



Parents, Educators and Friends,

In 2014, when reform education groups formed the Progressive Education Fund PAC and raised over \$270,000 to wage a smear campaign against me, it was important that you hear directly from me. Together, we sent the message that education reform policies have no place in Minneapolis Public Schools. Once again, a barrage of intentionally misleading and incorrect information is being pushed out to discredit my re-election campaign. Please take the time to read my response to these false claims.

My track record of advocating *for* equitable, accessible, quality public education throughout Minneapolis and *against* privatization and charters speaks for itself. I am seeking your support for the DFL endorsement today because we need strong, pro-public school, experienced Democratic voices on our school board.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rebecca Gagnon". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Rebecca" and the last name "Gagnon" clearly legible.

Rebecca Gagnon
At-Large School Board Candidate, Incumbent
www.rebeccaformn.com

introduced a resolution at the March 13th Board meeting to restore time allocation funding to middle and high schools. This funding was implemented a few years ago to increase equitable access to opportunities in our secondary schools by moving from a six period to seven period day. It is more expensive to educate secondary students, and the proposed deep budget cuts for fiscal year '19 ('19-'20 school year) disproportionately impacted our secondary schools. When we limit academic and elective options it has a disparate impact on students of color, students experiencing poverty, and students receiving Special Education and English Language Learner services. If you consider four core classes, a world language, and Health/PE, students are left with *maybe* one elective. Students who wish to take AVID or need an academic or language support class have limited access to art, music, theatre, and other electives.

Students from families with resources can supplement their extracurricular opportunities outside of school through private lessons and clubs, further exacerbating the opportunity gap. We must ensure equitable access to a well rounded education in middle and high school, as well as pathways to career and college programs like CTE, PSEO, and IB. **Time allocation revenue is a solution.** Increasing access to credits also supports students experiencing challenges that get them off track for graduation. A parent recently shared a story with me of their struggling South High student who was behind on credits. Without the continued 7 period day offerings, their student, and many others, would be unable to graduate on time.

I listened to the voices of community, looked at the deep harm the proposed FY19 budget cuts had on secondary schools, and worked with stakeholders to provide a solution. The Board Chair stated he would vote no on the FY19 budget in June. This is not a solution. It is difficult and controversial to challenge assumptions and force us to consider different ideas.

I lead with conviction and action. When I believe we can do better for our students and school communities, I refused to criticize, shame and blame the Superintendent and Administration. Instead, I come to the table and propose solutions, including restoring time allocation revenue. I also proposed reducing our school calendar, limited layoffs (type of furlough), reducing all testing, evaluations and data collection to the state minimum legally required, and sweeping our current budgets to find additional cost savings in fiscal year '18.

This resolution was not a surprise; I went through the proper channels with a first reading at the March Board Meeting and vote at the April Board meeting. There was a month before the vote on the resolution. No other suggestions or solutions were put forward by Board members or staff. No one, staff or Board member, pushed back on allocating per pupil. I received little feedback and questions about the resolution. The two concerns raised were maintaining fund balance and the notion that the

Superintendent had provided us with the best budget possible and we should approve it without question.

I put forth an amendment to the resolution in April, which passed as part of the overall resolution, directing the superintendent to NOT dip further in to fund balance to restore the \$6.4 million. There was already a provision in the resolution that the \$6.4 million could NOT be taken from other school allocations. **The additional funding cuts (\$4.9 million) and additional resources (\$1.5 million) the Superintendent recommended, which I believe are preferable to cuts to our students' academic opportunities, are below.**

