advisory Task Force was to learn about the current program at Crosswinds, study options for possible changes and recommend long range plans for future programs for the school.

EMID administrators outlined the following objectives for the Task Force:

1. To become familiar with the current magnet school themes, grade structure, student demographics, history, and staffing patterns at the school.
2. To establish planning principles to guide future program design.
3. To identify criteria for use in examining alternatives and developing recommendations.
4. To examine alternative grade structures, uses of available instructional spaces, and magnet foci options for the school.
5. To recommend a preferred long range plan for grade structure and program emphasis for the school to the EMID Board.

Task Force Membership

- Anne Andersen, Crosswinds Principal
- *Relesha Billups, Crosswinds Parent (did not attend after first meeting)*
- Kristine Black, Harambee Principal
- Mike Boguszewski, Crosswinds Parent
- John Brodrick, EMID Board Member
- Jessica Goff, Crosswinds Teacher
- Bruce Hagerty, EMID Board Chair
- Jay Haugen, West St. Paul Superintendent
- Kathy Romero, Crosswinds Teacher
- Lori Swanson, EMID Board Member
- Carl Wahlstrom, EMID Superintendent
- Dee Wells, Inver Grove Heights Superintendent

Task Force Facilitators:

- Laura Bloomberg, External Consultant
- Kathy Griebel, EMID Director of Education Services

Graduate Research Assistant:

- Phomdaen Souvanna

Overview of Task Force Process and Procedures

Based on the stated purpose and objectives for this work, the Task Force developed a set of operating assumptions and articulated the opportunities and threats facing Crosswinds in the next 3-5 years (see **Attachments A and B**).

The Task Force reviewed enrollment and magnet school trend data from area school districts and charter schools to help inform their identification of Crosswinds opportunities and threats (see **Attachment C**).

Once this groundwork was laid, Task Force members brainstormed a broad array of potential approaches to ensure Crosswinds could capitalize on identified opportunities and minimize potential threats in the coming years. The group also identified the criteria by which they would make decisions about final recommendations to the EMID Board (see **Attachment D**).

The comprehensive list of options was then summarized, reviewed, and narrowed through group surveys, discussion and informal “straw votes” among Task Force members (see **Attachment E**).

After the options were essentially narrowed to two, the Task Force reviewed financial and enrollment models for various scenarios (see **Attachment F**) and sought the input of member district superintendents through both an anonymous survey and discussion at the January, 2010 EMID Superintendent’s meeting (see **Attachment G**).

At their final meeting on January 20th, 2010, the Task Force reviewed feedback from the Superintendents and other stakeholders and conducted a final review and discussion of potential recommendations. Two recommendations for strengthening the magnet focus of Crosswinds received the unanimous support of Task Force members present at that meeting (maintain year round calendar; merge and reframe the IB, Arts, and Science magnet foci). Two differing sets of recommendations for grade level configuration received split support from the Task Force. Although neither grade level option received the super majority vote of 75% of the full Task Force (as stipulated in the Task Force’s operating assumptions), the 6-12 option did receive the majority of Task Force support (6 of 8 votes of those present for the meeting). Consequently, the Task Force decided to present both options to the EMID Board, indicating a majority preference for the first option (expand to grade 6-12), but recommending the “second choice” option as preferable to no Board action at all.

Task Force Recommendations

The Task Force recommendations are presented here in two key areas: magnet foci and grade level configuration.

1. Magnet Foci

The following recommendations are unanimously supported by Task Force members:

- **Maintain a year-round academic calendar at Crosswinds.**

Rationale: Although the Task Force reviewed the challenges of the current calendar, and entertained a potential recommendation to change it, ultimately they decided the benefits and opportunities outweigh the challenges.

Implications: no change from current programming

- **Continue International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program; eliminate Art and Science as specific magnet focus areas, and, instead, reframe existing Art, Science, and IB foci into a single theme “branded” as a Center for Inquiry.**

Rationale: The current multiple magnet focus areas are confusing to internal and external constituents and don't send a clear message about the priorities or cohesiveness of the school's curriculum. Further, a scan of regional and national information on successful magnet schools indicates that a clear, concise, and consistent magnet “message” is key to communicating with potential students and families. Eliminating arts and sciences as specific focus areas would provide the school with greater flexibility in allocating resources and embedding these core areas across the curriculum.

Implications: Crosswinds staff and EMID curriculum teams must now develop strategies to more fully integrate science, the arts, and core components of IB principles of inquiry across the curriculum. The Task Force agreed that a deeper and more consistent application of IB principles and practices is needed throughout the school. This will require increased and ongoing IB training among Crosswinds staff.

A “Center for Inquiry” planning and implementation team comprised of school and district staff should be put in place to develop specific strategies for ensuring an inquiry/IB focus across all grade levels and subject areas.

A public relations/marketing consultant could be retained to guide the public communications aspect of the naming and reframing process (currently the school is identified as Crosswinds –east metro arts and science school). This process, of course, will also be impacted by the Board's decision regarding grade level configuration (see below).

Timeframe: The reframing process could begin immediately, with plans for focused planning and staff development over the coming several months. The elimination of arts and sciences as specific foci and the reframing of Crosswinds as a Center for Inquiry could be implemented by Fall, 2010.

