INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 659
REGULAR SCHOOL BOARD MEETING
Monday, June 9, 2014, 7:00 PM
Northfield High School, Media Center

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Agenda Changes / Table File

III. Public Comment
This is an opportunity for members of the school district to address the Board. You are requested to do so from the podium. After being recognized by the chair, each individual will identify himself/herself and the group represented, if any. He/She will then state the reason for addressing the Board. To insure that all individuals have a chance to speak, speakers will be limited to one three-minute presentation. Please know that this is not a time to debate an issue, but for you to make your comments.

IV. Approval of Minutes

V. Announcements and Recognitions

VI. Items for Discussion and /or Reports.
1. Professional Learning Communities Presentation.
2. Demographic and Housing Unit Study.

VII. Superintendent's Report
A. Items for Individual Action
   1. 2014-2015 Proposed Budget – All Funds.
   2. FY 2014 Audit Engagement Letter.
   3. Resolution Establishing Dates for Filing Affidavits of Candidacy.

B. Items for Consent Grouping
   1. Family/Student/Co-Curricular Handbooks for 2014-2015.
   2. Student Citizenship Handbook.
   3. School Board Policy 807 – Health and Safety.
   4. Personnel Items.

VIII. Items for Information
1. Revised School Board Policy 514 – Bullying Prohibition.
2. Discontinue AdvancED (formerly North Central Association) Membership and Accreditation.

IX. Future Meetings
Monday, July 14, 2014, 7:00 PM, Regular School Board Meeting, Northfield High School Media Center
Monday, August 11, 2014, 7:00 PM, Regular School Board Meeting, Northfield High School Media Center

X. Adjournment

Closed Negotiation Strategy Session
to follow Regular School Board Meeting
District Office Conference Room

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEMORANDUM
Monday, June 9, 2014, 7:00 PM
Northfield High School Media Center

TO: **Members of the Board of Education**
FROM: **L. Chris Richardson, Ph. D., Superintendent**
RE: **Explanation of Agenda Items for the June 9, 2014, School Board Meeting**

I. Call to Order

II. Agenda Changes / Table File

III. Public Comment

IV. Approval of Minutes
Minutes of Regular School Board meeting held on May 27, 2014, are enclosed for your review and comment.

V. Announcements and Recognitions

VI. Items for Discussion and / or Reports

1. Professional Learning Communities Presentation.
Director of Teaching and Learning Mary Hanson will present facts about Professional Learning Communities followed by RtI Coaches Rebecca Gainey and Diane Torbenson, who will present on the joint PLCs held this year that involved the teachers at all three elementary schools. Middle School teacher Rose Turnacliff and High School teacher Ellen Mucha will present the work completed by the English Language Arts PLCs.

At the July 14th School Board meeting, elementary Art teacher Kate Woodstrup will present the work of the elementary Art PLC.

2. Demographic and Housing Unit Study.
Hazel Reinhardt will present the results of comprehensive enrollment projections and housing unit projections studies that was conducted at request of the school district. Information from the complete report and the PowerPoint presentation will provide both summary data as well as detailed analysis of various projection models. The results of these studies will inform the Board about district and school enrollment trends over the next five to ten years. The data from these studies will also be used to aid in the completion of the District Facilities Study that will be shared with the Board in the near future.

VII. Superintendent's Report

A. Items for Individual Action

1. Proposed 2014-2015 Budget – All Funds.
In the packet is the annual proposed budget book for 2014-15. The individual funds have been presented and reviewed in detail at school board meetings over the past few months. A summary of revenue and expenditure amounts are listed below.

Fund	Revenues	Expenditures
General (including Oper. Cap/H & S)	$43,828,390	$44,212,695
Child Nutrition	1,794,200	1,884,631
Community Services	1,997,058	1,976,395
Debt Service	5,661,437	5,330,129
Trust	59,755	68,180
Internal Service	6,074,035	5,827,239
Total	$59,414,875	$59,299,269

Superintendent's Recommendation: Motion to approve the proposed 2014-15 budgets as presented for all funds.

2. FY 2014 Audit Engagement Letter.
Director of Finance Val Mertesdorf recommends approval of the CliftonLarsonAllen, LLP Audit Engagement Letter for the audit of the 2013-14 school year. The engagement letter establishes the parameters and fees associated with the annual audit required by statute.

Superintendents Recommendation: Motion to accept the 2013-14 Engagement Letter from CliftonLarsonAllen, LLP.

3. Resolution Establishing Dates for Filing Affidavits of Candidacy.
As the first step in the process leading to the School Board election to be held on Tuesday, November 4, 2014, the Board is requested to adopt the attached Resolution Establishing Dates for Filing Affidavits of Candidacy. Upon adoption of this Resolution, the Notice of Filing Dates will be posted and advertised in the Northfield News, according to the deadlines indicated on the election calendar published by the Minnesota Secretary of State's Office. Affidavits of Candidacy for the three School Board vacancies may be filed at the District Office, 1400 Division Street South, beginning Tuesday, July 29, 2014, and ending Tuesday, August 12, 2014. An election will be held to fill three vacancies with four-year terms. The terms of John Fossum, Kari Nelson and Julie Pritchard expire on December 31, 2014.

Superintendent's Recommendation: Motion to approve the resolution establishing dates for filing affidavits of candidacy as presented.

B. Items for Consent Grouping
Superintendent's Recommendation: Motion to approve the following items listed under the Consent Grouping.

1. Family / Student / Co-Curricular Handbooks for 2014-2015.
The Elementary School Family Handbook, the Student Handbooks for the High School, Area Learning Center and the Middle School, and the Co-Curricular Activities Handbook for the 2014-2015 school year are ready for School Board consideration.
Once the School Board approves these handbooks, they carry the force of School Board policy. Enclosed are summaries of the recommended changes. A copy of the current family and student handbooks are available on the District's website. Go to http://nfld.k12.mn.us/about/handbooks/

2. Student Citizenship Handbook.
Enclosed are the changes that administration is recommending to the 2014-2015 Student Citizenship Handbook. A copy of the current Student Citizenship Handbook is available on the District's website. The distribution method of the Student Citizenship Handbook for 2014-2015 will remain the same as previous years. The youngest elementary student will receive the Handbook, which will include a page that is to be completed by a parent or guardian indicating that they have received and reviewed the Handbook with their elementary student(s). This page is to be returned to the classroom teacher. Each secondary student will receive the Handbook as an app on their iPad, which will be reviewed with secondary students at the beginning of the school year.

3. School Board Policy 807 – Health and Safety.
Director of Finance Val Mertesdorf is requesting that the Board approve Policy 807 – Health and Safety, which the Board approved on July 8, 2013. Even though there are no changes to the policy, the School Board is still required to annually review and approve it.

4. Personnel Items.
   a. Appointments*
      1. Dustee Armstrong, .5 FTE 4th Grade Teacher at Bridgewater beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; BA, Step 0.
      2. Joni Karl, .4 FTE Math Teacher at the High School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; MA, Step 2.

3. Bambijo Allison Sweeney, 1.0 FTE Grade 5 Teacher at Sibley Elementary beginning 08/25/2014; MA45, Step 6.
4. Community Services Summer Recreation Positions:
   - Michael Abdella, Junior Team Tennis Supervisor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $1,700 Summer Program Stipend.
   - Ryan Abdella, Junior Team Tennis Supervisor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $1,700 Summer Program Stipend.
   - Laurin Allin, Ultimate Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
   - Emily Anderson, Water Safety Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.50/hour.
   - Kate Arneson, Junior Team Tennis $10.00/hour; CS Tennis Instructor $7.75/hour beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014.
   - Nick Bornhauser, Baseball Supervisor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/204; $10.25/hour.
   - Kayla Burt, Lacrosse Supervisor $10.25/hour; Softball Instructor $7.75/hour beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014.
   - Matthew Christensen, Junior Team Tennis Instructor beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.50/hour.
   - William Clark, Lifeguard & Swim Aid beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $8.00/hour.
   - Savannah Dimick, Track Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.75/hour.
   - Benjamin R. Ertl, Soccer Staff beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
   - Tyler Faust, Pickleball Supervisor beginning 06/12/2014 – 08/07/2014; $10.00/hour.
   - Micahela Johnson, Lifeguard and Swim Aid beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $8.00/hour.
   - Bronte Karvel-Fuller, Water Safety Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.25/hour.
   - Kevin Kowalewski, Junior Team Tennis Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.00/hour.
   - David Kreis, Ultimate Supervisor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.00/hour.
   - Beth LaCanne, Tennis Supervisor beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $17.00/hour.
   - Sara Ludewig, GO FAR Supervisor $10.00/hour; Track & SUPER Kids Instructor $7.75/hour beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014.
   - Easton Martin, Baseball Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.75/hour.
   - Gabbie Noack, Tennis Instructor beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
   - Benjamin Papke, Lacrosse Supervisor $10.00/hour; Soccer Instructor $7.50/hour beginning 05/31/2014 -08/31/2014.
   - Mitchell Peterson, SUPER Kids Instructor, Swimming Lessons Instructor beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.75/hour.
   - Billy Roecklein, Baseball Instructor beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
   - Nancy Seeberg, Tennis Supervisor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.75/hour.
   - Samantha Sharpe, Lifeguard & Swim Aid beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $8.00/hour.
   - Anna Showers, SUPER Kids Supervisor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.25/hour.
   - Alison Simison, Tennis Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
   - Abby Stets, Soccer Instructor beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
   - Claire Vasilis, Softball Supervisor $10.00/hour, Track Instructor & Soccer Substitute $7.75/hour beginning 05/28/2014 – 08/31/2014.
   - Mark Welinski, Junior Team Tennis Instructor beginning 06/09/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.50/hour.
   - Rachel Will, Tennis Instructor beginning 05/31/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
   - Michael Zell, Tennis Instructor beginning 06/09/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.75/hour.
5. Summer Weight Room Coaches – beginning 06/11/2014 – 08/08/2014:
   - Lyndsey Callahan, $14.75/hour.
   - Kyle Eastman, $18.75/hour.

- Cole Jirik, $14.75/hour.
- Laura Marks, $18.75/hour.
- Sam Maus, $14.75/hour.
- Jed McGuire, $14.75/hour.
- Dan Meyers, $4,800 Stipend.
- Steven Pfahning, $14.75/hour.
- Larry Sanftner, $14.75/hour.
- Lindsay Schacht, $14.75/hour.
- Bob (Bubba) Sullivan, $18.75/hour.
- Travis Wiebe, $18.75/hour.

b. Increase/Decrease/Change in Assignment

1. Mairin Born, Grade 2 Companeros Teacher at Bridgewater, change to Kindergarten Teacher at Sibley beginning 08/25/2014.
2. Shari Bridley, Special Education EA-PCA Class IV at Longfellow, change to EA-PCA Class IV at Longfellow Monday-Thursday for 6.5 hours/day beginning 09/02/2014 – 06/05/2015.
3. Tyler Grave, KidVentures Student Site Assistant, change to KidVentures Site Assistant beginning 06/02/2014 – 06/09/2014.
4. Alissa Jorgenson, Auditorium Tech/EA Class I at CS/HS, change to Auditorium Tech/Office Generalist (Class II) at CS/High School beginning 07/01/2014.
5. Monique Kolb, Enrichment Coordinator with Community Services for 48 weeks, change to Enrichment Coordinator for 52 weeks, including Project ABLE program coordination beginning 07/01/2014.
6. MaryDee Kuklok, Special Education Teacher at Bridgewater/High School, add Summer Special Education Teacher DHH at Longfellow once/week for 60 minutes for up to 16 sessions beginning 06/10/2014 – 08/30/2014.
7. Yolanda Loken, Special Education EA-PCA (Class IV) for at Longfellow, change to EA-PCA (Class IV) at Longfellow for 24.25 hours/week beginning 09/02/2014 – 06/05/2015.
8. Curt Mikkelson, MS Social Studies Teacher, add High School Summer School Teacher at the High School for 5 hours/day, Monday-Thursday, beginning 06/10/2014 – 06/30/2014, plus 2 additional hours of prep time.
9. Susan Nelson, Special Education EA-PCA at Longfellow for 5.5 hours/day, change to EA Class I for .5 hours/day, and EA-PCA Class IV for 6.25 hours/day (6.75 hours/day total) at Bridgewater beginning 09/02/2014 – 06/05/2015.
10. Susan Puppe, Education Assistant (Class II) at Sibley Elementary for 3 hours/day, change to end date from 6/6/2014 to on-going position.
11. Karen Robach, Special Education EA-PCA (Class IV) at the Middle School for 4 hours/day, change to EA-PCA (Class IV) at the High School for 6.5 hours/day beginning the week of 08/25/2014.
12. Geoffrey Staab, 1.0 FTE Math Teacher at the ALC, change to 1.0 FTE Math Teacher at the High School, beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/06/2015.
13. Kathryn Stordahl, Special Education EA-PCA (Class IV) at Longfellow, change to EA-PCA (Class IV) at Longfellow for 30.75 hours/week beginning 09/02/2014 – 06/05/2015.
14. Shannon Tassava, Education Assistant-PCA at Sibley Elementary, change end date from 6/6/2014 to on-going position beginning 05/30/2014.
15. Andrea Waldock, Special Education EA-PCA at Longfellow, change to EA Class I for .5 hours/day, and EA-PCA Class IV for 6.25 hours/day (6.75 hours/day total) at Bridgewater beginning 09/02/2014 – 06/05/2015.
16. Dyler Warner, KidVentures Student Site Assistant, change to KidVentures Site Assistant beginning 06/02/2014 – 06/09/2014.

c. Leave of Absence

1. Geoffrey Staab, 1.0 FTE ALC Math Teacher, Leave of Absence for the 2014-2015 school year to serve as a 1.0 FTE Math Teacher at the High School for the 2014-15 school year.

d. Resignations / Retirement
1. Alison Kopp, Education Assistant at the High School, resignation effective 06/06/2014.
2. Lacey Neuman Bissonnette, Ventures Site Lead, resignation effective 5/28/2014.
3. Alisha Traeder, Ventures Site Assistant, resignation effective 06/20/2014.
4. Taylor Traeder, Education Assistant and Coach, resignation effective 5/28/2014.
5. Linda Wilson, Education Assistant at GVP, retirement effective and the end of the 2013-14 school year.

e. Administration is recommending approval of the following:
- Policy covering wages, working conditions and fringe benefits of Head Custodians for the period extending July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2016.
- Policy covering wages, working conditions and fringe benefits of the Custodians for the period extending July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2016.
- Policy covering wages, hours and fringe benefits for Child Nutrition Personnel for the period extending July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2016.
- Policy covering wages, hours and fringe benefits for Non-Union Administrators (Cabinet) for the period extending July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2016.
- Policy covering wages, hours and fringe benefits for Non-Union Administrators (Director) for the period extending July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2016.

* Conditional offers of employment are subject to successful completion of a criminal background check.

VIII. Items for Information

1. Revised School Board Policy 514 – Bullying Prohibition.
Enclosed is Revised School Board Policy 514 – Bullying Prohibition. This is the Bullying Prohibition Policy being recommended by the Minnesota School Boards Association following action during this past legislative session. A copy of the District's current Bullying Prohibition policy is also enclosed. The Board will be asked to act on the revised Board Policy 514 at the Board's next meeting on July 14, 2014.

2. Discontinue AdvancED (formerly North Central Association) Membership and Accreditation.
Enclosed is a request from High School Principal Joel Leer to Superintendent Richardson for Northfield High School to be allowed to discontinue membership in and accreditation by AdvancED effective July 1, 2014.

IX. Future Meetings

Monday, July 14, 2014, 7:00 PM, Regular School Board Meeting, Northfield High School Media Center
Monday, August 11, 2014, 7:00 PM, Regular School Board Meeting, Northfield High School Media Center

X. Adjournment

Closed Negotiation Strategy Session
to follow Regular School Board Meeting
District Office Conference Room

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Board Minutes

School Board Minutes
May 27, 2014
Northfield High School Media Center

I. Call to Order
Board Chair Ellen Iverson called the Regular meeting of the Northfield Board of Education to order at 7:00 PM. No one was absent.

II. Agenda Changes / Table File
The table file was added.

III. Public Comment
Bruce McWilliams asked the Board to table the individual action item, "Proposed K-12 Instrumental Music Program Realignment," so that additional information could be gathered.

IV. Approval of Minutes
On a motion by Pritchard, seconded by Nelson, minutes of the Regular School Board meeting held on May 12, 2014, were unanimously approved, as amended.

