Minnesota Department of Education

Districts' Use of and Need for Integration Revenue

February 2011

FY 2011
Report
To the
Legislature

As required by
Minn Laws 2009
Chapter 96
Sec. 63

COMMISSIONER:

Dr. Brenda Cassellius

Review of

Districts' Use of and Need for Integration Revenue

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dr. Anne M. Parks

Integration/Desegregation Specialist

T: (651) 582-8337

E-MAIL: anne.parks@state.mn.us

1500 Highway 36 West

Roseville, MN 55113-4266

TTY: (800) 627-3529 OR (651) 582-8201

February 2011

FY 2011
Report
To the
Legislature

As required by
Minn Laws 2009
Chapter 96
Sec. 63

.

Cost of Report Preparation

The total cost for the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to prepare this report was approximately $3,000. Most of these costs involved staff time researching, collecting, and analyzing data and preparing the written report. Incidental costs include paper, copying, and other office supplies.

Estimated costs are provided in accordance with Minnesota Statutes 2009, Section 3.197, which requires that at the beginning of a report to the Legislature, the cost of report preparation must be provided.

Report on

Districts' Use of and Need for Integration Revenue

Purpose of the Report

Minnesota Statutes, Section 124D.86, Subdivision 1b, requires the Commissioner of Education (Commissioner) to identify the elements and trends in district strategies and programs, the amount of success independent school districts (ISD) achieved in realizing the specific goals contained in their integration plans, and the estimated funds districts need to fully implement those plans.

In addition, Minnesota Law 2009, Chapter 96, HF2, Sec. 63, specifically directs the Commissioner to obtain and review the following information about districts' use of and need for integration revenue:

1) Impact of demographic changes experienced at school sites and districts involving: a) students of color, b) students with limited English proficiency, and c) students who are homeless or highly mobile.

2) Changes in immigration patterns and housing patterns experienced by schools and districts.

3) The availability of, and districts' participation in, interdistrict integration opportunities.

The Commissioner has obtained the following sources of data for this report: Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) data submitted annually by districts to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE), School District Integration/Desegregation plans submitted annually to MDE, 2009 Minnesota Homeless Study (Wilder Research, 2009), *A New Age of Immigrants* (Wilder Research, August 2010), *A Comprehensive Strategy to Integrate Twin Cities Schools and Neighborhoods* (Institute on Race and Poverty, University of Minnesota, draft report, 2009).

This report is the first submitted by MDE on the use of and need for integration revenue. It will establish a baseline for subsequent reports which will build on the data and recommendations included here. As data is gathered and appropriate systems for tracking, oversight, support, and assessment are implemented by the Commissioner, subsequent integration revenue reports will provide further analysis of the issues addressed here.

Background

Minnesota school districts receiving integration revenue must fall under one of four integration fund categories in order to be eligible for this funding: **RI**=*racially isolated district*, **A**=*adjoining district*, **V**=*voluntary district*. A district may also be identified as **RIS**=*racially identifiable school*.

Racially isolated districts (**RI**) have a district-wide enrollment of protected-class students which exceeds the enrollment of protected-class students of any adjoining district by more than 20 percentage points. Racially identified schools (**RIS**) have an enrollment of protected-class students which is 20 percentage points above the enrollment of protected-class students in the entire district for the grade levels served by that school (Minn. R. 3535.0110 Subp. 6-7).

Adjoining districts (**A**) adjoin a racially isolated district. Voluntary districts (**V**) have opted to join an existing integration collaborative in order to assist in reducing the isolation of a racially isolated district (Minn. R. 3535.0100 H).

Districts in any of these four categories are eligible to receive integration revenue pending submission and review of an integration plan and approval of a corresponding Integration Revenue budget. Exceptions to this are the St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth districts, which are not required to submit integration budgets for MDE approval (Minn. Stat. §124D.86, Subd.3. (5)).

The table below shows the number of schools districts receiving integration funding in Fiscal Year 2011 (FY 11) according to one of the four qualifying designations, as determined by reports submitted to MDE by October 2009, in accordance with the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) deadline. These reports include the racial composition of each school within a district which is used to determine a district's integration revenue status.

Note: Some districts qualify under more than one category but do not receive additional revenue as a result (i.e. a district with an adjoining district designation and having an identified school site receives the same amount of integration revenue as a district qualifying for integration revenue under only one designation). This also means the number of total participating districts in Table 1 below is not a total of the four qualifying categories. For example, in 09-10 Fridley qualified as both a racially isolated district and an adjoining district. It was included in each of those two qualifying areas but not counted twice in the district total.

Table 1) Minnesota Districts Receiving Integration Funding Qualifying Designation

School Year	Racially Isolated	Adjoining	Voluntary	Districts with a Racially Identified School	Total Districts
2003-2004*	**19**	**56**	**6**	**8**	**80**
2008-2009	**32**	**72**	**15**	**13**	**112**
2009-2010**	**35**	**94**	**15**	**13**	**138**

***Data for this year is taken from the 2005 Office of the Legislative Auditor's Report on Integration Revenue.
**New Districts: 10 districts became eligible to receive Integration Revenue in 2009-2010 and are included in the table here; 8 districts became eligible in 2010-2011.

Elements of District Strategies and Programs

In order to receive integration funds, a qualified district must submit an integration plan to MDE describing how the district will address the goal of realizing "greater opportunities for interracial contact between students" (Minn. R. 3535.0170 Subp. 5). Specifically, the Minnesota Integration Revenue Statute states that the revenue must be used "for students to have increased and sustained interracial contacts and improved educational opportunities and outcomes designed to close the academic achievement gap between white students and protected students as defined in Minnesota Rule 3535.0110, Subp. 4, through classroom experiences, staff initiatives and other educationally related programs" (Minn. Stat. §124D.86 Subp.1).

Districts have been encouraged by MDE to develop programs and activities that simultaneously advance the goal of improving student academic achievement and the goal of increased opportunities for interracial contact. As such, initiatives described below may be presented in terms of achieving a district-specific goal, but must ultimately be academically justifiable and increase opportunities for interracial contact. Furthermore, integration revenue spending, as categorical aid, is approved by MDE only for those programs and initiatives which align with the integration purposes for which it was generated (i.e. cross-district integration or integration of a racially-identifiable school building within a single district). MDE uses an established rubric to determine eligibility. See Appendix C.

District programs and initiatives must align with a district's integration plan's stated goals. Most frequently occurring integration plan goals include the following as targeted areas of improvement:

- Interracial contact
- Integrated learning environments
- Cultural awareness
- Parental involvement
- Professional development
- Student achievement

These goals are directly connected to the strategies employed by districts and, in themselves, reflect common elements occurring across current integration programs or initiatives. Integration plan goals are

also included here in order to organize and understand the intent behind frequently occurring district strategies.