2. Grade Level Configuration

Although neither of the following recommendations received a super majority vote of the full Task Force (75%), Option A below did receive support from six of the eight task force members present at the final meeting; Option B received support from two of eight members present.

- **Option A: Expand Crosswinds grade levels to serve students grades 6-12.**

Rationale: Task Force members who supported this option described a strong desire among families and students currently attending Crosswinds to be able to remain in the school through 12th grade for a number of reasons: small size of school, personalized academic attention, perceptions of not being welcomed upon returning to home district schools, the strong arts programs at Crosswinds, wanting to continue with IB. Further, Task Force members speculated that the current under-enrollment in grades 9 and 10 could be a result of parents not wanting to move their student in the middle of their high school years. While no data have been collected over the past several years to specifically address this issue, anecdotal evidence and conversations with parents suggest that this is why many students leave Crosswinds after the 8th grade. Some Task Force members predict that more students would come to Crosswinds (and stay) if they knew they could remain at the school all through high school.

Implications: There are several **grade level enrollment** implications with this option. **Attachment G** outlines the enrollment and cost scenarios examined by the Task Force. The current enrollment pattern across grade levels (declining from 150 students in grade 8, 75 in grade 9, to 36 students in grade 10) is not sustainable if this pattern of decline continues into grades 11 and 12. The most viable scenario, and the model the Task Force recommends Crosswinds seeks to achieve would cap enrollment by grade level (100 students per grade level in grades 6-8; 75 students per grade level in grades 9-12). This model, of course, becomes less financially viable if enrollment levels are not maintained in the high school grades.

In addition to the ongoing costs outlined in Attachment G, EMID administration estimates **one-time start up costs** for adding a basic 11th and 12th grade program at Crosswinds at \$313,000 (inclusive of facility upgrades, curriculum, and professional development). In this estimate, basic programming assumes a high school program that meets state graduation requirements, but does not reflect any program additions (e.g., IB diploma program) or expanded co-curricular programs.

In order for this option to be viable, key decisions must be made about Crosswinds' **academic and co-curricular program and implementation**. For example, the Task Force recommends maintaining the IB Middle Years Program, but a subsequent 11-12th grade planning group should examine the advisability (and feasibility) of implementing the IB diploma program for juniors and seniors, especially if it proves accurate that students will choose to stay at Crosswinds specifically because of the IB program.

Timeframe: The Task Force recommends that program planning for grades 11 and 12 begin immediately with a detailed plan prepared by the start of the 2010-2011 school year. Grade 11 could then be added for the 2011-2012 school year; and grade 12 in the 2012-2013 school year.

- **Option B: Maintain Crosswinds' current 6-10 grade configuration, but clarify and strengthen pathways for Crosswinds 10th graders to enter (and be welcomed into) EMID member district programs.**

Rationale: The Task Force believes creating clearer and more concrete plans for how, where, and why students transition from Crosswinds into other high schools would go a long way toward addressing some of the key transition concerns of Crosswinds students, families, and staff. While the counselor and staff at Crosswinds currently do work extensively with students to plan for this transition, Crosswinds seeks a clearer and more manageable process that clarifies responsibility on the part of receiving schools and that ensures students' transition is smooth, that students have real options, and that they feel welcomed by the receiving school district.

Implications: The Task Force identified specific strategies that both better "illustrate" existing pathways into member district high schools and create specialized pathways into high school programs that best align with the skills and experiences students receive in the Crosswinds program. Specifically, the Task Force recommends:

1. Working with each Crosswinds student to create a **multi-year education plan** (including, but not limited to, plans for 11th and 12th grade). This planning process would begin in 6th grade and could be part of reframing the school as a center for inquiry. Individual student plan development would likely entail use of technology and established planning tools (e.g., Naviance or GPS Lifeplan).

2. Establishing a **cross-district EMID transition committee** that would identify and describe educational options particularly relevant to the core focus areas of Crosswinds. The cross-district committee could also plan and host a high school fair.
3. Establishing a **communication strategy** between Crosswinds and member district high schools that would include a specifically **identified Liaison at each school** assigned to work with transitioning Crosswinds students and families. Each year a **letter/packet of information would be jointly prepared by member district liaisons and Crosswinds staff to students and families** outlining educational options after 10th grade.
4. Creating **specific incentives to recruit exiting Crosswinds students into targeted member district programs** (e.g., IB, arts enriched programs, science-focused programs). While the specifics of this option are beyond the charge of the current Task Force and may require member district board approval, incentives may include waiting list preferences, transportation stipends (or bus tokens), reserving a certain number of program spaces for Crosswinds students, or treating all exiting Crosswinds students as if they were resident students of each member district.

Timeframe: The Task Force recommends that the process for illustrating and formalizing pathways from Crosswinds to key programs in member district schools begins immediately, with student planning systems and some identified pathways in place by Fall, 2010.

Attachment A

Operating Norms and Essential Agreements

1. Task Force members will participate fully and candidly in a deliberative process that reflects our purpose and objectives. Task force members may represent (or report back to) a specific constituency, but will consider the best interests of the full Crosswinds community in this task force process.
2. Advocacy for specific recommendations will be suspended in the early part of this process to allow for respectful, open conversation where every option is considered.
3. Two-three minutes will be allotted at the end of each meeting to debrief and review what was covered.
4. Task Force members will receive draft working documents and internal data summaries as our work evolves. These documents are for internal task force planning only and should not be shared with constituent groups. Formal meeting minutes will not be kept.
5. Task Force members will receive a "one-pager" summarizing the group's purpose, objectives, and process. This document can be shared with constituents.
6. Until a final set of recommendations are developed, communication with individuals external to the Task Force will focus on status updates related to the progress of the Task Force and the process being utilized.
7. Decisions about final Task Force recommendations will be based on a supermajority vote (75%).