V. Announcements and Recognitions
- This year, WINGS (Women In Northfield Giving Support), granted a one-time, $10,000 award to a local non-profit with the most compelling dream to help women and children in the Northfield area reach their full potential. The WINGS' inaugural Dare to Dream recipient is the Greenvale Park Elementary Community School effort. This collaboration is the effort of a number of local nonprofit organizations, community partners and the local schools. WINGS funding will help with the start-up costs of this effort, including initial programming offerings and funding a coordinator to help schedule partners' times, coordinate activities, and develop systems to support families.
- The third annual creation of the Northfield Young Sculptors Project, entitled "Octopus Garden," was unveiled on May 16 at the Northfield Public Library plaza. The project supports the work of a local artist and high school students to come together to develop ideas around a collaborative public sculpture and then create a large-scale work.
- The Honors Art Final Gallery Show is being featured until May 31 at the Northfield Arts Guild, displaying works from 28 high school visual artists.

VI. Items for Discussion and / or Reports
1. 1:1 iPad Initiative Survey Results.
Students in High School Math Teacher Ray Coudret's Probability and Statistics class presented findings from their class research project about the first year of the Transformational Technology 1:1 iPad initiative for Middle and High School students. Statistics students conducted a random sample survey of 160 parents and 190 students. They also surveyed 127 teachers. The research focused on the goal of 'Substitution' in the SAMR model, distractions, and satisfaction.

The research found that students, parents, and teachers felt that iPads have had a positive impact on student organization. It found that students are routinely using the iPad for school work at both school and home. Almost three quarters of students reported having between two and four of their textbooks available on their iPad. Nearly three quarters of parents identified that iPads have had a positive impact on their student's education. Survey results show that teachers' efforts towards 'Substitution' have been successful overall with room for growth as we move forward.

The research also found teacher concerns about the level of restrictions for student use of games on their iPads as well as concerns from both students and teachers about distractions. Thank you to Mr. Coudret for his leadership on this project and to the following students for their excellent work on this project. Seniors: Emily Oberto, Elizabeth Pritchard, Erick Swanson, Millie Tjaden, James Rowley and Cassidy Nord. Juniors: Emily Swanson and Erik Mandsager

2. District Educational Program Advisory Committee (DEPAC) Goals for 2014-2015.
Kyle Wilkomm, one of this year's co-chairs of the District Educational Program Advisory Council (DEPAC), shared with the Board the recommended goals that were developed by this committee of citizens and staff members over the last several months. At DEPAC's last meeting of the school year, they reached consensus on the following goals that were then shared with the Board.

Assessment Goals:

- We will partner with community agencies that serve students by providing meaningful data support emphasizing key transitions young people make on the 'cradle to career' continuum.
- Students, teachers and parents will collaborate to implement and evaluate holistic strategies leading to individual student growth

Teaching and Learning Goals:

- The District will provide curricular and staff development support in the implementation of the tablet initiative using the Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, and Redefinition (SAMR) model as it is integrated into best practices of instruction.
- The District will develop continuous, accurate, and separate measurements of each student's progress toward academic mastery, work habits, and behavior standards.

Student Services:

- The District will refine the implementation of the MTSS model: tiered systems of support for academic, behavior, and social emotional learning.
- The District will investigate systems and services that will provide a coordinated, comprehensive approach to children's mental health within the MTSS model.
- The District will enhance engagement through school connectedness that promotes mutual respect and responsibility with students, families, and staff.

3. 2014-2015 General Fund Budget.
The General Fund budget was presented by Val Mertesdorf, Director of Finance. She spoke about the assumptions and parameters for revenues and expenditures used for development of this budget. These assumptions and parameters were presented to the Board on January 27, 2014. The material given to the Board presented the financial summary of the original budget plan along with additional Board action that has been taken with respect to program and staffing changes. No action was required on the budget until June 9, 2014.

VII. Superintendent's Report

A. Items for Individual Action

1. Proposed Budgets for Capital and Health and Safety.
On a motion by Nelson, seconded by Maple, the Board unanimously approved the following Revenue and Expenditure budget for the 2014-2015 Operating Capital and Health and Safety Budgets:

	Revenues	Expenditures
Operating Capital	$1,897,857	$1,896,339
Health & Safety	164,514	270,452
Total	$2,062,371	$ 2,166,791

2. Proposed K-12 Instrumental Music Program Realignment.
After a considerable amount of time was spent discussing this item, the Board voted to suspend the discussion and vote on the motion.
On a motion by Stratmoen, seconded by Fossum, the Board on a six to one vote approved the proposed realignment of K-12 instrumental Music and addition of 0.2 FTE staffing beginning in the 2014-15 school year. Voting 'yes' was Fossum, Maple, Pritchard, Nelson, Stratmoen and Iverson. Hardy voted 'no.'

B. Items for Consent Grouping
On a motion by Pritchard, seconded by Fossum, the Board unanimously approved the following items listed under the Consent Grouping.

1. Co-Curricular Overnight Trips for the 2014-2015 School Year.
   The list dated May 13, 2014, of co-curricular overnight trips for the 2014-15 school year was approved.

2. Seventh Grade Overnight Trip to Eagle Bluff – July 28-30, 2014.
   The Board approved the 7th grade environmental education overnight experience to Eagle Bluff Environmental Learning Center in Lanesboro from July 28 – 30, 2014.

3. District Youth Council Membership.
   The Board approved the following students to serve on the District Youth Council:
   Rising Seniors: Ben Andrew*, Courtney Asada, Hanna Bubser, Ahna Chapman, Josiah Cieluch, Annika Peterson* and Sami Ponder. * denotes current Mayor's Youth Council member
   Rising Juniors: Katie Geary, Andrew Kell, Audrey Kornkven, Alison Langston, Daniel Langehough and Sebastian Lawler.
   Rising Sophomores: Abigail Andrade-Flores, Synneva Bratland and Gabriella Estrada.

4. Personnel Items.
   a. Appointments*
      1. Erin Brush, 1.0 FTE Long-Term Substitute Math Teacher at the Middle School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; BA, Step 0.
      2. Kathleen Casson, .2 FTE German Teacher at the High School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; MA, Step 6.
      3. Kelly Distad, Community Services Summer Recreation Intern beginning 05/27/2014 – 08/31/2014; $13.08/hour.
      4. Kelly A. Gandrud, 1.0 FTE Long-Term Substitute 6th Grade Science Teacher at the Middle School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; BA, Step 6.
      5. Sarah Hubacher, Community Services Super Kids and Swim Aide beginning 05/22/2014 – 08/31/2014; $7.50/hour.
      6. Brenda Kell, Community Services Lifeguard/Swim Aide beginning 05/22/2014 – 08/31/2014; $8.00/hour.
      7. Kimbra Kosak, .55 FTE Read 180 Teacher at Greenvale Park beginning 08/25/2014; MA, Step 3.
      8. Alyse Lindholm, 1.0 FTE Primary Class Teacher-Grade 2 at Greenvale Park beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; BA, Step 2.
      9. Tiffany Malecha, 1.0 FTE Kindergarten Teacher at Greenvale Park beginning 08/25/2014; BA, Step 1.
      10. Michael Miller, ESY PCA at Longfellow for 3.5 hours/day beginning 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2014; Class IV, Step 2 - $14.00/hour.
      11. Erica Ness, 1.0 FTE Art Teacher at Sibley Elementary beginning 08/25/2014; MA, Step 6.
      12. Janet Otteson, Community Services Summer Aquatics WSI Instructor beginning 05/20/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.00/hour.
      13. Annika Peterson, Community Services Summer Aquatics WSI Instructor beginning 05/20/2014 – 08/31/2014; $10.00/hour.
      14. Teresa Swenson, Special Education EA-PCA at Bridgewater for 5 hours/day beginning 05/19/2014 – 06/06/2014; Class I EA, Step 1, $12.59/hour (1 hour); Class IV PCA, Step 1, $13.49/hour (4 hours).
      15. Daniel Taylor, 1.0 FTE Long-Term Substitute Biology Teacher at the High School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; MA, Step 2.
      16. Tricia Christopherson, 1.0 FTE EL Long-Term Substitute Teacher at Sibley Elementary beginning 05/19/2014 – 05/30/2014; BA, Step 6.
      17. Katherine Klein, .4 FTE Geoscience Teacher at the Middle School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; MA, Step 2.
      18. Amanda Kunkel, ESY Secondary Teacher at the Middle School for 3.5 hours/day beginning 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2014; BA, Step 1.
      19. Anna Spencer, Second Grade Companeros Teacher at Bridgewater Elementary beginning 08/25/2014; BA, Step 1.

20. Mary Harrity-Davidson, .50 FTE Physical Education Teacher at the Middle School, add .25 FTE Physical Education Teacher at the ALC beginning 8/25/2014 through 6/5/2015.

b. Increase/Decrease/Change in Assignment.
1. Janet Amundson, Class III SPED EA at the Middle School, add Sped EA-Bus PCA at the Middle School .5 hours/day on Fridays only, and .5 hours/day on 5/21 and 5/22/2014 beginning 5/21/2014 – 06/06/2014.
2. Lindsey Downs, 1.0 FTE Grade 2 Teacher at Bridgewater, change to 1.0 FTE Kindergarten Teacher at Sibley beginning 08/25/2014.
3. Karna Hauck, .8 FTE Art Teacher at the High School, change to .9 FTE Art Teacher at the High School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015 for the 2014-15 school year.
4. Gretchen Heil, 1.0 FTE Grade 1 Teacher at Sibley, change to 1.0 FTE Kindergarten Teacher at Sibley beginning 08/25/2014.
5. Rachael Hudson, 1.0 FTE School Psychologist at the Middle School, add .2 FTE Behavior Specialist at the Middle School for 2014-15 school year (one year overload).
6. Heather Kuehl, .4 FTE English Teacher at the Middle School, change to .4 FTE English-8 Teacher at the Middle School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; and .2 FTE Reading Lab Instructor at the Middle School beginning 01/26/2015 – 06/05/2015 (Semester 2).
7. Kimberly Milne, .6 FTE Science Teacher at the High School, change to .8 FTE Science Teacher at the High School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015 for the 2014-2015 school year.
8. Amy Moeller, .25 FTE Language Arts Teacher at the High School, and .25 FTE at the ALC, change to .5 FTE Language Arts Teacher at the High School beginning 08/25/2014.
9. Andrea Waldock, Special Ed. PCA at Head Start, decrease .5 hours/day from riding bus in the afternoon beginning 05/22/2014-06/05/2014.
10. Sara Webster, SLP Teacher at Sibley/Longfellow, change to SLP Teacher at Sibley beginning 08/25/2014.
11. Kristin Basinger, Education Assistant at Sibley, add Targeted Services Elementary Summer PLUS Site Lead at Sibley for 5.5 hours/day, Monday-Thursday beginning 06/19/2014 – 08/07/2014; Step 4 - $15.19/hour.
12. Anna Braun, Special Education Coordinator, change to Special Education Teacher at the Middle School beginning 08/25/2014; MA+45, Step 14.
13. Renee Burnham, ALC English Teacher at Longfellow, add HS Summer School Teacher at Longfellow for 5 hours/day, Monday-Thursday beginning 06/10/2014 – 07/24/2014.
14. Erin Carson, .90 FTE Social Studies Teacher at the High School, change to .4 FTE Geography-8 Teacher at the Middle School beginning 08/25/2014 – 06/05/2015; and .2 FTE Reading Lab Instructor at the Middle School beginning 08/25/2014 – 01/23/2015 (Semester 1).
15. Danielle Crase, Sped EA-PCA at Sibley, change from temporary position to on-going position 8:00 am – 3:15 pm, beginning 05/21/2014.
16. Paul Eddy, 1.0 Math Teacher at the HS, add HS Summer School Math Teacher at Longfellow for 5 hours/day, Monday-Thursday beginning 06/19/2014 – 08/07/2014.
17. Shelly Kruger, Special Education PCA at the High School, add Special Education PCA at the High School Football program for 2 hours/day beginning 08/11/2014 – 08/22/2014; Class IV, Step 3 - $14.32/hour.
18. Beth Kuyper, Special Education PCA (Class IV) at the Middle School, add Sped EA Bus PCA at the Middle School for .5 hours/day Monday-Thursday beginning 05/27/2014 – 06/06/2014.; Class IV, Step 6 - $15.39/hour.
19. Jeanne Mahoney-Hanzlik, 1.0 Science Teacher at the Middle School, add HS Summer School Teacher at Longfellow for 5 hours/day, Monday-Thursday, beginning 06/10/2014 – 07/24/2014.
20. Jed McGuire, Special Ed EA-PCA at Bridgewater, add Targeted Services Elementary Summer PLUS Site Assistant at Sibley for 5.5 hours/day beginning 06/19/2014 – 08/07/2014; Step 1 - $11.25/hour.

21. Curt Mikkelson, Social Studies Teacher at the Middle School, add HS Summer School Teacher at the High School for 4 hours/day, Monday-Thursday beginning 06/10/2014 – 06/30/2014.
22. Elizabeth Schmidt, Sped EA-PCA at Sibley, change from temporary position to on-going position 8:00 am – 3:25 pm, beginning 05/21/2014.
23. Deb Seitz, Special Education Teacher at the Middle School, add Homebound Instructor at the Middle School beginning 05/20/2014 – 06/06/2014.
24. Darcy Seurer, ALC Social Studies Teacher at Longfellow, add HS Summer School Teacher at Longfellow for 5 hours/day, Monday-Thursday, beginning 06/10/2014 – 07/24/2014.
25. Brian Stevens, .8 FTE Social Studies Teacher at the High School, increase to 1.0 FTE Social Studies Teacher at the High School beginning 08/25/2014.
26. Sara Tetreault, MSYC Site Lead at the Middle School, add Targeted Services Middle School Summer PLUS Site Lead for 5.5 hours/day, Monday-Thursday beginning 06/19/2014 – 08/07/2014; Step 2, $14.31/hour.
27. Extended School Year (ESY) PCA Positions for 3.5 hours/day Monday-Thursday beginning 07/01/2014 through 07/31/2014 (no class on July 2,3,4):
    - Allyson Bernstorf at Sibley
    - Shari Bridley at Longfellow
    - Danielle Crase at Sibley
    - Shelly Kruger at the Middle School
    - Lindsay Mehrhoff at Sibley
    - Jackie Moon at the Middle School
    - Darla Neufeldt at Sibley
    - Deb Pack at the Middle School
    - Lindsay Schacht at Sibley
    - Tammy Schwagerl at the Middle School
    - Jennifer Severson at Longfellow
    - Amanda Story at Longfellow
    - Linda Wasner at the Middle School
    - Carina Zick at Sibley
    - Mary Boyum at Sibley
    - Christina Chappuis at Sibley
    - Teresa Findlay at the Middle School
    - Yolanda Loken at Longfellow
    - Jacqueline Meyer at the Middle School
    - Lauren Murtha at the Middle School
    - Jacob Odell at the Middle School
    - Molly Peterson at the Middle School
    - Elizabeth Schmidt at Sibley
    - Andrea Schwalbe at Longfellow
    - Peggy Sheehy at Sibley
    - Andrea Waldock at Sibley
    - Lori Witt Macrae at Sibley
    - Laura Goodwin, ESY PCA at Longfellow/ALC for 2 hours/day (Monday/Wednesday/Friday) beginning 06/10/2014 – 06/24/2014 and 07/07/2014 – 07/24/2014.
28. Extended School Year (ESY) Teacher Positions for 3.5 hours/day Monday-Thursday beginning 07/01/2014 through 07/31/2014 (no class on July 2,3,4):
    - Katie Auge – ESY ECSE Teacher at Longfellow for 17 days
    - Kiwi Bielenberg, ESY Elementary Teacher at Sibley for 17 days
    - Debra James, ESY ECSE Teacher at Longfellow for 9 days
    - Kathryn Lean, ESY Secondary Teacher at the Middle School for 17 days
    - Kim Rohr, ESY Elementary Level Teacher at Sibley for 17 days
    - Debra Seitz, ESY Elementary Level Teacher at Sibley for 17 days
    - Dawn Sorenson, ESY ECSE Teacher at Longfellow for 9 days
    - Lydia Tilstra, ESY Elementary Level Teacher at Sibley for 17 days
29. Extended School Year (ESY) Teacher Positions:
    - Anne Balluff, ESY Homebound Teacher for 16 days beginning 07/01/2014 – 08/15/2014.
    - Anne Dybvik, ESY Speech Pathologist at LF/MS/SB beginning 07/01/2014 – 08/30/2014.
    - Joseph Jorgensen, WB-L ESY for up to 20 hours beginning 07/01/2014 – 08/15/2014; and ESY Secondary Teacher for 2 hours/day for 13 days beginning 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2014.