Specific examples of common elements of integration revenue-supported programs currently implemented by districts are listed in Table 2 and detailed in the narrative which follows. This section of the report reflects common elements and trends across 138 district integration plans receiving FY 11 integration revenue.

Note: Although a collaborative member district may share integration goals with districts within their collaborative, specific initiatives may vary from member district to member district.

Table 2) Elements in District Strategies and Programs Listed by Integration Plan Goals

Integration Plan Goals	Examples of Elements
1. Interracial Contact	Partnership Programming: South Washington County ISD 833
2. Integrated Learning Environment	Staff of Color Recruit and Retention, School Climate: Bloomington ISD 271
3. Cultural Awareness	Cross Cultural Partners: New London-Spicer ISD 345
4. Parental/Family Involvement	Parental Involvement: Austin ISD 492
5. Professional Development	Intercultural Developmental Inventory: Lakeville ISD 194
6. Student Achievement	School Success Coaches : Albert Lea ISD 241

Examples of Common Elements of District Programs

1) **Interracial Contact**: *Partnership Programming*
Adjoining (***A***) or voluntary (***V***) districts frequently use this model to bring their students together with students from a Racially Isolated District (***RI***). The intent is for students from the different districts to learn from and work with each other on academic or cultural enrichment projects. For example, in the Unity program, students from *A* district meet students from *RI* in a youth leadership program designed to develop leadership skills and their capacity to create inclusive communities. Other examples of partnership programming include summer language camps, Science Saturdays at the Science Museum of MN, an afterschool science program based in the *RI*, and a variety of culture camps. A second model has teachers creating afterschool and summer programs for students from adjoining districts. Teachers apply to receive funding to design and implement these programs; funds are used to market to families and transport students to the program site.

2) **Integrated Learning Environment***: School Climate*
Initiatives to address school climate include a variety of approaches: providing staff with training

designed to establish respectful, culturally responsive relationships with students and families; increasing interpreting and translation services to families district-wide; and, maintaining a physical environment which reflects the school/district's cultural and ethnic diversity. Efforts in the area of physical environment include curricular materials, school signage, and out-of-classroom interracial learning experiences.

Staff of Color Retention and Recruitment: A frequently occurring initiative implemented by districts to realize the goal of creating an integrated learning environment focuses on recruiting and retaining staff of color (SOC). SOC recruitment and retention efforts typically stem from recognition of the disparity between a percentage or total number of protected-class students relative to SOC. Specific efforts include implementation of inclusive, non-discriminatory recruitment strategies by district Human Resources staff and formal efforts to recruit current high school students from diverse backgrounds to join teacher preparatory clubs or school-based programs. Some of the student-based efforts in SOC Retention and Recruitment included collaborative efforts with local post secondary institutions.

Intra-District Integration: Efforts to decrease racial isolation within a district identified as *RIS* are required as part of that district's integration plan. Typical efforts occurring in school districts across Minnesota include attracting protected-class students to a racially isolated site through direct-marketing efforts, highlighting an unique academic program within the racially isolated site, establishing and maintaining strong family involvement, and developing the cultural competency of staff at the school site.

3) **Cultural Awareness**: This goal encompasses a broad array of initiatives. Examples found in several school districts include: *culture fairs* featuring a variety of art forms presented by culturally diverse artists or students; *theatre residencies* with an emphasis on literacy skills for students incorporating ethnic diversity via the production's content and staffing; *multicultural choir*, *culture workshops*, and *cultural lunch buddies*. The *cultural lunch buddies* pairs high school students from Spanish language classes with younger students to model leadership skills and emphasizes cross-cultural pairings.

4) **Parental Involvement/Family Success**: *Family Literacy*
Initiatives in this area are typically focused on families of color. The intent is to increase parental involvement with schools or the district as a whole via improved communication and increased support for maintaining these connections. In a Family Literacy program within ISD 492-Austin, which typifies such efforts, informational meetings are targeted at parents of protected classes (Sudanese and Hispanic) and are designed to increase parents' ability to support students' literacy development. Specifically, these meetings are intended to connect parents with academic enrichment programs, increase their understanding and awareness of college-prep focus/culture, and familiarize them with schools' focus on literacy. In the ISD 492-Austin program highlighted here, family involvement efforts are coordinated by School Success Coaches.

5) **Professional Development**: *Intercultural Developmental Inventory (IDI)*
Along with some form of interdistrict student partnerships, this is the most frequently occurring and

widely used form of professional development across the six integration goals listed here. It has been in use by some districts for six years. IDI is an assessment tool used to provide a measure of staff cultural competence and intercultural sensitivity. Assessment results are used to guide the planning and implementation of professional development activities and resources to ensure they address staff needs.

Staff development opportunities are typically offered to building principals, teaching staff, and building staff, though targeted recipients vary from district to district.

6) **Student Achievement**: *School Success Coaches*
In ISD 241-Albert Lea, School Success Coaches work with at-risk students, K-12, to increase school and community involvement, academic success, and graduation rates. An interdistrict network of coaches collaborates on best practices for assessing and addressing school and student needs. One means used for increasing students' community involvement is through a mentoring program (listed as a separate initiative) in which Success Coaches pair students with community members. These adults take on the role of mentor and support students' school and community involvement.

Interdistrict afterschool and summer activities (Mahtomedi 832, Lakeville)
ISD-832–Mahtomedi and ISD-194–Lakeville offer two examples of initiatives designed to both increase interracial contact and improve student achievement and takes a variety of forms. These district programs include using technology student-to-student interdistrict communication or using transportation to bring students together for shared programming.

Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) (Lakeville 194 and 833): AVID is a program also found in ISD 194-Lakeville and in ISD 833-South Washington County Schools. It is a college preparatory program targeting students in grades 4-12 who do not rank high academically but show the potential and desire to improve their academic standing. Participants are typically protected-class students, first-generation college attendees, and/or have lower-income status.

These approaches to addressing student academic achievement represent just two of many models designed to provide academic services and support to students with the intent that academic achievement is not predictable by a student's protected-class status.

Note: All initiatives supported with integration revenue must be linked to increased academic achievement in order to qualify for this funding. Integration revenue is intended for students to have increased and sustained interracial contacts and improved educational opportunities and outcomes designed to close the achievement gap between white students and protected-class students as defined in Minnesota Rule 3535.0110, Subp. 4.

Trends in District Strategies and Programs

The trends reported below reflect recurring and broad patterns of activity, organization, or implementation across district initiatives.

Combination initiatives: Either by design or in effect, integration plans often address two or more goals within a single initiative. For example, School Success Coaches referred to in the narrative above work to [1]address student achievement and to implement programs which support parental involvement. Examples of this kind are abundant: one staff development program is designed to both promote inclusive learning environments while increasing academic achievement of protected-class students. Another district expanded academic enrichment programs to intentionally include more protected-class students with the intent of addressing the need to increase the understanding of diversity issues within a community.