Crosswinds Task Force
October 21, 2009

Attachment B

Opportunities and Threats

What are the potential Opportunities and Threats/Challenges faced by Crosswinds in the next 3-5 years?

Summary of Task Force Discussion

Crosswinds has the opportunity to...	Crosswinds faces challenges and threats related to....
Build on the school's current strengths	The resources it <i>really</i> takes for all learners to achieve at high levels
Be an incubator for new initiatives	Some stakeholders' appetite for quick fixes
Be a model for forward-thinking educational options that are less easy to "pilot" in larger districts (Crosswinds' structure makes it more "nimble")	The MN Desegregation Rule and Legislative decision making
Build on community partnerships	Crosswinds not being viewed as providing value-added benefits for member districts
Create unique and value-added benefits for member districts	External accountability measures (e.g., NCLB, RTTT, MCAs, etc)
Be a school of choice for students from all participating districts	Internal and External competition for a declining population of students, and scarcer funds
Create strong positive relationships with <i>all</i> students	Unequal/imbalanced enrollment patterns among sending districts
Be a national model for inter-district, integration school	Unintended/unanticipated consequences of changing (or not changing) the magnet focus

Attachment C

EMID Member District Enrollment and Trend Data

Grades 6-10 Student Demographic Data for EMID and EMID Member Districts

The following two tables display demographic data for students in grades 6 through 10 attending a public school in EMID and EMID member school districts.

Table 1.1 Percent of Students in Grades 6-10 at EMID Member Districts by Category and District for the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 School Years

	White Students			Students of Color			Special Education Students		
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
East Metro Integration District	52.2%	50.0%	49.8%	47.8%	50.0%	50.2%	16.4%	14.7%	17.6%
Inver Grove Heights Schools District	78.8%	76.7%	75.9%	21.2%	23.3%	24.1%	13.7%	14.1%	13.3%
Mahtomedi Public School District	93.3%	94.1%	93.1%	6.7%	5.9%	6.9%	7.6%	8.4%	7.4%
Roseville Public School District	70.8%	67.4%	67.8%	29.2%	32.6%	32.2%	11.5%	11.8%	12.5%
South St. Paul Public School District	78.6%	76.2%	74.1%	21.4%	23.8%	25.9%	12.9%	12.8%	12.4%
South Washington County School	79.8%	79.4%	79.0%	20.2%	20.6%	21.0%	13.1%	12.6%	12.9%
Spring Lake Park Public Schools	73.7%	71.5%	71.2%	26.3%	28.5%	28.8%	12.7%	13.1%	14.0%
St. Paul Public School District	23.6%	23.1%	22.3%	76.4%	76.9%	77.7%	15.8%	16.3%	16.0%
Stillwater Area Public School Dist.	93.9%	93.5%	93.0%	6.1%	6.5%	7.0%	9.8%	11.0%	10.2%
West St. Paul-Mendota Hts.-Eagan	69.4%	67.2%	63.0%	30.6%	32.8%	37.0%	13.5%	14.3%	14.0%
White Bear Lake School District	85.2%	85.0%	85.2%	14.8%	15.0%	14.8%	11.8%	11.6%	10.7%

Table 1.1 displays the percent of students in grades 6 through 10 falling within the specified demographic category out of the total number of students in grades 6 through 10 in the school district for the school year. For example, in the 2006-2007 school year, 52.2% of students in grade 6-10 in the East Metro Integration District were white.

Table 1.2 Percent Change in Student Enrollment in Grades 6-10 for EMID Member Districts by Category and District for 2006-2007 to 2007-2008 and 2007-2008 to 2008-2009 School Years

	White Students		Students of Color		Special Education Students		Total Students	
	2006-2007 to 2007-2008	2007-2008 to 2008-2009	2006-2007 to 2007-2008	2007-2008 to 2008-2009	2006-2007 to 2007-2008	2007-2008 to 2008-2009	2006-2007 to 2007-2008	2007-2008 to 2008-2009
East Metro Integration District	-2.9%	-12.5%	6.3%	11.8%	9.1%	5.0%	1.5%	-7.1%
Inver Grove Heights Schools District	-5.1%	-4.1%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	-8.6%	-2.6%	-3.1%
Mahtomedi Public School District	4.2%	0.2%	8.9%	18.3%	13.7%	-1.2%	3.3%	1.2%
Roseville Public School District	-6.0%	-0.9%	10.2%	-3.0%	1.4%	3.7%	-1.3%	-1.6%
South St. Paul Public School District	-1.5%	-3.3%	12.9%	8.8%	0.6%	-3.8%	1.5%	-0.4%
South Washington County School	0.9%	-0.3%	3.2%	1.8%	-2.3%	2.4%	1.4%	0.1%
Spring Lake Park Public Schools	-4.2%	-4.5%	7.0%	-3.1%	1.8%	2.7%	-1.3%	-4.1%
St. Paul Public School District	6.4%	-8.3%	-4.0%	-3.9%	-1.6%	-6.6%	-4.5%	-4.9%
Stillwater Area Public School Dist.	-0.1%	-2.4%	6.2%	6.7%	11.8%	-8.7%	0.3%	-1.9%
West St. Paul-Mendota Hts.-Eagan	-6.2%	-9.6%	3.6%	9.0%	2.9%	-5.6%	-3.2%	-3.5%
White Bear Lake School District	-5.3%	-0.6%	-3.9%	-1.9%	-6.9%	-8.5%	-5.1%	-0.8%

