NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE SCHOOL BOARD
GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT #1
Monday, September 9, 2019 – 6:00 p.m.
Mark Sanford Education Center, 2400 47th Avenue South, Grand Forks, ND

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. CELEBRATING SUCCESS
   A. Helping Hands Program

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. August 19, 2019

V. CITIZEN COMMENTS (non-agenda items)
   (Citizens wishing to address the school board are asked to complete a Citizen Comment Card and submit it to the school board secretary prior to the start of the meeting. Citizens wishing to comment on non-agenda items will be invited by the chairperson to speak during the Citizen Comments item. Citizens wishing to comment on a specific agenda item will be invited by the chairperson to speak when that specific agenda item is reached. Each person may speak for up to three (3) minutes and will not be recognized a second time until all citizens wishing to speak have been heard. The chairperson reserves the right to limit the discussion and the number of speakers. School Board members shall not engage in a response or enter into a debate about any issue(s) brought before the board during this portion of the meeting. Citizens’ comments and concerns will be directed to the Superintendent of Schools, who will deal with the according to policies adopted by the Board.)

VI. SUPERINTENDENT’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISCUSSION
   A. Review School Board Norms
   B. Public Hearing on Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Tax Levy
   C. Open Meetings Refresher
   D. Summer School Reports
   E. NDSBA Opportunities for Board Member Development
   F. Board Member Feedback on Governor’s Summit on Innovative Education

VII. SUPERINTENDENT’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION
   A. Consent Agenda
      1. Appointments
      2. Open Enrollment Applications
      3. Resignations
      4. Student Travel Request
   B. Annual Compliance Report
   C. Declaration of Emergency for RRHS Elevator Shaft Repair
   D. Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission Nomination-Mid-Century Schools
   E. County Superintendent of Schools Position
   F. Appointment of School Board Member

VIII. OTHER
   A. Announcements
   B. Board Requests for Future Consideration
      (There should be no discussion concerning an individual item that is requested for future consideration. The Board President and Superintendent will determine the best method of response to board requests for future consideration.)
   C. School Board Norms - How Did We Do?

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Any person who requires an auxiliary aid or service to allow access or participation at a school board meeting is asked to notify the superintendent’s office (787-4880) at least one day before the meeting.
The Grand Forks School Board met in regular session on Monday, August 19, 2019, at the Mark Sanford Education Center with Bill Palmiscno presiding.

**Board Members Present:**
Bill Palmiscno, President/Voting Member
Amber Flynn, Vice President/Voting Member
Jacqueline Hoffarth, Voting Member
Eric Lunn, Voting Member
Cynthia Shabb, Voting Member
Matt Spivey, Voting Member

**Board Members Absent:**
Doug Carpenter, Voting Member
Shannon Mikula, Voting Member

**Student Board Members Present:**
Riley Thoreson, Non-voting Member

**Student Board Members Absent:**
None

**Others Present:**
Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
Scott J. Berge, Business Manager
Jody Thompson, Associate Superintendent of Elementary Education
Catherine Gillach, Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education
Amanda Weston-Caillier, President, Grand Forks Education Association (GFEA)
Cindy Johnson, Executive Secretary

---

**Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance.** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved by unanimous consensus. Absent: Carpenter, Flynn, and Mikula.

**Approval of Minutes.** It was moved by Spivey and seconded by Shabb to approve the minutes of August 5, 2019, as written. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: Carpenter, Flynn, and Mikula.

**Citizen Comments (non-agenda items).** None.

Flynn joined the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

**Review School Board Norms.** Spivey read aloud the school board norms.

**Consent Agenda.** It was moved by Lunn and seconded by Hoffarth to approve the consent agenda as follows: Teacher Appointments effective August 19, 2019, of Kelly Luing (salary $45,699) and Jodi Zavoral (salary $53,520); Open Enrollment applications as presented; and Resignation effective May 31, 2019, of Jessica Christofferson. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: Carpenter and Mikula.

**General Fund Financial Statement.** Berge explained that for the one month of fiscal year 2019-2020, total general fund revenues were $27,922 and total general fund expenditures were $3,124,849, resulting in an excess of expenses over revenue of $3,096,928. He also gave an update on the fiscal year 2018-2019 finances. The updated financial statement is an improvement over the preliminary financial results discussed at the July 15 meeting; however, the numbers will not be final until the audit in October.
It was moved by Shabb and seconded by Spivey to approve the General Fund Financial Statement for the period July 1, 2019, through July 31, 2019. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: Carpenter and Mikula.

Revised Teacher Negotiated Agreement for July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021. Dr. Brenner reported that the equal opportunity statement in Article I Section 6 of the agreement was updated and other minor formatting changes were made. The revised agreement was reviewed by a representative of the Grand Forks Education Association’s bargaining team.

It was moved by Lunn and seconded by Shabb to approve the revised Teacher Negotiated Agreement for July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: Carpenter and Mikula.

Student Transportation Services for 2019-2020. Berge explained that on May 12, 2014, the Grand Forks School Board approved the Student Transportation Services Agreement with Dietrich’s of Grand Forks, Inc. for three years beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2017 with an option to extend for an additional four contract years ending June 30, 2021, consistent with North Dakota Century Code Chapter 15.1-30. Administration met with Dietrich’s several times over the last few months regarding the 2019-2020 school year and has reached a tentative agreement based on an overall less than 5% increase, or approximately $70,000 for the year. The most significant change in services is that Dietrich’s will install cameras on all route buses. Shabb requested that the cost increase not be passed on to the families who use the buses.

It was moved by Lunn and seconded by Shabb to approve the Student Transportation Services Agreement with Dietrich’s of Grand Forks, Inc. for 2019-2020. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: Carpenter and Mikula.

Work Session - Planning for Community Meetings Related to Facilities. Dr. Brenner and Berge reviewed a draft presentation related to facilities meetings that are scheduled at five school campuses during the month of September. The purpose of the meetings is to engage the public, in person and through electronic means, on their thoughts and perspectives about what types of decisions the school board will make moving forward with District facilities.

Announcements. Brenner announced that a water main broke outside the building at Century Elementary School this past Saturday afternoon. No water entered the building. Provisions for teachers and the school’s upcoming open house will be made depending upon the timeline to complete the break.

Board Requests for Future Consideration. None.

School Board Norms - How Did We Do? Spivey reported that Board members were successful in meeting the school board norms.

Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Approved ___________________________ (Date)

_____________________________________
Bill Palmiscno, President

_____________________________________
Scott J. Berge, Business Manager
School Board Meeting Norms

The purpose of establishing school board norms is to ensure that all individuals have the opportunity to contribute in the meeting; to increase productivity and effectiveness; and to facilitate the achievement of its goals.

**NORMS**

1) Be prepared  
2) Be on time  
3) Value and respect each other  
4) Exercise thoughtful deliberation and conversation  
5) Be professional at the Board table and when visiting with the general public  
6) Speak up when the norms are not being followed  
7) Advocate on behalf of students and keep the community in mind

**GOVERNANCE**

1) Lead by policy  
2) Serve as advocates for K-12 public education  
3) Entrust the day-to-day operations to the professionals; Let the administrators do their work  
4) Assist community members and stakeholders in following the chain of command

**OTHER**

1) Consider staff and District capacity in resources  
2) Balance the meeting agendas so one meeting isn't heavier than the other

Board Approved 10.8.18
MEMORANDUM

TO: Grand Forks School Board

FROM: Scott Berge, Business Manager

RE: Public Hearing on Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Tax Levy

DATE: September 9, 2019

At its August 5, 2019 meeting, the school board authorized a preliminary budget and tax levy which called for a total levy of 101 mills which included three (3) mills for a new special reserve fund. This preliminary budget and tax levy was certified to the County Auditor as required by the new state law and Notices of Estimated Property Tax and Budget Hearing Dates (similar to the attached copy) were sent to each owner of taxable property in the District with a total estimated property tax of at least one hundred dollars.

The total Grand Forks Public School District property tax levy for fiscal year 2019-2020 will be 101.00 mills. This compares to a levy of 98.00 mills last year and represents an overall increase of 3.06%.

Citizens should then be given an opportunity to present oral or written comments regarding the district’s proposed fiscal year 2019-2020 budget.

No formal action needs to be taken on the budget or the tax levy at this meeting. Final approval of the fiscal year 2019-2020 budget and property tax levy will occur at the September 30, 2019 School Board meeting.
### GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
### PROPERTY TAX LEVY
#### FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18-19</th>
<th>FY 19-20</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valuation</strong></td>
<td>$238,194,358</td>
<td>$242,314,873</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mills</strong></td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Reserve</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00 Mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Fund</td>
<td>10.00 Mills</td>
<td>10.00 Mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ass'ts</td>
<td>2.00 Mills</td>
<td>2.00 Mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Levy</strong></td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPERTY TAX ESTIMATE BASED ON TOTAL LEVY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18-19</th>
<th>FY 19-20</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>$ Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Ratio</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mill Levy</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td>$40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$1,323.00</td>
<td>$1,363.50</td>
<td>$40.50</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**PROPERTY TAX ESTIMATES**

**FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 18-19</th>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
<th>Est @ 97%</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual $</th>
<th>Actual %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$238,194,358</td>
<td>86.00 Mills</td>
<td>$20,484,715</td>
<td>$19,870,173</td>
<td>$19,800,000</td>
<td>$19,416,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Fund</td>
<td>$2,381,944</td>
<td>10.00 Mills</td>
<td>$2,310,485</td>
<td>$2,310,485</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$2,277,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ass'ts</td>
<td>$476,389</td>
<td>2.00 Mills</td>
<td>$462,097</td>
<td>$462,097</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>$454,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.00 Mills</td>
<td>$23,343,047</td>
<td>$22,642,756</td>
<td>$22,560,000</td>
<td>$22,148,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.73% Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 19-20</th>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
<th>Est @ 96%</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Inc. in Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$242,314,873</td>
<td>86.00 Mills</td>
<td>$20,839,079</td>
<td>$20,005,516</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Reserve</td>
<td>$726,945</td>
<td>3.00 Mills</td>
<td>$697,867</td>
<td>$697,867</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Fund</td>
<td>$2,423,149</td>
<td>10.00 Mills</td>
<td>$2,326,223</td>
<td>$2,326,223</td>
<td>$2,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ass'ts</td>
<td>$484,630</td>
<td>2.00 Mills</td>
<td>$465,245</td>
<td>$465,245</td>
<td>$465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.00 Mills</td>
<td>$24,473,802</td>
<td>$23,494,850</td>
<td>$22,790,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPERTY TAX EXAMPLE BASED ON TOTAL LEVY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 18-19</th>
<th>FY 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Ratio</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mill Levy</td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$441.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIS IS NOT A BILL
Notice of Estimated Property Tax and Budget Hearing Dates

You are hereby notified of the potential change in your taxes based on each district’s preliminary budgets. Your actual taxes may vary based upon the final budgets of the districts and any valuation adjustments made by the State Board of Equalization. This notice does not include any special assessments.

Parcel Number: [Redacted]

Physical Address: [Redacted]

Legal Description: [Redacted]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Tax Relief</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Property Valuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True &amp; Full Value</td>
<td>$364,900</td>
<td>$364,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value</td>
<td>16,421</td>
<td>16,421</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Homestead Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Disabled Veteran Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxable Value</strong></td>
<td>$16,421</td>
<td>$16,421</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Taxes by District</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019 (Proposed)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County-Wide</td>
<td>$1,266.34</td>
<td>$1,298.40</td>
<td>$32.06</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks City</td>
<td>$1,622.74</td>
<td>$1,619.46</td>
<td>-$3.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks Park</td>
<td>$641.40</td>
<td>$640.10</td>
<td>-$1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks School</td>
<td>$1,609.28</td>
<td>$1,656.38</td>
<td>$47.10</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation</td>
<td>$14.46</td>
<td>$18.22</td>
<td>$3.76</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison Diversion</td>
<td>$16.42</td>
<td>$16.42</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$16.42</td>
<td>$16.42</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidated Tax</strong></td>
<td>$5,187.06</td>
<td>$5,265.40</td>
<td>$78.34</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Tax Rate (tax divided by value): 1.42% 1.44%

Hearing Schedule: (Hearing on Preliminary Budget)

- County-Wide: September 17, 2019 4:00pm, County Office Building, 151 S 4th St, 6 floor, Commission Room, Grand Forks, ND 58201
- Grand Forks City: September 16, 2019 5:30pm, Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers, 255 N 4th St, Grand Forks, ND 58203
- Grand Forks Park: October 1, 2019 5:00pm, Choice Health & Fitness Community Room, 4401 South 11th Street, Grand Forks, ND 58201
- Grand Forks School: September 9, 2019 6:00pm, Mark Sanford Education Center, 2400 47th Ave South, Grand Forks, ND 58201
- Soil Conservation: September 11, 2019 7:00am, Turtle River State Park, Woodland Lodge, 3084 Park Ave NE, Arvilla, ND 58214
- Garrison Diversion: September 12, 2019 11:00am, Garrison Diversion Office, 401 Highway 281 NE, Carrington, ND 58421

Citizens will have an opportunity to present oral or written comments regarding the district’s budget at or before the hearing. A copy of the district’s budget will be available at the district’s normal place of business at least 7 days prior to the hearing.

* Although property valuation information is included in this notice, property values cannot be addressed at the public hearings listed. Objections to valuations must be addressed to local, county and state boards of equalization or through abatement proceedings after the value is set. Governing bodies holding public hearings regarding preliminary budgets do not have the authority to change property values.
To the County Auditor of Grand Forks County, Grand Forks North Dakota.
You are hereby notified that the School Board of Grand Forks Public School District No. 1
has levied the following amount for:

| Fund Group | General Fund Property Tax Levy | 70.00 Mills up to | 16,962,041 |
| Fund Group 1 - General Fund | Tuition Fund Levy | 4.00 Mills up to | 969,259 |
| | Miscellaneous Fund Levy | 12.00 Mills up to | 2,907,778 |
| Fund Group 2 - Special Reserve | Special Reserve Levy | 3.00 Mills up to | 726,945 |
| Fund Group 3 - Capital Projects | Building Fund Levy | 10.00 Mills up to | 2,423,148 |
| | Special Assessments Fund Levy | 2.00 Mills up to | 484,630 |
| Fund Group 4 - Debt Service | Sinking & Interest Fund Levy* | - | - |
| | Judgment Bonding Levy | | |
| Total Amount Of Levies | | 101.00 Mills | 24,473,801 |

*Includes mills necessary to pay principal and interest on any bonded debt incurred under NDCC 57-15-17.1 before July 1, 2013.

You will duly enter and extend such tax upon the tax list for the current year against all taxable property in said school district. You will also enter and extend taxes previously levied, if any, by resolution of the school board of this district to pay interest on bonds outstanding and to pay the principal thereof at maturity.

Dated at __________________________, North Dakota, this _____ day of ___________ ______

Business Manager: ______________________________

Filed: ___________________________ ___________ County Auditor: __________________________
Filed: ___________________________ ___________ County Superintendent: __________________________
Filed: ___________________________ ___________ Business Manager: __________________________

Send the original and one copy to the County Superintendent of Schools or designee assigned by the county commissioners, and retain one copy in the school district files.
## Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1 Regular Programs</th>
<th>Estimated or Actual 2018-2019</th>
<th>Appropriation Requested 2019-2020</th>
<th>Final Appropriation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110-1000 Kindergarten Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-2100 Kindergarten Support Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-2410 Kindergarten Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-1000 Elementary Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-2100 Elementary Support Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-2410 Elementary Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-1000 Junior High Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-2100 Junior High Support Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-2410 Junior High Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-1000 Senior High Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-2100 Senior High Support Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-2410 Senior High Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,499,812</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,584,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1 Federal Programs</th>
<th>Estimated or Actual 2018-2019</th>
<th>Appropriation Requested 2019-2020</th>
<th>Final Appropriation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261-1000 Title I Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266-1000 Nutrition Education &amp; Training Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-1000 Title III English Language Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275-1000 Striving Readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285-1000 Student Support and Academic Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290-1000 Title II Professional Development Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295-1000 Indian Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296-1000 Title IV School and Community Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298-1000 Other Federal Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,694,928</td>
<td>2,785,758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1 Undistributed Expenditures</th>
<th>Estimated or Actual 2018-2019</th>
<th>Appropriation Requested 2019-2020</th>
<th>Final Appropriation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000-2210 Improvement of Instruction Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>808,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2220 Instructional Media Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,243,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2290 Other Instructional Support Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>703,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2310 School Board Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2320 Executive Administration - Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>908,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2330 Special Area Administrative Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2500 Support Service - Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2600 Operation &amp; Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2800 Support Service - Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-2900 Other Support Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>782,561</td>
<td>8,496,249</td>
<td>51,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section II Other Programs &amp; Services</th>
<th>Estimated or Actual 2018-2019</th>
<th>Appropriation Requested 2019-2020</th>
<th>Final Appropriation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000-2700 Student Transportation Service</td>
<td>550,602</td>
<td>569,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-3600 Services Provided for Another LEA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-4100 Facility Acquisition (Buildings/Land)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-4210 Construction Service (by Staff)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-4220 Construction Service (by Contractors)</td>
<td>2,503,812</td>
<td>2,588,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-2700 Extracurricular Student Transportation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-3400 Extracurricular Student Activities</td>
<td>2,269,362</td>
<td>2,345,849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-3300 Early Childhood Education Program</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297-3300 Headstart / Federal Early Childhood</td>
<td>2,575,763</td>
<td>2,662,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-3300 Adult Education</td>
<td>246,385</td>
<td>254,689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-3300 Community Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-3100 Food Services</td>
<td>30,542</td>
<td>31,571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990-3200 Other Enterprise Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section III Tuition & Assessments

| 110-1999 Kindergarten Tuition | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 120-1999 Elementary Tuition (1-6) | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 130-1999 Junior High Tuition | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 140-1999 Senior High Tuition | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 200-1999 Special Education Tuition/Assessments | 1,039,766                  | 1,074,810                       |                               |
| 200-2799 Student Transportation Service - Special Ed. | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 205-1999 Preschool Special Education Tuition | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 300-1999 Career & Technical Education Tuition/Assessments | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 300-2799 Student Transportation - Career & Technical Ed. | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-1999 Regional Ed. Assoc. Tuition/Assessments | -                           | -                               | -                             |