Efforts to reduce racial isolation within a school often involve efforts to raise cultural awareness among both teachers and students as well as to increase intercultural interactions between students. As such, these types of programs could also be considered as professional development, cultural awareness.

District Reporting: Districts use reporting methods which reflect the range of initiatives across districts. Reports to MDE consist of annual budget worksheets tied to the district's current year's integration plan goals. To date, it is not evident that districts have submitted evaluation or progress reports; hence, reports referred to here refer solely to districts' annual integration revenue budgets and integration plans. Districts use a variety of means to describe their integration programming. Descriptions range from a line item on a budget worksheet to several pages of documentation and description of district initiatives.

As described above, there is a wide range in the types of initiatives which address similar goals through a variety of methods. This diversity of programming and goals is likely a reflection of the needs of local communities and funding formula used to determine amount of integration revenue available to each district. This variety is not adequately captured in the budget form submitted annually to MDE or in the 3-4 year plans districts must submit (Minn. R. 3535.0170 Subp. 6 A and Subp.8 and Minn. Stat. §124D.86).

Staffing: As suggested by the range and variety of initiatives referred to above, there are multiple layers of staff involved in implementing an integration plan within a school district. At the management level, staff positions are created to coordinate the creation and implementation of a district's integration plan. Districts that are members of integration collaborative might also contribute to funding for staff to coordinate the collaborative plan (e.g., ISD 241-Albert Lea, ISD 833-South Washington County). Positions fully funded with integration revenue for a district receiving integration funding ranges from 0- 5 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

At the level of service delivery or instruction, each of the programs referred to above requires involvement of teaching staff. Sometimes the programs are part of a school day and are developed, delivered, and supported by teachers. Other programs require staff beyond the classroom teacher to coach, mentor, supervise, instruct students during or beyond the school day.

Success in Realizing Integration Plan Goals

By June 30 of the fiscal year subsequent to that in which they received Integration Revenue, districts are required to report to the Commissioner in writing regarding "the extent to which the integration plan goals in the plan were met" (Minn. Stat. 2004 §124D.86, Subd.1b.5).

In previous years, MDE did collect data regarding annual reports on school districts' progress toward meeting integration plan goals. Currently, MDE is working to create reporting systems to track and evaluate success in meeting the goals for use of integration revenue. The results of this reporting and tracking system will be included in future reports.

Estimated Funds Needed to Implement Plans

Eligibility to receive integration revenue is determined by protected-class student enrollment relative to neighboring districts' protected-class student enrollment. The maximum amount a district is eligible to receive is based on its funding rate as a **RI**, **A**, **V**, **RIS** and the number of protected-class students as a percentage of district's total student enrollment (Minn. Stat. §124D.86 Subd. 3).

Districts in any of the four categories listed above are eligible to receive integration revenue pending submission and review of an integration plan and approval of a corresponding Integration Revenue budget. The St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth districts are exceptions: These districts are not required to submit integration budgets for Minnesota Department of Education approval (Minn. Stat. §124D.86, Subd. 3. (5)).

The final amount of integration revenue given to each district is the lesser of the actual integration expenditures (as reported to MDE), the approved budget, or the integration revenue formula maximum calculated with actual, rather than estimated, pupil counts.

Integration Revenue Formula: The Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth districts receive a statute-defined rate. Voluntary districts are eligible for a minimum rate. The rest of the districts are eligible for one of two rates that are based on their percent of protected-class students. The integration revenue formulas are included in Minnesota Statute 124D.86 as follows:

> Subd. 3. Integration Revenue
>
> (1) for Independent School District No. 709, Duluth, $206 times the adjusted pupil units for the school year;
>
> (2) for Independent School District No. 625, St. Paul, $445 times the adjusted pupil units for the school year;
>
> (3) for Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis, the sum of $445 times the adjusted pupil units for the school year and an additional $35 times the adjusted pupil units for the school year that is provided entirely through a local levy;

(4) for a district not listed in clause (1), (2), or (3), that must implement a plan under Minnesota Rules, parts 3535.0100 to 3535.0180, where the district's enrollment of protected-class students, as defined under Minnesota Rules, part 3535.0110, exceeds 15 percent, the lesser of (i) the actual cost of implementing the plan during the fiscal year minus the aid received under subdivision 6, or (ii) $129 times the adjusted pupil units for the school year;

(5) for a district not listed in clause (1), (2), (3), or (4), that is required to implement a plan according to the requirements of Minnesota Rules, parts 3535.0100 to 3535.0180, the lesser of

(i) the actual cost of implementing the plan during the fiscal year minus the aid received under subdivision 6, or

(ii) $92 times the adjusted pupil units for the school year.

Any money received by districts in clauses (1) to (3) which exceeds the amount received in fiscal year 2000 shall be subject to the budget requirements in subdivision 1a; and

(6) for a member district of a multidistrict integration collaborative that files a plan with the commissioner, but is not contiguous to a racially isolated district, integration revenue equals the amount defined in clause (5).

Table 2 represents integration revenue budgets approved for a representative sampling of districts for FY 04-05 and FY 09-10.

A table showing integration revenue estimates for all 139 districts receiving integration funding for FY 10 appears in Appendix A.

FY 10 average of Integration Revenue estimates for all 139 districts = $615,529.

Table 2) Integration Revenue by Selected Districts, FY 10 and FY 05

Districts with the Most Integration Revenue 2010	**2010 Estimated Revenue**	**2010 Total Enrollment**	**Districts with the Most Integration Revenue 2005**	**2005 Estimated Revenue***	**2005 Total Enrollment***
St. Paul	$16,842,805	37,849	Minneapolis	$21,148,603	44,060
Minneapolis	$15,059,245	33,841	St. Paul	$20,999,608	47,190
Anoka-Hennepin	$5,086,599	39,431	Anoka-Hennepin	$ 4,305,370	47,173
Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan**	$3,515,637	27,253	Osseo	$3,187,903	24,712
Osseo	$2,662,302	20,638	Duluth	$2,537,691	12,319
Duluth	$1,983,162	9,627	**Rosemount-Apple Valley- Eagan	$11,964	N/A
Districts with the Least Integration Revenue			**Districts with the Least Integration Revenue**		
Butterfield	$30,186	234	Butterfield	$29,289	227
Brewster	$13,892	151	Brewster	$20,040	218
Ivanhoe	$13,892	151	***Ivanhoe	N/A	N/A
Comfrey	$13,524	147	Ellsworth	$19,098	208
Round Lake	$11,132	121	Comfrey	$15,860	172
Ellsworth	$9,936	108	Round Lake	$14,704	160

*****Source for 2005 data above is the Office of the Legislative Auditor Evaluation Report, *Integration Revenue*, 2005.
FY2005 this district qualified as **RIS and as **RI** in FY 2010.
***FY 2005 this district did not qualify to receive Integration Revenue based on any the four qualifying categories.