Table 1.2 displays the percent change in enrollment between school years for students in grades 6 through 10 falling within each demographic category. For example, the percent of white students in the East Metro Integration declined by 2.9% from the 2006-2007 school year to the 2007-2008 school year. For each change in school year and demographic category, the largest increase and decline in enrollment are highlighted in blue and red, respectively.

Crosswinds Student Demographics

The following table displays demographic information for Crosswinds East Metro Arts and Science School across three fiscal years: 2007, 2008, and 2009.

Table 2.1: Crosswinds Student Enrollment for the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 School Years

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Total Student Enrollment	528	523	462
Students of Color	247	315	255
Special Education Students	79	105	85

Table 2.1 displays the total student enrollment along with enrollment for students of color and special education students at Crosswind for the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 school years. In the 2006-2007 school year, a total of 528 students were enrolled at Crosswinds. Of the 528 total students, 247 (46.8%) students were students of color, while 79 (15.0%) students were special education students.

Table 2.2: Crosswinds Student Enrollment by Home District for the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 School Years

	2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009	
	n	% (n=528)	n	% (n=523)	n	% (n=463)
Spring Lake Park Public Schools	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
West St. Paul-Mendota Hts.-Eagan	9	1.7%	2	0.4%	7	1.5%
Inver Grove Heights Schools	13	2.5%	9	1.7%	9	1.9%
North St. Paul	98	18.6%	93	17.8%	76	16.4%
Roseville Public School District	24	4.5%	28	5.4%	26	5.6%
White Bear Lake School District	17	3.2%	23	4.4%	25	5.4%
St. Paul Public School Dist.	283	53.6%	275	52.6%	240	51.8%
Mahtomedi Public School District	10	1.9%	13	2.5%	8	1.7%
South Washington County School Dist	55	10.4%	60	11.5%	55	11.9%
Stillwater Area Public School Dist.	13	2.5%	11	2.1%	13	2.8%
South St. Paul Public School Dist.	6	1.1%	9	1.7%	4	0.9%

Table 2.2 displays Crosswind student enrollment by home district for the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 school years. In the 2006-2007 school year, a little over half of the student enrolled at Crosswinds were from the South St. Paul Public School district. The second largest group of students at 18.6% was from the North St. Paul School District.

Attachment D

Decision Criteria for Making Recommendations to the EMID Joint Powers Board

The following criteria were used to identify and study options for future programs:

- Key stakeholders and member districts see value-added benefit in recommendation
- EMID has staffing and expertise to implement recommendation
- Recommendation is financially feasible
- Recommendation is fully aligned with EMID's mission to provide and promote integrated learning opportunities that expand cultural understanding and support academic achievement
- Recommendation can be implemented by start of the 2010-2011 school year and sustainable for the foreseeable future (at least 3-5 years)
- Recommendation will promote a stable student population and enrollment

Table 2.3: Percent of Crosswinds Students by Home District and Category for Fiscal Years 2006 to 2009

	Students of Color			Special Education		
	2006-2007 (n=247)	2007-2008 (n=315)	2008-2009 (n=255)	2006-2007 (n=79)	2007-2008 (n=105)	2008-2009 (n=85)
Spring Lake Park Public Schools	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
West St. Paul-Mendota Hts.-Eagan	2.0%	1.6%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Inver Grove Heights Schools	4.0%	2.9%	2.4%	5.1%	3.8%	3.5%
ISD 622 NORTH ST. PAUL	12.1%	14.6%	13.3%	22.8%	25.7%	22.4%
Roseville Public School District	4.5%	5.7%	5.1%	2.5%	6.7%	4.7%
White Bear Lake School District	2.8%	3.8%	4.3%	1.3%	1.9%	4.7%
St. Paul Public School Dist.	58.3%	56.5%	58.8%	46.8%	42.9%	47.1%
Mahtomedi Public School District	1.2%	0.6%	0.8%	1.3%	1.0%	0.0%
South Washington County School Dist	12.1%	11.7%	10.2%	15.2%	13.3%	7.1%
Stillwater Area Public School Dist.	1.6%	1.0%	2.4%	5.1%	4.8%	7.1%
South St. Paul Public School Dist.	1.2%	1.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%

Table 2.3 displays the percent of students of color and special education students by home district for fiscal years 2006 to 2009. In fiscal year 2007, a little over half (58.3%) of the students of color enrolled at Crosswinds were from the home district of St. Paul Public School. A little less than half (46.8%) of the special education students were also from St. Paul. Across all three fiscal years, a higher percentage of students of color and special education students were from St. Paul than any other home district. The district where the second highest percentage of students was from was North St. Paul.