- Laurie Larson, ESY Physical Therapist at LF/MS/SB beginning 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2014
- Mary Magnuson, ESY Teacher at Longfellow/ALC for 2.25 hours/day on Tuesdays only beginning 06/10/2014 – 06/24/2014.
- Stephanie Mahal, ESY Occupational Therapist at LF/MS/SB beginning 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2014.
- John Schnorr, ESY Speech Pathologist at LF/MS/SB beginning 07/01/2014 – 08/30/2014.
- William Seeberg, ESY Elementary Level Teacher at Sibley for 2.5 hours/day for 17 days, Monday-Thursday beginning 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2014.
- Lisa Weis, ESY Teacher at Longfellow/ALC for 2.25 hours/day Tuesdays only beginning 07/07/2014 – 07/24/2014.

30. Claiborne Day, Grade 5 Teacher at Sibley Elementary, change to Grade 4 Teacher at Sibley Elementary effective 8/25/14.

c. Leaves of Absence.
   1. Mary Hansen, Administrative Assistant at Community Services, Family/Medical Leave of Absence beginning 05/12/2014 – 05/16/2014, with possible reduced schedule and/or intermittent FMLA Leave beginning on 05/19/2014.
   2. Amanda Schrader, ELL Teacher at Sibley, Family/Medical Leave of Absence beginning on or about 09/16/2014 and continuing for 8 work weeks.
   3. Karleen Sherman, Special Education Teacher at Sibley, Family/Medical Leave of Absence beginning 05/12/2014 – 06/09/2014.
   4. Brianna Spittle, EarlyVentures Site Assistant at Longfellow, Family/Medical Leave of Absence beginning 05/01/2014 – 05/09/2014. Extension of Leave through 05/13/2014, with half days (4 hours/day) beginning 05/14/2014 – 05/23/2014.
   5. Susan Wunderlich, Leave of Absence beginning May 23, 2014 through June 6, 2014.

d. Resignations / Retirement.
   1. Allison Kopp, SummerVentures Substitute Site Assistant, resignation effective 05/14/2014.
   2. Marilynn Neuville, Reading Teacher at the Middle School, retirement effective at the end of the 2013-2014 school year.
   3. Melanie Feldhake, Educational Assistant at Sibley, resignation effective 06/06/2014.

*Conditional offers of employment are subject to successful completion of a criminal background check.

5. Tentative High School Overnight Trips Planned for 2014-15.
   The Board approved the list dated May 2014 of tentative high school overnight field trips for the 2014-15 school year.

VIII. Items for Information

1. July 2014 – June 2015 School Board Meeting Schedule.
2. Upcoming dates:
   Friday, May 30 – 1:00 PM – Area Learning Center Graduation, Longfellow Gymnasium
   Sunday, June 1 – 2:00 PM – High School Graduation, Memorial Field
3. A Closed Negotiation Strategy Session will immediately follow the June 9, 2014, Regular School Board meeting.

IX. Future Meetings

Monday, June 9, 2014, 7:00 PM, Regular School Board Meeting, Northfield High School Media Center
Monday, July 14, 2014, 7:00 PM, Regular School Board Meeting, Northfield High School Media Center

X. On a motion by Stratmoen, seconded by Nelson, the Board adjourned at 9:48 PM

Noel Stratmoen
School Board Clerk

PLCS: 2013-14

A Three Part Story

THREE PART STORY

Elementary Joint PLCs

Rebecca Gainey and Diane Torbenson

Secondary English Language Arts PLCs

Rose Turnacliff, MS and Ellen Mucha, HS

Elementary Art PLC, July 14

Kate Woodstrup, BW Art Teacher

PLC FACTS

Wednesday Late Starts: 36 hours

Monday, June 9: 2 hours

Total: 38 hours

Next year: 38 hours

73 PLC teams across the district

PLC FACTS, CONT.

- Elementary: Organized by grade levels; specialists from the three buildings meet together
- MS and HS: Organized by subject matter
- PLCs generate SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, results oriented, timely) goals.
- Evidence of Practice documents are required twice each year at the end of each semester.

PLC GRANTS

- PLCs may apply to DCSDC (District Curriculum and Staff Development Committee) for a small grant.
- $6,000 to fund grants for the year
- PLCs must submit an application.
- The grant must be used to support the SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, results oriented, timely) goal.

THANK YOU!

- Coming together is a beginning…
- Keeping together is progress…
- Working together is success.

Henry Ford

Northfield Elementary Schools Joint PLC Report 2013-14

June 9, 2014

PURPOSE: BUILD DISTRICT-WIDE CAPACITY, EXPLORE SHARED BELIEFS AND UNIFY AND IGNITE OUR COLLECTIVE WISDOM.

"Alone we can do so little; together we can do so much." - *Helen Keller*

November 20, 2013 at Bridgewater

- Fixed and Growth Mindset
- PLC Word Craft-revisiting the goals of a PLC and discussion of how the work of the Joint PLC could impact students district-wide.
- All children can learn! Core beliefs about children and learning.
- District Reflection Partners — Teachers are paired with people in other buildings to promote the sharing of effective instructional strategies.

January 29, 2014 at Greenvale Park

- The function of the PLC: Cooperation, Coordination, and Collaboration
- PDSA Cycle-Plan, Do, Study, Act
- Jagged Profile
- Flight Stories

May 7, 2014 at Sibley

- **Reflection** on professional learning this year: Building Staff Development, PLC work, Pat Quinn, Danielle Theis' Mental Health Workshop, Use of Ipads.
- **Celebration** of best practices: Teachers were given time to share a particular resource/lesson/strategy that had a powerful impact on student learning.

Northfield Elementary Joint PLC

Looking back . . .	Looking Ahead . . .
• Building trust • Enhancing collaboration • Unifying grade levels/departments • Consistency • Developing growth mindset	• 3 more Joint PLCs proposed for 2014-15 school year • Continue sharing of best practices leading toward improved student achievement • Use PDSA (plan/do/study/act model) • Continue district wide collaboration

6th- 8th grade Language Arts PLC

Monika Burkhead- 6th
Linda Kovach- 6th
Rhea Merkens- 6th
Sara Mikkelson-6th
Marilynn Neuville-6th
Jan Ensrud- 7th
Rose Turnacliff -7th
Heather Kuehl-7th
Ann Jerdee- 8th
Jane Dolan- 8th

6+1 Traits of Good Writing

- Ideas
- Organization
- Word Choice
- Sentence Fluency
- Voice
- Conventions
- + Presentation (audience)

Idea Development

- Ideas are the heart of the message, the content of the piece, the main theme, together with the details that enrich and develop that theme.

- http://www.imschools.org/images/files/menu files/Overview6Traits.pdf

Smart Goal

- We will increase idea development of writing so that 75% of identified middle school students will demonstrate proficiency as measured by a scaled, common rubric by May 2014.

"Improving Adolescent Writing"
by Kelly Gallagher

1. The Importance of Modeling
2. Writing with Purpose
3. Assessment That Drives Better Student Writing

Smart Goal Results Mid-year

- After the second writing sample focusing on prewriting techniques, 39% of the targeted population demonstrated proficiency in idea development.

Final Smart Goal Results

- After the third writing sample focusing on revision, 54% of the targeted population demonstrated proficiency in idea development.
- Proficiency was a score of 3 on the rubric.
- The targeted audience represents about 10% of the middle school language arts students.

Additional Observations

- Writing assessment is not scientific; we will make some changes to our rubric for idea development.
- Our smart goal measured proficiency, not growth.

Idea Development Rubric

1	2	3	4
___ Has few, if any, original ideas. ___ Lacks or has a poorly developed topic; lacks a topic sentence. ___ Has a few, if any, details. ___ Has little or no focus.	___ Has some original ideas. ___ Has a minimally developed topic; may or may not have a topic sentence. ___ Some details are present. ___ Focus strays.	___ Has original ideas. ___ Has a fairly well-developed topic stated in a topic sentence. ___ Has some details that support the topic. ___ Generally maintains focus.	___ Has original ideas that tie in with each other. ___ Has a fully developed topic and a clear topic sentence that expresses the main idea. ___ Has carefully selected, interesting details that support the topic. ___ Maintains focus throughout.

Adapted from *Daily Writing* by Evan Moor.

Self Conference

Name: _____ Hour: _____

1. Read it **out loud** to yourself and you will notice many more things to improve upon.

Title:	You Read it out loud to yourself. YOU!
REVISING Help make the writing better.	What did you make better? Write it here:
Change/add **five** words to make your word choice stronger, more specific, and vivid. • verbs—Instead of *look*, write *glance*. • nouns—Instead of *lunch*, write *spaghetti & meatballs* • adjectives and adverbs—Add these where you can be more descriptive or specific.	
Add **at least two** specific, interesting details to clarify.	What did you make better? Write it here:
EDITING **COPS**	Check if this step is completed.
Do all sentences start with a **C**apital letter? Do specific people, places, and things (proper nouns) start with a capital letter?	
Is your writing **O**rganized - with a strong beginning, middle, and end? • Write down your clear, guiding topic sentence. Do you immediately know the main idea of the paragraph? • Write down your wrap up sentence. • Write down the transition words you used: first, then, next, in conclusion, as you can see.	

Do all sentences end with **p**unctuation? Did you use commas correctly?	Check if this step is completed.
Did you check the **S**pelling? **Circle** words to check…then check them!	Check if this step is completed.
Give **one specific** compliment. *What does specific mean?* *distinctive, unique, exact*	Write the specific compliment here:

English 11/12: Our Reality

- State Standards mandate students receive both domain-specific and college and career readiness vocabulary instruction. Our reality is that, currently, we don't have a systematic process for delivering either type of vocabulary. Students need to be exposed to "English" words, which we often call Literary Terms or Literary Devices. Students also need to be exposed to and taught Greek and Latin roots to help them decode challenging words. Upper levels also need to be taught specific ACT/SAT/College-level domain words they will be likely to encounter in their post-secondary endeavors.

English 11/12 SMART Goal

- by the end of 1st Semester, all students enrolled in an 11/12 grade literature elective will be explicitly taught a common list of essential literary terms, serving as the foundation for literary analysis and discussion. Students, by the end of the semester, will demonstrate mastery at the level of 90%, through assessments determined by the teacher (including quizzes, summative assessment, writing application, and graphic organizers/visual method).

English 11/12 SMART Goal

- by the end of the semester, all students in an 11/12 grade writing course will be explicitly taught a common list of domain specific vocabulary, serving as the foundation for the use of the writing process to create pieces of academic writing. Students, by the end of the semseter, will demonstrate mastery at the level of 90%, through assessments determined by the teacher (including quizzes, summative assessment, writing application, and graphic organizers/visual method).

Our Process

Literary Terms

- Identify essential learnings and compile list
- Created a chart to log when taught/discussed best practices
- Created common assessments
- Evaluated data

Domain Vocabulary

- Divided Greek/Latin roots among grade levels/classes
- Identified essential learnings based on state standards
- Discussed best practices
- Created a method to use for more efficient method of record keeping
- Evaluated Data

Domain Vocab

Styles of Writing and Composition Details- Junior/ Senior Electives

MLA Style: Modern Language Association's method of formatting academic papersAcademic Writing: research, critical essays, literary analysis, science lab reports; writing with more formal word choice and no slang

Personal Writing: journals, diaries, letters, essays about important personal events

Analysis: to break an event or issue into smaller parts and examines both the parts and the whole

Explanation: to clarify or make something more clear

Summarization: to give a short version of something

Response: analysis that shares a personal reaction

Evaluation: analysis that gives a judgment

Argument: to give a point of view that can be supported with facts or evidence

Persuasion: to make an attempt to get a reader, listener, or viewer to consider or change a point of view

Explication: a relatively short analysis which describes the possible meanings and relationships of the words, images, and other small units that make up a larger work or concept.

Thesis: The main idea or argument for an entire essay; it is what the writer will explain or prove to the reader; it is the last 1-2 sentences of the introductory paragraph

Topic Sentence: The first sentence of a paragraph; this sentence introduces the main idea of the paragraph and in an academic essay should refer back to the thesis

Evidence/Textual Support/Supporting Details: the sentences that support and follow the topic sentence; they give the reader information, facts, and opinions; the information discovered in research and used to support your thesis

Quotation: Writing that is taken word for word from a text or person. You must cite the source for every quotation.

Paraphrase: Writing that is adapted from another author that is put in your own words in order to convey the author's main idea. You must cite the source for every paraphrased idea.

Parenthetical documentation: to give credit using parentheses and a Works Cited list—example: (Smith 2).

Works Cited: an alphabetized list of resources that a writer used in an essay; this is the last page of an academic essay

Annotated bibliography: A list of the sources you will use in a research project, formatted in MLA style and including a paragraph explaining their usefulness

Persuasion

Logos
Pathos
Ethos
Monroe's Motivated Sequence
Strategies in persuasion/advertising
Testimonial- using words of an expert or famous person to persuade

- *Bandwagon*- using social pressure to persuade people to purchase the product because 'everyone else is doing it'.
- *Repetition*- idea is repeated over and over, like in that "Head On" commercial
- *Transfer*- using names or pictures of famous people but not direct quotes
- *Free or Bargain*- a speaker suggests that the public can get something for nothing or almost nothing
- *Glittering Generalities*- in glowing terms and offering no evidence the speaker or advertiser supports a candidate or a solution to social problems
- Common Sense- trying to persuade using everyday sense of good or bad/right or wrong
- *Emotional Words*- words are used that make you feel strongly about an idea
- *Reasoning*- luring the reader by listing or explaining reasons or an idea
- *Card Stacking*- telling only one side of the story as if there were no opposing view or other consideration
- *Exigency*- creating the impression that action is required immediately or the opportunity will be lost forever
- *Flag Waving*- connecting a person, product, or course with undue patriotism
- *Innuendo*- causing the audience to become wary or suspicious of the competition by hinting that negative info may be kept secret
- *Name Calling*- negative or derogatory words to create a distasteful association in the mind of the audience
- *Plain Folks*- using a person who represents the "typical" target of the ad to communicate the message that we are alike, and I use/buy/believe this so you should too

News and Feature Writing

News article
Inverted Pyramid organization
5Ws and 1 H
Lead paragraph
Feature article
Autobiography
Biography
Interviewing techniques

Styles of Writing and Composition Details

Literary Analysis: The analysis of a piece of literature using textual proof to prove a thesis.

Critical Lens Theory: Theories through which we can see texts. We will cover Archetypal, Historical, Biographical, Psychoanalytic, Feminist, Marxist, Deconstruction, New Criticism, and Reader Response Theories.

Genre: This term refers to a category in which a work of literature is classified—fiction (realistic, historical, mystery, etc.), nonfiction, poetry, drama, etc.

Fiction: story or prose that consists of imaginary elements

Non-fiction: prose that is true (news articles, historical/scientific works, etc.)
Memoir, Biography, Autobiography, Essay

Short story-a well-developed account of fictional characters resolving a conflict or problem; events in a short story revolve around a conflict faced by the main character.

Point of View

First Person
The narrator of a story IS a character IN the story and tells the story from his or her perspective. Key words: I, me, my

Third Person—Limited
Having a narrator who only knows one (or a few) character's thoughts or feelings

Third Person—Omniscient
Having a character who knows all characters' thoughts or feelings.

Third Person—Objective
Having a narrator who only reports on action, and does not know any characters' thoughts/feelings

Unreliable narrator

Character Types

Protagonist: The central character around which the story takes place, faces the central conflict of the story.

Antagonist: The character in conflict with the protagonist, often causes conflict the protagonist must face

Static Character: a character who does not change over the course of the story. Often minor characters.

Dynamic character: a character who changes over the course of the story as a result of the conflict. Most often the main characters.

Flat Character: Simplistic, only 1-2 characteristics or personality traits

Round Character: Complex, multi-dimensional, both positive and negative traits

Stock Characters: characters "stored" in large quantities in a stockroom and brought out whenever a writer needs them. Immediately recognizable and predictable; have the same characteristics. Often minor characters.

Anti-hero: a central character in a novel, play, etc., who lacks the traditional heroic virtues (courageous, strong, honorable, and intelligent).

Tragic Hero: great or virtuous character in a dramatic tragedy who is destined for downfall, suffering, or defeat.

Hero's Quest

Dialogue Writing and Formatting

Heroic Archetypes: A prototype for the classic hero figures used in literature

Conflict:

Internal Conflict: when a character is struggling with his/her own actions or beliefs (person vs. self)

External Conflict:

- Person vs. Person—one character against another in a verbal or physical struggle
- Person vs. Society—a character is in conflict with the rules or expectations of the community
- Person vs. Nature—a character is in conflict with something in nature (a weather event, the land, an animal, etc.)
- Person vs. Machine
- Person vs. Unknown

Irony:

Irony: The tension or difference between expectations and reality

- Situational Irony--When events are different from what was predicted or expected—plot twist.
- Verbal Irony--Often looks like sarcasm—when the meaning is different from the words: "Nice going, Einstein!" could also include words w/ double meanings
- Dramatic Irony--When readers or viewers know crucial information that characters don't yet know. Ex: Titanic, horror movies, Romeo and Juliet

Plot Elements:

Plot: the events that make up a story.