## Section IV Other Uses of Funds / Transfers

| 000-6100 Debt Service | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-6400 Other Use | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-6320 Transfer to Special Reserve | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-6330 Transfer to Capital Project | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-6340 Transfer to Sinking and Interest | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-6350 Transfer to Food Service | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-6360 Transfer to Student Activities | -                           | -                               | -                             |
| 000-6370 Transfer to Trust and Agency | -                           | -                               | -                             |
### Appropriations

#### Section V Special Education
- 200-1000 Special Education Instruction: 16,834,281
- 200-2000 Special Education Support Service: 2,167,805
- 200-2700 Special Education Transportation: 893,017
- 200-2950 Boarding Care: -

#### Section VI Career and Technical Education
- 300-1000 Career and Technical Education Instruction: 4,618,192
- 300-2000 Career and Technical Education Support Service: 388,969
- 300-2700 Career and Technical Education Transportation: 34,772
- 300-3300 Adult Education: -

Total Operating Budget: 106,114,735

#### Final Appropriation 2019-2020
- 17,401,661
- 2,240,868
- 923,115
- -
- 4,773,843
- 402,079
- 35,944
- -

Total: 109,288,208

### Fund Groups 2 – 7

#### Annual Budget for the Year

#### Appropriations

| Fund Group 2 – Special Reserve Fund | 726,945 |
| Fund Group 3 – Capital Projects Fund | 2,732,283 |
| Fund Group 4 – Debt Service Fund | 2,907,778 |
| Fund Group 5 – Food Service Fund | - |
| Fund Group 6 – Student Activities Fund | - |
| Fund Group 7 – Trust & Agency/Consortium Fund | - |

The appropriations for Fund Groups 2 through 4 are used to support the mill levy requests on page 1.
### Revenue

#### 1000 Revenue from Local Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual or Estimated 2018-2019</th>
<th>Revenue Estimated 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100 Taxes</td>
<td>15,913,017</td>
<td>16,962,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110 General Fund Property Tax Levy</td>
<td>896,801</td>
<td>969,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131 Tuition Fund Levy</td>
<td>2,722,595</td>
<td>2,907,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138 Miscellaneous Fund Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1190 Other Tax Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Revenue In-Lieu of District Property Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210 Electric Generation, Distribution and Transmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220 Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 Property Tax Credits Reimbursed by the State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240 Property Owned by State or Nonprofit Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 Mobile Home Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290 Other Revenue In-Lieu of Property Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tax Revenue</strong></td>
<td>19,755,246</td>
<td>21,063,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1300 Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual or Estimated 2018-2019</th>
<th>Revenue Estimated 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1310 Regular Programs</td>
<td>3,380,564</td>
<td>3,498,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320 Handicapped Programs</td>
<td>1,036,852</td>
<td>1,073,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330 Career and Technical Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340 Summer School</td>
<td>126,558</td>
<td>130,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 Adult Education</td>
<td>10,146</td>
<td>10,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360 Driver Education</td>
<td>35,010</td>
<td>36,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380 Residential Treatment Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tuition</strong></td>
<td>4,589,129</td>
<td>4,749,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1400 Transportation Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual or Estimated 2018-2019</th>
<th>Revenue Estimated 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1410 Regular Programs</td>
<td>107,418</td>
<td>111,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420 Handicapped Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430 Career and Technical Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transportation Fees</strong></td>
<td>107,418</td>
<td>111,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1500 Interest Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual or Estimated 2018-2019</th>
<th>Revenue Estimated 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600 Food Service Revenue</td>
<td>557,683</td>
<td>475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Student Activities Revenue</td>
<td>25,980</td>
<td>26,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 Community Service Activities Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Other Revenue From Local Sources</td>
<td>819,802</td>
<td>848,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Revenue</strong></td>
<td>25,855,258</td>
<td>27,274,619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Revenue

### 2000 Revenue from County Sources
- 2200 Mineral Resources
- 2210 Oil & Gas Production
- 2220 Coal Production
- 2230 Coal Conversion
- 2900 Other County Revenue

### Total County Revenue

### 3000 Revenue from State Sources
- 3100 Unrestricted State Revenue
  - 3110 State School Aid
  - 3130 Transportation
  - 3140 State Child Placement
  - 3190 Other Unrestricted State Revenue
- Total Unrestricted State Revenue
- 3200 Handicapped Program Aid
- 3300 Career and Technical Education Program Aid
- 3410 Special Education Joint Agreements
- 3420 Career and Technical Education Joint Agreements
- 3430 Regional Education Assoc. Joint Agreements
- 3900 Other Restricted State Revenue
- Total Restricted State Revenue

### Total State Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual or Estimated</th>
<th>Revenue Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Revenue from County Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2210 Oil &amp; Gas Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220 Coal Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2230 Coal Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900 Other County Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total County Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 Revenue from State Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100 Unrestricted State Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3110 State School Aid</td>
<td>63,985,727</td>
<td>64,808,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3130 Transportation</td>
<td>594,486</td>
<td>592,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3140 State Child Placement</td>
<td>236,786</td>
<td>241,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3190 Other Unrestricted State Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unrestricted State Revenue</td>
<td>64,817,000</td>
<td>65,642,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200 Handicapped Program Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 Career and Technical Education Program Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3410 Special Education Joint Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3420 Career and Technical Education Joint Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430 Regional Education Assoc. Joint Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900 Other Restricted State Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Restricted State Revenue</td>
<td>1,453,031</td>
<td>1,598,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total State Revenue</td>
<td>66,270,031</td>
<td>67,240,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fund Group 1
## Annual Budget for the Year
### Ending June 30, 2020

## Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4000 Revenue from Federal Sources</th>
<th>Actual or Estimated 2018-2019</th>
<th>Revenue Estimated 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4100 Unrestricted Federal Received Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110 P.L. 81-874 Impact Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200 Unrestricted Federal Through State or County Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4210 Taylor Grazing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4220 Flood Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4225 U.S. Fish And Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4230 Mineral Leases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4240 Bankhead Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4260 Johnson O'Malley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4270 PL 96-638 Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4290 Other Restricted Federal Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400 Restricted Federal Received Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410 P.L. 81-815 Construction Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4420 ESAA - Emergency School Assistance Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4440 Indian Education Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4450 Impact Aid (P.L. 874) Low Income Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4460 Headstart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4490 Other Restricted Federal Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500 Restricted Federal Received Through State Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4510 Title I Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4517 Title II Professional Development Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4520 Title III English Language Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4525 Title IV Student Support and Academic Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4531 Title IDEA - B Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4532 Preschool Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4535 Striving Readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4545 Carl Perkins Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4549 Other Career and Technical Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4550 Child Nutrition Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4559 Nutrition Education &amp; Training Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4560 Adult Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4575 Title IV School and Community Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4579 Other Community Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4580 Career Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4590 Other Restricted Federal Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4595 Other Federal Aid for Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700 Federal Revenue Through an Intermediate Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4710 Workforce Investment Act (WIA Classroom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4790 Other Federal Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4800 Federal Revenue in Lieu of Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4900 Federal Revenue for/On Behalf of LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4910 Special Education Joint Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4920 Career and Technical Education Joint Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4930 Regional Education Association Joint Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Federal Revenue**

|                               |                               |
|                               |                               |
| 9,359,926 | 9,734,323 |
Fund Group 1
Annual Budget for the Year
Ending June 30, 2020

Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual or Estimated Revenue</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000 Revenue From Other Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100 Sale of Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5200 Interfund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300 Sale/Compensation for Loss of Fixed Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400 Refund of Prior Year Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500 Services Provided for Another LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5700 Revenue to Offset Lease Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5900 Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001,877</td>
<td>660,540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Local, County, State, Federal, &amp; Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102,487,091</td>
<td>104,910,366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fund Group 1 Recap

Beginning Balance, July 1, 2019

| Total Revenue From Local Sources |
| Total Revenue From County Sources |
| Total Revenue From State Sources |
| Total Revenue From Federal Sources |
| Total Revenue From Other Sources |
| Total Revenue - Fund Group 1 |
| 104,910,366 |
| Total Beginning Balance And Revenue |
| 119,380,066 |
| Total Expenditures - Fund Group 1 |
| 109,288,208 |
| Estimated Ending Balance, June 30, 2020 |
| 10,091,858 |
Maximum School District General Fund Levy Worksheet

Complete section A, B, or C below as applicable.

2019 Taxable Valuation

A. General fund levy authority under 57-15-14.2
   1. Maximum general fund levy amount (70 mills times taxable valuation)
   2. Prior year general fund levy amount
   3. Percentage increase limitation (prior year general fund levy amount times 1.12 + DPI adjustment)
   4. Maximum general fund levy amount (lesser of line 1 or line 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>242,314,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16,962,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,673,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,674,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,962,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Alternative levy authority under 57-15-01.1 (if applicable)
   5. The amount allowed in dollars under 57-15-01.1
      (Note: This authority is seldom used. Contact your County Auditor for assistance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. NDCC 57-15-14 Voter approval of excess levies in school districts (if applicable)
   6. Specified mill rate approved for a period including taxable years 2009 through 2012
   7. Required mill rate reduction
   8. Adjusted specified levy (line 9 minus line 10)
   9. Specified mill rate approved after taxable year 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill Rate</th>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expiration date of specified levy authority

D. Maximum general fund levy authority (greater of lines 4, 5, 8, 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16,962,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
### GENERAL FUND BUDGET
#### FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>As of 8/5/2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Sources</td>
<td>$21,870,000</td>
<td>$23,800,000</td>
<td>$25,675,000</td>
<td>$26,650,000</td>
<td>$21,556,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sources</td>
<td>$63,540,000</td>
<td>$66,265,000</td>
<td>$65,875,000</td>
<td>$66,250,000</td>
<td>$64,178,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Sources</td>
<td>$9,465,000</td>
<td>$9,935,000</td>
<td>$9,950,000</td>
<td>$10,600,000</td>
<td>$9,046,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Reserves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$94,875,000</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>$102,000,000</td>
<td>$103,500,000</td>
<td>$94,780,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning General Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>20,153,017</td>
<td>19,433,299</td>
<td>18,396,147</td>
<td>18,097,344</td>
<td>20,153,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE</strong></td>
<td>$115,028,017</td>
<td>$119,433,299</td>
<td>$120,396,147</td>
<td>$121,597,344</td>
<td>$114,933,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>As of 8/5/2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$62,352,000</td>
<td>$66,666,000</td>
<td>$67,850,000</td>
<td>$69,500,000</td>
<td>$63,138,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$17,230,000</td>
<td>$18,632,000</td>
<td>$20,160,000</td>
<td>$20,625,000</td>
<td>$17,387,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>$12,868,000</td>
<td>$13,577,000</td>
<td>$13,365,000</td>
<td>$15,400,000</td>
<td>$13,115,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>$2,125,000</td>
<td>$2,125,000</td>
<td>$2,125,000</td>
<td>$1,858,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Reserves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$94,875,000</td>
<td>$101,000,000</td>
<td>$104,000,000</td>
<td>$107,650,000</td>
<td>$95,500,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rev in excess of Exp (Exp in excess of Rev) $0 $(1,000,000) $(2,000,000) $(4,150,000) $(719,718)

**ENDING GENERAL FUND BALANCE** $20,153,017 $18,433,299 $16,396,147 $13,947,344 $19,433,299

Percentage of Total Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>21.2%</th>
<th>18.3%</th>
<th>15.8%</th>
<th>13.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

% Rev in excess of Exp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>-1.0%</th>
<th>-2.0%</th>
<th>-4.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### LOCAL SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$16,222,000</td>
<td>$17,550,000</td>
<td>$19,275,000</td>
<td>$19,800,000</td>
<td>$16,051,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue in Lieu of Taxes</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$561,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Aid</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,227,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Ed Tuition</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$17,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Education</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$48,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$133,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Tickets</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$94,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCORE Fees</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$298,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA Activities</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$138,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School Activities</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$26,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$19,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Real Property</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>$390,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions / Donations</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$23,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$62,968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL LOCAL REVENUE** $21,870,000 $23,800,000 $25,675,000 $26,650,000 $21,556,317

### STATE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Aid Formula Payment</td>
<td>$61,600,000</td>
<td>$63,910,000</td>
<td>$63,700,000</td>
<td>$64,000,000</td>
<td>$61,896,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$406,000</td>
<td>$455,000</td>
<td>$368,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$1,047,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Education</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$342,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$321,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$196,000</td>
<td>$204,000</td>
<td>$221,000</td>
<td>$176,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Reimbursement</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted State Aid - Northeast</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>76,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>GENERAL FUND BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRELIM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As of 8/5/2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015-2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016-2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2017-2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2018-2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2015-2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016-2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2017-2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2018-2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019-2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. FEDERAL SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I, Part A</th>
<th>$2,673,200</th>
<th>$2,873,105</th>
<th>$3,151,884</th>
<th>$2,959,973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II, Part A</td>
<td>753,806</td>
<td>713,475</td>
<td>799,420</td>
<td>770,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III, Part A</td>
<td>109,468</td>
<td>77,020</td>
<td>39,981</td>
<td>35,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV, Part A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76,837</td>
<td>430,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCORE (21st Century CCLC)</td>
<td>703,768</td>
<td>1,011,365</td>
<td>479,203</td>
<td>838,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>2,510,160</td>
<td>2,531,289</td>
<td>2,566,269</td>
<td>2,621,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA B - Special Education</td>
<td>2,141,727</td>
<td>2,193,559</td>
<td>2,318,451</td>
<td>2,378,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Program</td>
<td>138,626</td>
<td>84,433</td>
<td>73,556</td>
<td>77,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education Programs</td>
<td>72,365</td>
<td>80,749</td>
<td>80,485</td>
<td>87,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Perkins</td>
<td>187,483</td>
<td>211,169</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>39,495</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Rate Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81,078</td>
<td>54,720</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Federal - Other</td>
<td>94,896</td>
<td>47,735</td>
<td>10,195</td>
<td>21,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEDERAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,465,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,935,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,950,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. GRANT RESERVES

| - | - | 500,000 | - |

| **TOTAL REVENUE** | **$9,487,000** | **$100,000,000** | **$102,000,000** | **$103,500,000** |

### A. SALARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Staff</th>
<th>$48,325,000</th>
<th>$50,943,692</th>
<th>$51,600,000</th>
<th>$53,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paras / Classified Staff</td>
<td>12,927,000</td>
<td>14,472,308</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs / Other</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SALARIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,352,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,666,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$67,850,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. FRINGE BENEFITS

| Health Insurance | $6,200,702 | $6,750,000 | $8,266,000 | $8,500,000 |
| TFRF (Employer Share) | 5,687,696 | 6,000,000 | 6,056,000 | 6,275,000 |
| FICA (Employer Share) | 4,467,877 | 4,925,000 | 4,850,000 | 4,900,000 |
| IRA/403B (Employer Share) | 500,000 | 555,000 | 550,000 | 550,000 |
| Disability Insurance | 143,525 | 210,000 | 200,000 | 205,000 |
| Workers Comp | 202,000 | 155,000 | 155,000 | 150,000 |
| Unemployment Comp | 3,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 7,000 |
| Life Insurance | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| **TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS** | **$17,230,000** | **$18,632,000** | **$20,160,000** | **$20,625,000** |

### C. OTHER EXPENSES

| Supplies | $2,500,000 | $2,335,000 | $2,335,000 | $2,200,000 |
| Equipment & Furniture | 1,500,000 | 1,380,000 | 1,380,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Textbooks / Curriculum Adoption | 650,000 | 550,000 | 654,000 | 500,000 |
| Library Books & Materials | 425,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 135,000 |
| Purchased Services | 1,400,000 | 1,570,000 | 1,670,000 | 1,640,000 |
| Legal Services | 15,000 | 13,000 | 10,000 | 9,000 |
| Student Transportation | 1,150,000 | 1,230,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,500,000 |
| **TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES** | **$17,387,432** | **$18,370,065** | **$19,695,334** | **$20,471,267** |
# GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

## GENERAL FUND BUDGET

### FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>61,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1,236,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephones</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>230,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>65,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>133,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>323,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>467,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Lease</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>224,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agreements</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>635,000</td>
<td>635,000</td>
<td>635,000</td>
<td>572,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Services</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>361,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>197,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Allowances</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>173,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas &amp; Oil</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>45,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Meals</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>34,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues / Fees</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>648,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Awards / Emp Recognition</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Fund #61</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>490,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$12,886,000</td>
<td>$13,877,000</td>
<td>$13,365,000</td>
<td>$15,400,000</td>
<td>$13,115,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. UTILITIES

| **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **BUDGET** |
| Water & Sewage | 375,000 | 375,000 | 375,000 | 375,000 | 365,442 | 343,438 | 341,436 | 347,143 | 354,086 |
| Natural Gas | 800,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 307,050 | 368,578 | 453,592 | 516,585 | 532,083 |
| Electricity | 1,250,000 | 1,250,000 | 1,250,000 | 1,250,000 | 1,186,388 | 1,151,314 | 1,199,419 | 1,138,607 | 1,184,152 |
| **TOTAL UTILITIES** | $2,425,000 | $2,125,000 | $2,125,000 | $2,125,000 | $1,858,880 | $1,863,329 | $1,994,448 | $2,002,336 | $2,070,321 |