Table 2.4: Crosswinds Grade 8, 9, 10 enrollment from 06-07 school year to current school year

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
Grade 8	153	125	122	145
Grade 9	83	98	59	81
Grade 10	47	57	49	36

Attachment E: Potential Recommendations Considered by Task Force (with priorities notes)

	6 to 10	6 to 12	6 to 8	9 to 12	7 to 12
Reframe existing Art, Science, and IB into Center for Inquiry or Global School	⊙ ◇ +	□ *	⊙ ◇ ×	+	⊙
IB only, drop Arts and Science	◇ H	⊙	◇		
Arts only drop Science and IB		*	⊙		
Arts & Science only drop IB	+		⊙		
Add Spanish Immersion	*	*	⊙		
Cap grade-level enrollment to maintain balance	*	*	⊙ ◇ ×		
Move to traditional school calendar	H				
Create/illustrate grades 11-12 pathways within member districts	⊙ ◇ +	□ *	⊙ ×		⊙
Move Crosswinds to charter school status					
Create/invite grades 11-12 charter school to co-locate at Crosswinds	□ * +	⊙ *	⊙		
Establish comprehensive college in the schools program or similar partnerships	*	□ ⊙ * ◆			

Attachment E: Potential Recommendation Considered by Task Force (with priorities notes)

	6 to 10	6 to 12	6 to 8	9 to 12	7 to 12
Reframe existing Art, Science, and IB into Center for Inquiry or Global School	⊙ ◇ +	⊙ ◇ *	⊙ ◇ *	⊙ ◇ *	⊙ ◇ *
IB only, drop Arts and Science	◇ H	◇ H	◇	◇	◇
Arts only drop Science and IB		*	◇		
Arts & Science only drop IB	+		⊙		
Add Spanish Immersion	*	*	◇		
Cap grade-level enrollment to maintain balance	*	*	⊙ ◇ ◇		
Move to traditional school calendar	H				
Create/illustrate grades 11-12 pathways within member districts	⊙ ◇ +	⊙ ◇ *	⊙ ◇ *		⊙
Move Crosswinds to charter school status					
Create/invite grades 11-12 charter school to co-locate at Crosswinds	⊙ ◇ +	*	◇		
Establish comprehensive college in the schools program or similar partnerships	*	⊙ ◇ *	⊙ ◇ *		

(1)

(2)

(3)

Attachment E: Potential Recommendation Considered by Task Force (with priorities notes)

	6 to 10	6 to 12	6 to 18	9 to 12	7 to 12
Reframe existing Art, Science, and IB into Center for Inquiry or Global School	⬠ ⬠ ⬠	⬠ ⬠ ⬠	⬠ ⬠ ⬠	⬠ ⬠ ⬠	⬠
IB only, drop Arts and Science	⬠ ⬠				
Arts only drop Science and IB		*			
Arts & Science only drop IB	⬠		⬠		
Add Spanish Immersion		*			
Cap grade-level enrollment to maintain balance		* * *			
Move to traditional school calendar	⬠				
Create/illustrate grades 11-12 pathways within member districts	⬠ ⬠ ⬠	⬠ ⬠ ⬠			⬠
Move Crosswinds to charter school status					
Create/invite grades 11-12 charter school to co-locate at Crosswinds	⬠ * +				
Establish comprehensive college in the schools program or similar partnerships	*	⬠ ⬠			

**CROSSWINDS TASK FORCE - FINANCIAL MODELS
OVERALL ASSUMPTIONS**

All documents included are for internal use only - not for distribution.

Models have been created for use by Crosswinds Task Force in developing recommendations.

Building capacity is approximately 600 students.

All models assume a six-period day.

Food Service revenue and expenditures are not included in the models.

6-12 models based on a "bare bones" high school program meeting state graduation requirements.

Staffing projections based on current program foci (arts, science, IB Middle Years Program).

Models do not reflect any program additions (i.e. IB Diploma Program, Spanish Immersion etc.).

Models project operational costs based on FY10 revenue and expenditures.

6-12 models would require additional one-time start up costs.

Start-up costs to add 11-12 include facility renovations, additional curriculum, and planning.

START-UP COSTS	
Facility	\$130,000
Curriculum materials	\$130,000
Planning/staff development	\$53,000
TOTAL	\$313,000

Facility - renovation of food lab to science lab

Facility - remodel media center

Curriculum - books, etc. for HS courses

Planning - two weeks of additional time for 15 staff members

To reach enrollment projections would take two to three years depending on the model.

Attachment E: Potential Recommendation Considered by Task Force (with priorities notes)

	6 to 10	6 to 12	6 to 8	9 to 12	7 to 12
Reframe existing Art, Science, and IB into Center for Inquiry or Global School	⊙ ◇ +*	□ *	⊙ ◇ *◇	+⊙ ◇ ⊙	⊙
IB only, drop Arts and Science	◇ H		◇		
Arts only drop Science and IB		*	⊙		
Arts & Science only drop IB	+		⊙		
Add Spanish Immersion	*	*	⊙		
Cap grade-level enrollment to maintain balance	*	** *	⊙ ◇ ◇		
Move to traditional school calendar	H				
Create/illustrate grades 11-12 pathways within member districts	⊙ ◇ +*	□ *	⊙ *		⊙
Move Crosswinds to charter school status					
Create/invite grades 11-12 charter school to co-locate at Crosswinds	□ * +	*	◇		
Establish comprehensive college in the schools program or similar partnerships	*	□ ⊙ * *			