Exposition: refers to the background of a story. The exposition provides
Character information, Setting (Time, Place, Mood), and Information about what happened prior to the story's beginning

Rising action: where the conflict is introduced and begins to build; it increases the story's suspense and tension

Climax: also called the "Turning Point". It is the point of highest suspense, tension, conflict, and excitement. Once the climax occurs, the story shifts and the characters can never go back to the way things were before the climax.

Falling Action: the events after the climax that move the plot toward resolution.

The falling action will usually begin to tie up loose ends or answer lingering questions.

Resolution or Denouement: This is at the end of a story where most or all loose ends will be tied up. The main conflict will be resolved; not all questions may be answered, but there is a sense of ending and result to the plot and conflict.
Stories that end with cliff hangers do not have a resolution.

Setting

Poetic and Literary Devices:
Simile: The comparison of two objects using "like" or "as"

Metaphor: A comparison of two objects that does not use like or as,
(regular, implied, extended)

Personification: Giving inhuman objects or animals human characteristics

Internal Rhyme: Rhyme that occurs within the same line of a poem

End Rhyme: rhyme that occurs at the end of two lines in a poem

Near or Approximate Rhyme: rhyme that does not really rhyme but sounds like it does.

Rhyme Scheme: a pattern of end rhymes in a poem; readers can note a rhyme by assigning a letter of the alphabet, starting with a, to each line. Lines that rhyme are given the same letter.

Stanza: A fixed number of lines, kind of like verses in a song; a grouping of lines in a poem.

Meter: a regular pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables in a poem.

Imagery: Creating pictures and showing a moment with words that describe it.

Sensory Language: language that appeals to the 5 senses—sight, smell, taste, touch, and hearing

Figurative Language: language that communicates meanings beyond its literal meaning. Simile, metaphor, hyperbole, and personification are examples of figurative language.

Paradox: a seemingly contradictory or absurd statement that may nonetheless suggest an important truth.

Oxymoron: a kind of paradox that brings together two contradictory terms (examples—loving hate, jumbo shrimp, clearly confused, pretty ugly, act naturally)

Repetition: a technique in which a sound, word, phrase, or line is repeated for emphasis or unity. It often helps to reinforce meaning or create an appealing rhythm.

Symbol: An object that stands for or represents an idea or value.

Motif: a recurring object, concept, or structure in a work of literature. Motif: any element, subject, idea or concept that is constantly present through the entire body of literature.

Free Verse: poetry that does NOT contain regular patterns of rhythm or rhyme

Narrative: a collection of events that tells a story; there is also narrative nonfiction and narrative poetry

Satire: a literary technique in which ideas, customs, behaviors, or institutions are ridiculed for the purpose of improving society. It can be witty, abrasive, or bitterly critical, and it often involves the use of irony and exaggeration.

Parody: an imitation of another work, a type of literature, or a writer's style, usually for the purpose of poking fun. The purpose may be to ridicule through exaggeration, humor, or inappropriate subject matter. Parody is often more light-hearted than satire.

Parable: a brief and often simple narrative that illustrates a moral or religious lesson

Dialect: a form of language that is spoken in a particular geographic area or by a particular social or ethnic group.

Rhyme
Allusion
Stanza
Meter
Imagery
Sensory Language
Figurative Language
Diction
Speaker/persona
Paradox/Oxymoron
Repetition
Colloquialism: a word or phrase used in everyday conversation and informal speech
Symbolism
Pun

Antithesis: The use of two sentences of contradictory meaning right next to each other.

Circumlocution: Using exaggeratingly long sentences when shorter ones could have been used. In writing or speaking: going around an unknown word in order to convey meaning without using that word.

Plot Elements/Author's Tools

Setting: The time and place of the action of a story.

Mood: The feeling or atmosphere created by the poem.

Tone: The author's feeling toward the subject of a poem.

Theme: The central lesson or idea the author wants to convey about life through the story. Themes must be full sentences—otherwise they're just thematic ideas, not theme statements. Themes must be applicable to real life and to the story

Foreshadowing—hints at events yet to come

Flashback— "cutting" back to a previous time in which to tell the story, show characterization, or build background info

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS
Hazel H. Reinhardt
June 9, 2014

SUMMARY

- In the past ten years, enrollment decreased by -9 students or -0.2 percent
  - The increasing number of district residents attending a charter school or open enrolling out of the district accounts for flat enrollment
  - The district's school age population is up modestly

SUMMARY

- Projected enrollment
  - Cohort Survival method projections show enrollment decreasing in the next ten years
    - K-5 enrollment projected to be down in next five years due to lower number of births and then partially recover in the second five years
    - Middle school enrollment projected to increase in the next five years but then decrease in second five projections years as the smaller elementary grade reach middle school
    - High school enrollment projected to increase

SUMMARY

- Projected additional housing modest in the near term
  - 88 additional single-family detached units projected in the next two years
  - Nearly half (47 percent) of single-family detached housing units have at least one resident who is 55+ years old
  - Current Northfield Public School student yields per single-family detached unit are low, another indicator that the district's population is aging

TOTAL ENROLLMENT HISTORY

K-12 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	
2004-05	3,762
2005-06	3,792
2006-07	3,826
2007-08	3,833
2008-09	3,785
2009-10	3,753
2010-11	3,717
2011-12	3,733
2012-13	3,782
2013-14	3,753
Excludes Early Childhood and ALC	

COMPONENTS OF ENROLLMENT CHANGE

Fall to Fall	Total		Natural Increase/Decrease	Net Migration
	#	%		
2004 to 2005	30	0.8	-58	88
2005 to 2006	34	0.9	-20	54
2006 to 2007	7	0.2	-41	18
2007 to 2008	-48	-1.3	-49	1
2008 to 2009	-32	-0.8	-45	13
2009 to 2010	-36	-1.0	-88	52
2010 to 2011	16	0.4	-46	62
2011 to 2012	49	1.3	-11	60
2012 to 2013	-29	-0.8	-91	62

EDUCATION CHOICES

2011-12

	Minnesota	Northfield
Nonpublic settings	10.0%	6.9%
Traditional schools	8.1%	4.2%
Home schools	1.9%	2.9%
Public Options		
Open enrollment	6.4%	
In		7.0%
Out		3.8%
Charter schools	4.1%	5.9%
Capture Rate	78.8%	81.1%

Grade	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
K	250	254	280	272	247	269	247	267	281	235
1	262	268	249	287	272	251	273	256	269	300
2	249	250	276	250	291	255	258	283	251	266
3	258	258	264	281	253	290	254	271	276	255
4	284	265	258	274	273	248	292	264	270	278
5	262	288	272	264	281	273	256	306	269	278
6	292	299	331	287	293	306	297	264	339	296
7	319	314	294	336	279	282	297	306	269	347
8	312	328	316	298	334	277	290	297	314	269
9	324	336	336	331	305	346	307	310	319	328
10	311	313	332	335	317	311	335	298	307	310
11	327	319	305	322	326	310	298	319	292	296
12	312	300	313	296	314	335	313	292	326	295
Total	3,762	3,792	3,826	3,833	3,785	3,753	3,717	3,733	3,782	3,753

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE

- "Average" class size
  - 269 K-5
  - 304 6-8
  - 307 9-12
  - The distribution of students by grade (elementary versus middle school) suggests enrollment will continue to decrease if kindergarten remains near its current level

Calendar Year	Minnesota	Rice County	Northfield City
1998	65,207	671	195
1999	65,953	670	175
2000	67,451	663	159
2001	66,617	721	210
2002	68,037	716	201
2003	70,053	698	191
2004	70,617	797	223
2005	70,950	794	231
2006	73,515	842	242
2007	73,675	796	213
2008	72,382	794	203
2009	70,617	748	206
2010	68,407	720	178
2011	68,416	733	208

Year (Sept to Aug)	District Resident Births
1998; 1999	196
1999; 2000	183
2000; 2001	235
2001; 2002	209
2002; 2003	220
2003; 2004	230
2004; 2005	231
2005; 2006	229
2006; 2007	259
2007; 2008	211
2008; 2009	226
2009; 2010	204
2010; 2011	174
2011; 2012	127
2012; 2013	145

MACRO TRENDS

- Aging population
  - Less mobility
  - Decrease in school age population per household
  - Shift in size of adult age groups
    - Less demand for single-family detached housing
- More births this decade and the next (Gen Y)
  - Another enrollment cycle (third)
    - Rising elementary enrollment in the first half of the cycle
    - Another large graduating class about 2040 (end of cycle)

PROJECTION METHODOLOGIES

- Cohort survival method
  - Projections by grade
  - Reflects recent births and current size of grades
  - Difficult to calibrate survival rates to reflect additional housing units, especially if a large number of units

Birth Years	District Pool	Percentage	Kindergarten
1998; 1999	196	127.6%	2004-05
1999; 2000	183	138.8%	2005-06
2000; 2001	235	119.1%	2006-07
2001; 2002	209	130.1%	2007-08
2002; 2003	220	112.3%	2008-09
2003; 2004	230	117.0%	2009-10
2004; 2005	231	106.9%	2010-11
2005; 2006	229	116.6%	2011-12
2006; 2007	259	108.5%	2012-13
2007; 2008	211	111.4%	2013-14
2008; 2009	226		2014-15
2009; 2010	204		2015-16
2010; 2011	174 (218)		2016-17
2011; 2012	127 (159)		2017-18
2012; 2013	145 (181)		2018-19

KINDERGARTEN CAPTURE RATES

- Cohort survival method
  - Kindergarten Assumptions
    - Low is 110.0%
    - High is 112.1%
  - Longer-term
    - Rice County births are below projected level (-21.5%)
      - Northfield Public Schools at 29 percent of Rice County

KINDERGARTEN PROJECTIONS

Year	@110.0%	@112.1%
2013-14	**235**	**235**
2014-15	249	253
2015-16	224	229
2016-17	240	244
2017-18	175	178
2018-19	199	203
2019-20	240	244
2020-21	243	248
2021-22	246	251
2022-23	248	252
2023-24	248	252
Total	2,312	2,354

NET MIGRATION

SCHOOL YEAR TO SCHOOL YEAR									
Grade	04 to 05	05 to 06	06 to 07	07 to 08	08 to 09	09 to 10	10 to 11	11 to 12	12 to 13
K-5	26	24	29	6	-19	20	56	-6	30
6-8	68	40	24	19	12	23	17	46	35
9-12	-6	-10	-5	-24	20	9	-11	20	-3
Total	88	54	48	1	13	52	62	60	62

NET MIGRATION BY GRADE

Grade	04 to 05	05 to 06	06 to 07	07 to 08	08 to 09	09 to 10	10 to 11	11 to 12	12 to 13
K to 1	18	-5	7	0	4	4	9	2	19
1 to 2	-12	8	1	4	-17	7	10	-5	-3
2 to 3	9	14	5	3	-1	-1	13	-7	4
3 to 4	7	0	10	-8	-5	2	10	-1	2
4 to 5	4	7	6	7	0	8	14	5	8
5 to 6	**37**	**43**	**15**	**29**	**25**	**24**	**8**	**33**	**27**
6 to 7	22	-5	5	-8	-11	-9	9	5	8
7 to 8	9	2	4	-2	-2	8	0	8	0
8 to 9	**24**	**8**	**15**	**7**	**12**	**30**	**20**	**22**	**14**
9 to 10	-11	-4	-1	-14	6	-11	-9	-3	-9
10 to 11	8	-8	-10	-9	-7	-13	-16	-6	-11
11 to 12	-27	-6	-9	-8	9	3	-6	7	3
Total	88	54	48	1	13	52	62	60	62

PROJECTED SURVIVAL RATES

Grade	Low (past 10 years)	High (past 3 years)
K to 1	1.024	1.037
1 to 2	0.997	1.002
2 to 3	1.017	1.014
3 to 4	1.007	1.014
4 to 5	1.024	1.032
5 to 6	1.097	1.080
6 to 7	1.006	1.024
7 to 8	1.010	1.009
8 to 9	1.056	1.063
9 to 10	0.981	0.978
10 to 11	0.975	0.965
11 to 12	0.988	1.004

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Year	Low K Low Mig	High K Low Mig	Low K High Mig	High K High Mig
2013-14	**3,753**	**3,753**	**3,753**	**3,753**
2014-15	3,754	3,758	3,765	3,769
2015-16	3,739	3,748	3,756	3,766
2016-17	3,728	3,741	3,755	3,769
2017-18	3,642	3,658	3,679	3,696
2018-19	3,622	3,643	3,668	3,688
2019-20	3,557	3,582	3,611	3,636
2020-21	3,546	3,576	3,603	3,634
2021-22	3,528	3,564	3,595	3,632
2022-23	3,501	3,542	3,573	3,615
2023-24	3,494	3,540	3,570	3,617

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

	K-5	6-8	9-12	Total
2013-14	**1,612**	**912**	**1,229**	**3,753**
2018-19				
Low K/Low Mig	1,368	945	1,310	3,622
High K/Low Mig	1,388	945	1,310	3,643
Low K/High Mig	1,391	954	1,322	3,668
High K/High Mig	1,412	954	1,322	3,688
2023-24				
Low K/Low Mig	1,469	756	1,268	3,494
High K/Low Mig	1,496	771	1,273	3,540
Low K/High Mig	1,493	777	1,301	3,570
High K/High Mig	1,520	791	1,306	3,617

SCHOOL PROJECTIONS

- Elementary school projections are based on the high kindergarten and high migration assumptions

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROJECTIONS

School	2013-14	2018-19	Change	
			#	%
Bridgewater	556	472	-84	-15.1
Greenvale Park	474	435	-39	-8.2
Sibley	582	508	-74	-12.7
Sum	1,612	1,415	-197	-12.2
District wide	1,612	1,412	-200	-12.4

NEW HOUSING UNITS

- 88 new single-family detached units are anticipated in the next two years
  - 84 in the Sibley attendance area
  - 4 in the Greenvale Park attendance area

STUDENT YIELD BY DWELLING TYPE

Dwelling Type	Number	K-5 Yield	6-8 Yield	9-12 Yield
Single-Family Detached	3,804	0.18	0.10	0.15
Townhomes	108	0.04	0.04	0.05
Duplex/Triplex	217	0.07	0.03	0.05

ANNUAL SALES
EXISTING S-F DETACHED UNITS

2011-2013

Attendance Area	%
Bridgewater	7.0%
Greenvale Park	4.7%
Sibley	8.7%

K-5 RESIDENT YIELD FROM S-F UNITS

Attendance Area	Existing units (pre 2011)				New Units (2011-2013)	
	Non Movers		Movers			
	#	Yield	#	Yield	#	Yield
Bridgewater	1,520	0.20	388	0.23	36	0.41
Greenvale Park	1,927	0.14	311	0.14	17	0.23
Sibley	2,120	0.18	456	0.19	29	0.37
Total	5,567	0.17	1,115	0.19	82	0.36

COMPARISON OF PROJECTIONS

- Cohort projections include nonresidents
- Housing unit projections are for resident only
  - Not all students attend the elementary school in their attendance area
    - Varies by attendance area
- Attendance area projections (housing unit method) appear to be lower, but
  - When all adjustments made, housing unit projections are higher than the cohort projections

K-5 PROJECTIONS 2015-16

	School (Sum)	Attendance Area (Residents Only)
Bridgewater	544	528
Greenvale Park	471	505
Sibley	567	543
Total	1,582	1,576

NORTHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT #659

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Hazel H. Reinhardt

5/26/2014

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Executive Summary

- Over the past ten years, Northfield Public School enrollment decreased by -9 students or -0.2 percent
    - The increasing number of district residents attending a charter school or open enrolling out of the district accounts for flat enrollment

- Projected enrollment
    - Cohort Survival method projections show enrollment decreasing in both the next five years and in the second five years of the ten projection period
        - K-5 enrollment is projected to be down in the next five years due to the lower number of births and then partially rebound in the second five projection years
        - Middle school (Grades 6-8) enrollment is projected to increase in the next five years but then decrease in the second five projection years as the smaller elementary grades that reflect the recent decline in births move into middle school
        - High school enrollment is projected to increase

- Projected additional housing is modest in the near term in the Northfield School District
    - Eighty-eight (88) additional single-family detached units are projected in the next two years
    - Nearly half (47 percent) of single-family detached housing units have at least one resident who is 55+ years-old
    - Current Northfield Public School student yields are low, another indicator that the district's population is aging

CHAPTER 1

DISTRICT WIDE ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Introduction

School age population is closely related to other population characteristics. For example, age can affect the number of births in a school district. A larger number of women of prime childbearing age results in more births and larger kindergarten classes five years later. Moving from one locale to another is also related to age; and the movement of families with children under 18 years of age can have a major effect on school enrollment. Population "turnover" is ongoing in a mobile society and enrollment changes throughout the school year as families and children move. In this study, enrollment projections are for the fall headcount, that is, headcount on or about October 1.