**Recommended Additional \$6.4M in Central Office Budget Reductions & Adjustments
Revised April 20, 2018**

Central office Department	Amount of Reduction	Where were reductions taken?
General Counsel	\$304,462	Elimination of the expulsion office and other staff reduction.
Athletics	\$496,895	Middle school athletics will be moved to the Community Education budget. The athletic director positions at each school will be reduced.
Academics	\$669,038	Multiple reductions over 11 departments that will have varying impact to schools, students and staff.
Accountability, Innovation and Research	\$106,217	Reductions in research and evaluation support. Eliminated Office of Innovation.
Information Technology	\$610,000	Replacement of district technology will be delayed.
Human Resources	\$1,552,723	Reductions in Talent Acquisition and Talent Management. Reduced amount budgeted for attendance management.
Operations Division	\$567,065	Reduced security at the Davis Service Center. No additional money for landscaping. Reduction in number of department administrators.
Transportation	\$440,000	Reduction of subcontracted routes and anticipated changes in remaining subcontracted services.
Professional Development	\$63,800	Staffing changes and changes to delivery model.
IRS Credit	\$500,000	Tax-credit rebate.
Potential State Revenue	\$1,050,000	Assumes added funding from proposed legislation (special education, community education).
Total	\$6,360,199	

There has also been a suggestion that the time allocation revenue be distributed differently with a poverty component. The resolution reinstated the funding exactly as it had been distributed the past few years, about \$462 per pupil. It is per pupil because it has to account for how many additional teachers/staff you need to add offerings for the number of total students you must serve.

More students require more classes which equates to more teachers. Southwest, South and Washburn are by far our largest high schools, twice as big or more than our other four schools - Patrick Henry, Roosevelt, Edison and North. When you actually break down the per pupil funding after the reallocation, **the four smaller high schools receive significantly more per pupil than our three largest high schools.** For example, Edison receives 21% more funding than South, 30% more than SW, and 32% more than Washburn.

This is not the end of the budget conversation. We don't approve the budget until June. However, budget tie out for schools and departments must happen as early as possible so that we have the opportunity to hire quality employees and meet the contractual obligations for notice in our union contracts, which is mid March. I will continue, as I always have, to work with my fellow Board members to address issues as they arise.