1a) **District Demographics**

This section identifies those districts which qualified for FY 10 integration revenue as Racially Isolated districts (i.e., those districts where the district wide enrollment or protected-class students exceeds the enrollment of protected-class students of any adjoining district by more than 20 percent).

Table 3 below reflects the percentage of protected-class students relative to total student enrollment of RI districts for FY 10. For a complete list of the 139 districts receiving integration revenue FY 10 with percentage of protected-class students relative to total student enrollment see Appendix B.

Table 3) Percentage of Protected-Class Students for Racially Isolated Districts FY 10
Districts in this table are sorted according to percentage of protected-class students relative to a district's total enrollment, highest to lowest.

District Number	Name	Percent Protected October 2009	K12 Enrollment
625	St. Paul	75%	37,324
1	Minneapolis	69%	33,555
13	Columbia Heights	66%	2,880
280	Richfield	65%	3,918
286	Brooklyn	65%	2,238
518	Worthington	58%	2,376
281	Robbinsdale	46%	11,766
279	Osseo	45%	20,510
840	St. James	43%	1,096
415	Lynd	41%	111
271	Bloomington	39%	10,113
347	Willmar	39%	4,113
197	West St. Paul-Mendota Heights-Eagan	38%	4,378
283	St. Louis Park	38%	4,335
191	Burnsville	37%	9,864
623	Roseville	37%	6,458
837	Madelia	37%	558
622	North St. Paul-Maplewood	36%	10,598
548	Pelican Rapids	35%	926
836	Butterfield	35%	235
270	Hopkins	34%	7,187
6	South St. Paul	32%	3,232
492	Austin	32%	4,378
720	Shakopee	31%	6,715
535	Rochester	30%	16,046
656	Faribault	28%	3,957
2190	Yellow Medicine East	28%	889
2310	Sibley East	27%	1,176
742	St. Cloud	26%	9,256
392	Le Center	24%	670
621	Mounds View	24%	9,887
196	Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan	23%	27,058
282	St. Anthony-New Brighton	22%	1,790
11	Anoka-Hennepin	21%	39,100
241	Albert Lea	21%	3,239
	Total Districts=36	Average 38%	Average 8,627

Note: Percent Protected includes all students enrolled in any school within the district. Average Student Enrollment across 139 districts eligible to receive Integration Revenue FY10=3,781.

1b) **District English Learners (EL)**

This summary table reflects the number of English Language (EL) students relative to total student enrollment for a sampling of districts in each of the qualifying categories for integration revenue FY 10.

EL refers to K-12 students with a home language other than English who have not developed proficiencies in English sufficient to participate fully in classes taught in English. The data on EL students included in the table below represents those students who were identified by districts as needing EL services in October 2009.

For a complete list of the 139 districts receiving Integration Revenue FY 10 with number of identified English Language students see Appendix B.

Table 4) English Learners

District Number	District Name	English Language	Student Enrollment	Funding Category*	Percent Protected Student
625	St. Paul	13,641	37,324	RI & RS	75.32%
1	Minneapolis	7,442	33,555	RI &RS	69.14%
280	Richfield	1,219	3,918	RI	64.83%
13	Columbia Heights	810	2,880	RI	65.50%
286	Brooklyn Center	374	2,238	RI	65.38%
518	Worthington	308	2376	RI	58.42%
728	Elk River	342	12,459	A	8.57%
194	Lakeville	298	11,126	A	12.09%
413	Marshall	199	2,136	A	19.06%
834	Stillwater	73	8,371	A	9.18%
516	Round Lake	10	111	A	9.01%
23	Frazee-Vergas	6	896	A	12.92%
272	Eden Prairie	471	9,689	V	N/A
16	Spring Lake Park	460	4,729	V	N/A
177	Windom	60	909	V	N/A
22	Detroit Lakes	4	2,730	V	N/A
2754	Cedar Mountain	0	455	V	N/A
402	Hendricks	0	143	V	N/A

* **RI**=*racially isolated district*, **A**=*adjoining district*, **V**=*voluntary district*, **RIS**=*racially identifiable school*

1c) **Homeless or Highly Mobile Students**

Data from Wilder Research state-wide homeless 2009 survey shows the number of homeless children with their parents make up about one-third of Minnesota's total homeless population. This is an increase of 6.18 percent over three years (between 2006-2009) with the average age of a homeless child is 6.5 years old (Wilder Research, 2009 Minnesota Homeless Study fact sheet, 7/2009).

Protected-class students/families are significantly over-represented in the homeless population. For example, 48 percent of homeless parents identified as African American compared to 5 percent of all Minnesota parents identifying as African American (Wilder Research, 2009 Minnesota Homeless Study fact sheet, 7/2009).

The most frequently occurring barriers to housing given by parents surveyed by Wilder Research were:

- Lack of job (68%)
- Lack of affordable housing (45%)
- Credit problems (30%)
- Bad rental history (22%)

Sixty-five percent of parents surveyed reported being on a waiting list for a housing voucher, and 16 percent reported waiting lists they tried to access were closed. (Wilder Research, 2009 Minnesota Homeless Study fact sheet, 7/2009).

2) Immigration and Housing Patterns

In 2008, 6.5 percent of Minnesota's total population was foreign-born compared to approximately 13 percent of the entire nation's population status as foreign-born (all findings in this section come from the following source: Wilder Research, *A New Age of Immigrants*, summary of key findings, August 2010).

This 2008 data continues a trend of increases in Minnesota's foreign born population but indicates that the rate of increase has declined for the time periods documented. These increases are represented in Table 5 below.

A majority of Minnesota's foreign-born residents are working-age adults between the ages of 18 and 65 with children between ages 5-17 making up approximately 10 percent of the Minnesota foreign-born population. However, the impact of the growing presence of immigrant families in Minnesota can be seen within Minnesota schools. In 2009, EL students comprised over 40 percent of total student enrollment in the St. Paul Public School district. In the nine districts with EL population over 30 percent of a district's total, five districts were in southern Minnesota, three were in the metro area, and one was in Western Minnesota.

Table 5) Total Immigrant Population Percent Increase

Year	% Minnesota's Total Population	% Nationwide
1990	130%	57%
2000-2007	33%	22%

Note: This Wilder Research study shows that the highest concentrations of foreign-born in rural Minnesota are found in the southern and western regions of the state, where Latinos, East Africans, and Southeast Asians are working in meat-packing, poultry-processing and other large-scale agricultural operations.