While population changes affect the total number of school age children residing in a school district, Minnesota students and their families have education choices. Therefore, when analyzing public school enrollment, choice must be considered as well as population dynamics. Choice includes nonpublic schools, home schools, and the public choices of open enrollment, charter schools and alternative schools. Two others choices exist: a) dropping out of high school, and b) delaying entering kindergarten.

Enrollment Trends

Enrollment in the Northfield Public Schools

Current Enrollment/Past Trends

Total enrollment in the Northfield Public Schools is -9 students or -0.2 percent lower in 2013-14 than in 2004-05. Enrollment was essentially flat although it fluctuated from year to year during the ten year period.

K-12 TOTAL ENROLLMENT									
2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
3,762	3,792	3,826	3,833	3,785	3,753	3,717	3,733	3,782	3,753

Source: Northfield School District, Fall Enrollment. Excludes Early Childhood and ALC

Like all population changes, school enrollment change results from two different phenomena. The difference between the size of the incoming kindergarten class and the previous year's Grade 12, called natural increase or decrease, measures the change in past birth numbers or cohort change. For example, the Baby Boom (1946-1964) and the Baby Bust (1965-1976) set in motion cycles of rising and falling enrollment that were reflected as natural increase/decrease. As the next table shows, in the past

ten years, Northfield's kindergarten classes have been smaller than the previous year's Grade 12 every year. The difference is large in some years and smaller in others. Much of this natural decrease is artificial resulting from students who attended kindergarten elsewhere but enrolled in the Northfield Public Schools' middle school and high school, which then "inflates" Grade 12 compared to Kindergarten.

COMPONENTS OF ENROLLMENT CHANGE				
	Total		Natural Increase/	Net
Fall to Fall	#	%	Decrease	Migration
2004 to 2005	30	0.8	-58	88
2005 to 2006	34	0.9	-20	54
2006 to 2007	7	0.2	-41	18
2007 to 2008	-48	-1.3	-49	1
2008 to 2009	-32	-0.8	-45	13
2009 to 2010	-36	-1.0	-88	52
2010 to 2011	16	0.4	-46	62
2011 to 2012	49	1.3	-11	60
2012 to 2013	-29	-0.8	-91	62

The other phenomenon affecting school enrollment is migration, an indirectly derived estimate. Migration is the term used when people move across a boundary or border, in this case, the school district boundary. Net migration is calculated by the progression from grade-to-grade of public school students. For example, public school Kindergarten students are moved to Grade 1 in the following year, Grade 1 students to Grade 2, etc. Because the probability of death is very low among children, the same number of students should be in the next higher grade the following year. Therefore, if the number of students changes, migration is assumed to have occurred. A positive number indicates a net flow into the public schools and a negative number reflects a net flow out of the public schools.

This method for estimating migration does not distinguish between physical movement across the district's boundaries and education choices, such as transferring from a nonpublic school to a public school, transferring to a charter school or open enrolling in another public school outside the district. Further, students who move into or out of a school district but never enroll in the district's public schools are not reflected in the migration numbers in this report.

Based on the described methodology, net migration has been positive every year. These numbers largely reflect the inflows from nonpublic schools and other public options.

Student Choices in the Northfield School District

Minnesota students and their families have education choices. Nonpublic schools have been an option for many years. More recently, home schools became another option. Since its inception, public school options are attracting more students. Open enrollment allows residents of one district to attend

public schools in another district. Charter schools are another public option. All these choices mean competition for a district's public schools.

Nonpublic Enrollment and Home Schools

Today, nonpublic enrollment falls into two categories—traditional nonpublic schools and home schools. Most traditional nonpublic schools are associated with religious institutions and many home school curriculums also have religious ties.

NONPUBLIC SETTINGS			
Year	Traditional Nonpublic Schools	Home Schools	Total
2004-05	194	109	303
2005-06	199	123	322
2006-07	191	130	321
2007-08	215	129	344
2008-09	223	133	356
2009-10	231	128	359
2010-11	231	123	354
2011-12	235	123	358
2012-13	232	115	347
2013-14	185	111	296

Source: Northfield School District

In Minnesota, 8.1 percent of all enrolled students were enrolled in traditional nonpublic schools and 1.9 percent of enrolled students were home schooled in 2011-12. (To date, the Minnesota Department of Education has not released comparable date for 2012-13.) In the Northfield School District, traditional nonpublic schools accounted for 4.2 percent of enrolled students and home schooled students accounted for 2.9 percent. The proportion of ISD #659 residents in nonpublic settings is lower than the statewide percentages. Combining home school students and nonpublic students, 6.9 percent of Northfield district residents were in nonpublic settings. In Minnesota, 10.0 percent were enrolled in nonpublic settings.

In the past ten years, traditional nonpublic enrollment decreased statewide while home schooled children increased. Traditional nonpublic enrollment in the Northfield School District increased but today it is about what it was in 2004-05. Home schooled students show the same pattern and today, the number of home schooled students is similar to 2004-05.

Public Options

Open Enrollment. Open enrollment allows Minnesota students to attend public schools outside their district of residence. The application to open enroll is made by the student and his/her parents and families generally provide their own school transportation. No tuition is charged.

Some students attend public schools outside their home district because their home district enters into an agreement with another district, usually to provide specialized services. This is called a tuition agreement, but this arrangement is not technically a student choice.

Since its beginning, open enrollment has attracted more and more students statewide and in the Northfield School District. In 2013-14, 281 nonresident students open enrolled into the Northfield Public Schools while 193 district residents attended public schools elsewhere through open enrollment.

PUBLIC OPTIONS					
	In	Out			
Year	Open Enrollment & Tuition	Open Enrollment & Tuition	Charter Schools	Other Options* (ALC and Other)	Net
2004-05	279	124	181	118	-26
2005-06	247	129	197	58	-79
2006-07	257	147	189	89	-79
2007-08	250	135	201	77	-86
2008-09	294	144	205	98	-55
2009-10	276	157	256	80	-137
2010-11	282	176	262	76	-156
2011-12	262	164	254	67	-156
2012-13	278	191	300	42	-213
2013-14	281	193	268	52	-180

Other Options not included in the net
Source: Northfield School District

Nonresident students who open enroll into the Northfield Public Schools accounted for 7.0 percent of Northfield's total enrollment in 2011-12. Students leaving the district to attend public schools elsewhere represented 3.8 percent of district school age residents. In 2011-12, 6.4 percent of Minnesota students chose open enrollment.

Charter Schools. Charter schools are another public education option. While 4.1 percent of Minnesota students attend charter schools, 5.9 percent of Northfield School District residents attend charter schools, making charter schools the public option with the largest (net) negative impact on Northfield Public School enrollment.

As the public option data show, the Northfield Public Schools are a net loser among students selecting public options. The net loss has increased over the past decade.

Summary of District School Age Residents

To estimate market share (capture rate), there must be an estimate of a district's school age population or more precisely, a district's school age population enrolled in school. A district's enrolled population can be constructed based on resident students in the district's schools and then adding district residents attending traditional nonpublic schools, residents being home schooled and residents

opting for open enrollment out, charter schools and other public options. Based on 2004-05 and 2013-14, the estimated resident school age population increased slightly, going from 4,209 to 4,281. During this same period, resident enrollment in the Northfield Public Schools decreased by -11 students or -0.3 percent. These data suggest that the Northfield Public Schools' market share decreased, which is typical in Minnesota. Based on the estimated 2013-14 enrolled population of 4,281, the Northfield Public Schools captured 81.1 percent of the district's school age population. In 2004-05, using the same definition, market share was 82.8 percent. Northfield's current market share is higher than the state wide average.

NORTHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT ESTIMATED RESIDENT SCHOOL AGE POPULATION				
Year	Northfield Public Schools Resident Enrollment	Nonpublic Settings	Public Options*	Total
2004-05	3,483	303	423	4,209
2005-06	3,545	322	384	4,251
2006-07	3,569	321	425	4,315
2007-08	3,583	344	413	4,340
2008-09	3,491	356	447	4,294
2009-10	3,477	359	493	4,329
2010-11	3,435	354	514	4,303
2011-12	3,471	358	485	4,314
2012-13	3,504	347	533	4,384
2013-14	3,472	296	513	4,281

*Includes Other Options

History of Resident Enrollment by Grade

The history of public school enrollment contains several patterns with implications for the future. First, the size of the kindergarten class fluctuated from year to year but in 2013-14 was smaller than in 2004-05. In most years between these two years, kindergarten was larger.

Future enrollment is heavily influenced by current grade size. A way of expressing grade size differences is to calculate the "average" number of students per grade. For example, the average elementary grade (K-5) has 269 students. The average middle school grade (Grades 6-8) has 304 students while the average for a high school grade is 307 students. The larger middle school and high school classes reflects some net inflow of students; however, the difference between the size of the average elementary grade and the average middle school grade points to decline if kindergarten remains near its current level.

Minnesota's largest graduating high school class since 1978 graduated in 2009. Statewide, graduating classes will be getting smaller. Based on Northfield's enrollment history, Northfield's largest senior class most likely graduated in 2010.

ENROLLMENT										
Grade	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
K	250	254	280	272	247	269	247	267	281	235
1	262	268	249	287	272	251	273	256	269	300
2	249	250	276	250	291	255	258	283	251	266
3	258	258	264	281	253	290	254	271	276	255
4	284	265	258	274	273	248	292	264	270	278
5	262	288	272	264	281	273	256	306	269	278
6	292	299	331	287	293	306	297	264	339	296
7	319	314	294	336	279	282	297	306	269	347
8	312	328	316	298	334	277	290	297	314	269
9	324	336	336	331	305	346	307	310	319	328
10	311	313	332	335	317	311	335	298	307	310
11	327	319	305	322	326	310	298	319	292	296
12	312	300	313	296	314	335	313	292	326	295
Total	3,762	3,792	3,826	3,833	3,785	3,753	3,717	3,733	3,782	3,753

Source: Northfield School District. Excludes Early Childhood and ALC

Enrollment Projections

Projection Background

Some factors affecting future school enrollment are known. However, other important factors are less clear. First, the trends around which there is confidence.

Trends Where Confidence is High

- Aging. The population in the U.S. and Minnesota is aging. By 2020, 16-17 percent of Minnesota's population will be 65 years old or older. In 2010, the elderly made up 12.9 percent of the population. There is no historical precedent for this high proportion of older population; therefore, society is entering uncharted waters as to the effects of this change. However, we know that aging will affect the housing market and reduce geographic mobility because older people move less frequently than younger people.

- Decrease in the school age population per household. From 2000 to 2010, the number of school age children per household decreased sharply as Baby Boomer households empty nested and started to "age in place." After 2010, households with children will be headed primarily by Generation X parents who are members of a much smaller generation. Gen X (1965-1976) is only 60 percent the size of the Baby Boom (1946-1964) generation, which means the percentage of households with 5-17 year-olds will continue to decrease but more slowly.

- Shift in size of key adult age groups. The size of the Baby Boom generation and the Baby Bust generation will result in significant changes in the size of adult age groups, which in turn will affect the demand for new housing units. The modest increase in the 20-34 year-old population

between 2010 and 2020 is especially significant for the demand for "first" homes (including apartments) and the decrease in 35-54 year-olds will affect the "move up" market. Growth in the 55+ year-old markets will create demand for housing for mature adults and seniors; however, these units will not yield school age children. These population changes by age point to a future very different from the recent past. Demand for additional housing will slow because the adult population age 20+ will increase more slowly and the 35-54 year-old age group that helped fuel the housing boom will decrease from 2010-2020. Furthermore, 60 percent of the increase in adults 20 years of age and older will be persons 65+ years of age. There may be more sellers than buyers in the housing market.

- Fertility. Today, completed fertility is near the replacement level. Completed fertility refers to the number of children born per woman throughout her childbearing years. In the U.S., White non-Hispanic and Black women have near or below replacement fertility. (Replacement is 2.11 children per female at the end of childbearing.) Fertility rates are likely to remain at or near replacement levels. Hispanic women and immigrant women have higher fertility.

- Births. Births fell after 1990 in the U.S. and in Minnesota; however, since 2003, births had been increasing until the past four years. In 2007, births were higher than at any time since 1964; however, 2007 births were well below the peak Minnesota birth year of 1959 (88,000 resident births). Births fell in the U.S. and Minnesota in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011, although in Minnesota, births were flat between 2010 and 2011 (+9 births). These declines are attributed to the poor economy.

  As the history of resident births shows, from 1998 to 2011, resident births in Minnesota increased 4.9 percent while resident births in Rice County increased 9.2 percent. Resident births in Northfield City increased 6.7 percent. Rice County resident births peaked in 2006.

RESIDENT LIVE BIRTHS			
Calendar Year	Minnesota	Rice County	Northfield City
1998	65,207	671	195
1999	65,953	670	175
2000	67,451	663	159
2001	66,617	721	210
2002	68,037	716	201
2003	70,053	698	191
2004	70,617	797	223
2005	70,950	794	231
2006	73,515	842	242
2007	73,675	796	213
2008	72,382	794	203
2009	70,617	748	206
2010	68,407	720	178
2011	68,416	733	208

Source: Minnesota Department of Health

- Enrollment cycles. Births will increase again and a third enrollment cycle will occur in the first half of this century. Already, kindergarten classes are increasing in some districts, a sign of the beginning of this third enrollment cycle. The end of the third enrollment cycle is projected to be around 2040. (From start to finish, these cycles last about 30 years.)

Unknowns

The unknowns reflect recent changes such as the collapse of the housing market and tighter credit. Another unknown is the longer-term effect of the recession on domestic migration and international immigration, especially in a sluggish economy. Furthermore, will attitude and behavior changes prompted by the recession last?

- Collapse of the housing market and tighter credit. A high level of mobility was possible with a robust housing market with rapid appreciation and easy credit. This has now changed with the collapse of the housing market and tighter credit. The change in the housing market has slowed growth in many school districts. Recently, however, home prices have been increasing and new construction is occurring.

- The recession. Although the recession is over, the sluggish job market slowed population movement between and within states. Minnesota felt the effect of this change as fewer young and middle-aged adults moved to Minnesota slowing population growth, although population has increased more rapidly in the past year. The recession also increased public school enrollment as some families decided that nonpublic schools were beyond their current financial resources.

Cohort Survival Method

The most common and most robust model for projecting school enrollment is the cohort survival method. The first step in the cohort survival method is aging the population. In a standard cohort survival model, aging the population involves estimating the number of deaths expected in an age group before it reaches the next older age group. When the cohort survival method is applied to school enrollment, the first step is to move a grade to the next higher grade. However, because mortality is so low in the school age population, the entire grade is assumed to "survive" to the next higher grade in the following year.

Once a grade or cohort has been "aged" to the next grade, net migration is added to or subtracted from that grade. Using survival rates accomplishes both "aging" and migration in a single step. Over time, the size of a cohort will increase or decrease as a result of migration as its progresses through the grades. For example, the 2004-05 kindergarten class had 250 members. This same cohort had 328 members in Grade 9 in 2013-14; however, most of this increase represents nonpublic and charter school students entering the Northfield Public Schools not new residents to the district.

The projection of future kindergarten class size is important in long-term enrollment projections because these students will be in school over the life of the projection. If a school census exists, it is a resource for short-term kindergarten projections, i.e., a couple of years. However, school censuses are notoriously inaccurate for children less than four years of age.

To project kindergarten, the best theoretical approach, but the least practical, is to project births based on the age of the female population. These birth projections then must be survived to age five and then adjusted for migration to yield kindergarten projections. Determining the age of females in a school district is the first challenge and then, many assumptions must be made, making this approach impractical.

A simpler approach is to use resident births as a proxy for kindergarten five years later. Of course, not every child born in the district will enter the district's kindergarten classes five to six years later. However, some "native born" children who move out before enrolling in kindergarten will be replaced by children born elsewhere who move into the district before entering kindergarten. If the number of "ins" and "outs" is equal, the net effect is zero and the kindergarten class would be 100 percent of resident births. However, no public school system captures all its potential. Some resident kindergarten students attend private schools or are home schooled. Others may attend a charter school or open enroll at another district. Therefore, a public school's capture rate is expected to be less than 100 percent. If the capture rate is 100 percent or higher, more preschool children are moving into the district than leaving (net in migration).

