

Associate Superintendent Saddler,

In preparation for the Area C School Board Meeting on April 16 we, members of Area C parent leadership, request that the following questions be answered at that meeting by you and Mr. Doty. We ask these questions in the spirit of transparency and our desire to work you as we advocate for the needs of all students.

1. Please provide an explanation of the misallocation of public funds that resulted in Area C schools having initially received far less funding than was expected. In addition to your explanation we have some related questions:
 - a. What steps have been taken to prevent this from occurring again?
 - i. One recommendation we have is implementing a system where if there is a deviation of X percent from the prior year's budget, a flag is raised requiring the district to check its calculations or engage in other processes.
 - b. Can the district specifically account for how all funds are allocated directly (i.e. teachers) and indirectly (i.e. training for teachers) to each Area C school, and is the district willing to provide us with that itemized accounting?
2. How is minimal programming defined at the district level?
 - a. What does the district consider to be minimal programming to be funded for all Minneapolis Public Schools?
 - i. In this question, the term 'minimal' represents programming the district funds for all schools because such funding is necessary for student's needs to be safe and have the same basic educational opportunities district-wide.
 - b. Does the district believe professional development for teachers (i.e. coaches, professional workshops, etc) is a minimum need that should be funded for all schools?

The above questions related to minimum funding become even more important as the topic of weighted funding continues to be discussed. As parents, we believe ensuring parents understand how weighted funding will impact the MPS educational experience and providing parents the opportunity to be involved in the planning is critical.

3. Classroom size for most Area C schools is at or over the guideline established as part of the Strong Schools Strong City referendum passed in 2008. There is no physical space in most of our schools to add more classrooms. For example, Kenny will be at 33-34 per classroom in 4th/5th grade next year.
 - a. What are the district's plans to address this issue?
 - b. Is the district considering plans that include co-teaching and/or hiring EAs?
 - c. What is the district's staff-to-student ratio purely from a safety perspective?
4. Outside of shifts by the district to provide money directly to the school, rather than District to department to school as was described at the last Area C Meeting, is it the district's position that Area C schools received increases in their funding this year?
 - a. If that's your position, what can you point us to?
 - b. If not, why not? Doesn't the district have more funding, particularly from the State Legislature?
5. At the March Area C Meeting, the budgeting process was described as a series of

exchanges between the district and the school occurring March through May with tie-out (occurring in March) not being a significant event in that process.

- a. Does the district intend to approach next year in the same manner?
- b. What about teachers and staff that are given notice of their jobs being terminated following tie-out? Is the process fair to them? Does the process need to start earlier?

Thank you for responding to our questions and concerns.

Sincerely,
Members of Area C Parent Leadership