Housing

Findings from a 2009 draft report by the University of Minnesota's Institute on Race and Poverty (IRP) provide the basis for this section on demographic changes. The IRP report suggests that segregation tends to remain constant where it exists in Twin Cities Area neighborhoods, while integrated neighborhoods are often merely in transition to becoming more segregated. The report points out that "stably integrated school systems can affect these trends dramatically" by decreasing the likelihood of resegregation (A Comprehensive Strategy to Integrate Twin Cities Schools and Neighborhoods, 2009, p. 11). This relationship between integrated schools and neighborhoods seems to be inversely related to a strong trend towards resegregation: an increase in the non-white population predicts a greater likelihood of segregation, but not to the same extent if integrated schools are available to those residents.

While the report cited here does not extend its findings to communities outside of the Twin Cities area, its findings establish a positive correlation between integrated schools which were the result of regional desegregation policies and housing patterns: In communities with an increasingly high percentage of people of color, numbers of white households in those neighborhoods tended to remain relatively stable if integrated schools were available for their children (p. 12).

This study looked at housing shifts and regional integration policies (as opposed to smaller-scaled geographic plans or policies) that occurred or were in place between 1980 and 2000. A key finding relates to the scope of school desegregation plans: For plans and policies that address smaller geographic regions (e.g., a single city as opposed to an entire county), the corresponding "real estate practices and preferences remain school-identified and race-based" (p. 14).

Key Findings

- Fifty-six percent of Twin Cities' neighborhoods that were integrated in 1980 became segregated by 2000.
- Eighty-three percent of the neighborhoods that were segregated in 1980 in the region were still segregated two decades later.
- The higher the share of non-white residents in a neighborhood, the greater is the likelihood that the neighborhood will eventually become segregated.

3) Availability of and Districts' Participation in Interdistrict Integration Opportunities

Minnesota Rule 3535.0170, Subp. 2-6 details the formation and purpose of interdistrict collaboratives, the primary means available to districts for creating interdistrict integration initiatives. Racially isolated districts and their adjoining districts are required to establish a Multidistrict Collaboration Council. This collaborative is responsible for developing a plan and identifying ways to offer cross-district opportunities to improve integration. Representation on this council is intended to "reasonably represent" the diversity of the participating districts. Participating districts that are members of joint powers boards that have advisory councils may use those joint powers boards and advisory councils in lieu of creating a new council.

This council develops an interdistrict integration plan and establishes goals for increasing interracial contact through cross-district opportunities. The plan goes before member districts' school boards for modification and approval. Each member district (other than Duluth, Minneapolis, St. Paul) submits a plan to MDE which reflects the established multi-district goals and district-specific programs with a budget specific to its own district. MDE reviews the respective plans and approves the budgets.

As of FY10, there were 23 Multi-District Collaboratives recognized by MDE. Some collaborative were governed under a joint powers agreement; others operate without any formal governance structure in place. Those with joint powers boards are officially recognized as an Integration District; these integration districts receive their Integration Revenue directly from their member districts rather than MDE.

List 1) FY 2010 Interdistrict Collaboratives (23 total)
RI=*racially isolated district*, **A**=*adjoining district*, **V**=*voluntary district*, **RIS**=*racially identifiable school*.

AUSTIN – RI
Albert Lea – RI
Glenville-Emmons – A
Hayfield – A
Lyle – A
Southland – A

BLOOMINGTON – RI
Richfield – A

BUTTERFIELD – RI
Comfrey – A
Martin County West – A

COTTONWOOD RIVER
Cedar Mountain – A
GFW – V
New Ulm – A
Sleepy Eye – RI
Springfield – A
St. James – RI

DULUTH – RI

EAST METRO
Forest Lake – V
Inver Grove Hts. – V
Roseville – A
South St. Paul – RI
Southern Washington County – A
Spring Lake Park – V
Stillwater – A
West St. Paul – A
White Bear Lake –V

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY ALLIANCE
Mahtomedi – A
North St. Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale – RI

LYND – RI
Hendricks – V
Marshall – A
RTR – A

FARIBAULT
Waterville-Elysian-Morristown – A

LAKEVILLE – RI
Burnsville-Eagan-Savage – RI
LeCenter – RI

LONG PRAIRIE – GREY EAGLE – RI
Browerville – A
Eagle Valley – A
Melrose – A
Osakis – A
Swanville – A

MADELLA – RI
Lake Crystal – A
Maple River – A
Truman – A

MINNEAPOLIS – RI

MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY – RI
Jordan – A
Shakopee – A
Prior Lake – A

NICOLLET – RI
Belle Plaine – A
Sibley East – A

NOBLES COUNTY
Adrian – A
Brewster – A
Ellsworth – A
Fulda – A
Round Lake – A
Worthington - RI

NORTHWEST
Anoka-Hennepin – A
Buffalo-Hanover-Montrose – A
Elk River – A
Fridley – A
Mounds View – RI
Osseo – RI
Rockford – V

RED ROCK RIDGE – RI
Jackson County – A
Mountain Lake – A
Windom – V

ROCHESTER – RI
Byron – A
Chatfield – A
Dover-Eyota – A
Lake City – A
Pine Island – A
Plainville-Elgin-Millville – A
Stewartville – A
Zumbrota-Mazeppa – A

ROSEMOUNT – RI

ST. CLOUD – RI
Albany – A
Annandale – A
Becker – A
Foley – A
Holdingford – A
Kimball – A
Sartell-St. Stephen – A
Sauk Rapids-Rice – V

ST. PAUL – RI

SOUTHWEST
Milroy – A
Murray County – A
Red Rock Central – A
Tracy – V
Wabasso – A
Westbrook – RI

WEST CENTRAL
ACGC – A
BOLD – V
Kerkhoven-Murdock – A
MACCRAY – A
Montevideo – V
New London Spicer – A
Renville Co. West – V
Willmar – RI

WEST METRO
Brooklyn Center – V
Columbia Heights – V
Eden Prairie – V
Edina – A
Hopkins – A
Minnetonka – A
Robbinsdale – RI
St. Anthony-New Brighton – A
St. Louis Park – A
Wayzata – V

WEST CENRAL MULTI-DISTRICT
Barnesville – A
Battle Lake – V
Detroit Lakes –V
Fergus Falls – A
Frazee-Vergas – V
Hawley – A
Lake Park- Audubon – A
Pelican Rapids – RI
Perham – A
Rothsay – A
Underwood – A

YELLOW MEDICINE – RI
Canby – A
Dawson-Boyd
Ivanhoe – V
Lakeview – A
Minneota – A

Recommendations

Clarification of Intent: In order to create usable metrics, the intent of the integration rule should be clarified beyond "increased and sustained interracial contacts and improved educational opportunities and outcomes designed to close the academic achievement gap between white students and protected students" (Minn. Stat. §124D.86 Sub.1).