Using resident births as a proxy for kindergarten results in kindergarten projections for only a few years into the future. To extend kindergarten projections another five years, Northfield's kindergarten will be projected based on the Minnesota Demographic Center's projection of Rice County resident births.

Kindergarten Assumptions

Although births five years earlier are a good proxy for a kindergarten class, kindergarten students must be 5 years-old by September 1. This age requirement means that about one-third of the kindergarten class is born six years earlier not five years earlier. Adjusting birth years to fit the age requirements of kindergarten creates a kindergarten pool.

DISTRICT RESIDENT LIVE BIRTHS SEPTEMBER 1 TO AUGUST 31	
1998-1999	196
1999-2000	183
2000-2001	235
2001-2002	209
2002-2003	220
2003-2004	230
2004-2005	231
2005-2006	229
2006-2007	259
2007-2008	211
2008-2009	226
2009-2010	204
2010-2011	174
2011-2012	127
2012-2013	145

Source: Minnesota Department of Health

Upon special request, the Minnesota Department of Health will provide resident births by address so births can be geocoded to a school district's boundaries. Some "out-of-wedlock" births may be withheld because unmarried parents may choose whether to make birth information by address public. (All resident births are reported in published city and county data.)

The resident births pool for District #659 is smaller in 2012-13 than it was in 1998-1999; and for the past three years, the pool is smaller than it was earlier. Further, the district's births are less than those in the City of Northfield in 2010-11 suggesting that more births by address are being withheld. Therefore, the Northfield District pool was adjusted upward to maintain the typical ratio between district and city resident births. The adjusted numbers for the past three years are shown in parenthesizes. Even with the adjustment, kindergarten classes will be smaller in the future unless more preschool children move into the district in the next several years.

NORTHFIELD'S KINDERGARTEN AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE DISTRICT KINDERGARTEN POOL			
Birth Years	Northfield District Pool	Percentage	Kindergarten Year
1998; 1999	196	127.6%	2004-05
1999; 2000	183	138.8%	2005-06
2000; 2001	235	119.1%	2006-07
2001; 2002	209	130.1%	2007-08
2002; 2003	220	112.3%	2008-09
2003; 2004	230	117.0%	2009-10
2004; 2005	231	106.9%	2010-11
2005; 2006	229	116.6%	2011-12
2006; 2007	259	108.5%	2012-13
2007; 2008	211	111.4%	2013-14
2008; 2009	226		2014-15
2009; 2010	204		2015-16
2010; 2011	174 (218)		2016-17
2011; 2012	127 (159)		2017-18
2012; 2013	145 (181)		2018-19

Applying a ratio of Northfield's kindergarten to the kindergarten pool takes advantage of actual births in the past several years. With district birth data available through September 2013, kindergarten classes can be projected from actual births through 2018-19.

Northfield's kindergarten as percentage of the district pool fluctuates in a fairly wide range even in the past six years. Averaging the percentages is a way to remove some of the annual fluctuations. For example, the average of the past six years is 112.1 percent while the average of the past three years is 112.2 percent. The average of the past two years is 110.0 percent while the average of the past four years is 110.9 percent. While the percentage varies annually, a kindergarten percentage of around 112 percent and one around 110 percent reflect recent history. For kindergarten projections the average of 112.1 percent and the average of 110.0 percent will be used.

RESIDENT BIRTHS RICE COUNTY				
	Births			
Year	Original Projection	Actual	Difference	Adjusted Projection
2005	805	794	-1.4%	
2006	828	842	1.7%	
2007	851	796	-6.5%	
2008	875	794	-9.3%	
2009	898	748	-16.7%	
2010	921	720	-21.8%	
2011	933	733	-21.4%	
2012	946			743
2013	958			752
2014	971			762
2015	983			772
2016	987			775
2017	991			778
2018	995			781

Source: Minnesota Demographic Center

To extend kindergarten projections beyond 2018-19, projected Rice County resident births will be used as a guide. As the above table shows, actual births are much lower than projected births; therefore, the projections will be reduced by 21.5 percent. These reduced projections will be used as a guide for Northfield district births. In the past five years, Northfield district births have been about 29 percent of Rice County births.

The next table shows the district kindergarten pool based on district resident births through 2018-19 and the projected pool based on Rice County resident birth projections for 2019-20 through

PROJECTED DISTRICT KINDERGARTEN POOL	
2014-15	**226**
2015-16	**204**
2016-17	**218**
2017-18	**159**
2018-19	**181**
2019-20	218
2020-21	221
2021-22	224
2022-23	225
2023-24	225

2023-24. Note that the kindergarten pool does not return to its 2013-14 level (226) until 2021-22 (224). Unless more preschool children move into the district or more kindergarten students open enroll into the Northfield Public Schools, kindergarten classes will be smaller for a number of years. As the Millennials (Gen Y) move into their prime childbearing years, births should rise and the kindergarten pool will become larger in the 2020s.

Based on history, a 110.0 percent capture rate will be used as the low kindergarten assumption and a 112.1 percent capture rate will be used as a high kindergarten assumption.

KINDERGARTEN ASSUMPTIONS		
Year	@110.0%	@112.1%
2013-14	**235**	**235**
2014-15	249	253
2015-16	224	229
2016-17	240	244
2017-18	175	178
2018-19	199	203
2019-20	240	244
2020-21	243	248
2021-22	246	251
2022-23	248	252
2023-24	248	252
Total	2,312	2,354

The low resident kindergarten projection results in 2,312 kindergarten students over ten years while the high projection produces 2,354 kindergarten students in ten years. This compares with 2,602 kindergarten students over the past ten years. The large Gen Y (Millennial) population will begin to enter its prime childbearing years after 2015. When this happens, the kindergarten pool should increase. As the pool increases, so will the size of the kindergarten classes.

Net Migration Assumptions

The method for estimating migration does not distinguish between physical movement across the district's boundaries and education choices, such as transferring from a nonpublic school to a public school, transferring to a charter school or open enrolling in another public school. Further, students who move into or out of a school district but never enroll in the district's public schools are not reflected in the migration numbers in this report.

In the past ten years, annual net migration fluctuated from year to year but has always been positive. The next table shows net migration aggregated by the elementary grades (Kindergarten-Grade 5), the middle school grades (Grades 6-8) and the high school grades. Kindergarten to Grade 5 net in migration accounted for a majority of the net in migration in some years while middle school net in migration was larger than elementary net in migration in most years. The high school grades show a net loss most years, which is typical in Minnesota as students leave for alternatives (ALCs) or drop out.

NET MIGRATION SCHOOL YEAR TO SCHOOL YEAR									
	04 to 05	05 to 06	06 to 07	07 to 08	08 to 09	09 to 10	10 to 11	11 to 12	12 to 13
K-5	26	24	29	6	-19	20	56	-6	30
6-8	68	40	24	19	12	23	17	46	35
9-12	-6	-10	-5	-24	20	9	-11	20	-3
Total	88	54	48	1	13	52	62	60	62

NET MIGRATION BY GRADE SCHOOL YEAR TO SCHOOL YEAR									
	04 to 05	05 to 06	06 to 07	07 to 08	08 to 09	09 to 10	10 to 11	11 to 12	12 to 13
K to 1	18	-5	7	0	4	4	9	2	19
1 to 2	-12	8	1	4	-17	7	10	-5	-3
2 to 3	9	14	5	3	-1	-1	13	-7	4
3 to 4	7	0	10	-8	-5	2	10	-1	2
4 to 5	4	7	6	7	0	8	14	5	8
5 to 6	**37**	**43**	**15**	**29**	**25**	**24**	**8**	**33**	**27**
6 to 7	22	-5	5	-8	-11	-9	9	5	8
7 to 8	9	2	4	-2	-2	8	0	8	0
8 to 9	**24**	**8**	**15**	**7**	**12**	**30**	**20**	**22**	**14**
9 to 10	-11	-4	-1	-14	6	-11	-9	-3	-9
10 to 11	8	-8	-10	-9	-7	-13	-16	-6	-11
11 to 12	-27	-6	-9	-8	9	3	-6	7	3
Total	88	54	48	1	13	52	62	60	62
Percent	2.3	1.4	1.3	---	0.3	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.6

In the Northfield Public Schools, net in migration occurs most years between Kindergarten and Grade 1. Net in migration between Kindergarten and Grade 1 is typical in Minnesota's public schools. The progression from grade to grade in the remaining elementary grades fluctuates but is usually positive. Northfield also has relatively large and consistent net in migration from Grade 5 to Grade 6 and again from Grade 8 to Grade 9, when charter school and nonpublic students transfer into the Northfield Public Schools. After Grade 9, the high school grades show losses. This also is typical.

Migration is converted to survival rates for projection purposes. These rates show the percentage change from grade to grade each year. For example, 1.00 indicates no change or 100 percent of the grade progressed to the next highest grade. Any number over 1.00 reflects the percentage increase while a number below 1.00 reflects the percentage decrease. For example, 0.98 indicates a 2 percent decrease.

SURVIVAL RATES SCHOOL YEAR TO SCHOOL YEAR									
	04 to 05	05 to 06	06 to 07	07 to 08	08 to 09	09 to 10	10 to 11	11 to 12	12 to 13
K to 1	1.072	0.980	1.025	1.000	1.016	1.015	1.036	1.008	1.068
1 to 2	0.954	1.030	1.004	1.014	0.938	1.028	1.037	0.981	0.989
2 to 3	1.036	1.056	1.018	1.012	0.997	0.996	1.050	0.975	1.016
3 to 4	1.027	1.000	1.038	0.972	0.980	1.007	1.039	0.996	1.007
4 to 5	1.014	1.026	1.023	1.026	1.000	1.032	1.048	1.019	1.030
5 to 6	1.141	1.149	1.055	1.110	1.089	1.088	1.031	1.108	1.100
6 to 7	1.075	0.983	1.015	0.972	0.963	0.971	1.030	1.019	1.024
7 to 8	1.028	1.006	1.014	0.994	0.993	1.028	1.000	1.026	1.000
8 to 9	1.077	1.024	1.048	1.024	1.036	1.108	1.069	1.074	1.045
9 to 10	0.966	0.988	0.997	0.958	1.020	0.968	0.971	0.990	0.972
10 to 11	1.026	0.974	0.970	0.973	0.978	0.958	0.952	0.980	0.964
11 to 12	0.917	0.981	0.971	0.975	1.028	1.010	0.980	1.022	1.010

One of the advantages of the cohort survival method is that it produces projections for every grade. However, this requires migration assumptions for every grade. At first glance, some of the rates look quite similar. However, the average of survival rates for the past ten years results in a higher

COMPARISON OF SURVIVAL RATES AVERAGED			
Grade	Past 10 years	Past 5 years	Past 3 years
K to 1	1.024	1.029	1.037
1 to 2	0.997	0.995	1.002
2 to 3	1.017	1.007	1.014
3 to 4	1.007	1.006	1.014
4 to 5	1.024	1.026	1.032
5 to 6	1.097	1.083	1.080
6 to 7	1.006	1.001	1.024
7 to 8	1.010	1.009	1.009
8 to 9	1.056	1.066	1.063
9 to 10	0.981	0.984	0.978
10 to 11	0.975	0.966	0.965
11 to 12	0.988	1.010	1.004

projection than the average of the survival rates of the past five years. The average of the survival rates of the past three years results in the highest projection. The three year average will be used for the high migration assumption while the ten year average will be used for the low migration assumption.

Because net migration will be projected based on survival rates by grade, the percentage change will be the same each year while the actual number of students added or subtracted by grade may change from year to year.

PROJECTED SURVIVAL RATES		
Grade	Low (Past 10 Years)	High (Past 3 Years)
K to 1	1.024	1.037
1 to 2	0.997	1.002
2 to 3	1.017	1.014
3 to 4	1.007	1.014
4 to 5	1.024	1.032
5 to 6	1.097	1.080
6 to 7	1.006	1.024
7 to 8	1.010	1.009
8 to 9	1.056	1.063
9 to 10	0.981	0.978
10 to 11	0.975	0.965
11 to 12	0.988	1.004

Projection Results

The kindergarten and net migration assumptions are trend lines, which remove annual fluctuations. However, the future, like the past, will be characterized by annual fluctuation, sometimes large. Because there is no reasonable way to forecast when fluctuations around trend lines will occur, it is arbitrary to project them. Furthermore, long-term projections are designed to approximate a future point in time not to yield the best projection for each intervening year between the present and the projection end date. For this reason, long-term projections should not be used for annual budgeting purposes. The district should continue to use its version of the cohort survival methodology for annual enrollment projections.

Four cohort projections are shown in the next table. In ten years, there is a 123 student difference between the lowest projection and the highest projection. This difference results from different assumptions. The kindergarten assumptions result in a 46-47 student difference over the ten years, while the migration assumptions result in a 76-77 student difference in those same years. As these projections show, the migration assumptions have a larger effect on the outcome than the kindergarten assumptions. Of course, assumptions different from these would result in still different projections.

The lowest projection is based on the low kindergarten and low migration assumptions. In this projection, enrollment decreases by -131 students by 2018-19 and continues to decrease so that in 2023-24, enrollment is -259 students lower than in 2013-14. This projection is probably the worst case scenario.

The highest projection, based on the high kindergarten and high migration assumptions, shows an enrollment decrease of -65 students or -1.7 percent between 2013-14 and 2018-19. Enrollment continues to decrease and in 2023-24, enrollment is -136 students lower than in 2013-14.

In between the highest and lowest projections are two other projections that differ by 30 students in ten years. Both of these projections show enrollment decreasing throughout the ten year projection period as well.

Projected enrollment decline results from the recent decline in births and larger grades "aging out" of the elementary schools. Other education options could also play a role in future enrollment depending on the robustness of these options.

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS				
Year	Low K Low Mig	High K Low Mig	Low K High Mig	High K High Mig
2013-14	**3,753**	**3,753**	**3,753**	**3,753**
2014-15	3,754	3,758	3,765	3,769
2015-16	3,739	3,748	3,756	3,766
2016-17	3,728	3,741	3,755	3,769
2017-18	3,642	3,658	3,679	3,696
2018-19	3,622	3,643	3,668	3,688
2019-20	3,557	3,582	3,611	3,636
2020-21	3,546	3,576	3,603	3,634
2021-22	3,528	3,564	3,595	3,632
2022-23	3,501	3,542	3,573	3,615
2023-24	3,494	3,540	3,570	3,617

Excludes Early Childhood and ALC

Looking at the projections based on the elementary, middle school and high school grades is instructive. For the first five projection years, K-5 enrollment is 200 to 244 students lower than it is today as a result of the recent low number of births and larger classes "aging out." Even in 2023-24, K-5 enrollment is lower than it is today.

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS				
	K-5	6-8	9-12	Total
2013-14	**1,612**	**912**	**1,229**	**3,753**
2018-19				
Low K/Low Mig	1,368	945	1,310	3,622
High K/Low Mig	1,388	945	1,310	3,643
Low K/High Mig	1,391	954	1,322	3,668
High K/High Mig	1,412	954	1,322	3,688
2023-24				
Low K/Low Mig	1,469	756	1,268	3,494
High K/Low Mig	1,496	771	1,273	3,540
Low K/High Mig	1,493	777	1,301	3,570
High K/High Mig	1,520	791	1,306	3,617

Excludes Early Childhood and ALC

In the first five projection years, middle school enrollment is 33-42 students larger than today. In 2018-19, grades resulting from the kindergarten assumptions have not yet reached the middle school so we see the effects of the migration assumptions only. By 2023-24, the kindergarten assumptions effect the middle school population and middle school enrollment falls.

All four projections show high school enrollment exceeding its current level throughout the ten projection years.

In 2023-24, the 2013-14 kindergarten class will be in Grade 10, which means that all the grades below Grade 10 are products of the projection assumptions. Detailed grade by year projections are at the end of this report.

Housing Unit Method

The housing unit method provides another way of projecting population and school enrollment. While the number of dwelling units (housing units) is related to the number of school age children, dwelling units alone do not determine the number of school age children. The number of school age children per unit is also a key variable in the projection equation.

The chief reason to use the housing unit method is to understand the effect of additional housing units on enrollment. It could be said that housing stock is like DNA. It determines the size and characteristics of the resident school age population.

The most important dwelling unit characteristics after unit type are the year built and the market value. Year built reflects how families lived in a particular era and is a proxy for square feet and characteristics such as number of bedrooms, number of bathrooms and number of garage spaces. The presence of a master suite, walk-in closets, etc. can also be inferred from year built. Value implies some of these same characteristics plus lot size, location and interior amenities such as kitchen and bathroom appointments and finishes.