### E. GRANT RESERVES

| **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **BUDGET** |

### TOTAL EXPENDITURES

| Rev in excess of Exp (Exp in excess of Rev) - Excluding Construction Exp | $94,875,000 | $101,000,000 | $104,000,000 | $107,650,000 | $95,500,402 | $99,822,319 | $101,278,672 | $105,206,832 | $108,353,153 |

| **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **BUDGET** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **ACTUAL** | **BUDGET** |
| $220,000 | $400,000 | $(1,000,000) | $(1,250,000) | $(358,300) | $320,090 | $704,143 | $(104,234) | $(1,877,842) |
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## GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
### GENERAL FUND BUDGET
#### FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>PRELIM</th>
<th>PRELIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$1,930,000</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$5,125,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$(5,125,000)</td>
<td>$(3,875,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>$(4,052,882)</td>
<td>$982,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exp in excess of Exp (Exp in excess of Rev)**

**ENDING GENERAL FUND BALANCE**

**% Rev in excess of Exp**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL SOURCES</th>
<th>PRELIM</th>
<th>PRELIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$1,328,000</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue in lieu of Taxes</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Aid</strong></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Education</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPA Activities</strong></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer School Activities</strong></td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(19,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rentals</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$(1,930,000)</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATE SOURCES**

| **Revenue** | $2,310,000 | $210,000 | $300,000 | $808,000 | $2,331,763 | $(361,635) | $116,191 | $822,273 | 3.8% | -0.6% | 0.2% | 1.3% |
| **Transportation** | - | 36,000 | 49,000 | 137,400 | 37,821 | 48,831 | 138,638 | (2,086) | 10.2% | 12.0% | 30.5% | -0.4% |
| **Special Education** | 250,000 | (75,000) | (25,000) | 50,000 | (81,818) | (35,139) | (149,157) | 219,077 | -7.8% | -3.6% | -16.0% | 28.1% |
| **Career & Technical Education** | 42,000 | (42,000) | 15,000 | 25,000 | (1,206) | (745) | (291,295) | 311,357 | -0.4% | -0.2% | -91.0% | 1087.0% |
| **Adult Education** | 36,000 | 8,000 | 17,000 | (96,000) | 29,249 | (81,000) | (60,386) | 60,358 | 16.5% | -39.3% | -48.3% | 93.4% |
| **Medicaid Reimbursement** | - | (32,000) | (22,000) | 164,000 | 45,511 | (22,415) | 144,001 | 20,104 | 355.6% | -38.4% | 401.2% | 11.2% |
| **Restricted State Aid - Northeast** | 8,000 | - | 17,000 | (25,000) | 6,170 | 16,894 | (39,958) | 15,063 | 8.0% | 20.4% | -40.0% | 25.1% |
## C. FEDERAL SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted State Aid - Day Treatment</td>
<td>(14,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted State Aid - ELL</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(35,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted State Aid - Other</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL STATE REVENUE**

|                     | $2,726,000 | $(390,000) | $375,000 | $1,070,400 |

## D. GRANT RESERVES

| Grant Reserves | 500,000 | ($500,000) |

**TOTAL REVENUE**

|                     | $5,125,000 | $2,000,000 | $1,500,000 | $475,311 |

## A. SALARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>$2,618,692</td>
<td>$656,308</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$455,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional Staff</td>
<td>1,545,308</td>
<td>527,692</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>523,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/Other</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>235,886</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SALARIES**

|                     | $4,314,000 | $1,184,000 | $1,650,000| $2,124,789|

## B. FRINGE BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>$549,298</td>
<td>$1,518,000</td>
<td>$232,000</td>
<td>$193,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFFR (Employer Share)</td>
<td>312,104</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>(29,418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA (Employer Share)</td>
<td>457,123</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>127,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA/403B (Employer)</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(63,773)</td>
<td>(65,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Insurance</td>
<td>66,475</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>13,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' Comp</td>
<td>(47,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(6,341)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Comp</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>(3,230)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS**

|                     | $1,402,000 | $1,528,000 | $465,000  | $153,733  |

## C. OTHER EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$237,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Furniture</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks/Curriculum</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>163,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Books/Materials</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Services</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>168,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Transportation</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS**

|                     | $982,633  | $1,325,269 | $179,684  | $596,249  |

---

*Note: All figures represent budgetary estimates for the GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS General Fund for Fiscal Year 2019-2020.*
### GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
#### GENERAL FUND BUDGET

**FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>As of 8/5/2019</strong></td>
<td>$ Budget Growth</td>
<td>$ Budget Growth</td>
<td>$ Budget Growth</td>
<td>$ Budget Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7,353)</td>
<td>1,077 (3,914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>(87,160)</td>
<td>(264,768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephones</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>19,757 (2,337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,136)</td>
<td>10,594 (4,746)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,788</td>
<td>(16,074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>14,283 (13,356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>(35,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>23,021 (58,056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Lease</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>(26,397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agreements</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(45,477)</td>
<td>60,306 (6,856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Services</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>995,824 (353,175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(65,000)</td>
<td>14,548</td>
<td>25,984 (73,136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Allowances</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>49,649</td>
<td>(2,032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas &amp; Oil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7,211)</td>
<td>(1,790)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Meals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(778)</td>
<td>(5,933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues / Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>(39,221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Awards / Empl Recognition</td>
<td>- (10,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6,947)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,513)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Fund #61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,945 (3,978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 709,000</strong></td>
<td>**$ (212,000)$$ 2,035,000$ **</td>
<td>**$ (303,224)$$ 2,035,000$ **</td>
<td>**$ 278,778$$ 1,622,555$$ 422,432$ **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. UTILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewage</td>
<td>$ (22,005)</td>
<td>(2,001)</td>
<td>$ 5,706</td>
<td>$ 6,943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>61,528</td>
<td>85,015</td>
<td>62,993</td>
<td>15,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td>**$ (300,000)$$ (2,001)$</td>
<td>**$ 5,706$$ 6,943$ **</td>
<td>**$ 67,986$ **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. GRANT RESERVES**

- 500,000

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 6,125,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>$ 3,650,000</td>
<td>$ 703,153</td>
<td>$ 4,321,917</td>
<td>$ 1,456,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev in excess of Exp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rev in excess of Exp (Exp in excess of Rev) - Excluding Construction Exp*
**GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**BUILDING FUND BUDGET**

**FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>(1,567,268)</td>
<td>(1,567,268)</td>
<td>(1,598,780)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax @ 10.00 mills</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>2,277,683</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>2,277,683</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Payments - Principal</td>
<td>1,838,328</td>
<td>1,837,084</td>
<td>1,986,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Payments - Interest</td>
<td>507,960</td>
<td>469,611</td>
<td>464,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Payments - Paying Agent Fees</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,349,288</td>
<td>2,309,195</td>
<td>2,453,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>(1,616,556)</td>
<td>(1,598,780)</td>
<td>(1,727,473)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
### SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FUND BUDGET
#### FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>(150,221)</td>
<td>(150,221)</td>
<td>105,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax @ 2.00 mills</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>454,600</td>
<td>465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>454,600</td>
<td>465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assessments</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>198,778</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>198,778</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>105,601</td>
<td>320,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Grand Forks School Board  
FROM: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
DATE: September 9, 2019  
SUBJECT: Open Meetings Refresher

Grand Forks Public Schools’ Legal Counsel Richard (Dick) Olson and Attorney Laura Cobb will be at the meeting and provide a refresher on North Dakota open meetings law for board members and administrators.

cj
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 9, 2019
TO: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent
FROM: Jody Thompson, Associate Superintendent of Elementary Education
       Catherine Gillach, Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education
RE: Summer School Reports

Attached are the summer school reports for elementary school, middle school, high school, Summer Performing Arts and Drivers Education. We had another excellent summer school program for our community.

Kevin Ohnstad, Gabe Dahl, Terry Bohan and Dean Opp will be available to share program highlights and answer questions at the school board meeting.
To: Mr. Jody Thompson, Associate Superintendent of Teaching and Learning

Fr: Kevin Ohnstad, Elementary Summer School Director

Re: Summer School Summary 2019 – School Board Report

Dt: Tuesday, September 3, 2019

Mr. Thompson:

Thank you for the opportunity to present a summary regarding Elementary Summer School to the Grand Forks School Board and the Grand Forks Air Force Base School Board. I have included the enrollment summary for your review. I would like to highlight a few of the programs offered during Elementary Summer School.

Elementary Summer School Programs

- 10th Month Remedial Reading – June
- Introduction to Kindergarten – June
- 10th Month Remedial Math – August

2019 Elementary Summer School Enrollment

- Remedial Reading K-5 523
- Intro to Kindergarten 409
- Remedial Math K-5 206
- Enrollment Total 1,138

I look forward to the opportunity to visit with our Grand Forks School Board and Grand Forks Air Force Base School Board members regarding the success of our Elementary Summer School Program.
Attached is a summary of the 2019 secondary summer school session. I will make myself available to answer questions.

Dr. Gabe Dahl
## 2019 High School Summer School Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td>Annette Kohlmeier (Brittany Bunde)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Government</td>
<td>Tina Parkes (Carol Cano, Missy Arends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Kyle Ellingson (Carol Cano, Missy Arends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English EL (RRHS)</td>
<td>Kristijana Dogan, Sarah Hellyer, (Ione Seidlinger, Alyssa Homan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English I</td>
<td>Yvonne Kalka and Katie Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English II</td>
<td>Sarah Tuchscherer (Laurie Holcomb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English III</td>
<td>Scott Conrad (Barb Jorgenson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English III (EL)</td>
<td>Brooke Goodwin (Andrea Eklund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Studies</td>
<td>Lonny Brakel and Sharon Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Education</td>
<td>Michael McNelly, Nathan Murray, Roger Quinn (Brittany Baker), George Roughhead, Tyler Theil (Ashley Stavnes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Michelle Cremers (Hannah Chaussee), Stetson Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Geometry</td>
<td>Annette Kohlmeier (Brittany Bunde)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Networking Summer Academy</td>
<td>Jerome Gunderson and Paul Zettler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN Manager</td>
<td>Nate Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>LoRia Novak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Alex Hedlund (Hannah Chaussee), Stetson Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>Dave Kohlmeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Tami Hoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>Mary Pomeroy (Kathryn Englerth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School Director</td>
<td>Gabe Dahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States History</td>
<td>Nick Graves (Deb Oatman) and Emma Schreiber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Paras in parantheses)
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The 2019 high school summer session met 26 days from June 3, 2019 to July 10, 2019. Half-credit courses met for 60 hours, one-credit courses met for 120 hours, and lab science courses met for 75 hours for half-credit classes. Students were able to attend two half-credit courses or one-full credit course for the summer school session. In all there were 804 seats enrolled for summer school, compared to 814 and 784 the previous two years (students may take more than one class), 6 students (1% this year as opposed to 4%, 12% and 11% the previous three years) did not attend the class they originally signed up for, 30 (4%) students exceeded the limit in semester A and didn’t attend in semester B (compared to 2% the previous year), 49 (6% this year as opposed to 6%, 7% and 10% the previous three years) were dropped because they did not adhere to the attendance policy, and 8 (1% this year which equaled the same percentage over the previous three years) did not earn credit for the class due to academic performance and 714 (89% as compared to 87%, 80% and 78% over the previous three years) earned credit for the class.

Throughout the summer school session, parents were kept informed of their child’s attendance through attendance reports that were emailed to them as well as Google Docs. Students enrolled in a half-credit class were allowed to miss five hours and still earn credit, while students enrolled in a one-credit class were allowed to miss ten hours and still earn credit. We are in the second year to an attendance policy change. Students enrolled in both semester A and semester B of the same course were allotted ten hours to use at their discretion, meaning the time was not designated as five hours for semester A and five hours for semester B. Parents received 1067 emails (compared to 804 in 2018, 1079 in 2017 and 1064 emails in 2016) if their student was tardy, absent, or missed time during the class period. The attendance reports have been a very effective way to communicate with parents about their child’s attendance and to alert them if their child is in jeopardy of being dropped from the class because of too many hours missed. In addition to attendance reports, both midterm reports and final grades were also emailed to parents with email addresses and mailed to parents without email addresses.
Students attending summer school were surveyed during the time frame of June 3 and July 10 to identify student demographics. A total of 315 students replied to the survey. The survey asked students to identify their gender, grade for the 2019-20 school year, school attended during the year, number of credits they were enrolled, classes they were enrolled, teacher’s name, reason for taking school, and whether or not the student planned on bringing their own device to summer school.

2019 Demographic Information of Sample, n=315
2018 Demographic Information of Sample, n=285
2017 Demographic Information of Sample, n=279
2016 Demographic Information of Sample, n=273
2015 Demographic Information of Sample, n=277
2014 Demographic Information of Sample, n=296
2013 Demographic Information of Sample, n=294

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Summer School Students</th>
<th>2019 Count</th>
<th>2019 % of Mean</th>
<th>2018 Count</th>
<th>2018 % of Mean</th>
<th>2017 Count</th>
<th>2017 % of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade for the following school year</th>
<th>2019 Count</th>
<th>2019 % of Mean</th>
<th>2018 Count</th>
<th>2018 % of Mean</th>
<th>2017 Count</th>
<th>2017 % of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Completed High School after summer | 0          | 0              | 0          | 0              | 0          | 1.1            |

### Reasons students enroll in summer school (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>To graduate after summer school</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>To graduate a semester early</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>To create a place for a free period</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>To create space for an elective class</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**76% of students surveyed enrolled for enrichment purposes**

| 19%      | To recover a credit that was not earned during the school year | Remedial |
| 5.1%     | To replace a grade for a course                 | Remedial  |

**24% of students surveyed enrolled for remedial purposes**
### Reasons students enroll in summer school (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>To graduate after summer school</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>To graduate a semester early</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>To create a place for a free period</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>To create space for an elective class</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**74% of students surveyed enrolled for enrichment purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>To recover a credit that was not earned during the school year</td>
<td>Remedial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>To replace a grade for a course</td>
<td>Remedial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**26% of students surveyed enrolled for remedial purposes**

### Reasons students enroll in summer school (2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>To graduate after summer school</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>To graduate a semester early</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>To create a place for a free period</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>To create space for an elective class</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**77.3% of students surveyed enrolled for enrichment purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>To recover a credit that was not earned during the school year</td>
<td>Remedial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**22.7% of students surveyed enrolled for remedial purposes**

### Reasons students enroll in summer school (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>To graduate after summer school</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>To graduate a semester early</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>To create a place for a free period</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>To create space for an elective class</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**68.2% of students surveyed enrolled for enrichment purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>To recover a credit that was not earned during the school year</td>
<td>Remedial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**17.9% of students surveyed enrolled for remedial purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>Teacher/Counselor Recommendation</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**13.6% of students surveyed enrolled for other purposes**

### Reasons students enroll in summer school (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>To graduate after summer school</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>To graduate a semester early</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>To create a place for a free period</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>To create space for an elective class</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**79% of students surveyed enrolled for enrichment purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>To recover a credit that was not earned during the school year</td>
<td>Remedial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**21% of students surveyed enrolled for remedial purposes**
The 2019 summer school session continued the process of integrating technology and instruction through the Bring Your Own Device Initiative that was implemented at both high schools during the 2015-16 school year and that initiative continues remain constant. Of the 315 students who responded to the survey, 58.4% (184) planned on bringing their own device, which is down 4 students the previous year. This may be due to the fact that each student has access to a device already in the classroom.

**Physical Science**

Similar to the enrollment numbers for physical science for the 2018 summer school session, there were a low number of students registered to take Physical Science A and Physical Science B for the 2019 summer school session. As a result, we provided an online possibility for students to recover the credit not earned during the 2018-19 school year. Mr. Dave Kohlmeier (Science teacher at Grand Forks Central High School) taught Physical Science A and Physical Science B concurrently via an online platform of Edmentum. Mr. Kohlmeier served as the teacher of record, helped to set up labs for the students, motivated students and answered questions. Students followed the same schedule for summer school (7:45 to 12:25), however, were given the incentive of working at their own pace and when they completed the requirements for the course, they were done for the summer. Six out of the nine students enrolled earned credit for the summer.

*Was this the first online class that you have ever taken?*

7 responses

- Yes: 85.7%
- No: 14.3%
If I had my preference, I would prefer to take a class...

7 responses

- All Online (including the teacher) 57.1%
- Traditionally (like the school year) 42.9%
- Online/traditional mix (Similar to Physical Science Class that you just took)

Having taking Physical Science via Edmentum, would you take the class via "Edmentum" again if the situation presented itself.

7 responses

- Yes 28.6%
- No 42.9%
- Maybe 28.6%

**STUDENT POSITIVES**

Don’t interact with people
Got help from my teacher (Teacher was great)
Still got to do the labs (Labs online)
Tests were short, but effective

**STUDENT NEGATIVES**

Would like more traditional teaching (4 agreed)
Not online

**TEACHER POSITIVES**

Students were able to move at their own pace
Students who failed multiple courses had the opportunity to take multiple courses during summer school
The platform worked well as a remedial course (2/4 earned semester A, 4/5 earned semester B)
ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Continue to move forward in offering this option for classes where registration numbers do not warrant running a traditional class to allow students the opportunity to take classes of their choice.

2) Discuss with the English department the feasibility and practicality of offering a combined English (Literature and Composition run concurrently via an online platform) course for a future summer school session.