Middle & High School Allocation Comparison with Time Adjustment Resolution FY19

SCHOOL	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	% STUDENTS IN POVERTY	# STUDENTS IN POVERTY	SpEd%	HHM%	ELL%	FY19 ALLOCATION	\$6.4 million TIME ADJUSTMENT re-allocation (\$462 per pupil)	SpED	ELL	TOTAL ALLOCATION (+ time allocation - SpED & ELL)*	PER PUPIL
ANTHONY	786	41.9%	329	11.9%	0.8%	12.1%	\$5,382,024	\$363,132	\$874,000	\$201,210	\$4,669,946	\$5941
ANWATIN	574	71.4%	410	18.6%	3.9%	27.6%	\$6,193,934	\$265,188	\$1,684,000	\$352,118	\$4,423,004	\$7706
FRANKLIN	426	87.4%	372	27.1%	7.1%	10.8%	\$4,862,256	\$196,182	\$1,310,000	\$100,605	\$3,647,833	\$8563
NORTHEAST	505	76.7%	387	22.4%	5.2%	17.2%	\$5,463,821	\$233,310	\$1,476,000	\$352,118	\$3,869,013	\$7661
OLSON	373	87.4%	326	24.7%	12.5%	10.5%	\$4,356,402	\$172,326	\$1,050,000	\$100,605	\$3,378,123	\$9057
JUSTICE PAGE	843	46.4%	391	12.2%	19.2%	1.7%	\$6,207,333	\$389,466	\$1,255,000	\$352,118	\$4,989,681	\$5919
SANFORD MS	963	61.1%	588	14.9%	3.4%	18%	\$8,343,469	\$444,906	\$1,828,000	\$402,420	\$6,557,955	\$6810
	4472											
EDISON	950	78.4%	745	23.2%	6.5%	29%	\$11,749,658	\$438,900	\$3,037,000	\$754,538	\$8,397,020	\$8839
FAIR DOWNTOWN 9-12	215	54.6%	117	16.3%	3.7%	6%	\$1,859,561	\$99,330	\$325,000	\$20,121	\$1,613,770	\$7506
HENRY	980	77.6%	760	20.8%	3.7%	13.9%	\$11,217,820	\$453,684	\$2,119,000	\$452,723	\$9,099,781	\$9286
NORTH	455	80.6%	367	26.6%	4.4%	4.1%	\$6,063,516	\$210,210	\$1,372,000	\$50,303	\$4,851,423	\$10,662
ROOSEVELT	947	64.1%	607	20.5%	1.9%	28.8%	\$10,637,626	\$437,514	\$2,262,000	\$754,538	\$8,058,602	\$8510
SOUTH	1750	55.3%	968	11.6%	1.8%	24.2%	\$14,740,859	\$808,500	\$2,313,000	\$1,056,353	\$12,180,006	\$6960
SOUTHWEST	1901	39.1%	743	11.8%	0.5%	12.8%	\$14,498,131	\$878,262	\$2,998,000	\$653,933	\$11,724,490	\$6168
WASHBURN	1635	37.6%	615	12.2%	1.3%	12.3%	\$11,203,484	\$755,370	\$1,574,000	\$553,328	\$9,831,526	\$6013
WELLSTONE	271	91.3%	247	4%	3.2%	99.2%	\$3,749,332	\$125,202	\$70,424	\$1,106,655	\$2,697,455	\$9954
HERITAGE	187	94.2%	176	2.7%	—	53.7%	\$2,342,156	\$86,394	\$40,242	\$352,118	\$2,036,190	\$10,889
LONGFELLOW	85	97.7%	83	21.4%	14.3%	20.2%	\$1,690,875	\$39,270	\$130,000	\$100,605	\$1,499,540	\$17,642
	9376											
TOTAL	13848											
SCHOOL (PER PUPIL) ~ Poverty%	Edison (\$8839.00) ~ 78.4%	Henry (\$9286) ~ 77.6%	North (\$10,662) ~ 80.6%	Roosevelt (\$8510) ~ 64.1%								
SOUTH (\$6960) ~ 55.3%	21%	25%	34%	18%								
SOUTHWEST (\$6168) ~ 39.1%	30%	33%	41%	27%								
WASHBURN (\$6013) ~ 37.6%	32%	35%	43%	29%								

*SpEd & ELL allocations are spent ONLY to serve students in the school receiving those services. I've removed those dollars for a more accurate per pupil comparison.

As a member of the City Planning Commission (CPC) for five years, I was “charged with hearing and deciding applications for land use reviews, including site plan review, conditional use permits, changes or expansions of a nonconforming use, variances, and land subdivisions. In addition, the CPC makes recommendations to the city council on planning decisions, including proposed re-zonings, street and alley vacations, public land sales, zoning code text amendments, and amendments to the comprehensive plan.”

The City Charter requires a school board, park board, and hennepin county representative on the CPC. The reason is we are all three major property owners in the city, MPS being the second largest property owner in Minneapolis. **Our job is to apply the law, city ordinances and codes, to the projects brought before us and make recommendations to the City Council.** There were many MPS projects I was able to support in my five years on the CPC. I also approved variances for buildings being leased to charter schools. There are union leaders that are using my votes on the CPC to message that I approved charter schools. This absolutely untrue. And while I have shared with these leaders why their accusations are untrue they continue to push this false narrative.

CPC has NOTHING to do with approving charter schools. Charter schools cannot own their buildings by state law and must lease space. The requests that came before me on CPC in regards to the physical buildings and space involved parking variances, size of the side walk and how many feet the yard must set back from the street. These are legally allowed under city codes and ordinances, and, again, have nothing to do with the charter school itself. **I have never approved a charter school.**

Could I have voted no in protest of charter schools? I could have. However, I had no legal basis to deny the building variances. A no vote by myself or even the entire CPC would not have stopped the project from moving forward. CPC is an advisory committee. The decision (which would have been against our own zoning and planning codes) would have been appealed and overturned by the City Zoning & Planning Commission and the City Council. As a City Planning Commissioner, I agreed to apply city ordinances and zoning codes to the projects before us.