Given the current intent of state laws and rules governing integration revenue, MDE recommends that outcomes linked to integration plans be focused specifically on achieving physically integrated school sites and districts. Further, within those sites and districts, programs and initiatives should be implemented in order to increase and maintain academic achievement with the intent that achievement is not predictable or disproportionate by protected-class.

Determination of Success: Minnesota Statute 124D.86 Subd. 1b requires that districts shall "establish valid and reliable longitudinal measures for the district to use in demonstrating to the commissioner the amount of progress it has achieved in realizing the goals in its plan. By June 30 of the subsequent fiscal year, each district shall report to the commissioner in writing about the extent to which the integration goals identified in the plan were met."

There is currently no system in place within MDE for measuring districts' success in realizing the specific goals contained within their respective integration plans. It is recommended that MDE staff create and implement an assessment system based on measurable valid metrics which can be effectively applied to district integration plans. The means of assessment must be both valid and reliable and accommodate the variety of needs and circumstances across districts. It should also be flexible enough to allow for the creation and implementation of creative, unconventional approaches to integration.

Compliance: MDE has not received nor actively collected data which would allow staff to systematically determine districts' success in achieving their respective integration plan goals and to determine the impact of their integration plan programs and initiatives.

In order to ensure compliance among the 138 districts for this mandate, MDE requires appropriate levels of staff. Appropriate integration program staffing requirements should be determined by looking at education programs currently receiving oversight from the commissioner and tied to a comparable amount of revenue.

Determination of Revenue: This report recommends that Integration Revenue be targeted specifically at districts with a significant number of protected-class students relative to the district's total enrollment. Currently this determination is made by comparing the percentage of a district's protected-class students relative to the percentage of protected-class students enrolled in neighboring districts.

A region-wide definition of racial integration needs to be established. This definition should be based on documented demographic trends and data and should be directly informed by relevant academic research. This definition of what it means to be "racially integrated" would determine eligibility for

integration revenue. Continuation of revenue would be based specifically on a district's ability to successfully meet the two specified integration goals.

Specifically, district programs and initiatives which are documented to be making progress toward measureable integration of school sites and academic achievement not predictable by protected-class status should be supported with integration revenue.

The Commissioner of Education supports a recommendation from the Minnesota School Integration Council to "maintain a categorical funding source . . . to support integration efforts that meet the identified outcomes" (Final Report, January 2011).

This report also recommends that the current method of determining integration revenue eligibility be reevaluated based on the previous recommendation that integration revenue be made available to those districts or schools with a significant number of protected-class students relative to the district's or school's total enrollment.

For specific recommendations on restructuring rates of Integration Revenue, see the report *Segregation in the Twin Cities: Reforming the Integration Revenue Program* (Institute on Race and Poverty, University of Minnesota Law School, 2009) and the Minnesota School Integration Council's Final Report 2011.

Uniformity of Reporting: The range in the types of initiatives addressing similar and multiple goals through a variety of methods reflects a richness typical of quality educational programming. Without standard forms or methods for reporting on programs which are supported by integration revenue, however, there are challenges to tracking success and change across the 138 districts. This lack of uniformity creates layers of complexity for reporting, tracking, and evaluation of integration revenue-supported efforts.

Target Revenue: MDE recommends that integration efforts remain focused on those districts or schools with a significant number of protected-class students relative to the district's or school's total enrollment.

American Indian Students: In the current Minnesota rules and laws governing integration, American Indian students are not reflected in the determination of need for integration revenue. This report recommends exploring the inclusion of American Indian students in student count data used to determine eligibility for integration revenue.

Conclusion

As shown by Table 1 of this report, the number of protected students in Racially Isolated districts has increased steadily since 2003. The findings in this report are similar to those of the Office of the Legislative Auditor for 2001- 2005 (OLA, Evaluation Report: School District Integration Revenue, 2005, p. 14). In response to these findings and the data presented in the body of this report, the commissioner recommends changes to the Integration Revenue program based on those included in this report.

Appendix A Fiscal Year 10 Estimated Integration Revenue by District

District Number	District Name	Student Count	Integration Revenue
2310	Sibley East	1,213	$156,477.00
2365	G.F.W.	745	$68,540.00
2396	A.C.G.C.	787	$72,404.00
2448	Martin County West	789	$72,588.00
2534	B.O.L.D.	794	$73,048.00
2753	Long Prairie-Grey Eagle	1,119	$144,351.00
2754	Cedar Mountain	421	$46,000.00
2759	Eagle Valley	327	$30,084.00
2805	Zumbrota-Mazeppa	1,068	$ 98,256.00
2884	Red Rock Central	466	$ 42,872.00
2886	Glenville-Emmons	342	$31,464.00
2889	Lake Park Audubon	612	$56,304.00
2890	Renville County West	577	$74,433.00
2895	Jackson County Central	1,128	$103,776.00
2898	Westbrook-Walnut Grove	548	$70,692.00
2899	Plainview-Elgin-Millville	1,572	$144,624.00
2902	RTR Public Schools	553	$50,876.00
1	Minneapolis Public	33,841	$15,059,245.00

District Number	District Name	Student Count	Integration Revenue
6	South St. Paul	3,274	$ 422,346.00
11	Anoka-Hennepin	39,431	$5,086,599.00
13	Columbia Heights	2,831	$365,199.00
14	Fridley	2,664	$343,656.00
16	Spring Lake Park	4,564	$419,888.00
22	Detroit Lakes	2,697	$248,124.00
23	Frazee-Vergas	934	$85,928.00
47	Sauk Rapids-Rice	3,691	$339,572.00
51	Foley	1,661	$152,812.00
81	Comfrey	147	$13,524.00
84	Sleepy Eye	611	$78,819.00
85	Springfield	588	$54,096.00
88	New Ulm	2,012	$185,104.00
129	Montevideo	1,360	$159,528.00
146	Barnesville	777	$71,484.00
150	Hawley	862	$79,304.00
173	Mountain Lake	472	$60,888.00
177	Windom	886	$100,860
191	Burnsville	9,773	$1,260,717.00
194	Lakeville	11,177	$1,028,284.00
196	Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan	27253	$3,515,637.00
197	West St. Paul-Mendota Heights-Eagan	4,368	$563,472.00
199	Inver Grove Heights	3,691	$ 339,572.00
203	Hayfield	816	$75,072.00