INFORMAL GEOMETRY PILOT

After studying the past summer school sessions, it was evident that we have only offered a second math class (informal geometry) once in the 8 years that I have been the summer school director. There was interest from a teacher to pilot an online informal geometry class. Two teachers received a professional development day during the school year to set up an online class that mirrored our traditional informal geometry class. After spending a day with the informal geometry content provided by Edmentum, Mrs. Annette Kohlmeier and Ms. Brittany Bunde designed a course to meet the learning targets and common assessments of the traditional informal geometry course offered during the school year through the means of videos and online tutorials (with the platform of googledocs as opposed to Edmentum). We have phenomenal teachers who are willing to take risks to help students.

Three students were enrolled in the online session of informal geometry, worked at their own pace in the same classroom as students taking Algebra I A and Algebra I B. Mrs. Kohlmeier served as the teacher of record, and together with Ms. Bunde (math teacher serving as a para for the summer school session) motivated students and answered questions. Students followed the same schedule for summer school (7:45 to 12:25), however, were given the incentive of working at their own pace and when they completed the requirements for the course, they were done for the summer.
Was this the first online class that you have ever taken?
2 responses

100%

Having taking Informal Geometry Online, would you take the class online again if the situation presented itself.
2 responses

100%
**STUDENT POSITIVES**
Working at my own pace
Collaborating with another student

**STUDENT NEGATIVES**
More videos to help with understanding
Split the students (Algebra I/Informal Geometry) into different rooms with a teacher for each

**TEACHER POSITIVES**
Credit recovery is possible when there aren’t enough students enrolled to offer the course traditionally.

It is self-paced and students have the incentive to finish the course prior to the typical 13 days.

It prevents a student from having to double up on math classes during the school year.

**TEACHER AREAS FOR GROWTH**
Access to help is dependent upon the needs and class size of the course being traditionally taught.

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS**
1) Continue to move forward in offering this option for classes where registration numbers do not warrant running a traditional class to allow students the opportunity to take classes of their choice.
   a. Further investigate running multiple courses concurrently with a teacher of the content area serving as a guide to help students.

Dietrichs provided transportation for the students who live on the Grand Forks Air Force Base and made two stops, dropping students off at Valley Middle School/Winship Elementary (for the middle school summer program) and Central High School (high school summer program). During the summer session, the bus averaged thirty-two (32) riders a day, sixteen (16) were picked up to brought to summer school and sixteen (16) were picked and brought home from summer school as compared to an average of nine (9) in 2018 and eleven (11) in 2017. The bus service has proven to be a very important service, without it several of the students would not have been able to attend summer school.

The work of the school counselors at the three high schools was integral in the organization of summer school as they facilitated the online student registration process. Thank you to Kate Smothers and Leigh Olson, secretaries at Central High School, for all the work they did in preparation (registration and enrollment) and throughout the summer school session (communication, PowerSchool, and attendance).

Other groups that need recognition include the custodial staff at Central High School for their flexibility during summer cleaning; Kent Ripplinger and Nate Carlson for the work loading teachers’
computers and working behind the scenes to be sure instructors had the necessary tools to do their jobs successfully. A special thank you to Scott Conrad for creating the online registration form, Google Docs for each teacher to keep track of attendance online, and setting up an email notification to parents to keep them informed on their student’s attendance.

The summer school staff was excellent. The teachers and paraprofessionals made summer school a successful and engaging learning experience for all students. Of the twenty-nine (29) staff members hired, twenty-three (23) were employed by the Grand Forks Public Schools for the 2018-19 school year. For the six (6) staff members that were not, three (3) of them have previously taught in the Grand Forks Public Schools, two (2) of them are substitutes in the district, and one (1) of them will teach in the Grand Forks Public Schools for the 2019-20 school year. There were thirteen paraprofessionals hired for the summer school session. Nine (9) of them served as paraprofessionals for the 2018-19 school year, three (3) of them were teachers in the district, and one (1) of them was hired to be a teacher for the 2019-20 school year. The work of the staff kept student learning at the forefront and was greatly appreciated. The continued support of the summer school program by the school board is strongly encouraged. I have been very impressed with the teachers, their programs, and the students. Their commitment and attitude is what makes summer school a successful experience for everyone involved.

**Administrative Recommendations**

1) Parents have become accustomed to PowerSchool as a means of identifying student progress during the school year, however, this is not an option during summer school. Pilot a gradebook (similar to that of PowerSchool) so that grades can be seen, real time, and parents have better idea of how their student is doing academically, as opposed to sending out progress reports at the halfway point of classes.
2019 Middle School Summer Program

Middle school classes were held at Schroeder, South, and Valley this summer from June 4th to June 28, for two hours each weekday. The middle school program consisted of remedial math, remedial reading/language arts, and students had the option of enrolling in either course or both. The summer school staff was excellent. The teachers and paraprofessionals made summer school a successful and engaging learning experience for all students. All eight teachers were employed by the Grand Forks Public Schools for the 2018-19 school year. All ten of the paraprofessionals hired for the summer school session worked in the district for the 2018-19 school year. The teachers and the students had a great session of summer school. Thank you to them for all of the work they put into our program.

Valley Middle School encountered some unforeseen problems with construction projects, as a result, summer school was cancelled for one day, (June 7th) and transferred to Winship Elementary for the remainder of the summer school session (June 10th to June 27th). A special thanks to the district office for the prompt communication and problem-solving effort to keep learning on the forefront with limited time missed.
### 2019 Middle School Summer School Staff:

#### Schroeder Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deb Boucher</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Math</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Cebula</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Reading</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Paras—Katie Hagen, Bryce Nordine, and Jenna Tezel*

#### South Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nikki Polum</td>
<td>6th to 8th Reading</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Novak</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Math</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Wiltse</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; ELL Math</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karrie Bohan</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; ELL Reading</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Paras—Amanda Braxton, Katie Hagen, Amanda Hewitt, and Melissa Salveson,*

#### Valley Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janelle Holt</td>
<td>6th to 8th Math</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Millner</td>
<td>6th to 8th Reading</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Paras—Kassidy Axness, Ashley Morris, and Charlotte Woods,*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Math Enrolled</th>
<th>Math Completed</th>
<th>Reading/Language Arts Enrolled</th>
<th>Reading/Language Arts Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19 (95%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20 (83%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21 (81%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60 (86%)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(40) 82%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65 (92%)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73 (85%)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70 (90%)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78 (98%)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73 (92%)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64 (90%)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57 (85%)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2019</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 (92%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2018</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28 (88%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2017</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16 (84%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2016</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20 (87%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2015</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20 (83%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (ELL) 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

2) The middle school reading and math teachers met three times this year for at least one hour at a time. They were charged with identifying 5 things that students can essentially take away from the summer school curriculum that is a guaranteed and viable curriculum and collaborate to share ideas.

   a. English Curriculum
      i. Comprehension
      ii. Fluency
      iii. Main Idea
      iv. Sequencing
      v. Value Importance of Reading

   b. Math Curriculum
      i. Expressions
      ii. Fractions
      iii. Ratios
      iv. Multiplication
      v. Division

3) The teachers collaborated to create a share drive for lessons, tests, and ideas. The goal is to work towards a common assessment amongst all middle school summer school classes as a means of demonstrating growth at the end of the summer school session.

   a. Continue with this work for the 2020 summer school session to identify consistency amongst the middle schools.
Demonstrate Growth

- Pre/Post
- Independent reading books and levels
- Independent reading levels
- Comprehension checks and exit slips
- Pre/Post—Sequencing, predicting, contrasting, and comprehending,
  - Retelling
  - Written predictions/inferences
  - Annotating and making connections
- Pre/Post
  - Daily/weekly skills
  - Reports and post tests

Changes

- Have all EL Kids Bussed
- Budgets for extension activities
- Which sections would teach first (teachers can work together to identify this)
- Have students entered into Powerschool the 1st day

Support

- Budget Money
Ms. Gillach,

Driver Education for 2019 began on June 3 and ended on July 12. Four Driver Education sessions were offered with 244 students enrolling in the program. A total of 242 students successfully completed Driver Education. Fifteen of our students were out of district students. The enrollment for 2019 was a reduction of 63 students from 2018. The 14 instructors hired for our summer program are highly qualified by the state of North Dakota to teach Driver Education. Four additional staff members were hired as interns in our program. The student experience in Driver’s Ed is a three-tiered setting that includes classroom instruction, simulated driving, and behind-the-wheel instruction each day. We feel this is a highly effective and authentic learning experience for young drivers.

Prior to our summer program, several of our instructors participated in a book study hosted by Minot State University. We read Not So Fast: Parenting Your Teen Through the Dangers of Driving (2013). Authors Tim Hollister and Pam Fisher provided excellent suggestions for instructors and families who are working with young drivers.

One of our four sessions this summer was a hybrid or alternative version of driver’s ed. This smaller session utilized Google Classroom for a “distance” classroom option combined with face-to-face classroom instruction, simulated lessons, and behind-the-wheel driving with an instructor one day per week for the month of June. Eight students enrolled in this program with seven students successfully completing the course as designed by our instructor. We plan to continue this new method next summer.

In preparation for the future, we have arranged for two current teachers in our district to secure a Driver Education endorsement for the summer of 2020. I hope we can secure a similar arrangement during the 2020-21 school year. I believe we can expand our summer driving program in the future with a certified staff of 16-18 teachers. Our service to 242 students in 2019 can hopefully expand to around 300 students, provided we have certified staff to serve as instructors. This would match past enrollment in our summer program.
The SPA Mentoring/Outreach program, now in its 19th year, provided many opportunities for students this summer. We chose "Building Bridges" as our focus for our character education component that we use on all levels of the SPA program. Operating in close proximity with students for 4-6 hours per day, our mentors practice formal and informal mentoring. Formally each mentor is assigned particular students within the production groups. Informally we ask that our mentors try to connect with all students, as we believe all students are at-risk. High School SPA students collected food items for the Hope Food pantry as part of a service-learning project.

Over the course of the six-week EL program, 35 High School students engaged in activities, games, and rehearsals that enabled them to explore the fine arts, develop increased English proficiency, and increase personal confidence in public settings. Students participated in activities to help with pronunciation difficulties, enjoyed learning about rudimentary aspects of drums and guitar, and in previous years performed an original music piece. SPA staff members developed and facilitated each activity, and at the end of each morning, data on personal growth/behavioral issues was documented on every individual in the section. HS and Elementary EL students performed at the Town Square for World Refugee Day.

MySPA, now in its ninth year, created opportunities for 29 students (an increase from 2018) in grades K-12, and a few of who are in the transitional program. The mission of MySPA is to offer a unique experience of the performing arts in an individual, educational, inspirational, and exciting environment. The focus was on a variety of creative expression including drama, music, movement, literature and visual arts. All MySPA students produced a show called "Theatre Shapes Me".

Bands on the Red saw another increase in enrollment this year, surpassing 100 students. Elementary and Middle School students met at South Middle School and High School students met at Central High School. It culminated at a concert at the Myra Gazebo in June. 131 students participated between the three programs.
The **Elementary SPA program** (students who have completed grades K-5) held two-week drama sessions at Red River, Phoenix, and Grand Forks Central in June and a July session at Red River. A class was offered at Twining once again this year after a hiatus from that location. Elementary SPA also included a session at Winship in conjunction with the ENCORE program. Throughout all sessions and locations, students learned the basic fundamentals of drama and movement through games and exercises specially designed to inspire creativity. This year, 486 students participated in these programs.

Piloted in 2018, the **Pre-K SPA program** offered 6 sessions this year at Central High School to children aged 3-6 and have not yet been in Kindergarten. 71 students participated in movement, creative dramatic, and music exercises. A show and tell performance for parents was held at the end of each session.

The **Middle School SPA program** (students who have completed grades 6-7) met at South Middle School for four weeks in June. This year’s theme was “Don’t Stop Me Now” and the group focused on training in music, drama, and dance, as well as basic performance techniques and teamwork/problem-solving skills. Voice lessons were also offered to Middle School SPA students. The enrollment for 2019 was 148 - a sharp increase from 2018.

The **High School SPA program** (students who have completed grades 8-11) had 148 students this summer. Students were involved in two musical productions, a technical and production team, and Fine Arts classes.

Our first High School production was **Bye Bye Birdie** and was presented at the Grand Forks Central Auditorium. This cast included students entering 9th and 10th grades, and enjoyed 4 full performances. Our second High School production was **Tuck Everlasting**, and was presented at the Red River High School Performance Hall. The Technical and Production team worked on the set, lights, spotlights, sound, makeup, costumes and video for both productions.

The **Grand Cities Children’s Choir** (GCCC) met during the school year and includes students in grades 3-9. There were four mixed choirs this season, and auditions are held in the fall and in the spring. Student helpers, or "GGs", from grades 10-12 serve as mentors for the choir. 267 students participated in 2018-19.
There was a total of $5,710 requested in scholarships by program participants who qualified for financial need based on free and reduced lunch criteria. This enabled 77 students, who otherwise would not be able to participate, the opportunity to engage in positive summer activities.

Overall participation for Elementary, Middle, and High School, including instrumental lessons for elementary and secondary students, and participation in the Grand Cities Children’s Choir was 1,426 students - which is record enrollment for years where SPA has not had any additional school-year camps, classes, or special events.
Trend information from 2015-2019

The following is a brief accounting for SPA—however, it is important to remember that this program represents more than just numbers. SPA represents an excellent program that provides opportunities for many GFPS students. We hear many times from those outside this community how impressed they are with what Grand Forks can offer its young people.

### HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT NUMBERS: (School they came from)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>VALLEY</th>
<th>SCH.</th>
<th>TWIN.</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>GFC</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENT NUMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>VALLEY</th>
<th>SCH.</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TWIN.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GCCC NUMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TWIN.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MYSPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EL SPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ELEMENTARY STUDENT NUMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PRE-K SPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SPA ACTIVITIES DURING SCHOOL YEAR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### STUDENT INSTRUMENTAL LESSONS NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BANDS ON THE RED NUMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### GRAND TOTAL PER YEAR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### BOX OFFICE NUMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL AUDIENCE</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In 32 years, SPA has:
- had over 36,000 students involved.
- given 595 public performances.
- seen over 214,700 audience members.

### Areas of focus for SPA 2020

**Student Focus (continuing)**
- Identifying at-risk students that could benefit from participating in the SPA program

**Curriculum/Program Development (continuing)**
- Develop collaboration between production groups/sections

**Public Relations (continuing)**
- Increasing public relations footprint. Coordinated PR/Donor Plan ~."Telling our Story"
MEMORANDUM

TO: Grand Forks School Board
FROM: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
SUBJECT: NDSBA Opportunities for Board Member Development
DATE: September 9, 2019

Pursuant to Grand Forks School Board Policy 8320, school board members are herein notified of the following opportunities for board member development sponsored by the North Dakota School Boards Association (NDSBA).

The New Member Seminar, which North Dakota Century Code 15.1-09-32 requires each newly elected school board member to attend within one year of assuming office, will be held on Thursday, October 24, 2019.

The School Law Seminar also will be held on Thursday, October 24, 2019.

The Annual Convention, which School Board Policy 8320 encourages board members to attend, will be held on Thursday and Friday, October 24-25, 2019.

All events will be held at the Ramkota Hotel in Bismarck.

Registration and lodging for all board members wishing to attend any of the events are arranged through the superintendent’s office. Mileage and meals not provided by the event are reimbursed to the board member according to state law.

Board members are asked to notify Cindy Johnson whether they wish to attend any or all of the NDSBA events mentioned above no later than Friday, September 20.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Grand Forks School Board
FROM: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
SUBJECT: Consent Agenda
DATE: September 9, 2019

Many items of a routine nature can be handled as one item rather than spending additional time on each individual item. Therefore, the Consent Agenda has been developed for the school board’s use in order to speed up the process of conducting its meetings. Items that may be listed on the Consent Agenda include:

- Appointments (excludes administrative appointments)
- Leave Requests (excludes requests for extension)
- Open Enrollment Applications
- Resignations
- Student Placements
- Student Travel Requests

There should be no discussion concerning an individual item on the Consent Agenda. However, during the approval of the school board meeting agenda, any board member may request an item be removed from the Consent Agenda for further discussion. Once the school board meeting agenda has been approved, all items listed on the Consent Agenda are handled as one item.

**Items appearing on the Consent Agenda at the time of the publishing of this agenda packet with their requested considerations are:**

- Appointments (excludes administrative appointments)
- Open Enrollment Applications
- Resignations
- Student Travel Requests

**Administrative recommendation is for approval.**

cj
Attachments
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent
FROM: Tracy Abentroth, Director of Human Resources
RE: Teacher Appointments
DATE: September 9, 2019

Pursuant to North Dakota Century Code 15.1-09-33 the School Board approves the issuance of contracts to school district personnel.

Appointments appearing on this list at the time of the publishing of the agenda packet follow. There may be additional appointments presented for consideration at the meeting.

Administrative recommendation is to approve the appointments, effective August 19, 2019.

Attachment

mjs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Yrs of Exp</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie Heuchert</td>
<td>BA+45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$54,463</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Day Treatment Teacher</td>
<td>Valley Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Hung</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$44,923</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>World Languages</td>
<td>World Language Teacher</td>
<td>Valley Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Laurie</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$43,371</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>Discovery Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logen Letofsky</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$41,818</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Business Ed/General Business</td>
<td>Business Education Teacher</td>
<td>South Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carissa Olson</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$41,818</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Preschool Special Needs Teacher</td>
<td>Phoenix Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Rerick</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$43,371</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music Teacher</td>
<td>Phoenix Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Sarah Stevens</td>
<td>Major:</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree:</td>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs of Exp:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>J. Nelson Kelly Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary:</td>
<td>$55,073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Robert Waddle, II</th>
<th>Major:</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree:</td>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
<td>Intervention Strategist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs of Exp:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Valley Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary:</td>
<td>$46,532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>New Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Michaella Wavra</th>
<th>Major:</th>
<th>Speech Language Pathology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree:</td>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
<td>Speech Language Pathologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs of Exp:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Century Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary:</td>
<td>$46,532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent
FROM: Scott Berge, Business Manager
DATE: September 9, 2019
SUBJECT: Open Enrollment Applications

Pursuant to North Dakota Century Code and School Board Policy, administrative recommendation is to approve the following open enrollment application(s) for the 2019-20 school year because a deadline waiver was requested due to moving:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>App Type</th>
<th>Co No</th>
<th>Dist No</th>
<th>District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. M.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Midway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mo
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent
FROM: Tracy Abentroth, Director of Human Resources
RE: Resignations
DATE: September 9, 2019

North Dakota Century Code 15.1-09-33 provides authority for the School Board to act on employment contracts for school district personnel.