The relationship between housing unit characteristics and student numbers and characteristics has been established by work in three states. Findings based on school districts in three states follow.

- Dwelling unit type affects the school age child per unit yield. Single-family detached units have the highest school age child per unit yield. Single-family attached, such as townhouses, have significantly fewer children per unit than single-family detached units while apartment units have even fewer school age children per unit, although there are some local exceptions. In most districts, the change in single-family detached housing units is what affects the number of school age children in a district.

  Eighty-three (83) percent of Northfield Public School resident students come from the district's single-family detached units. This is a relatively high percentage.

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS HOUSING TYPE BY STUDENT YIELD			
Housing Type	Units	K-12 Students	K-12 Yield
Single-Family Detached	6,804	2,962	0.44
Single-Family Attached*	108	14	0.13
Apartments	n.a.	372	n.a.
Mobile Homes	n.a.	194	n.a.
Duplex/Triplex/Twin units	217	32	0.15
Total		3,574	

*Townhomes

Source: Dakota and Rice County Geographic Information Systems and Student Information System

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS STUDENT YIELD BY MINOR CIVIL DIVISION				
Minor Civil Division	Single-Family Detached Homes	Median Value of Single-Family Detached Homes	K-12 Students	K-12 Student Yield
Northfield	4,163	$166,400	1,929	0.46
Dundas	371	$142,300	253	0.53

Source: Dakota and Rice County Geographic Information Systems and Student Information System

- Newer single-family detached units yield more students per unit than older single-family detached units. For Northfield, student yield is higher in units built in 2000 or later. Single-family detached units built pre 1960 have the lowest yields; therefore, age of unit makes a difference in student yield for the Northfield Public Schools.

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENT STUDENT YIELD BY YEAR BUILT			
		Resident K-12	
Era Built	Units	#	Yield
2000 or later	1,586	1,052	0.66
1980-99	1,871	763	0.41
1960-79	1,451	535	0.37
Pre 1960	1,896	612	0.32
Total	6,804	2,962	0.44

Source: Dakota and Rice County Geographic Information Systems and Student Information System

- As single-family detached units sell (turnover), the student yield often increases, especially in the newer units.

In the Northfield School District, K-12 yield is lower in units that were sold. Therefore, the sale of single-family detached units has a slightly negative affect on the number of public school students.

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED UNITS BY SALES STATUS (2011-2013)		
Status	Units	K-12 Yield
New (Built 2011-13)	82	0.77
Existing (Pre 2011)		
Not Sold	5,567	0.44
Sold	1,155	0.38
Total	6,804	0.44

Source: Dakota and Rice County Geographic Information Systems and Student Information System

- The market value of single-family detached units affects the school age child per unit yield. Moderately priced to higher priced units yield more school age children than the lowest priced units.

  In the Northfield School District, market value affects the yield of public school students. The most expensive units yield the most students per unit.

NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENT STUDENT YIELD BY MARKET VALUE			
Estimated Market Value	Single-Family Units	Resident K-12	
		#	Yield
$149,000 or less	2,007	636	0.32
$150,000 - $249,999	3,136	1,404	0.45
$250,000+	1,661	922	0.56
Total	6,804	2,962	0.44

Source: Dakota and Rice County Geographic Information Systems and Student Information System

- Different racial/ethnic groups and/or major language groups have different housing patterns by unit type.

- As the population ages, more dwelling units are being built for mature adults (55+ years) and for seniors. These units will have zero school age children per unit.

Currently, 47 percent of the district's single-family detached units contain at least one person age 55+, while 23 percent of single-family detached units contain a Northfield Public Schools student. The percentage of 55+ population is high in the Northfield School District.

NORTHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED HOMES WITH NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOL K-12 STUDENTS OR REGISTERED VOTERS AGE 55+					
Attendance Area	Single-Family Detached	With K-12 Northfield Public School Students	Percentage with K-12 Northfield Public School Students	With Registered Voter 55+	Percentage with Registered Voter 55+
District wide	6,804	1,601	23%	3,236	47%

Source: Dakota and Rice County Geographic Information Systems and Student Information System

Versions of the Housing Unit Method

The Housing Unit Method has two versions. One version is based on adding the projected number of dwelling units to the existing stock and then applying a child per dwelling unit estimate to the total dwelling unit count. The other version, the housing starts method, is based on estimating the school age children per new unit and adding these students to the student population from existing units. Both versions of the Housing Unit Method face some of the same challenges. Historically, the weakness of both versions was the difficulty in quantifying the effect of housing turnover and the demographic change that occurs when existing housing units are sold. Some of these weaknesses are overcome with data from the Enrollment and Housing Study. Yet, the method doesn't reflect changes in grade size or in births because the yields per unit remain the same throughout the projection period.

Projections

Dwelling Unit Growth

In 2013, the Northfield School District is estimated to have more than 10,000 dwelling units of which the majority are single-family detached units. Some dwelling units may be vacant, but for the purposes of this report, all dwelling units will be treated as occupied.

The next table shows projected development for the next two years. As the numbers show, new residential development is modest.

PROJECTED DEVELOPMENT FOR NEXT TWO YEARS			
City	Single-Family Detached	Townhomes	Condos
Northfield	88	0	0
Dundas	0	0	0
Total	88	0	0

Projections based on the housing unit method are in Chapter 2, which focuses on resident K-5 projections by attendance area.

CHAPTER 2

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND ELEMENTRY ATTENDANCE AREAS

Projecting K-5 enrollment by school or attendance area is fraught with potential errors because the enrollment at any one school or in any one attendance area is small, which magnifies annual fluctuations. For this reason along with the short time that existing students are part of the K-5 student body, projections will be made for five years rather than ten years. This chapter focuses on the three Northfield elementary schools and the district's three elementary attendance areas.

Past Trends

The following three tables show a five year history of K-5 enrollment by school, kindergarten enrollment by school, and net migration by school. Since 2009-10, K-5 enrollment increased by 26 students or 1.6 percent. K-5 enrollment is shifting within the district. Sibley Elementary School increased by 104 students in the past five years while Bridgewater and Greenvale Park elementary schools both saw enrollment declines.

ENROLLMENT GRADES K-5					
School	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Bridgewater	599	544	574	548	556
Greenvale Park	509	486	503	502	474
Sibley	478	550	570	566	582
Total	1,586	1,580	1,647	1,616	1,612

District wide, the 2013-14 kindergarten was -34 students lower than the 2009-10 kindergarten. The largest decrease occurred at Bridgewater.

KINDERGARTEN					
School	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Bridgewater	103	96	94	99	81
Greenvale Park	81	79	87	92	79
Sibley	85	72	86	90	75
Total	269	247	267	281	235

K-5 net migration has been positive every year beginning in 2009-10. Years of high net in migration alternate with years of smaller net in migration. Sibley Elementary School has the highest net in migration, although the numbers suggest some boundary adjustments.

NET MIGRATION GRADES K-5				
School	2009-10 to 2010-11	2010-11 to 2011-12	2011-12 to 2012-13	2012-13 to 2013-14
Bridgewater	-49	18	-23	14
Greenvale Park	-7	17	2	-25
Sibley	76	21	15	41
Total	20	56	-6	30

K-5 Projections

Individual Elementary Schools

Individual school projections will be made using the cohort survival method. The advantage of this method is that it begins by aging the student population. Therefore, any differences in grade sizes are reflected in the projections when these classes leave elementary school. Further, this method is sensitive to the number of births in the immediate past. However, with the cohort survival method, it is very difficult to calibrate migration rates to reflect new housing units, which is a disadvantage. Therefore, the method is weak in anticipating enrollment growth as the result of additional housing units.

Kindergarten

The next table shows births by attendance area. Resident births are declining in all three attendance areas with large decreases in the Bridgewater and Greenvale Park attendance areas.

RESIDENT BIRTHS BY ATTENDANCE AREAS (September 1 to August 31)			
School Year	Bridgewater	Greenvale Park	Sibley
2004-05	73	86	72
2005-06	69	84	76
2006-07	75	117	67
2007-08	69	89	53
2008-09	64	84	78
2009-10	56	91	57
2010-11	49	73	52
2011-12	38	49	40
2012-13	35	55	55

Kindergarten projections will be based on the district wide kindergarten projections.

PERCENT OF KINDERGARTEN AT EACH SCHOOL							
School	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Past 2 yr. avg.	Projection
Bridgewater	38.3%	38.9%	35.2%	35.2%	34.5%	34.8%	34.8%
Greenvale Park	30.1%	32.0%	32.6%	32.8%	33.6%	33.2%	33.2%
Sibley	31.6%	29.1%	32.2%	32.0%	31.9%	32.0%	32.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

KINDERGARTEN PROJECTIONS BY SCHOOL						
School	**2013-14**	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Bridgewater	**81**	88	80	85	62	71
Greenvale Park	**79**	84	76	81	59	67
Sibley	**75**	81	73	78	57	65
Total	**235**	253	229	244	178	203

Migration

Averaging survival rates removes some of the year to year fluctuations, although the average may not be the actual rate in any future year. The average of the past three years is shown below and was used in the projections

PROJECTED SURVIVAL RATES					
	K to 1	1 to 2	2 to 3	3 to 4	4 to 5
Bridgewater	1.016	0.978	1.018	0.996	1.026
Greenvale Park	0.957	1.021	0.979	1.021	1.007
Sibley	1.145	1.014	1.042	1.027	1.059

Projection Results

Resident enrollment projections by school will extend only five years into the future. The 2013-14 kindergarten will be in Grade 5 in 2018-19. Therefore, enrollment in the last couple projection years is largely derived from the assumptions. A summary of the cohort survival projections by school is shown in the next table and annual projections are in a following table. (Background data are in the Appendix.)

COHORT SURVIVAL METHOD PROJECTION BY SCHOOL GRADES K-5 HIGH/HIGH				
			Change	
School	**2013-14**	2018-19	#	%
Bridgewater	**556**	472	-84	-15.1
Greenvale Park	**474**	435	-39	-8.2
Sibley	**582**	508	-74	-12.7
Total	**1,612**	1,415	-197	-12.2
District wide	**1,612**	1,412	-200	-12.4

With the high migration assumption, K-5 enrollment is -200 students lower in 2018-19 than in 2013-14. The sum of the individual school projections is only 3 students higher than the district wide projection (high kindergarten and high migration projection), which means the individual school projections are a good fit with the district wide projections. All three elementary schools show declining enrollment with the largest decrease at Bridgewater. The smaller kindergarten pools due to the recent lower number of births are depressing elementary enrollment.

COHORT SURVIVAL METHOD PROJECTIONS BY SCHOOL BY YEAR GRADES K-5 HIGH/HIGH						
School	**2013-14**	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Bridgewater	**556**	562	544	528	505	472
Greenvale Park	**474**	477	471	483	457	435
Sibley	**582**	575	567	576	547	508
Sum	**1,612**	1,614	1,582	1,587	1,509	1,415
District wide	**1,612**	1,612	1,581	1,583	1,506	1,412
Difference	**0**	+2	+1	+5	+3	+3

Attendance Area Projections

Attendance area projections will be made using the housing starts method. These projections show the potential of each attendance area to produce resident K-5 students. The housing starts method shows the effect of new housing units and the sale of existing units. The method's weakness is that it doesn't reflect changes in grade size or in births because the yields per unit remain at today's level throughout the projection period.

Method

The Housing Occupancy and Enrollment Study for the Northfield School District provides resident K-5 yields for existing units and new units. Yield data for existing units are specific for recently sold units and units that did not turnover. The housing starts method will be calculated as follows:

New Single-Family Detached Units X K-5 yield = Projected students (A)

Existing Single-Family Detached Units X Percent Sold Annually = Units with movers (new residents) and units with non-movers (no change)

--Existing Single-Family Detached Units (not sold) X K-5 yield = Projected students (B)
--Existing Single-Family Detached Units (sold) X K-5 yield = Projected students (C)

Add Projected Students from A, B and C = Projected students from Single-Family Detached Units

Add Projected Students from Single-Family Detached Units to Projected Students from Non Single-Family Detached Units = K-5 Resident Students by Attendance Area

Only 88 new single-family detached housing units are projected over the next two years. When compared to the total number of single-family detached units, this is a small increase.

PROJECTED NEW SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED UNITS						
Attendance Area	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total
Bridgewater	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greenvale Park	4	0	0	0	0	4
Sibley	61	23	0	0	0	84
District	65	23	0	0	0	88

The next two tables show estimated annual single-family detached unit sales and the K-5 Northfield Public School yields by attendance area. The sales data are based on sales from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2013.

The annual rate of sales differs by attendance area but is very high. The Sibley attendance area has the highest rate of sales annually while Greenvale Park has the lowest rate of sales annually. Areas where annual sales exceed 4 percent a year should be thought of as having high annual sales.

PERCENT OF EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED UNITS WITH TURNOVER ANNUALLY (2011-2013)	
Attendance Area	%
Bridgewater	7.0%
Greenvale Park	4.7%
Sibley	8.7%

K-5 RESIDENT STUDENT YIELD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY UNITS						
	Existing Units (pre 2011)				New Units (2011-2013)	
	Non Movers		Movers (New Residents)			
Attendance Area	#	Yield	#	Yield	#	Yield
Bridgewater	1,520	0.20	388	0.23	36	0.41
Greenvale Park	1,927	0.14	311	0.14	17	0.23
Sibley	2,120	0.18	456	0.19	29	0.37
Total	5,567	0.17	1,155	0.19	82	0.36

The student yield in single-family detached units is low for units that did not turnover and the sale of single-family units barely increases the yield of K-5 students. Further, the number of new units was modest, although yields in new units was higher than in existing units in every attendance area.

Students also reside in non-single-family detached units. The resident K-5 yield is lower in single-family attached units (townhomes, etc.) compared to single-family detached units. The next table dramatically illustrates this difference in the Northfield School District. Townhomes yield very few K-5 students.

RESIDENT STUDENT YIELD BY DWELLING UNIT TYPE				
Dwelling Type	Number	K-5 Yield	6-9 Yield	9-12 Yield
Single-Family Detached	6,804	0.18	0.10	0.15
Townhomes	108	0.04	0.04	0.05
Duplex/Triplex	217	0.07	0.03	0.05

About 9 percent (9.2) of K-5 students do not reside in single-family detached units. This is a low percentage and rather than trying to project resident students from non-single family detached units, the 2013-14 student numbers will be used throughout the projection period. This assumption has some weaknesses, but overall is less problematic than trying to project students in these units.

STUDENTS FROM OTHER DWELLING UNIT TYPES* 2013-14	
Attendance Area	K-5 Resident Students
Bridgewater	114
Greenvale Park	185
Sibley	29
Total	328

*Townhomes, Condos, Twin Homes, Quad Homes and Apartments

The housing unit method projections show the K-5 resident potential of current and projected new units. With this method, the district total is the sum of the attendance area projections. In 2013-14, there were 1,220 resident K-5 students residing in single-family detached units with another 328 resident K-5 students living in other unit types for a total of 1,548 resident K-5 students.

Projections from the housing starts method show 1,576 resident K-5 students residing in single-family detached units by 2015-16. Over the two years, resident K-5 students residing in single-family detached units increase by 28 students or 1.8 percent.

HOUSING UNIT METHOD PROJECTIONS RESIDENT K-5 NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS BY ATTENDANCE AREA 2015-16			
	Resident K-5 Students		
Attendance Area	Single-Family Units	All Other Units	Total
Bridgewater	414	114	528
Greenvale Park	320	185	505
Sibley	514	29	543
Total	1,248	328	1,576

The attendance area projections reflect attendance area specific new unit yields as well as attendance area specific turnover rates and yields.

HOUSING UNIT METHOD RESIDENT K-5 NORTHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS BY ATTENDANCE AREA 2013-14 AND 2015-16				
Attendance Area	**2013-14**		2015-16	
	Single-Family	Total	Single-Family	Total
Bridgewater	405	**519**	414	528
Greenvale Park	319	**504**	320	505
Sibley	496	**525**	514	543
Total	1,220	**1,548**	1,248	1,576

School and Attendance Area Projections

The individual school cohort projections differ from the attendance area projections and direct comparisons are difficult. Individual school projections include nonresidents while the attendance area projections do not. Further, the attendance area projections reflect all resident students residing in an attendance area regardless of which school they attend. As the next table shows, the percentage of students who attend their neighborhood K-5 school varies.

NORTHFIELD AREA SCHOOLS K-5 STUDENTS BY ATTENDANCE AREA AND BY SCHOOL ATTENDED			
	Attendance Area		
School	Bridgewater	Greenvale Park	Sibley
Bridgewater	446	35	45
Greenvale Park	31	413	20
Sibley	42	56	460
Total	519	504	525

When factoring in the number of nonresidents, the housing unit method projections are higher than the cohort projections. These projections illustrate the complexity of the interaction among the many factors that affect future enrollment. The cohort projections reflect the recent decline in births, the difference in the size of grades, and the growing number of students selecting other public options. However, the cohort method does not account for the increase in residential units or the effect of turnover.