District Number	District Name	Student Count	Integration Revenue
213	Osakis	765	$70,380.00
227	Chatfield	882	$81,144.00
241	Albert Lea	3,201	$412,929.00
255	Pine Island	1,234	$113,528.00
270	Hopkins	7,197	$928,413.00
271	Bloomington	10,237	$1,320,573.00
272	Eden Prairie	9,702	$892,584.00
273	Edina	7,871	$1,015,359.00
276	Minnetonka	8,142	$749,064.00
279	Osseo	20,638	$2,662,302.00
280	Richfield	4,010	$517,290.00
281	Robbinsdale	12,349	$1,593,021.00
282	St. Anthony-New Brighton	1,702	$219,558.00
283	St. Louis Park	4,174	$538,446.00
284	Wayzata	10,100	$1,302,900.00
286	Brooklyn Center	2,001	$258,129.00
345	New London-Spicer	1,506	$138,552.00
347	Willmar	4,106	$529,674.00
378	Dawson-Boyd	522	$48,024.00
391	Cleveland	406	$37,352.00
392	Lecenter	670	$86,430.00
394	Montgomery-Lonsdale	1,066	$98,072.00
402	Hendricks	166	$16,000
403	Ivanhoe	151	$13,892.00

District Number	District Name	Student Count	Integration Revenue
413	Marshall	2,170	$279,930.00
414	Minneota	447	$41,124.00
415	Lynd	126	$16,254.00
458	Truman	308	$28,336.00
486	Swanville	343	$31,556.00
487	Upsala	400	36,800.00
492	Austin	4,257	549,153.00
497	Lyle	233	$21,436.00
500	Southland	562	$51,704.00
505	Fulda	370	$34,040.00
507	Nicollet	308	$28,336.00
511	Adrian	617	$56,764.00
513	Brewster	151	$13,892.00
514	Ellsworth	108	$9,936.00
516	Round Lake	121	$11,132.00
518	Worthington	2271	$292,959.00
531	Byron	1,671	$153,732.00
533	Dover-Eyota	1,130	$103,960.00
534	Stewartville	1,727	$158,884.00
535	Rochester	16,004	$2,064,516.00
542	Battle Lake	502	$54,096.00
544	Fergus Falls	2,569	$236,348.00
548	Pelican Rapids	950	$122,550.00
549	Perham	1,452	$133,584.00

District Number	District Name	Student Count	Integration Revenue
550	Underwood	542	$49,864.00
621	Mounds View	9,909	$1,278,261.00
622	North St Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale	10,722	$1,383,138.00
623	Roseville	6,439	$830,631.00
624	White Bear Lake	8,101	$1,045,029.00
625	St. Paul	37,849	$16,842,805.00
635	Milroy	35	$3,220.00
640	Wabasso	398	$36,616.00
656	Faribault	3,994	$515,226.00
709	Duluth	9,627	$1,983,162.00
716	Belle Plaine	1,514	$139,288.00
717	Jordan	1,640	$150,880.00
719	Prior Lake-Savage	6,868	$631,856.00
720	Shakopee	6,423	$828,567.00
721	New Prague	3,537	$325,404.00
726	Becker	2,815	$258,980.00
728	Elk River	11,853	$1,090,476.00
738	Holdingford	1,020	$93,840.00
739	Kimball	731	$67,252.00
740	Melrose	1,358	$143,060.00
742	St. Cloud	9,220	$1,189,380.00
743	Sauk Centre	1,035	$95,220.00
745	Albany	1,550	$142,600.00
748	Sartell-St. Stephen	3,316	$305,072.00

District Number	District Name	Student Count	Integration Revenue
756	Blooming Prairie	695	$63,940.00
775	Kerkhoven-Murdock-Sunburg	539	$49,588.00
787	Browerville	495	$45,540.00
813	Lake City	1,311	$120,612.00
831	Forest Lake	7,053	$648,876.00
832	Mahtomedi	3,194	$293,848.00
833	South Washington County	16,396	$ 2,115,084.00
834	Stillwater	8,336	$766,912.00
836	Butterfield	234	$30,186.00
837	Madelia	553	$71,337.00
840	St. James	1,131	$145,899.00
850	Rothsay	203	$18,676.00
876	Annandale	1,695	$155,940.00
877	Buffalo	5,796	$533,232.00
883	Rockford	1,533	$141,036.00
891	Canby	522	$48,024.00
2071	Lake Crystal-Wellcome Memorial	772	$71,024.00
2135	Maple River	1,131	$104,052.00
2143	Waterville-Elysian-Morristown	887	$81,604.00
2167	Lakeview	572	$52,624.00
2168	N.R.H.E.G. District	968	$89,056.00
2169	Murray County Central	739	$67,988.00
2180	M.A.C.C.R.A.Y.	697	$64,124.00
2190	Yellow Medicine East	875	$112,875.00

Total Number of Districts=139.
Average amount of FY10 estimated integration revenue available to districts=$615,529.43

Appendix B

Demographics: Protected-Class Students and Limited English Proficiency Students in District Receiving Integration Revenue Fiscal Year 10

Districts are listed according to percentage of protected-class students. Isolated districts are those with a percentage of protected-class students greater than 20 percent. Voluntary districts as identified as such: no data on percentage of protected-class students in these districts was available at the time this report was prepared. All districts not identified as Volunteer or Isolated qualify for Integration Revenue as Adjoining Districts.

English Learners (EL) refers to K-12 students with a home language other than English who have not developed proficiencies in English sufficient to participate fully in classes taught in English. The data on EL students included in the table below represents the number of students who were identified by districts as needing EL services in October 2009.

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
625	St. Paul	75.32%	37,324	13,641
1	Minneapolis	69.14%	33,555	7,442
13	Columbia Heights	65.50%	2,880	810
286	Brooklyn Center	65.38%	2,238	374
280	Richfield	64.83%	3,918	1,219
518	Worthington	58.42%	2,376	308
281	Robbinsdale	46.30%	11,766	1,346
279	Osseo	45.03%	20,510	1,960
840	St. James	43.28%	1,096	150
14	Fridley	42.77%	2,811	375
415	Lynd	41.23%	111	36
271	Bloomington	39.36%	10,113	1,088

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
347	Willmar	39.29%	4,113	676
283	St. Louis Park	38.03%	4,335	375
197	West St. Paul-Mendota Heights-Eagan	37.59%	4,378	424
837	Madelia	37.32%	558	68
191	Burnsville	37.30%	9,864	1,552
623	Roseville	37.03%	6,458	839
622	North St Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale	36.35%	10,598	655
836	Butterfield	35.44%	235	28
548	Pelican Rapids	35.06%	926	119
2898	Westbrook-Walnut Grove Schools	34.58%	497	117
270	Hopkins	33.54%	7,187	455
84	Sleepy Eye	32.55%	634	49
6	South St. Paul	31.87%	3,232	250
173	Mountain Lake	31.79%	467	68
2753	Long Prairie-Grey Eagle	31.56%	1,043	215
492	Austin	31.50%	4,378	571
720	Shakopee	31.08%	6,715	928
535	Rochester	29.51%	16,046	2,058
2890	Renville County West	29.35%	552	75