Please find attached a letter of partial contract percentage resignation from the following:

Suzanne Grant-Gooden  Physical Therapist  Special Education
100% to 90%

Administrative recommendation is to approve the resignation effective August 19, 2019.

Attachments
mjs
To: Tricia Lee  
From: Suzanne Grant-Gooden, PT  
Date: August 19, 2019  
Re: PT schedule

Tricia,

I am writing to request a decrease in PT hours to 90% of the time. So instead of a 40 hour week I will be working a 36 hour week for the 2019-2020 school year. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you for considering my request,

Suzanne Grant-Gooden, PT

Suzanne Grant-Gooden, PT
TRAVEL REQUEST

Out-of-Town/Out-of-State trips must be approved. The School Board will consider requests for student travel to countries other than the United States and Canada. The Assistant Superintendents will approve all other requests. (See Policy 5410)

Fill in the necessary information below and turn in into your building principal.

Date: 6/30/19

Organization/Class: AP World History
Advisor/Instructor: Elizabeth Carlson

# of Students Participating: 10-15

Destination: Europe - Austria, Hungary, Croatia, Italy

"European Treasures" by People to People

Beginning Date: Late June 2020 Ending Date: Early July 2020

Purpose of Trip: Allow AP World History students, who have taken the exam, to experience history and the world first hand.

Description of Activity: Students will have the opportunity to visit historically and culturally significant places, participate in volunteer work, and stay with a host family.

Additional Information: This program is run through People to People student travel ambassador programs.

Funding Source: Students and families fundraising possible.

School Approval:

Approved Signed: [Signature] 8/30/19

Denied Date:

District Approval:

Approved Signed: [Signature]

Denied Date:
MEMORANDUM

TO: Grand Forks School Board
FROM: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
DATE: September 9, 2019
SUBJECT: Annual Compliance Report

North Dakota Century Code 15.1-06-06 requires that all North Dakota schools and school districts must submit an “Annual Compliance Report” to the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction by October 1st of each school year in order to be declared “APPROVED” and receive foundation aid. The report is completed and submitted on the state STARS system.

In order to obtain certification for approval, the school district superintendent must submit a report for each of the district’s schools, complete with the signature of the school principal and the superintendent. The Annual Compliance Report must be approved by the school board prior to submission by the superintendent.

Attached is a copy of a summary report as evidence of compliance by each of the District’s eighteen schools. All school principals indicate complete compliance with all compliance areas.

Administrative recommendation is for approval of the 2019-2020 Annual Compliance Report.

cj
Attachment
# Annual Compliance Report

## Approval of LEAs

### County No. 18  LEA No. 001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Compliance Completion Date</th>
<th>Extension Date</th>
<th>School Board Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>School Compliance Report Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Franklin Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/27/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central High School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/29/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/05/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Alternative High School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/05/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/29/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Nelson Kelly Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>09/04/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Agassiz Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>09/04/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis and Clark Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Twining Elem-Middle School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/23/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>09/04/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red River High School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder Middle School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>09/04/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Middle School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Middle School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>09/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viking Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/29/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>08/29/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder Elem School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>09/04/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HB 1029 (effective July 1, 2011)

This LEA notifies the Department of Public Instruction that it complies with the following statutory requirements (NDCC 15.1-06-06):

In order to obtain certification that a LEA is approved, the superintendent of the district in which the LEA is located shall submit to the Superintendent of Public Instruction an Annual Compliance Report verifying that each school in the district is in accordance with statutory requirements. By checking each compliance area, providing the signatures of the principal(s) and superintendent, and being formally approved by the board of the school district, the district is providing assurance that:

1. **Valid Teaching License Pre-K-12**
   Each classroom teacher is licensed to teach by the education standards and practices board or approved to teach by the education standards and practices board (15.1-09-57 and 15.1-18).

2. **Teacher Highly Qualified Pre-K-12**
   Each classroom teacher is teaching only in those course areas or fields for which the teacher is licensed or for which the teacher has received an exception under section 15.1-09-57 and 15.1-18.

3. **Curriculum Pre-K-12**
   The school meets all curricular requirements set forth in chapter 15.1-21.

4. **Safety Requirements Pre-K-12**
   The school has been inspected by the state fire marshal or the state fire marshal’s designee in accordance with section 15.1-06-09 and;
   a. Has no unremedied deficiency; or
   b. Has deficiencies that have been addressed in a plan of correction that was submitted to and approved by the state fire marshal or the state fire marshal’s designee.

5. **Background Checks Pre-K-12**
   All individuals hired after June 30, 2011, and having unsupervised contact with students at the school have:
   a. Undergone a criminal history background check requested by the employing school district; or
   b. Undergone a criminal history background check in order to be licensed by the education standards and practices board or by any other state licensing board (15.1-06-06).

6. **Review Process Pre-K-12**
   The school participates in and meets the requirements of a review process that is:
   a. Designed to improve student achievement through a continuous cycle of improvement; and
   b. Approved by the superintendent of public instruction (15.1-06-06).
   The continuous cycle of improvement includes the below statements. Please assure the institution is complying with these statements.
   c. The institution certifies that all administrators employed by the district hold a valid North Dakota Administrative Credential appropriate for the position they hold.
      Elementary Credential (NDAC 67.11.02)
      Secondary Credential (NDAC 67.11.06)
      Superintendent Credential (NDAC 67.11.07)
   d. The institution certifies that all library media specialists employed by the district hold a valid North Dakota Credential appropriate for the position they hold.
      Library Media Credential (NDAC 67.11.04)
   e. The institution certifies that appropriate and effective library media services are provided for all students.
      School Library Media Program Standards Rubric
f. The institution certifies that all counselors employed by the district hold a valid North Dakota Credential appropriate for the position they hold. 
School Counselor Credential (NDAC 67.11.05)

g. The institution certifies that appropriate and effective counseling services are provided for all students.
7-12 School Counselor Requirements (NDCC 15.1-06-19)
School Counseling Program Standards Rubric

h. The institution certifies that a comprehensive education program is provided to all students to include coursework required by NDCC as well as appropriate elective areas such as Fine Arts, Foreign Language, and Career and Technical Education.
Curriculum Requirements (NDCC 15.1-21)
Music Program Standard Rubric

i. The institution certifies that they are in compliance with all requirements outlined for schools in North Dakota Century Code.
North Dakota Century Code Elementary and Secondary Education (NDCC 15.1)
North Dakota Department of Public Instruction Administrative Rules
Criminal History Record Check (NDCC 12-60-24(2)( X and Y})
Attorney General Opinions:
Criminal History Record Checks (2008-L-06, 5/12/08)
School Fees (2001-L-29, 8/10/01)
Home Education (2007-L-03, 2/1/07)
Contagious or Infectious Disease (NDCC 23-07-16 to 23-07-17.1)
Reporting of Child Abuse (NDCC 50-25.1-03, -09. -13)
Access to Public Meetings (NDCC 44-04-19)
NDPPI Statement on School Fees
School Enrollment Procedures to Aid Identification and Location of Lost, Missing, and Runaway Children (NDCC 12-60-26)

j. The institution certifies that it is evaluating all principals a minimum of once each year using a comprehensive and state approved principal evaluation system as defined in the ND principal evaluation guidelines.
Principal and Teacher Evaluation System Support (PTESS)

k. The institution certifies that it is evaluating all teachers a minimum of once each year using a comprehensive and state approved teacher evaluation system as defined in the ND teacher evaluation guidelines.
Principal and Teacher Evaluation System Support (PTESS)

l. The institution certifies that it is evaluating its superintendent in accordance to section 15.1-14-03 of the NDCC. It is further recommended that the evaluation tool that the school boards use is the model provided by the ND School Boards Association.
http://www.ndsba.org/Resources/ResourcesIndex.asp

7. eTranscript
The school uses North Dakota eTranscripts, or an alternative information system designated by the information technology department in collaboration with the superintendent of public instruction, to generate official transcripts (15.1-06-06).

Formally Approved by the Board - Authorized Representative Signatures of Annual Compliance Report

Requirements before submission:

a. Be signed by the school principal(s) and the superintendent of the school district;
b. Be formally approved by the board of the school district; and
c. Be filed with the Superintendent of Public Instruction before 5 p.m. on
   1. October 1, 2019; or that
   2. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the date the extension has been granted by DPI. The extension terminates at 5 p.m. on October 15, 2019 [15.1-06-06 (2) and (6)].

I hereby certify that the school identified above meets all statutory requirements for school approval as stated in the North Dakota Century Code, with the exception of the items noted below. Electronic data submissions each year to the Department of Public Instruction are also considered legal signatures. The
North Dakota Attorney General allows 'signature by submission' and any submission of electronic data is considered to be signed. I recognize that it is a class A misdemeanor if I make a false statement when the statement is material and I do not believe it to be true (NDCC 12.1-11-02).

Exceptions: All schools/districts must comply with the statutory requirements for school approval. However, there are rare occasions when even though extensive efforts have been made, schools are unable to meet a specific requirement. Please note any exceptions and the efforts that have been made to comply.

Signature of District Administrator Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
FROM: Christopher M. Arnold, Director of Buildings and Grounds
DATE: August 30, 2019
SUBJECT: Declaration of Emergency for RRHS Elevator Shaft Repair

Situation. Red River elevator shaft and associated stairwell located near door 14 has sustained a structural failure. The failure is located at the bottom of the elevator shaft where the CMU block has begun to move, which has jeopardized the integrity of the wall.

Background. During the week of 19 August, servicemen from B&G noticed a water sound while working at RRHS. When the sound was investigated, it was discovered that the elevator shaft pit was full of ground water that had seeped in. The facility manager at RRHS along with B&G staff repaired the sump pump and removed the water. When the water was removed, a large deflection was discovered in the lowest four feet of the elevator shaft pit. The B&G director contacted AE2S for a structural engineering opinion, where it was decided that work will need to be completed on the wall to prevent damage to the existing elevator and associated equipment. Additionally, the elevator serves as the only ADA accessibility for the basement. The stairwell also serves as a fire exit for students and staff located in the basement.

Assessment. The superintendent has, for the safety of students and teachers, closed off the elevator and stairwell from all usage. The elevator and associated stairwell are vital access points for the basement at RRHS. The impact is quite significant for staff and students and will cause strain for all parties using the area. The B&G director has assessed that the project will require significant work to repair the wall. This work will need to be completed during nights and weekends to prevent disturbances to student learning. The rough order of magnitude is estimated to be approximately $200K-300K. This amount exceeds the Century Code, 48-01.2-02.1, bid construction threshold of $200K. Century Code 48-01.2-04 permits the School Board, as the governing body, to declare an emergency which would bypass the bidding process.

Recommendation. It is recommended that the board approve the emergency declaration. Failure to not proceed immediately will likely result in further structural and equipment damage to the building. Additionally, the limited basement accessibility will place burden on staff and students. The result will be longer walk times between classes and no ADA accessibility to the basement.
# Red River High School Elevator Shaft

## Situation
- Failure of RRHS elevator shaft CMU wall is comprising the structural integrity of the building and has resulted in limited access to the basement.

## Background
- Why did it happen?
  - High water table
  - CMU construction w/o grout
- Where is it at?
  - Stairwell/Elevator is located near door
- Who uses it?
  - Those who need ADA access to basement, students/staff who have classes in basement

## Assessment
- Structural Engineer has determined a repair is necessary
- GFPS Superintendent has closed the stairwell for safety
- GFFD has deemed the basement safe for use with the stairwell closed
- ADA non-compliant while elevator is down
- RRHS Principal and B&G Director developed alternative safety routes for staff and students

## Recommendation
- Fund Repair of $200K–$300K
- Design fees will likely be approx. $50K
- Emergency Declaration for Contract Approval
  - N.D.C.C. Section 48-01.2-04
  - School Board is governing body
  - Project exceeds $200K threshold
MEMORANDUM

TO: Grand Forks School Board
FROM: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
SUBJECT: Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission Nomination - Mid-Century Schools
DATE: September 9, 2019

On behalf of Cabinet (Brenner, Thompson, Berge, Gillach, Bartsch, Abentroth, and Jentz) and Buildings & Grounds Director Chris Arnold, I have attached a variety of Technical Preservation Services Standards and Guidelines from the U.S. Department of the Interior. Federal agencies, state and local officials, and historic district and planning commissions across the country use the Standards and Guidelines in carrying out historic preservation responsibilities, in reviewing proposals, and guiding design review processes. There are four approaches to the treatment of historic properties – preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. One set of standards will apply to a property undergoing treatment, depending upon the property’s significance, existing physical condition, the extent of documentation available, and interpretive goals, when applicable.

We find these standards concerning in regard to potential additional time, effort, and cost for the six additional schools in consideration for addition to the Historic Register. For students, staff, and our community, focus on facilities must first and foremost be on safety, security, ADA compliance, environments conducive to learning (HVAC, technology, and otherwise), and financial capacity. A specific example of some potential unintended consequences of the Historic Standards and Guidelines, and as a result, significant additional time and costs, is a recent window replacement at Ben Franklin Elementary School. This summer, several windows were replaced. The contractor discovered that the original windows were much larger than what appeared from the exterior of the building. When the school first opened, it had windows that went nearly to the ceiling in each classroom. At some point, for energy efficiency, and perhaps other reasons, the top portion of the windows around the building were covered with wood on the exterior and other materials on the interior. The replacement windows were smaller than the current visible portion of the windows, and significantly smaller than the original window frame. Teachers and staff wanted smaller windows to allow for more wall space in their classrooms. Per an attached Technical Preservation Services document, “where historic windows remain in place, replacement windows on primary, street-facing or any highly visible elevations of buildings of three stories or less must match the historic windows in all their details and in material.” In a building where no historic windows remain, “replacement windows must always fill the original window openings and must be compatible with the overall historic character of the building.” Had Ben Franklin been on the Historic Register earlier this year, we may not have been able to install the windows and renovate as we did.
Another concern relates to the building characteristics of recessed entrances with overhanging eaves, which were referenced in a June 3, 2019 letter from the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission to Dr. Brenner. With safety and security concerns nationwide, we need more secure entrances to our facilities. Specifically, we need to reconfigure main entrance design so that there is a secondary set of secure doors and all visitors are funneled through a second door before gaining entrance to our buildings. This would change the character of the buildings and eliminate the recessed entrances.

On Friday August 30, 2019, some City of Grand Forks staff, the architect working on design planning for the Grand Forks Herald Building, and several school district staff met to discuss reconfiguring the space within the Grand Forks Herald Building. A portion of the Herald building is on the National Register. As part of the design reconfiguration, the architect discussed potentially adding an entrance to the side of the building that is on the National Register. He did not think adding an entrance was feasible, given National Register guidelines.

Please consider the potential impact of these standards on one-third of our schools before making a decision on allowing the six schools to be forwarded to the Federal Government for determination of being allowed on the Historic Register. Our legal counsel previously weighed in with their concerns consistent with district administration.

Administrative recommendation is to not approve the nomination of West Elementary School, Lewis & Clark Elementary School, Valley Middle School, Viking Elementary School, Ben Franklin Elementary School, and Wilder Elementary school to the National Register of Historic Places.

Respectfully,

Dr. Terry Brenner
Superintendent of Schools

Scott J. Berge
Business Manager

Amy Bartsch
Chief Academic Officer

Tracy Jentz
Communications and Community Engagement Coordinator

Chris Arnold
Buildings and Grounds Director

Jody Thompson
Associate Superintendent of Elementary Education

Catherine Gillach
Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education

Tracy Abentroth
Human Resources Director

Attachments
Technical Preservation Services

Home > The Standards

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties are common sense historic preservation principles in non-technical language. They promote historic preservation best practices that will help to protect our nation’s irreplaceable cultural resources.

- Standards for Preservation
- Standards for Rehabilitation
- Standards for Rehabilitation (for historic tax credit projects)
- Standards for Restoration
- Standards for Reconstruction
- History of the Standards
- Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties
- Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes
- Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
- Guidelines on Sustainability

The Treatment of Historic Properties

The Standards offer four distinct approaches to the treatment of historic properties—preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction—with accompanying Guidelines for each. One set of standards will apply to a property undergoing treatment, depending upon the property's significance, existing physical condition, the extent of documentation available and interpretive goals, when applicable.

The Standards are a series of concepts about maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations. The Guidelines offer general design and technical recommendations to assist in applying the

https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards—Technical Preservation Services, National Park Service

Standards to a specific property. Together, they provide a framework and guidance for decision-making about work or changes to a historic property.

The Standards and Guidelines can be applied to historic properties of all types, materials, construction, sizes, and use. They include both the exterior and the interior and extend to a property's landscape features, site, environment, as well as related new construction.

Federal agencies use the Standards and Guidelines in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities. State and local officials use them in reviewing both Federal and nonfederal rehabilitation proposals. Historic district and planning commissions across the country use the Standards and Guidelines to guide their design review processes.