In conclusion, the housing starts method projection probably over projects enrollment at Greenvale Park and under projects enrollment at Sibley.

K-5 ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS 2015-16		
School	School (Sum)	Attendance Area*
Bridgewater	544	528
Greenvale Park	471	505
Sibley	567	543
Total	1,582	1,576

*Resident only

APPENDIX

NORTHFIELD
BRIDGEWATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

ENROLLMENT HISTORY					
Grade	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
K	103	96	94	99	81
1	90	99	99	90	105
2	100	84	105	92	85
3	118	86	86	98	101
4	86	97	88	82	99
5	102	82	102	87	85
Total	599	544	574	548	556

NET MIGRATION (GRADES K to 5)				
	2009-10 to 2010-11	2010-11 to 2011-12	2011-12 to 2012-13	2012-13 to 2013-14
K to 1	-4	3	-4	6
1 to 2	-6	6	-7	-5
2 to 3	-14	2	-7	9
3 to 4	-21	2	-4	1
4 to 5	-4	5	-1	3
Total	-49	18	-23	14

SURVIVAL RATES				
	2009-10 to 2010-11	2010-11 to 2011-12	2011-12 to 2012-13	2012-13 to 2013-14
K to 1	0.961	1.031	0.957	1.061
1 to 2	0.933	1.061	0.929	0.944
2 to 3	0.860	1.024	0.933	1.098
3 to 4	0.822	1.023	0.954	1.010
4 to 5	0.954	1.052	0.989	1.037

NORTHFIELD
GREENVALE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

ENROLLMENT HISTORY					
Grade	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
K	81	79	87	92	79
1	76	78	73	88	86
2	80	77	82	78	83
3	92	73	84	81	67
4	85	92	82	81	79
5	95	87	95	82	80
Total	509	486	503	502	474

NET MIGRATION (GRADES K to 5)				
	2009-10 to 2010-11	2010-11 to 2011-12	2011-12 to 2012-13	2012-13 to 2013-14
K to 1	-3	-6	1	-6
1 to 2	1	4	5	-5
2 to 3	-7	7	-1	-11
3 to 4	0	9	-3	-2
4 to 5	2	3	0	-1
Total	-7	17	2	-25

SURVIVAL RATES				
	2009-10 to 2010-11	2010-11 to 2011-12	2011-12 to 2012-13	2012-13 to 2013-14
K to 1	0.963	0.924	1.012	0.935
1 to 2	1.013	1.051	1.069	0.943
2 to 3	0.913	1.091	0.988	0.859
3 to 4	1.000	1.123	0.964	0.975
4 to 5	1.024	1.033	1.000	0.988

NORTHFIELD
SIBLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

ENROLLMENT HISTORY					
Grade	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
K	85	72	86	90	75
1	85	96	84	91	109
2	75	97	96	81	98
3	80	95	101	97	87
4	77	103	94	107	100
5	76	87	109	100	113
Total	478	550	570	566	582

NET MIGRATION (GRADES K to 5)				
	2009-10 to 2010-11	2010-11 to 2011-12	2011-12 to 2012-13	2012-13 to 2013-14
K to 1	11	12	5	19
1 to 2	12	0	-3	7
2 to 3	20	4	1	6
3 to 4	23	-1	6	3
4 to 5	10	6	6	6
Total	76	21	15	41

SURVIVAL RATES				
	2009-10 to 2010-11	2010-11 to 2011-12	2011-12 to 2012-13	2012-13 to 2013-14
K to 1	1.129	1.167	1.058	1.211
1 to 2	1.141	1.000	0.964	1.077
2 to 3	1.267	1.041	1.010	1.074
3 to 4	1.288	0.990	1.059	1.031
4 to 5	1.130	1.058	1.064	1.056

Northfield 2013 Low K/Low Mig

	K (+Hdcp)	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12 total
2013-14 Actual	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	295	1612	912	1229	3753
2013-14 Cohort	249	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	1583	921	1203	3707
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
14-15 Proj	249	241	299	271	257	285	305	298	350	284	322	302	292	1601	953	1201	3754
14-15 Cohort	224	249	241	299	271	257	285	305	298	350	284	322	302	1540	887	1259	3686
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
15-16 Proj	224	255	240	304	272	263	312	307	301	370	279	314	299	1558	920	1261	3739
15-16 Cohort	240	224	255	240	304	272	263	312	307	301	370	279	314	1535	882	1263	3681
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
16-17 Proj	240	229	254	244	306	279	288	314	310	318	363	272	310	1553	912	1262	3728
16-17 Cohort	175	240	229	254	244	306	279	288	314	310	318	363	272	1449	882	1262	3593
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
17-18 Proj	175	246	229	259	246	314	306	290	317	327	312	354	268	1467	913	1261	3642
17-18 Cohort	199	175	246	229	259	246	314	306	290	317	327	312	354	1353	910	1310	3573
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
18-19 Proj	199	179	245	233	260	252	344	308	293	335	321	304	350	1368	945	1310	3622
18-19 Cohort	240	199	179	245	233	260	252	344	308	293	335	321	304	1356	904	1253	3513
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
19-20 Proj	240	204	179	249	234	267	276	346	311	309	329	313	300	1372	933	1251	3557
19-20 Cohort	243	240	204	179	249	234	267	276	346	311	309	329	313	1349	889	1262	3500
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
20-21 Proj	243	246	203	182	251	240	292	278	350	328	304	320	309	1364	920	1262	3546
20-21 Cohort	246	243	246	203	182	251	240	292	278	350	328	304	320	1371	810	1302	3483
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
21-22 Proj	246	249	245	207	183	257	263	294	280	369	322	296	317	1386	838	1304	3528
21-22 Cohort	248	246	249	245	207	183	257	263	294	280	369	322	296	1377	814	1268	3459
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
22-23 Proj	248	252	248	249	208	187	282	265	297	296	362	314	292	1393	844	1265	3501
22-23 Cohort	248	248	252	248	249	208	187	282	265	297	296	362	314	1453	734	1270	3457
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
23-24 Proj	248	254	251	252	251	213	206	284	267	314	291	353	310	1469	756	1268	3494

Northfield 2013 Low K/High Mig

	K (+Hdcp)	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12 total
2013-14 Actual	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	295	1612	912	1229	3753
2013-14 Cohort	249	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	1583	921	1203	3707
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
14-15 Proj	249	244	301	270	259	287	300	303	350	286	321	299	297	1608	953	1203	3765
14-15 Cohort	224	249	244	301	270	259	287	300	303	350	286	321	299	1546	890	1256	3692
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
15-16 Proj	224	258	244	305	274	267	310	307	306	372	280	310	300	1572	923	1262	3756
15-16 Cohort	240	224	258	244	305	274	267	310	307	306	372	280	310	1545	884	1267	3696
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
16-17 Proj	240	232	259	248	309	282	288	317	310	325	364	270	311	1570	916	1270	3755
16-17 Cohort	175	240	232	259	248	309	282	288	317	310	325	364	270	1463	888	1269	3620
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
17-18 Proj	175	249	233	262	251	319	305	295	320	330	318	351	271	1489	920	1270	3679
17-18 Cohort	199	175	249	233	262	251	319	305	295	320	330	318	351	1369	919	1319	3607
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
18-19 Proj	199	181	249	236	266	259	344	312	298	340	323	307	353	1391	954	1322	3668
18-19 Cohort	240	199	181	249	236	266	259	344	312	298	340	323	307	1372	916	1267	3555
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
19-20 Proj	240	206	182	253	239	275	280	353	315	317	333	311	308	1395	948	1269	3611
19-20 Cohort	243	240	206	182	253	239	275	280	353	315	317	333	311	1363	907	1276	3546
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
20-21 Proj	243	249	207	184	256	247	297	287	356	335	310	321	312	1386	939	1278	3603
20-21 Cohort	246	243	249	207	184	256	247	297	287	356	335	310	321	1385	830	1321	3537
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
21-22 Proj	246	252	249	210	187	265	267	304	289	378	327	299	322	1409	859	1327	3595
21-22 Cohort	248	246	252	249	210	187	265	267	304	289	378	327	299	1392	835	1294	3521
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
22-23 Proj	248	255	252	253	213	193	286	273	306	307	370	316	300	1414	865	1293	3573
22-23 Cohort	248	248	255	252	253	213	193	286	273	306	307	370	316	1469	752	1300	3521
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
23-24 Proj	248	257	256	256	256	219	208	293	276	326	301	357	317	1493	777	1301	3570

Northfield 2013 High K/Low Mig

	K (+Hdcp)	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12 total
2013-14 Actual	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	295	1612	912	1229	3753
2013-14 Cohort	253	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	1587	921	1203	3711
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
14-15 Proj	253	241	299	271	257	285	305	298	350	284	322	302	292	1605	953	1201	3758
14-15 Cohort	229	253	241	299	271	257	285	305	298	350	284	322	302	1549	887	1259	3695
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
15-16 Proj	229	259	240	304	272	263	312	307	301	370	279	314	299	1568	920	1261	3748
15-16 Cohort	244	229	259	240	304	272	263	312	307	301	370	279	314	1549	882	1263	3694
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
16-17 Proj	244	234	258	244	306	279	288	314	310	318	363	272	310	1566	912	1262	3741
16-17 Cohort	178	244	234	258	244	306	279	288	314	310	318	363	272	1465	882	1262	3609
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
17-18 Proj	178	250	234	263	246	314	306	290	317	327	312	354	268	1484	913	1261	3658
17-18 Cohort	203	178	250	234	263	246	314	306	290	317	327	312	354	1373	910	1310	3593
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
18-19 Proj	203	182	249	238	265	252	344	308	293	335	321	304	350	1388	945	1310	3643
18-19 Cohort	244	203	182	249	238	265	252	344	308	293	335	321	304	1381	904	1253	3537
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
19-20 Proj	244	208	182	253	239	271	276	346	311	309	329	313	300	1397	933	1251	3582
19-20 Cohort	248	244	208	182	253	239	271	276	346	311	309	329	313	1374	893	1262	3530
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
20-21 Proj	248	250	207	185	255	245	297	278	350	328	304	320	309	1390	924	1262	3576
20-21 Cohort	251	248	250	207	185	255	245	297	278	350	328	304	320	1396	820	1302	3518
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
21-22 Proj	251	254	249	211	186	261	269	299	280	369	322	296	317	1412	848	1304	3564
21-22 Cohort	252	251	254	249	211	186	261	269	299	280	369	322	296	1403	829	1268	3500
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
22-23 Proj	252	257	253	253	212	191	287	271	302	296	362	314	292	1418	859	1265	3542
22-23 Cohort	252	252	257	253	253	212	191	287	271	302	296	362	314	1480	748	1274	3502
Historical		1.024	0.997	1.017	1.007	1.024	1.097	1.006	1.01	1.056	0.981	0.975	0.988	0	0	0	0
23-24 Proj	252	258	256	257	255	217	209	288	273	319	291	353	310	1496	771	1273	3540

Northfield 2013 High K/High Mig

	K (+Hdcp)	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12 total
2013-14 Actual	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	295	1612	912	1229	3753
2013-14 Cohort	253	235	300	266	255	278	278	296	347	269	328	310	296	1587	921	1203	3711
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
14-15 Proj	253	244	301	270	259	287	300	303	350	286	321	299	297	1612	953	1203	3769
14-15 Cohort	229	253	244	301	270	259	287	300	303	350	286	321	299	1555	890	1256	3701
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
15-16 Proj	229	262	244	305	274	267	310	307	306	372	280	310	300	1581	923	1262	3766
15-16 Cohort	244	229	262	244	305	274	267	310	307	306	372	280	310	1558	884	1267	3709
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
16-17 Proj	244	237	263	248	309	282	288	317	310	325	364	270	311	1583	916	1270	3769
16-17 Cohort	178	244	237	263	248	309	282	288	317	310	325	364	270	1479	888	1269	3636
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
17-18 Proj	178	253	238	267	251	319	305	295	320	330	318	351	271	1506	920	1270	3696
17-18 Cohort	203	178	253	238	267	251	319	305	295	320	330	318	351	1390	919	1319	3628
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
18-19 Proj	203	185	254	241	270	259	344	312	298	340	323	307	353	1412	954	1322	3688
18-19 Cohort	244	203	185	254	241	270	259	344	312	298	340	323	307	1397	916	1267	3580
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
19-20 Proj	244	211	185	257	245	279	280	353	315	317	333	311	308	1420	948	1269	3636
19-20 Cohort	248	244	211	185	257	245	279	280	353	315	317	333	311	1389	912	1276	3576
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
20-21 Proj	248	253	211	188	261	252	301	287	356	335	310	321	312	1413	944	1278	3634
20-21 Cohort	251	248	253	211	188	261	252	301	287	356	335	310	321	1411	840	1321	3573
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
21-22 Proj	251	257	254	214	190	269	273	308	289	378	327	299	322	1435	870	1327	3632
21-22 Cohort	252	251	257	254	214	190	269	273	308	289	378	327	299	1418	850	1294	3562
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
22-23 Proj	252	260	258	257	217	196	291	279	311	307	370	316	300	1440	881	1293	3615
22-23 Cohort	252	252	260	258	257	217	196	291	279	311	307	370	316	1496	766	1305	3567
Historical		1.037	1.002	1.014	1.014	1.032	1.08	1.024	1.009	1.063	0.978	0.965	1.004	0	0	0	0
23-24 Proj	252	261	261	261	261	224	212	298	282	331	301	357	317	1520	791	1306	3617

Bridgewater

	K (+Hdcp)	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	K-5
2013-14 Actual	81	105	85	101	99	85	556
2013-14 Cohort	88	81	105	85	101	99	559
Historical		1.016	0.978	1.018	0.996	1.026	0
14-15 Proj	88	82	103	87	101	102	562
14-15 Cohort	80	88	82	103	87	101	540
Historical		1.016	0.978	1.018	0.996	1.026	0
15-16 Proj	80	89	80	105	86	103	544
15-16 Cohort	85	80	89	80	105	86	526
Historical		1.016	0.978	1.018	0.996	1.026	0
16-17 Proj	85	81	87	82	104	88	528
16-17 Cohort	62	85	81	87	82	104	502
Historical		1.016	0.978	1.018	0.996	1.026	0
17-18 Proj	62	86	79	89	82	107	505
17-18 Cohort	71	62	86	79	89	82	469
Historical		1.016	0.978	1.018	0.996	1.026	0
18-19 Proj	71	63	84	81	89	84	472

Greenvale Park

	K (+Hdcp)	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	K-5
2013-14 Actual	79	86	83	67	79	80	474
2013-14 Cohort	84	79	86	83	67	79	478
Historical		0.957	1.021	0.979	1.021	1.007	0
14-15 Proj	84	76	88	81	68	80	477
14-15 Cohort	76	84	76	88	81	68	473
Historical		0.957	1.021	0.979	1.021	1.007	0
15-16 Proj	76	80	77	86	83	69	471
15-16 Cohort	81	76	80	77	86	83	484
Historical		0.957	1.021	0.979	1.021	1.007	0
16-17 Proj	81	73	82	76	88	84	483
16-17 Cohort	59	81	73	82	76	88	458
Historical		0.957	1.021	0.979	1.021	1.007	0
17-18 Proj	59	78	74	80	77	88	457
17-18 Cohort	67	59	78	74	80	77	435
Historical		0.957	1.021	0.979	1.021	1.007	0
18-19 Proj	67	56	79	73	82	78	435

Sibley

	K (+Hdcp)	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	K-5
2013-14 Actual	75	109	98	87	100	113	582
2013-14 Cohort	81	75	109	98	87	100	550
Historical		1.145	1.014	1.042	1.027	1.059	0
14-15 Proj	81	86	111	102	89	106	575
14-15 Cohort	73	81	86	111	102	89	542
Historical		1.145	1.014	1.042	1.027	1.059	0
15-16 Proj	73	93	87	115	105	95	567
15-16 Cohort	78	73	93	87	115	105	551
Historical		1.145	1.014	1.042	1.027	1.059	0
16-17 Proj	78	84	94	91	118	111	576
16-17 Cohort	57	78	84	94	91	118	522
Historical		1.145	1.014	1.042	1.027	1.059	0
17-18 Proj	57	89	85	98	93	125	547
17-18 Cohort	65	57	89	85	98	93	487
Historical		1.145	1.014	1.042	1.027	1.059	0
18-19 Proj	65	65	91	88	101	99	508