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
656	Faribault	28.41%	3,957	608
2190	Yellow Medicine East	27.84%	889	62
2310	Sibley East	27.17%	1,176	189
742	St. Cloud	25.69%	9,256	938
621	Mounds View	24.43%	9,887	487
392	Lecenter	24.34%	670	59
196	Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan	23.37%	27,058	1323
833	South Washington County	23.00%	16,488	637
284	Wayzata	22.08%	10,279	230
282	St. Anthony-New Brighton	22.03%	1,790	86
11	Anoka-Hennepin	21.16%	39,100	2589
241	Albert Lea	21.12%	3,239	220
413	Marshall	19.06%	2,136	199
709	Duluth	17.40%	9,293	32
624	White Bear Lake	16.67%	8,089	352
273	Edina	15.44%	7,988	251
23	Frazee-Vergas	12.92%	896	6
719	Prior Lake-Savage	12.23%	7,002	197

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
194	Lakeville	12.09%	11,126	298
756	Blooming Prairie	10.46%	709	19
276	Minnetonka	10.28%	8,409	143
883	Rockford	9.52%	1,528	47
775	Kerkhoven-Murdock-Sunburg	9.51%	545	14
834	Stillwater	9.18%	8,371	73
516	Round Lake	9.01%	111	10
635	Milroy	8.82%	33	
458	Truman	8.74%	309	10
717	Jordan	8.67%	1,688	57
544	Fergus Falls	8.58%	2,564	9
728	Elk River	8.57%	12,459	342
414	Minneota	8.53%	453	23
394	Montgomery-Lonsdale	8.37%	1,104	59
513	Brewster	8.33%	156	1
832	Mahtomedi	8.13%	3,214	35
2899	Plainview-Elgin-Millville	7.85%	1,524	49
2180	M.A.C.C.R.A.Y.	7.66%	726	4
505	Fulda	7.61%	376	

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
877	Buffalo	7.45%	5,766	129
511	Adrian	7.20%	580	3
2895	Jackson County Central	6.86%	1,131	12
743	Sauk Centre	6.80%	997	26
549	Perham	6.58%	1,437	30
2167	Lakeview	6.43%	567	18
2396	A.C.G.C.	6.41%	813	5
497	Lyle	6.38%	234	
716	Belle Plaine	6.15%	1,522	24
203	Hayfield	6.13%	788	16
85	Springfield	6.01%	578	4
2805	Zumbrota-Mazeppa	5.99%	1,055	4
2169	Murray County Central	5.93%	742	29
813	Lake City	5.90%	1,281	24
2902	RTR Public Schools	5.89%	544	6
2884	Red Rock Central	5.73%	457	
2143	Waterville-Elysian-Morristown	5.70%	868	22
2886	Glenville-Emmons	5.52%	326	
507	Nicollet	5.28%	340	

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
2889	Lake Park Audubon	5.09%	607	2
2135	Maple River	5.06%	1,108	13
255	Pine Island	4.96%	1,218	
534	Stewartville	4.96%	1,757	3
345	New London-Spicer	4.85%	1,466	7
88	New Ulm	4.74%	1,990	24
378	Dawson-Boyd	4.65%	501	4
500	Southland	4.52%	562	10
514	Ellsworth	4.49%	177	
2071	Lake Crystal-Wellcome Memorial	4.48%	754	
745	Albany	4.31%	1,598	19
891	Canby	4.31%	522	1
531	Byron	4.27%	1,712	
391	Cleveland	4.20%	401	
2759	Eagle Valley	3.85%	309	
876	Annandale	3.80%	1,698	16
81	Comfrey	3.75%	155	
748	Sartell-St. Stephen	3.70%	3,436	29
726	Becker	3.59%	2,739	44

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
640	Wabasso	3.49%	424	1
721	New Prague Area Schools	3.42%	3,665	37
213	Osakis	3.36%	790	
739	Kimball	3.03%	720	
533	Dover-Eyota	3.01%	1,119	
850	Rothsay	3.00%	200	
227	Chatfield	2.98%	866	3
550	Underwood	2.56%	544	
486	Swanville	2.41%	363	
487	Upsala	2.36%	419	
2448	Martin County West	2.11%	758	
150	Hawley	2.11%	899	52
787	Browerville	1.63%	490	
51	Foley	1.55%	1,715	
738	Holdingford	1.17%	1,017	
2168	N.R.H.E.G. District	0.85%	923	
146	Barnesville	0.62%	804	
2365	G.F.W.	Volunteer	825	40
2534	B.O.L.D.	Volunteer	757	56
2754	Cedar Mountain	Volunteer	455	

District Number	District Name	Percent Protected-Class Students	K12 Enrollment	EL
16	Spring Lake Park	Volunteer	4,729	460
22	Detroit Lakes	Volunteer	2,730	4
47	Sauk Rapids-Rice	Volunteer	3,679	21
129	Montevideo	Volunteer	1,351	52
177	Windom	Volunteer	909	60
199	Inver Grove Heights	Volunteer	3,752	227
272	Eden Prairie	Volunteer	9,689	471
402	Hendricks	Volunteer	143	
403	Ivanhoe	Volunteer	150	1
542	Battle Lake	Volunteer	507	1
740	Melrose	Volunteer	1,351	201
831	Forest Lake	Volunteer	6,797	87

Appendix C Minnesota Integration Revenue Budget Rubric, Form B

This rubric is used by MDE to review integration revenue budgets submitted by districts. The same rubric is used to review and comment upon each of the goals listed on a district's Integration Plan, with a separate sheets used to record comments for each respective goal.

Goal I **(Intra-/Inter District):**	***Cross-district integration strategies***			
	A	***B***	***C***	***D***
	No Evidence *Lacks compelling information that this is an effective integration strategy with the isolated school site.*	**Supplant** *Worthy programming but should be paid for by general education funds or another approved fund in the district.*	**Need additional Information** *Worthy programming but not cost-effective as integration strategy with isolated site, considering the scope and impact of activities.*	**Sufficient Evidence** *Satisfies requirement that spending work toward decreased racial isolation site and satisfy academic value.*
ACADEMIC PROGRAMS				
1. General Education				
2. English Language Learners				
3. Special Education				
STUDENT ACTIVITIES				
1. Classroom partnership				
2. Afterschool Programs				
3. Summer Activities				
TRANSPORTATION				
1. Magnet schools				
2. Field trips				
3. Extra-curricular activities				
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT				
1. Conference/workshop				
2. Training				
3. Lectures				
OPERATIONS				
1. Salaries				
2. Marketing				
3. Supplies/Technology				
COMMUNITY COLLABORATION				
1. Planning			.	
2. Diversity				
3. Integration effort				