Attachment F

Grade Level Enrollment and Financial Models

CURRENT REALITY

ENROLLMENT			
Grade	Number	Sections	Class Size
6	100	5	20.00
7	150	6	25.00
8	150	6	25.00
9	75	3	25.00
10	36	2	18.00
11	0	0	0.00
12	0	0	0.00
	511		

STAFFING			
Instruction	MS	HS	Total
Math	3.5	1.5	5
LA	4.5	1	5.5
Science	4	1.5	5.5
Social	3.5	1	4.5
SPED	4.2	1.2	5.4
Band			1
Orchestra			1
Visual Art			2
Drama			0.5
Spanish			2.5
Health			1
PE			1
ELL			1
SUB-TOTAL			35.9
Support	MS	HS	Total
Principal			1
AP			1
TOSA			1
Soc Worker			1.5
Counselor			0.5
School Psych			0.5
Media			1
Nurse			0.8
Interession			0.5
Behavior Spec			1
Tech			1
EAs			2
SPED EAs			8
Clerical			2.7
Custodial			4
SUB-TOTAL			26.5
TOTAL			62.4

REVENUE	
Source	Amount
Tuition Revenue	\$3,297,545.00
Integration Revenue	\$1,110,375.00
SPED Revenue	\$827,820.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$5,235,740.00
Per Pupil Revenue	\$8,177.01

EXPENDITURES	
Source	Amount
Licensed Staff	\$2,692,500.00
Non-licensed Staff	\$1,145,600.00
Administrative Staff	\$275,000.00
Other	\$971,000.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$5,084,100.00
Per Pupil Expenditure	\$7,940.18

ASSUMPTIONS

Enrollment

Enrollment reflects current reality

Staffing

Staffing reflects current reality

Revenue

Tuition revenue calculated at \$5150 per pupil unit

Integration revenue calculated per FY10 distribution

SPED revenue calculated per FY10 budget

Expenditures

Licensed staff calculated at \$75000 (salary + benefits)

Non-licensed staff calculated at \$38000 (salary + benefits)

"Other" expenditures include the following:

- * district administration and support
- * instructional materials
- * staff development
- * capital expenditures
- * facility costs
- * student activities

ENROLLMENT			
Grade	Number	Sections	Class Size
6	100	5	20.00
7	100	5	20.00
8	100	5	20.00
9	75	3	25.00
10	75	3	25.00
11	75	3	25.00
12	75	3	25.00
	600		

STAFFING			
Instruction	MS	HS	Total
Math	3	3	6
LA	3.5	3	6.5
Science	3	3	6
Social	3	3	6
SPED	3.4	3	6.4
Band	0.5	0.5	1
Orchestra	0.5	0.5	1
Visual Art	1.25	1.25	2.5
Drama	0.5	0.5	1
Spanish	2	1.5	3.5
Health	0.5	0.75	1.25
PE	0.5	0.75	1.25
ELL	0.5	0.5	1
SUB-TOTAL	22.15	21.25	43.4
Support	MS	HS	Total
Principal	0.5	0.5	1
AP	0.5	0.5	1
TOSA	0.5	1	1.5
Soc Worker	1	0.5	1.5
Counselor	0.25	0.75	1
School Psych	0.25	0.25	0.5
Media	0.5	0.5	1
Nurse	0.5	0.5	1
Intersession	0.25	0.25	0.5
Behavior Sp	1	1	2
Tech	0.5	0.5	1
EAs	1	1	2
SPED EAs	4	6	10
Clerical	1.5	1.5	3
Custodial	2	2	4
SUB-TOTAL	14.25	16.75	31
TOTAL	36.4	38	74.4

REVENUE	
Source	Amount
Tuition Revenue	\$3,893,400.00
Integration Revenue	\$1,110,375.00
SPED Revenue	\$972,000.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$5,975,775.00
Per Pupil Revenue	\$7,904.46

EXPENDITURE	
Source	Amount
Licensed Staff	\$3,255,000.00
Non-Licensed Staff	\$1,361,000.00
Administrative Staff	\$275,000.00
Other	\$1,011,000.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$5,902,000.00
Per Pupil Expenditure	\$7,806.88

ASSUMPTIONS

Enrollment

Enrollment reflects balance between MS and HS
 Enrollment at grades 6, 7 and 8 capped at 100
 Three "houses" of 100 students each at MS
 HS enrollment balanced across all four grades

Staffing

All additional staffing at HS
 Some current MS staff would move to HS
 Additional 4.0 core instructional staff (LA, Math, Science, SS)
 Additional 1.0 SPED (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional 2.5 sky staff (Arts, etc.)
 Additional 1.2 non-instructional licensed staff
 Additional 1.0 non-instructional support staff
 Additional 2.0 SPED EAs (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional .3 clerical staff

Revenue

Tuition revenue calculated at \$5150 per pupil unit
 Integration revenue calculated per FY10 distribution
 SPED revenue calculated at 18% overall SPED population

Expenditures

Licensed staff calculated at \$75000 (salary + benefits)
 Non-licensed staff calculated at \$38000 (salary + benefits)
 "Other" expenditures include the following:
 * district administration and support - no additional costs
 * instructional materials - additional \$15,000
 * staff development - additional \$5000
 * capital expenditures - additional \$15,000
 * facility costs - no additional costs
 * student activities - additional \$5000