The Standards offer four distinct approaches to the treatment of historic properties—preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction with Guidelines for each.

The Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, codified in 36 CFR 68, are regulatory for all grant-in-aid projects assisted through the national Historic Preservation Fund.

The Standards for Rehabilitation, codified in 36 CFR 67, are regulatory for the review of rehabilitation work in the Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program.

The Guidelines are advisory, not regulatory.
Planning Successful Rehabilitation Projects

Acquired Significance and Standard 4
Continued Historic Use and Standard 1
Windows
Evaluating Historic Windows for Repair or Replacement
Replacement Windows that Meet the Standards
Documentation Requirements for Proposed Window Replacement

Interior treatments
Identifying Primary and Secondary Interior Spaces in Historic Buildings
Changing Secondary Interior Spaces in Historic Buildings
Historically-Finished Secondary Spaces—Avoiding Problematic Treatments at Project Completion
Subdividing Assembly Spaces in Historic Buildings
Retaining Corridors and Other Circulation Spaces in Historic Buildings
Interior Spaces, Features, and Materials in Highly Deteriorated Condition and Standard 2

New additions and related new construction
New Additions to Historic Buildings
New Construction within the Boundaries of Historic Properties

Modern requirements and new technologies and materials
Codes and Regulatory Requirements for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
Energy Efficiency, Sustainability, and Green Building Practices in Historic Buildings
Evaluating Substitute Materials in Historic Buildings

Replacement Windows that Meet the Standards
The decision-making process for selecting replacement windows divides into two tracks depending on whether historic windows remain in place or no historic windows survive.

Replacement of Existing Historic Windows

When historic windows exist, they should be repaired when possible. When they are too deteriorated to repair, selection of the replacement windows must be guided by Standard 6. Design, visual qualities, and materials are specific criteria provided by the Standard that are pertinent to evaluating the match of a replacement window. Evaluating the adequacy of the match of the replacement window involves the consideration of multiple issues.

**How accurate does the match need to be?**

The more important a window is in defining the historic character of a building the more critical it is to have a close match for its replacement. **Location is a key factor** in two ways. It is usually a consideration in determining the relative importance of a building's various parts. For example, the street-facing facade is likely to be more important than an obscured rear elevation. The more important the elevation, feature or space of which the window is a part, the more important the window is likely to be, and thus, the more critical that its replacement be a very accurate match. Secondly, the location of the window can affect how much of the window's features and details are visible. This will affect the nature of an acceptable replacement. For example, windows at or near ground level present a different case from windows in the upper stories of a tall building.

**Using the hierarchy of a building's features and taking into account the window's visibility, some general guidance can be drawn.**

- **Replacement windows on primary, street-facing or any highly visible elevations of buildings of three stories or less must match the historic windows in all their details and in material (wood for wood and metal for metal).**

- **Replacement windows on the primary, street-facing or any highly visible elevations that are part of the base of high-rise buildings must match the historic windows in all their details and in material (wood for wood and metal for metal).** The base may vary in the number of stories, but is generally defined by massing or architectural detailing.

- **Replacement windows on the primary, street-facing or highly visible elevations of tall buildings above a distinct base must match the historic windows in size, design and all details that can be perceived from ground level. Substitute materials can be considered to the extent that they do not compromise other important visual qualities.**

- **Replacement windows on secondary elevations that have limited visibility must match the historic windows in size, configuration and general characteristics, though finer details may not need to be duplicated and substitute materials may be considered.**

- **Replacement windows whose interior components are a significant part of the interior historic finishes must have interior profiles and finishes that are compatible with the surrounding historic materials. However, in most cases, the match of the exterior of a replacement window will take precedence over the interior appearance.**

- **Replacement windows in buildings or parts of buildings that do not fit into any of the above categories must generally match the historic windows in all their details and in material (wood for wood and metal for metal). Variations in the details and the use of substitute materials can be considered in individual cases where these differences result in only minimal change to the appearance of the window and in no change to the historic character of the overall building.**

**How well does the new window need to match the old?**

The evaluation of the match of a replacement window depends primarily on its visual qualities. Dimensions, profiles, finish, and placement are all perceived in relative terms. For example, an eighth of an inch variation in the size of an element that measures a few inches across may be imperceptible, yet it could be more noticeable on the appearance of an element that is only half an inch in size. The depth of a muntin or the relative complexity of a brick mold profile are more often made visually apparent through the shadows they create. Thus, while comparable drawings are the typical basis for evaluating a replacement window, a three-dimensional sample or mock-up provides the most definitive test of an effective visual match.

The way a historic window operates is an important factor in its design and appearance. A replacement window, however, need not operate in the same manner as the historic window or need not operate at all as long as the change in operation does not change the form and appearance of the window to the point that it does not match the historic window or otherwise impair the appearance and character of the building.

**Factors to consider in evaluating the match of a replacement window**

- **Window unit placement in relation to the wall** plane; the degree to which the window is recessed into the wall. The location of the window affects the three-dimensional appearance of the wall.

- **Window frame size and shape.** For example, with a wood window, this would include the brick mold, blind stop, and sill.

• The specific profile of the brick mold is usually less critical than its overall complexity and general shape, such as stepped or curved.

• Typical sight lines reduce the importance of the size and profile of the sill on windows high above ground level, especially when the windows are deeply set in the wall.

• Though a blind stop is a small element of the overall window assembly, it is a noticeable part of the frame profile and it is an important part of the transition between wall and glass.

• Steel windows that were installed as a building’s walls were constructed have so little of their outer frame exposed that any replacement window will necessitate some addition to this dimension, but it must be minimal.

• Glass size and divisions. Muntins reproduced as simulated divided lights – consisting of a three-dimensional exterior grid, between-the-glass spacers, and an interior grid – may provide an adequate match when the dimensions and profile of the exterior grid are equivalent to the historic muntin and the grid is permanently affixed tight to the glass.

• Sash elements width and depth. For example with a wood window, this would include the rails, stiles and muntins; with a steel window, this would include the operator frame and muntins.

• The depth of the sash in a double-hung window, or its thickness, affects the depth of the offset at the meeting rail of a hung window. This depth is perceived through the shadow that it creates.

• Because of its small size, even slight differences in the dimension of a muntin will have a noticeable effect on the overall character of a window. Shape, as well as depth, is important to the visual effect of a muntin.

• The stiles of double-hung historic windows align vertically and are the same width at the upper and lower sashes. The use of single-hung windows as replacements may alter this relationship with varying effects on the appearance of a window. In particular, when the distinction between the frame and the sash is blurred, details such as lugs may be impossible to accurately reproduce.

• Meeting rails of historic windows were sometimes too narrow to be structurally sound. Reproducing a structurally-inadequate condition is not required.

• The operating sash of a steel window is usually wider than the overall muntin grid of the window. In addition, the frame of the operating sash often has slight projections or overlaps that vary from the profile of the surrounding muntins. The shadow lines the muntins create add another important layer to the three-dimensional appearance of the window.

• Materials and finish.

• While it may be theoretically possible to match all the significant characteristics of a historic window in a substitute material, in actuality, finish, profiles, dimensions and details are all affected by a change in material.

• In addition to the surface characteristics, vinyl-clad or enameled aluminum-clad windows may have joints in the cladding that can make them look very different from a painted wood window.

• Secondary window elements that do not match the finish or color of the window can also diminish the match. Examples include white vinyl tracks on dark-painted wood windows or wide, black, glazing gaskets on white aluminum windows.

• Glass characteristics.

• Insulated glass is generally acceptable for new windows as long as it does not compromise other important aspects of the match.

• The clarity and reflectivity of standard clear window glass are significant characteristics of most windows. Because these characteristics are often diminished for old glass, new glass equivalent to the original should be the basis for evaluating the glazing proposed for new windows. Color should only be a noticeable characteristic of the new glass where it was historically, and any coating added must not perceptibly increase the reflectivity of the glass.

• Where the glazing is predominantly obscure glass, it may be replaced with clear glass, but some evidence of the historic glazing must be retained, either in parts of windows or in selected window units.

**Replacement Windows Where No Historic Windows Remain**

Replacement windows for missing or non-historic windows must be compatible with the historic appearance and character of the building. Although replacement windows may be based on physical or pictorial documentation, if available, recreation of the missing historic windows is not required to meet the Standards. Replacement of missing or non-historic windows must, however, always fill the original window openings and must be compatible with the overall historic character of the building. The general type of window – industrial steel, wood double-hung, etc. – that is appropriate can usually be determined from the proportions of the openings, and the period and historic function of the building. The appearance of the replacement windows must be consistent with the general characteristics of a historic window of the type and period, but need not replicate the missing historic window. In many cases, this may be accomplished using substitute materials. There may be some additional flexibility with regard to the details of windows on secondary elevations that are not highly visible, consistent with the approach outlined for replacing existing historic windows. Replacing existing incompatible, non-historic windows with similarly incompatible new windows does not meet the Standards.

*See Separate Sheet – Building Additions*
Rehabilitation as a Treatment

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

Standards for Preservation
Standards for Rehabilitation
Standards for Rehabilitation (for historic tax credit projects)
Standards for Restoration
Standards for Reconstruction
History of the Standards
Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties
Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes
Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
Guidelines on Sustainability

Standards for Rehabilitation

Please note: For the Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program use the Standards for Rehabilitation that are codified separately in 36 CFR 67 and are regulatory for the review of rehabilitation work for that program.

The Standards will be applied taking into consideration the economic and technical feasibility of each project.

https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm
1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Rehabilitation as a treatment

When repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate, Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment.

The Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties illustrate the practical application of these treatment standards to historic properties.

The Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes apply these treatment standards to historic cultural landscapes.

https://www.nps.govtps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm
Preservation as a Treatment

Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

Standards for Preservation
Standards for Rehabilitation
Standards for Rehabilitation (for historic tax credit projects)
Standards for Restoration
Standards for Reconstruction
History of the Standards
Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties
Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes
Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
Guidelines on Sustainability

Standards for Preservation

The Standards will be applied taking into consideration the economic and technical feasibility of each project.

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-preservation.htm
6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color and texture.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

**Preservation as a treatment**

When the property's distinctive materials, features, and spaces are essentially intact and thus convey the historic significance without extensive repair or replacement; when depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate; and when a continuing or new use does not require additions or extensive alterations, Preservation may be considered as a treatment.

The *Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties* illustrate the practical application of these treatment standards to historic properties.

The *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* apply these treatment standards to historic cultural landscapes.
Restoration as a Treatment

Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.

Standards for Preservation
Standards for Rehabilitation
Standards for Rehabilitation (for historic tax credit projects)
Standards for Restoration
Standards for Reconstruction
History of the Standards
Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties
Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes
Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
Guidelines on Sustainability

Standards for Restoration
The Standards will be applied taking into consideration the economic and technical feasibility of each project.

https://www.nps.gov/tips/standards/four-treatments/treatment-restoration.htm
1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that interprets the property and its restoration period.

2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.

4. Materials, features, spaces and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials.

7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

9. Archeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

10. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

**Restoration as a treatment**

When the property's design, architectural, or historical significance during a particular period of time outweighs the potential loss of extant materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods; when there is substantial physical and documentary evidence for the work; and when contemporary alterations and additions are not planned, Restoration may be considered as a treatment. Prior to undertaking work, a particular period of time, i.e., the restoration period, should be selected and justified, and a documentation plan for Restoration developed.

The Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties Illustrate the practical application of these treatment standards to historic properties.

The Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes apply these treatment standards to historic cultural landscapes.
Rehabilitation Standards and Guidelines

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, codified as 36 CFR 67, are regulatory for the Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program. The Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and the Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, which assist in applying the Standards, are advisory.

Applying the Standards for Rehabilitation

Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
Guidelines on Sustainability

Other Standards and Guidelines:

Four Treatment Standards: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction
Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties
History of the Standards

Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation

The following Standards for Rehabilitation are the criteria used to determine if a rehabilitation project qualifies as a certified rehabilitation. The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features. The Standards pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The Standards also encompass related landscape features and the building's site and environment, as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. To be certified, a rehabilitation project must be determined by the Secretary to be consistent with the historic character of the structure(s) and, where applicable, the district in which it is located. The following Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible,
materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings

The Guidelines assist in applying the Standards to rehabilitation projects in general; consequently, they are not meant to give case-specific advice or address exceptions or rare instances. For example, they cannot tell a building owner which features of an historic building are important in defining the historic character and must be preserved or which features could be altered, if necessary, for the new use. Careful case-by-case decision-making is best accomplished by seeking assistance from qualified historic preservation professionals in the planning stage of the project. Such professionals include architects, architectural historians, historians, archeologists, and others who are skilled in the preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of the historic properties. These Guidelines are also available in PDF format.

The Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings stress the inherent sustainability of historic buildings and offer specific guidance on "recommended" rehabilitation treatments and "not recommended" treatments, which could negatively impact a building's historic character. These Guidelines are also available as an interactive web feature.

https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation.htm
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Rehabilitation Standards and Guidelines

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, codified as 36 CFR 67, are regulatory for the Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program. The Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and the Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, which assist in applying the Standards, are advisory.

Applying the Standards for Rehabilitation
Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
Guidelines on Sustainability

Other Standards and Guidelines:
Four Treatment Standards: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction
Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties
History of the Standards

Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation

The following Standards for Rehabilitation are the criteria used to determine if a rehabilitation project qualifies as a certified rehabilitation. The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features. The Standards pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The Standards also encompass related landscape features and the building's site and environment, as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. To be certified, a rehabilitation project must be determined by the Secretary to be consistent with the historic character of the structure(s) and, where applicable, the district in which it is located. The following Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible,
materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings

The Guidelines assist in applying the Standards to rehabilitation projects in general; consequently, they are not meant to give case-specific advice or address exceptions or rare instances. For example, they cannot tell a building owner which features of an historic building are important in defining the historic character and must be preserved or which features could be altered, if necessary, for the new use. Careful case-by-case decision-making is best accomplished by seeking assistance from qualified historic preservation professionals in the planning stage of the project. Such professionals include architects, architectural historians, historians, archeologists, and others who are skilled in the preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of the historic properties. These Guidelines are also available in PDF format.

The Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings stress the inherent sustainability of historic buildings and offer specific guidance on "recommended" rehabilitation treatments and "not recommended" treatments, which could negatively impact a building's historic character. These Guidelines are also available as an interactive web feature.
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State Review Board Meeting - Six Mid-Century Schools in Grand Forks, North Dakota

1 message

Quinnell, Susan L. <squinnell@nd.gov>       Wed, Sep 4, 2019 at 2:54 PM
To: "cjohnson260@mygfschools.org" <cjohnson260@mygfschools.org>

Hi Cindy,

The State Review Board held their meeting August 30, 2019 and reviewed all five nominations to the National Register of Historic Places with the same recommendation that they are acceptable pending minor edits. So Susan Caraher is presumably doing edits now. When the edits are done we would hold the nomination in our office pending obtaining permission to list the property from the Board of the Grand Forks Public School District #1.

Susan Quinnell
Review and Compliance Coordinator
Acting Architectural Historian
ND State Historic Preservation Office
State Historical Society of North Dakota
North Dakota Heritage Center
612 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck ND 58505-0830

701-328-3576 Office

http://www.history.nd.gov/hp/
Blog: http://blog.statemuseum.nd.gov/users/susan-quinnell
Mid-century Schools nomination approved by State Review Board

GFHPC <GFHPC@grandforksgov.com>  
To: "cjohson260@mygfschools.org" <cjohson260@mygfschools.org>  

Wed, Sep 4, 2019 at 1:51 PM

Hi Cindy,

Please feel free to attach the previous draft for the School Board. The State Historic Preservation Review Board approved the nomination at the meeting on Friday, with a request to add a couple of additional sentences further emphasizing the changes in post-war construction methods and post-war educational shifts. There were also some minor edits for typos.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards

Susan

Susan Caraher
Coordinator
Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission

(701) 772-8756
Draft of National Register nomination for Mid-century schools

1 message

GFHPC <GFHPC@grandforksgov.com>
To: "cjohnson260@mygfschools.org" <cjohnson260@mygfschools.org>

Thu, Jul 25, 2019 at 9:44 AM

Good morning, Cindy,

I am pleased to attach the current draft of the Six Mid-century Schools nomination. Please feel free to share this with Dr. Brenner and the Grand Forks Public Schools Board members. I will be giving a presentation of this nomination to the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission regular meeting on August 13 in City Hall A101. This meeting begins at 6:30 pm a public notice will be published in the Grand Forks Herald ahead of the meeting.

This draft has been shared with the State Historical Society which will forward to their Review Board ahead of my August 30 presentation in Bismarck.

I know there have been questions from the Board regarding having the schools listed on the National Register, and I thought that this list on the State Historical Society of North Dakota’s website might be helpful.

http://history.nd.gov/hp/nrwhatlistingmeans.html

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

Susan

Susan Caraher
Coordinator
Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission

(701) 772-8756

Draft 4 - Mid-Century Schools.pdf
5716K
What does “listing a property” mean?

Listing a property on the National Register of Historic Places or being determined eligible for listing does not automatically preserve a building, and it does not keep a building from being modified or destroyed.

**National Register Listing:**

- Provides recognition of a property’s significance in history, architecture, engineering, or archaeology
- Provides a tool for local planning, heritage tourism, and heritage education.
- Provides some protection in the form of consideration and mitigation of adverse effects to historic properties from federally-funded or licensed projects.
- Provides the owner of an income-producing property (commercial, industrial, or rental residential) the opportunity to receive federal investment tax credits of up to 20% of costs for a certified rehabilitation.
- Provides the owner the opportunity to apply for matching grant-in-aid funds for restoration, when such funds are available.
- Allows the owner to receive technical assistance from State Historical Society staff on following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation for maintenance and rehabilitation or restoration of the historic property.

However, National Register Listing:

- Does not place restrictions on a private property owner regarding use, maintenance, or alterations to the property.
- Does not require the city to restrict the use of the private property, although local ordinances may require architectural review or review of the property by a local historic preservation commission.
- Does not require Federal or State review of proposed alterations unless Federal money is being used to fund the project. Owners interested in technical assistance with rehabilitation should contact the State Historical Society.
- Does not mean the Federal or State government will seek to purchase or place restrictions on private property.
- Does not affect the use or sale of private property.
- Does not require an owner to allow public access to private property.
- Encourages, but does not require, continual maintenance of the private property.
- Does not require any government entity to maintain private property, nor to provide funds for restoration and preservation.
- Does not provide an historical marker for the property, although owners are eligible to purchase one through private vendors.

---

[https://www.history.nd.gov/hp/nrwhatlistingmeans.html](https://www.history.nd.gov/hp/nrwhatlistingmeans.html)
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The Statement of Historical Context

The goal of this project is to prepare a nomination to the National Register for six mid-century modern schools in Grand Forks, North Dakota. Using the National Register’s criteria for evaluation, these schools align with both Criteria A (“…associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history”) and Criteria C (“that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction…”).

The five elementary schools and one junior high school nominated embody a period of the country’s history marked by a sharp population increase, postwar prosperity, and an active national building program. The postwar baby boom, coupled with a trend of rural migration to towns and cities, precipitated the need for more schools to serve the growing population in urban areas. Like other cities around the nation, Grand Forks constructed numerous new schools during the late 1940’s through the 1960’s. The city’s boundaries continued to expand south and west, and various efforts at redistricting could only temporarily ease the overpopulated classrooms. As neighborhoods grew, new schools were constructed on large lots of land within easy access of the residential areas.

The building program also coincided with significant shifts in educational principles informed by new philosophical and practical approaches to delivering a high-quality education that matured in the decades after the Second World War. More students not only attended school but also stayed in school longer either to prepare for post-secondary education provided by an expanding network of colleges and universities or to enter a dynamic and changing workforce.

This mid-century school Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) began with an historical architectural survey conducted in 2013. “The Mid-Century Schools of Grand Forks, North Dakota” survey, completed by M.L. Dennis Consulting, evaluated a total of twelve of the city’s schools built between 1949 and 1967. Of those twelve, the survey considered six schools to be eligible for a thematic nomination. These buildings saw the least remodeling and the fewest substantial additions that would detract from their original design. Schools are, of course, adaptable and living buildings which require regular maintenance to serve their primary function, but the basic design of the six examples selected for this nomination best preserve their original exterior appearance and relationship to their surroundings.

The schools contributing to this thematic nomination are West Elementary (1949), Lewis and Clark Elementary (1952), Valley Junior High School, now Valley Middle School (1954), Viking Elementary (1957), Wilder Elementary (Gymnasium 1955, new school 1965) and Ben Franklin Elementary (1960).

This group of schools demonstrates and maintains a common architectural canon typical of the Modern Movement that characterized mid-twentieth century American public architecture. Constructed between 1949 and 1965, these one-story, brick structures with flat roofs and lots of windows, show a distinct
architectural departure from the two- and three-story schools of the early decades of the twentieth century. This new style of architecture reflected both evolving educational principles that emphasized student learning and physical health, as well as an efficiency of design and construction. Their sprawling, low elevation designs, replete with banks of windows for maximizing natural light, often overlooked landscaped gardens, playgrounds or nearby public parks.

The six schools within this submission preserve the historic architectural integrity typical of Mid-Century Modern architecture and are significant not only to the history of Grand Forks but also demonstrate the local realization of national trends in architecture, school design, and urban planning following the Second World War.

The following study contextualizes these schools within local trends and politics of Grand Forks and North Dakota and then proceeds to the larger national contexts which framed these local responses.

The Context for Grand Forks School Building

History

The mid-century modern schools represent a new chapter in the history of both education and school architecture in Grand Forks. The earliest schools in the city predate North Dakota’s statehood. From the state’s earliest days, education has continually been a point of pride and communities have invested in high-quality facilities and contemporary approaches to teaching and learning. Residents of Grand Forks funded and built its first two schoolhouses in 1872, and within a few years, added two more to serve the growing population. In 1881, the Territorial Act established the city’s first school board. The seven-member board comprised some of Grand Forks’ most esteemed leaders including founding father, Alexander Griggs, steamboat captain M.L. McCormack, and attorneys R.W. Cutts and J.G. Hamilton.

In the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries the city’s footprint centered around the commercial downtown, with residential neighborhoods immediately to the north, south and west. By 1882, the school-age population exceeded the capacity of small schoolhouses forcing high school students to take classes in rooms within the court house (Lamb, 57). In 1891, a new grade school, Wilder, opened just north of the downtown district. Fire destroyed the school after only three years, but it was quickly rebuilt and opened again in 1895. Washington School, also serving north side neighborhoods, opened in 1907 with four classrooms on each of the second and third floors, likely one room for each grade one through eight (Roberts, 1981) (Fig. 1).
School construction in the late nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century reflected the growing population of the city and the educational values seen elsewhere around the country. Those schools, however, did not and could not anticipate the postwar reforms in education and the population boom that shaped the size, character, and distribution of the mid-century schools which are the subject of this nomination. For example, residents on the south side of town attended Belmont School which opened in 1883, on the site of present-day Phoenix Elementary on the corner of Belmont Road and 4th Ave South. Additions to Belmont in 1893 and 1911 followed the growing population of this neighborhood and the southern expansion of Grand Forks in the first decades of the twentieth century (Fig. 2). Like its early contemporaries such as Wilder and Winship, Belmont School was constructed using a common two-story symmetrical design but received a mid-century period gymnasium that adapted it to the new educational philosophies supported by the newer mid-century schools. A mid-century facelift was also required for the 1930s era South Junior High School, which modernized the chemistry lab, shop, and home economics departments to accommodate more students, and changing
demands on the curriculum (Series 1, Vol. 10, p.103).

![Belmont School](image_url)

**Figure 2: Belmont School served the near southside neighborhood and opened in 1883**

Grand Forks’ response to the booming population and educational change in mid-century America typified certain national trends: a vigorous building program that struggled to keep pace with enrollments and expansion; an active and dedicated Board of Education and District Superintendent faced with managing the ever-insufficient funds for schools, salaries and a changing curriculum; and an increasingly better educated and specialized teacher body motivated by improved salaries for improved credentials.

**Migration, overcrowding and redistricting**

The proximate impetus for mid-century school building in Grand Forks represents a local response to the changing demographics of the city in the postwar era. Like elsewhere around the country, North Dakota benefitted from the energy and progress after World War II. Those returning from the war were looking for opportunities to start a new life. President Harry S. Truman’s GI Bill offered returning servicemen tuition assistance for a university education and low interest mortgages. Locally, the
University of North Dakota attracted a significant influx of veterans to Grand Forks who were drawn to post-secondary education, affordable housing, and job opportunities.

Migration also happened on a regional level as residents of rural areas moved to small towns and cities. As Elwyn Robinson noted in his *History of North Dakota*, rural losses produced urban gains as workers moved from farms to find employment (p.442-443). These demographic changes pushed communities to improve infrastructure to accommodate the increasing population. North Dakota residents appealed for better roads in order to help facilitate the reorganization of school districts. In 1947, the League of North Dakota Municipalities proposed a one cent gas tax to be awarded to the cities and towns to pay for road construction - just one example of searching for a solution to address the need.

The improved infrastructure enabled students to be transported more easily from rural to urban communities. This accelerated the closing of small rural schoolhouses and increased the burden on already crowded classrooms in Grand Forks. Annual reports of the Grand Forks County Superintendent demonstrated this trend in their reports on the number of one-room schools county-wide as well as the number of public elementary and high schools. In this context high schools included both junior high and high schools. A total of 121 one-room schools are recorded in the 1948 Report, seventy-four of which were “in session”. That same year, Grand Forks operated two high schools and five graded (or consolidated) schools. By 1964, Grand Forks County reported only seventeen one-room schools and the city of Grand Forks, officially Grand Forks Independent District #1, boasted four high schools and thirteen public elementary schools. Furthermore, classrooms were regularly added to existing schools to accommodate more students.

Biennial school census data show the number of enrolled students in the city’s schools increased from 5239 to 5713 in the eight years from 1945 to 1953, while overall figures for the county showed a slight decrease indicating the population shift towards city schools. Grand Forks Board of Education minutes record the problems faced in rural districts with their pleas to the City to accept their students. As the school district was grappling with the need to find additional classroom space at Lewis and Clark, and anticipating the building of a new air base, a district official from Duckworth District #4 was negotiating for their elementary students to be accepted to Independent District #1 (Series 1, Vol. 9, p. 235).

In an effort to manage the rapidly growing school age population, the Grand Forks School District sought to adjust district lines to distribute the student population more evenly across the schools. At a meeting of the Grand Forks’ Board of Education in December 1945, Dr. Elroy Schroeder, Superintendent of Schools, presented the Board with the results of a survey conducted in concert with the city’s school principals showing the distribution of students and proposed new dividing lines for three of the schools on the north side of the city (Series 1, Vol. 7, p. 203-206). However, shifting school boundary lines was only a temporary solution and it was soon apparent that the Board needed to develop a longer-term building program to further address the growing school-age population. With the
development of the school district over the next fifteen years, the Superintendent returned to the Board on several occasions with redistricting proposals.

Until the mid-1950s, Grand Forks Public Schools District collected data on boys and girls aged six to twenty years. In May 1948, Dr. Schroeder requested the Board’s permission to conduct a census of pre-school aged children who would be entering the first grade in the coming years to better anticipate the needs for the school building program (Series 1, Vol. 8, p. 49-50). This special census request became part of the formalized reporting and from 1955, reporting forms sought information on boys and girls aged 0-5 as part of the required data collection. From 1955, the new census reporting for Grand Forks Independent District #1 shows an increase from 10,205 boys and girls aged 1-20, to 15,659 a decade later. Recognizing the need for future expansion underscores the national trend of increasing enrollments and students staying in school longer to complete their high school degree.

Overcrowding was a frequent problem, and the school district used several tactics to resolve the issue including moving students to less crowded schools, dividing up auditoriums with curtains to create temporary classrooms, employing more teachers, the use of temporary buildings, redistricting and building school additions. No sooner was Viking Elementary opened in 1957 than overcrowded classrooms were reported, with one instance of 43 students in one class (Series 1, Vol. 11, p.146). The school partitioned the lunchroom to create extra classroom space. Additional classrooms were often planned as soon as the core building was operational as neighborhoods continued to grow around the new schools.

While expanding the city’s boundaries increased the taxable valuations of property, it also further burdened the School District. In August 1955, Grand Forks added Fairlawn Addition to its boundaries bringing more students to the District at a time when there were five school building projects underway. It soon became apparent that there was insufficient transportation for these new students, and despite pleas to the Superintendent, the parents attempted to find their own solution by “launching a campaign to try to interest local citizens to collectively employ a taxi or other transportation service to get their children to school at their own expense” (Series 1, Vol. 10, p.157-158).

North Dakota’s 30th Legislative Assembly in 1947 gave considerable attention to education submitting that school districts faced the critical issue of managing a fast-changing student body. They passed redistricting laws to define more clearly the jurisdiction and responsibilities of county and state committees, county and state officers, school boards and school districts (H.B. 43, 1947). House Bill 153 detailed the new requirements for school building construction including air and light quality. Furthermore, this bill declared an emergency recognizing that plans for many proposed school buildings would be required prior to July 1st. The State also appropriated $20,640 for salaries and expenses for the school lunch program (H.B. 47, 1947).
The Board of Education also recognized soon after the end of the War that new buildings were necessary to accommodate the growing school-age population in the city. They entered into discussions with the University's president and former Schools Superintendent, Dr. John West, regarding a new elementary school near the University of North Dakota (Series 1, Vol. 8, p.3-4). Negotiations with the University included the need for clearing temporary buildings from school district-owned land used by the University to house returned servicemen enrolled at UND. The scarcity of classroom space prompted the Board to seek special dispensation from the city to permit temporary storage sheds to be converted to classrooms. At a meeting in the Spring of 1948, members of the Winship Elementary School PTA addressed the Board with concerns of overcrowding and to ask about the plan for the building program (Series 1, Vol. 8, p. 39-40).

The Grand Forks School District was faced with a growing need for new buildings coupled with the need for greater fiscal responsibility. A 1948 Grand Forks Herald article, “School Districts Need More Help” highlights the financial pressure felt by school districts around the state that were struggling, “[e]ven by voting excess taxes on top of the regular maximum levies, many of the districts don’t make ends meet.” The state legislature appropriated $500,000 for emergency funds for the biennium to which schools could apply for financial assistance.

Board of Education minutes of the mid-1940s to mid-1950s reveal much of their business centered on new facilities including gymnasiums and auditoriums for existing schools, additions, and new school buildings in areas of residential growth. Architects were frequent meeting attendees, partnering closely with School District leadership to address the most pressing needs, offer solutions to issues that arose in construction and to act as intermediaries between the Board and the myriad contractors. In the mid-1950s, three local architectural firms were in the employment of the Grand Forks Board of Education. These firms were Wells-Denbrook; DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy; and Grosz and Anderson.

The lowest construction bids were almost always chosen, and at times, it is possible to discern a level of frustration if multiple bids were not received on any part of a project leaving no option but to accept the only tender. The architect of the project managed the bidding process which involved keeping them sealed until opened at the Board meeting where contractors were typically in attendance. This points to a thriving, if not overwhelmed, construction industry in mid-century Grand Forks. The quantity and rate of construction also caused problems. The minutes of a September 1956 Board meeting show that contractors were unable to get sufficient construction materials causing a delay with finalizing Lewis and Clark Elementary School. At this time, both Viking Elementary and an addition to Valley Junior High School were also underway and the pressure on resources is evident.

The pressure of time and costs is also evidenced by the reuse of architectural plans. Several schools used the same or similar plans adjusted only for location-specific differences. The new gymnasiums at
Belmont and Wilder were designed and built concurrently (Series 1, Vol.10, p.225). Another new school, Lake Agassiz Elementary, shares its plan with Ben Franklin Elementary. Architect, Theodore Wells, who designed the earlier South Junior High School and was very active in Grand Forks’ civic construction, was asked, on more than one occasion, to accommodate the need for efficiency,

“It was further proposed that Mr. Theodore B. Wells, having completed his drawing for the (new) Winship School, use the same plans and specifications for the west end school at the university…” (Series 1, Vol. 8, p. 69).

The connection between schools and green space is a key element in mid-century school planning. An arrangement between the Board of Education and Parks District saw the two organizations coordinate their planning in order to provide schools with nearby park and playground areas, and to allow the Parks District to offer summer programs close to school facilities. Among the new neighborhood schools, Lewis and Clark stands adjacent to Elks Park and Pool, Viking Elementary shares the block with Cox Park, and both Valley Junior and West Elementary overlook University Park. While it does have a playground area and large lawn, the new Wilder school was constructed on the site of the older building which predated this philosophical shift. Ben Franklin’s planning included a large field used for a variety of athletic activities. It was noted that while neither the School Board nor the Parks District had representatives on the City Planning Committee, it would be to the benefit of all parties to continue this initiative (Series 1. Vol. 11, p.139-140).

In the two decades following the end of World War II, Grand Forks Public Schools District experienced a dynamic building program, adding a total of twelve schools including two junior high schools and eight elementary schools. Additionally, with the opening of the Grand Forks Air Force Base in 1967, two more schools opened on the Base to serve the families of those servicemen.

*Mid-Century Architecture and Grand Forks Schools*

Mid-century design exhibits a significant departure from the highly ornamented European-style Gothic Revival and Neoclassical styles that dominated civic architecture at the turn of the twentieth century. The modern architectural style of the postwar period has its roots in European and American architectural trends and developed from styles associated with the Modern Movement such as the Bauhaus in the 1920s, Internationalist (1920-1940) and Functionalism of the 1930s. It emphasized functional spaces over ornamentation and featured horizontal orientations with flat roofs, and the rhythmic arrangement of vertical windows for lighting break up surfaces constructed with efficient and somewhat modular designs. The influence of the International style with its grounding in industrial architecture led to an emphasis of the functional potential of concrete and steel often made explicit in mid-century architecture.
The earliest Modern and International style buildings appear in the Red River Valley during the interwar period. The Black Building in downtown Fargo on Broadway, built in 1930-31, offers a good early example of the development of Modernist architecture in the Red River Valley (Hickey). The collaboration between Minnesota architects Lang, Raugland, and Lewis and the Fargo firm of Ole A. Braseth and S. Marius Houkom facilitated local familiarity with the aesthetic and technical aspects of mid-century styles.

In the post war period, local firms such as Wells-Denbrook and DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy designed hundreds of buildings during the mid-1940 to the mid-1960s in Grand Forks, throughout North Dakota and western Minnesota. In addition to residential homes, their projects included schools, churches, university buildings, businesses and office buildings, service stations, and warehouses. Wells-Denbrook and DeRemer, Harrie, and Kennedy showed particular interest in institutional buildings. Wells-Denbrook’s Grand Forks’ U.S. Immigration Service Border Control Station (1959) and the Grand Forks City Auditorium (1954) embody many of the key design traits of high modernism (Martens 2015) and demonstrates a clear pivot away from Joseph Bell DeRemer’s Art Deco style of buildings like North Dakota State Capitol (1934) or Wells’ Grand Forks Fairgrounds Hall (1936).