ENROLLMENT			
Grade	Number	Sections	Class Size
6	110	5	22.00
7	105	5	21.00
8	100	5	20.00
9	85	3	28.33
10	75	3	25.00
11	65	3	21.67
12	55	3	18.33
	595		

REVENUE	
Source	Amount
Tuition Revenue	\$3,847,565.00
Integration Revenue	\$1,110,375.00
SPED Revenue	\$891,000.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$5,848,940.00
Per Pupil Revenue	\$7,829.91

STAFFING			
Instruction	MS	HS	Total
Math	3	3	6
LA	3.5	3	6.5
Science	3	3	6
Social	3	3	6
SPED	3	3	6
Band	0.5	0.5	1
Orchestra	0.5	0.5	1
Visual Art	1.25	1.25	2.5
Drama	0.5	0.5	1
Spanish	2	1.5	3.5
Health	0.5	0.75	1.25
PE	0.5	0.75	1.25
ELL	0.5	0.5	1
SUB-TOTAL	21.75	21.25	43
Support	MS	HS	Total
Principal	0.5	0.5	1
AP	0.5	0.5	1
TOSA	0.5	1	1.5
Soc Worker	1	0.5	1.5
Counselor	0.5	0.5	1
School Psych	0.25	0.25	0.5
Media	0.5	0.5	1
Nurse	0.5	0.5	1
Intersession	0.25	0.25	0.5
Behavior Sp	1	1	2
Tech	0.5	0.5	1
EAs	1	1	2
SPED EAs	4	5	9
Clerical	1.5	1.5	3
Custodial	2	2	4
SUB-TOTAL	14.5	15.5	30
TOTAL	36.25	36.75	73

EXPENDITURE	
Source	Amount
Licensed Staff	\$3,225,000.00
Non-Licensed Staff	\$1,323,000.00
Administrative Staff	\$275,000.00
Other	\$1,011,000.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$5,834,000.00
Per Pupil Expenditure	\$7,809.91

ASSUMPTIONS

Enrollment

Enrollment at grade 6 capped at 110
 Three "houses" of approximately 100 students each at MS
 HS enrollment diminishes from 85 at grade 9 to 55 at grade 12

Staffing

All additional staffing at HS
 Some current MS staff would move to HS
 Additional 4.0 core instructional staff (LA, Math, Science, SS)
 Additional .6 SPED (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional 2.5 sky staff (Arts, etc.)
 Additional 1.2 non-instructional licensed staff
 Additional 1.0 non-instructional support staff
 Additional 1.0 SPED EAs (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional .3 clerical staff

Revenue

Tuition revenue calculated at \$5150 per pupil unit
 Integration revenue calculated per FY10 distribution
 SPED revenue calculated at 18% overall SPED population

Expenditures

Licensed staff calculated at \$75000 (salary + benefits)
 Non-licensed staff calculated at \$38000 (salary + benefits)
 "Other" expenditures include the following:
 * district administration and support - no additional costs
 * instructional materials - additional \$15,000
 * staff development - additional \$5000
 * capital expenditures - additional \$15,000
 * facility costs - no additional costs
 * student activities - additional \$5000

ENROLLMENT			
Grade	Number	Sections	Class Size
6	100	5	20.00
7	150	7.0	21.43
8	140	7.0	20.00
9	75	4	18.75
10	60	3	20.00
11	45	3	15.00
12	30	2	15.00
	600		

REVENUE	
Source	Amount
Tuition Revenue	\$3,893,400.00
Integration Revenue	\$1,110,375.00
SPED Revenue	\$988,200.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$5,991,975.00
Per Pupil Revenue	\$7,925.89

STAFFING			
Instruction	MS	HS	Total
Math	4	3	7
LA	4.5	3	7.5
Science	4	3	7
Social	4	3	7
SPED	3.4	3	6.4
Band	0.5	0.5	1
Orchestra	0.5	0.5	1
Visual Art	1.5	1	2.5
Drama	0.5	0.5	1
Spanish	2	1.5	3.5
Health	0.75	0.25	1
PE	0.75	0.25	1
ELL	0.5	0.5	1
SUB-TOTAL	26.9	20	46.9
Support	MS	HS	Total
Principal	0.5	0.5	1
AP	0.5	0.5	1
TOSA	0.5	1	1.5
Soc Worker	1	0.5	1.5
Counselor	0.5	0.5	1
School Psych	0.25	0.25	0.5
Media	0.5	0.5	1
Nurse	0.4	0.6	1
Intersession	0.25	0.25	0.5
Behavior Sp	1	1	2
Tech	0.5	0.5	1
EAs	1	1	2
SPED EAs	6	4	10
Clerical	1.5	1.5	3
Custodial	2	2	4
SUB-TOTAL	16.4	14.6	31
TOTAL	43.3	34.6	77.9

EXPENDITURE	
Source	Amount
Licensed Staff	\$3,517,500.00
Non-Licensed Staff	\$1,361,000.00
Administrative Staff	\$275,000.00
Other	\$1,011,000.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$6,164,500.00
Per Pupil Expenditure	\$8,154.10

ASSUMPTIONS

Enrollment

Enrollment at grades 6-8 reflect current reality
 HS enrollment diminishes from 75 at grade 9 to 30 at grade 12

Staffing

Some additional staffing at MS - 1.0 core instructional staff
 Remainder of additional staffing at HS
 Additional 4.0 core instructional staff (LA, Math, Science, SS)
 Additional 1.0 SPED (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional 2.0 sky staff (Arts, etc.)
 Additional 1.2 non-instructional licensed staff
 Additional 1.0 non-instructional support staff
 Additional 2.0 SPED EAs (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional .3 clerical staff

Revenue

Tuition revenue calculated at \$5150 per pupil unit
 Integration revenue calculated per FY10 distribution
 SPED revenue calculated at 18% overall SPED population

Expenditures

Licensed staff calculated at \$75000 (salary + benefits)
 Non-licensed staff calculated \$38000 (salary + benefits)
 "Other" expenditures include the following:
 * district administration and support - no additional costs
 * instructional materials - additional \$15,000
 * staff development - additional \$5000
 * capital expenditures - additional \$15,000
 * facility costs - no additional costs
 * student activities - additional \$5000

ENROLLMENT			
Grade	Number	Sections	Class Size
6	100	5	20.00
7	150	6	25.00
8	150	6	25.00
9	100	5	20.00
10	100	5	20.00
11	0	0	0.00
12	0	0	0.00
	600		

STAFFING			
Instruction	MS	HS	Total
Math	4	3	7
LA	4.5	3	7.5
Science	4	3	7
Social	4	3	7
SPED	3.4	3	6.4
Band	0.75	0.25	1
Orchestra	0.75	0.25	1
Visual Art	1.5	1	2.5
Drama	0.5	0.5	1
Spanish	2	1.5	3.5
Health	0.75	0.25	1
PE	0.75	0.25	1
ELL	0.5	0.5	1
SUB-TOTAL			46.9
Support	MS	HS	Total
Principal	0.5	0.5	1
AP	0.5	0.5	1
TOSA	0.5	0.5	1
Soc Worker	1	0.5	1.5
Counselor	0.5	0.5	1
School Psych	0.25	0.25	0.5
Media	0.5	0.5	1
Nurse	0.4	0.6	1
Intersession	0.25	0.25	0.5
Behavior Sp	1	1	2
Tech	0.5	0.5	1
EAs	1	1	2
SPED EAs	6	4	10
Clerical	1.5	1.5	3
Custodial	2	2	4
SUB-TOTAL			30.5
TOTAL			77.4

REVENUE	
Source	Amount
Tuition Revenue	\$3,893,400.00
Integration Revenue	\$1,110,375.00
SPED Revenue	\$972,000.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$5,975,775.00
Per Pupil Revenue	\$7,904.46

EXPENDITURE	
Source	Amount
Licensed Staff	\$3,517,500.00
Non-licensed Staff	\$1,323,500.00
Administrative Staff	\$275,000.00
Other	\$996,000.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$6,112,000.00
Per Pupil Expenditure	\$8,084.66

ASSUMPTIONS

Enrollment

Enrollment at grades 6-8 reflect current reality
 HS enrollment diminishes from 75 at grade 9 to 30 at grade 12

Staffing

Some additional staffing at MS - 1.0 core instructional staff
 Remainder of additional staffing at HS
 Additional 4.0 core instructional staff (LA, Math, Science, SS)
 Additional 1.0 SPED (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional 2.0 sky staff (Arts, etc.)
 Additional .7 non-instructional licensed staff
 Additional 1.0 non-instructional support staff
 Additional 2.0 SPED EAs (increase offset by revenue)
 Additional .3 clerical staff

Revenue

Tuition revenue calculated at \$5150 per pupil unit
 Integration revenue calculated per FY10 distribution
 SPED revenue calculated at 18% overall SPED population

Expenditures

Licensed staff calculated at \$75000 (salary + benefits)
 Non-licensed staff calculated at \$38000 (salary + benefits)
 "Other" expenditures include the following:
 * district administration and support - no additional costs
 * instructional materials - additional \$10,000
 * staff development - additional \$5000
 * capital expenditures - additional \$5000
 * facility costs - no additional costs
 * student activities - additional \$5000

Attachment G

Grade Level Configuration Feedback from EMID Member District Superintendents

Crosswinds Task Force - Feedback Form

1. Indicate the extent to which you support the following recommendations of the Crosswinds Task Force:

	5 - Strongly Support	4	3	2	1 - Do Not Support	Response Count
Maintain year-round calendar	28.6% (2)	57.1% (4)	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7
Maintain IB Middle Years Program	28.6% (2)	42.9% (3)	28.6% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7
Reframe to a single focus	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	50.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	6
					<i>answered question</i>	7
					<i>skipped question</i>	0

2. Indicate the extent to which you support the following elements of Option #1:

	5 - Strongly Support	4	3	2	1 - Do Not Support	Response Count
Grades 6-10	71.4% (5)	28.6% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7
Create pathways for grades 11-12	57.1% (4)	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	7
					<i>answered question</i>	7
					<i>skipped question</i>	0

3. Indicate the extent to which you support the following elements of Option #2:

	5 - Strongly Support	4	3	2	1 - Do Not Support	Response Count
Grades 6-12	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	85.7% (6)	7
Cap enrollment at grades 6-8 to maintain balance	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (6)	6
					<i>answered question</i>	7
					<i>skipped question</i>	0