An impressive example of a Wells-Denbrook mid-century design is that of the firm’s own office building at the corner of Cherry Street and 17th Ave. South in Grand Forks. Built in 1954, the open plan office and studio was built in the same expanding neighborhood as Lewis and Clark and Viking Elementary schools. Like the schools of the period, the office building blends into the surrounding residential neighborhood of modest mid-century homes. In his historic context study of the Wells-Denbrook firm, Martens notes, “In non-urban regional settings like North Dakota, Modernist architecture was rational, literal, explicit, and often emphasized open space planning” (2015, 23).

The architectural style of mid-century modern schools in Grand Forks followed a developing canon of features that emerged across a range of contexts in the postwar era and coincided with the use of new materials, and national trends in educational philosophy and practice. Awareness of the trends emerge clearly in Samuel DeRemer’s (1894-1967) address to the meeting of Grand Forks Builder’s and Trader’s Exchange where he shared his thoughts on Modern Design. Samuel DeRemer was the son of North Dakota’s arguably best-known architect Joseph Bell DeRemer (1871-1944) and his speech was later published in The Improvement Bulletin (year unknown). The father and son were in partnership, working on scores of building projects predominately in North Dakota. To read the younger DeRemer’s approach to modern design illustrates the enormous shift from traditional architecture and construction to which they had dedicated so much of their careers prior to the War. Samuel DeRemer explains,

“After all this talk in favor of this new freedom, just what is our contemporary style? In as clear a conception as I can give, one who welcomes the opportunity of working on it, I would describe it as being a frank expression of unhampered individuality. One works with solids and voids, making no attempt to masquerade the structural features, on the contrary making the structural
features function both for the strength and beauty, abandoning the use of supercilious ornamentation in the shape of heavy cornices, belt courses and innumerable other jig saw embellishments scattered about over an unsuspecting façade if from a salt and pepper shaker” (DeRemer 9).

DeRemer’s remarks and the design of Grand Forks’ mid-century modern schools are consistent with many of the observations made in the October 1949 issue of Architectural Forum magazine which was dedicated to schools. This issue drew attention to what the editors regarded as a national crisis in school design and construction as it struggled to keep ahead of the swelling postwar population. The issue looked at construction standards, design, materials, financing, and other issues facing school districts across the nation. These schools were economical with lighter construction methods and more functional since their asymmetrical design allowed for isolation of noisy activities such as the workshop, music rooms and kitchens to be away from classrooms. Finally, they also improved access to natural light (Clapp, 1949, p.102).

The mid-century style rejected the conventions of architectural ornamentation prominent in Gothic Revival and Neoclassical styles of the Victorian era as well as the playful monumentality of Art Deco design. Taking design cues of the Frank Lloyd Wright’s Prairie-style architecture with low elevation, low pitched roofs and overhanging eaves, mid-century schools blended into the residential neighborhoods that they served. Modern architecture adopted a cleaner aesthetic. It is possible to detect a transition from traditional to the modern architecture aesthetic in Theodore Well’s design at the earliest extant mid-century school in this nomination, West Elementary, with a singular brick relief framed with stone on the south elevation of the building (Fig. 4).

In contrast to the use of brick or limestone ornamentation, the designs of the mid-century modern schools celebrated the use of new material and technologies in an overt and explicit way. Poured concrete foundations and the use of steel reflected the practical and rational designs while also facilitating efficient construction. The presence of raised foundations in some buildings and the use of concrete block in interior walls and gymnasiums make these economical and aesthetic design choices explicit.

Furthermore, postwar American architects embraced many of the technical advancements from new construction methods and materials, to better technologies for thermal comfort, lighting and acoustics that encouraged new approaches. Steel posts can be found in both a functional use on the interiors of classrooms as well as architectural features such as those seen at the entrances of Lewis and Clark and Ben Franklin, for example. Concrete blocks were used extensively making construction economical and expedient. Fluorescent bulbs became the preferred lighting replacing incandescent bulbs, as they too, were more economical. Board of Education minutes discuss running the telephone and electricity above ground at Lewis and Clark, further evidence of time- and cost-saving measures.
The explicit practicality of the construction materials and techniques serves to rationalize the often-asymmetrical designs of the mid-century schools. The exterior of the buildings features rhythmic rows of windows alternating with blocks of exterior treatments that extend the length of the building. The flat or low-pitched roof with overhanging eaves creates deep, linear shadows in the raking light of the North Dakota sun. The eaves and recessed doors protect and define walkways or entries marking the transition between the building’s exterior and interior. Another example of visibly explicit structural elements are the steel beams that run the full width of a building from eave to eave providing a strong horizontal visual on the interior of classrooms, still seen at Viking and Ben Franklin, further blurring the lines between exterior and interior spaces. The use of light and line to define the interior and exterior space while also allowing for communication between the school and the large surrounding lots extends to the use of large windows, clerestories and glass panels throughout the buildings.

Skylights, floor to ceiling glass panels or sliding doors were commonly used to maximize natural light to the interior. The introduction of inexpensive fluorescent lighting in the 1940s allowed for schools to gain greater control over lighting classrooms and other functional spaces. At the same time, school buildings were introducing more natural light through the abundance of windows or the use of glass blocks. Glass blocks were used at West Elementary on the north wall of the gym and on the south elevation above the entrance (Fig. 5 - 6). This was a relatively new architectural material having first been used in America by renowned modernist architect, William Lescaze, at his own New York office and home in the mid-1930s. Glass blocks allowed for light to pass through to further illuminate the interior. Furthermore, photographs of the schools taken in 1983 show sections of glass panel were used at the top of interior walls to allow for exterior light to pass through into the hallways (Fig. 7), and several of the nominated schools still exhibit this feature. Ironically, perhaps, teachers sought ways to darken spaces as they gained better teaching tools like film projectors. Several requests were made to the Superintendent for adding shades to classrooms. The Kindergarten teacher at Lewis and Clark also requested drapes for their classroom, presumably to help young children rest during the day.

A new design vocabulary rendered obsolete the two- and three-story schools with classrooms arranged along double-loaded corridors, separated by a central hallway and stacked vertically resulting in identical classrooms with a static function. Washington School on the city’s near northside is one example of a turn-of-the-century school that followed this eight-room design to serve first through eighth grades. National critics observed that the stairwells and corridors were choke points for students entering and leaving the building complicating and even slowing evacuation in the case of a fire. Wilfred Clapp’s contribution to the Architectural Forum issue observed that the one-story school was safer since all rooms could be evacuated faster than multi-story buildings with stairwells (Clapp, 1949, p.102). Grand Forks School District was all too familiar with school fires, having lost the original Wilder School soon after it was completed. Fireproof doors were installed at the rebuilt Wilder even before the mid-century school building was constructed. Another incident at Central raised serious questions from the Board when it was discovered that a number of students had been locked in classrooms to serve detention at the outbreak of a fire.
In this new approach, the asymmetrical sprawling school campuses required a greater area to accommodate an increasing number of spaces with distinct functions. Gymnasiums, school cafeterias, libraries and sometimes, health services, became part of the new school plan. Classrooms no longer featured fixed furniture in a set orientation but became multipurpose spaces that accommodated a variety of interactive learning, group work, art and reading spaces (Fig. 8 - 9). A first-grade classroom at Ben Franklin Elementary featured a reading loft accessed by a set of stairs at the rear of the classroom where children also stored their bags and coats (Fig. 10). The sprawling, low-slung designs oriented the buildings more deliberately toward the surrounding landscaping, and visually and physically framed courtyards, parks, and playgrounds which emphasized a well-ordered relationship between a child’s intellectual, physical and psychological growth.

National Context:

The mid-century modern schools in Grand Forks embody national trends in demographics, education, and construction adapted for the local needs of the community.

The Baby Boom, Construction, and Efficiency

The rapid growth of Grand Forks was not an isolated phenomenon but reflected the larger post-World War II population boom across the U.S. and coincided with a new optimism and prosperity across the nation. Large scale construction programs such as highways, hospitals and churches brought renewed energy, infrastructure investment and employment to a country emerging from three decades that had seen two wars and the Great Depression. Those years that followed saw an estimated seven million children born and those children began entering the school system in the late 1940s, creating a new urgency to expand school building programs in every state, and to do so as efficiently and as economically as possible.

Nationally, the baby boom placed considerable pressure on states’ school systems. Despite some continued school construction during the 1930s by the U.S. Public Works Administration, it was not enough to accommodate the sharp increase in numbers and the shifting populations that followed the war. Furthermore, many school districts continued to struggle with aging and insufficient physical plants built during the previous decades and securing the financing to address maintenance issues was difficult since it was often weighed against the need to fund new schools. Central High School’s 1937 auditorium and gymnasium was one of several PWA projects in Grand Forks including the airport terminal, fairgrounds and other civic construction.

In his 1949 editorial, Henry Luce, Editor-in-chief of Architectural Forum stated that experts believed “ten billion dollars must be spent for new school construction during the next 11 years” (81), accounting for
four times the money spent during the previous 11 years. According to the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, the estimated ten billion was, in fact, doubled from the end of the War through 1964 (Baker, 11). Despite the postwar sense of optimism, the required school building program far outpaced the funding available to support it. Luce’s article asserted that more classrooms would need to be built in that decade than in the previous two (83). Not only was there a demand for more physical plants, but the construction costs had also increased since before the war. Furthermore, local bond issues, with the limits of the bonded indebtedness set by state legislatures years earlier when construction costs were considerably lower meant that school boards had less purchasing power than before the war.

From the mid-1940s kindergartens and elementary schools enrolled record numbers of students, with junior high schools and high schools responding to this impact in the following decade as students came of age to advance through the education system. Where it had been common for students to finish school at the eighth grade, students were now staying in school longer to complete a high school degree before attending college or joining an increasingly specialized workforce.

State and Federal government agencies invested in new building programs providing much needed infrastructure, employment, and economic stimulation. A byproduct of the population boom was the need for a greater framework of public buildings. New hospitals, civic buildings, and schools served growing communities around the nation and improved highways facilitated easier transportation and migration to places that were traditionally underpopulated. Such a vigorous building program demanded a considerable investment. In 1947, building and construction programs in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota were in excess of $241.2 million (GFH Jan. 25, 1948). In January 1948 the State’s public roads administration approved contracts for improvements to several sections of North Dakota highways and by the following summer, work was underway on twenty-five state and federal highways (GFH, Jan. 24, 1948). Federal appropriations for rural electrification and soil conservation were addressing issues impacting the largely agricultural, isolated state.

Postwar Education

In addition to the school building program, teaching and learning also was undergoing a transformation which is evident in the architecture and location of the mid-century school buildings in Grand Forks. Public education in the United States received considerable attention following World War II, both in the schools and universities. In the American landscape at the dawn of the Cold War, policy makers saw education as a safeguard of democracy defending the country’s ideals and values. The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools was formally established in 1949 by the Educational Policies Commission and the American Council on Education, two years after President Truman’s Commission on Higher Education. The goal of the National Citizens Commission was “to help Americans realize how important our public schools are to our expanding democracy, and to arouse in
each community the intelligence and will to improve our public schools” (Corbally and Seeger, 142).

The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools emphasized the need to provide active citizen support to public education at a time of significant change and it did so through national and regional workshops, sponsored conferences and providing guidance and written resources to thousands of citizen support groups in local school districts across the nation. During its relatively short lifespan the Commission produced fifteen practical guides to help local school districts cope with topics such as How can we help our school boards? A guide for mutual understanding, and What are our school building needs? A guide to planning. As noted in Corbally and Seeger, “The Commission sent out over seven hundred thousand separate published items [and] it is estimated that the money value of advertising devoted to school issues and developed jointly through the Commission and the Advertising Council equaled $40 million.” When considering the make-up of the Commission, it is worth noting that eleven of the twenty-five members were from publishing and related industries which may explain the large sum of advertising expenditure to further the message. The Commission’s bylaws stipulated that it ought to be dissolved after six years to make way for a new organization and new ideas, and in January 1956, the Commission was terminated.

The Citizens Federal Committee on Education was another group active in preparing and publishing materials addressing proximate concerns to school administrators. Superintendent Schroeder circulated one such pamphlet entitled, Citizens Look at Our Schoolhouses, distributed by the Federal Government’s Superintendent of Documents and was intended to highlight problems in school building planning around the country. Other topics published by the Committee include The Organization Federal Activity in Education, and Citizens Look at Education: A Progress Report by the Citizens Federal Committee on Education, 1947-1948. There clearly was a deep well of resources, best practices and guidelines available to school boards and administrators to help them navigate the challenges faced locally and nationally.

Citizen support like that offered by Parent and Teacher Associations was part of the public school fabric that aided the schools in a variety of efforts from securing funding for new equipment to pressuring the Board for action at times of overcrowding in the classrooms. Grand Forks’ PTA groups attended meetings of the Board of Education to raise issues, seek information about the schools building programs, transportation solutions for students who were displaced due to overcrowding, and to argue for modernization of school facilities.

The introduction of school lunch programs, school dietitians, health services, civic-focused extracurricular activities were afforded to students across the nation and Grand Forks alike. The mid-century school was responsible, in part, for instilling civic virtue and creating good future citizens. It was recommended by one Grand Forks board member that the Board of Education give more emphasis to the recreational aspects of junior high school students sparking a “lively discussion in which many suggestions relating to the general welfare of the schools were presented” (Series 1, Vol. 10, p.141). In
response, the Superintendent and school principals proposed enrichment curricula for elementary and junior-high school students that included time for activities such as music, drama, athletics as well as encouraging civic engagement with time set aside for Scouts, YMCA and church group visits. The urban planning coordination between the Board of Education and the Park Board underscores the attention provided to recreation and the value of play, and the emphasis on the transition between inside and outside which is characteristic of the modern, prairie style.

Progressive education reform in the U.S. dates to the mid-nineteenth century with significant movements such as the Common School Movement championed by education leaders such as Horace Mann and Henry Barnard who advocated public education for all, regardless of social, economic or religious status, and for the improvement of teacher salaries and facilities for better education, respectively. The early twentieth century saw major reforms from John Dewey and those whom he influenced in the philosophical approaches to child-centered and experiential learning. These major reforms can be seen to impact progressive education of the postwar era with an emphasis on the teaching and learning environment, child-centered curriculum and the citizen-supported system.

While progressive education reform in the early decades of the twentieth century was hampered by war and the Great Depression it made great strides in the 1930s and 1940s that demonstrate considerable changes that shaped the American mid-century education experience. Evolving educational principles shifted focus to students' needs and placed greater emphasis on the child's physical health and wellbeing. The child became an active participant in their learning and was offered a broader scope of subjects and extracurricular activity than ever before. The influence of Dewey’s democratically-driven, child-centered educational philosophy advanced everything from the curriculum to the pedagogical delivery to school design.

The imposing multi-story school made way for a more neighborhood-appropriate and welcoming space for its young charges. No longer were schools, “almost universally, badly located, exposed to the noise, dust and danger of the highway, unattractive, if not positively repulsive in their external and internal appearance”, as vented by Henry Barnard (Weisser, 198). Schools were now a central fixture of the neighborhood.

Abigail Christman neatly summarized (NRHP, 2016) the key elements of a Progressive school as follows:

- A broad conception of the role of the school that encompassed the general welfare of the students, not just their intellectual development;
- The promotion of individuality over conformity and encouragement of individual interests;
- Experiential learning emphasized over traditional book learning and memorization;
- Curriculum focused on practical education rather than knowledge for its own sake;
• The introduction of new topics into the curriculum, such as functional problems related to personal development, family life and the community;
• Less time spent on traditional subjects such as history, English, science, and math;
• More flexible, less regimented schedules;
• A focus on teamwork and group projects rather than competition between students;
• No corporal punishment;
• Active learning (activities and projects) promoted over passive learning (reading);
• A more democratic classroom with the teacher working and planning cooperatively with the students;
• Experimentation within the school encouraged; and
• Concern with physical welfare of students including the addition of health services and hot lunches.

The classroom experience shifted to one of collaborative learning with the teacher acting more as an education guide helping students to find and foster their interests. Rote learning and reading gave way to group work. Students became active in their learning, to learn more by doing. The flexible classroom with movable furniture and separate, specialized spaces allowed for group work, interactivity and practical education (Fig. 8 - 9).

Postwar curricula presented challenges for junior and senior high schools to balance suitable offerings of subjects for students wishing to pursue a college education and those who would enter a changing workforce after graduation. The National Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth, created by the U.S. Office of Education, was introduced in the late 1940s in an effort to provide practical lessons to prepare students for work, family and civic life after school. The purpose of Life Adjustment Education was to provide secondary students with life skills and maturity as a safeguard against the growing fear of postwar communism. According to Andrew Hartman, author of Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American School, there are four principles to the life adjustment movement: relevance, instrumentalism, social order, and patriotism (56). School guidance counselors helped students identify their interests, and the new and developing curriculum was designed to provide those necessary skills to achieve the student’s role after school.

Grand Forks Schools worked with the Chamber of Commerce and local businesses on a Business-Education Day to assist teachers with gaining practical information on the American business profit system so they may better educate their students on such practices (Series 1, Vol. 9, p. 225-226). Superintendent Schroeder proposed a new curriculum for junior and high school students “to outline specific courses for various professions so that students aspiring to these professions may make plans at least four years in advance under school guidance experts” (Series 1, Vol. 11, p.62).
Six Grand Forks Mid-Century Schools

The following descriptions of each school are drawn from both the 2013 survey data, 2019 site visits to ground-truth the exterior data and identify any significant changes, interior observations as well as archival research. Access to building plans and specifications would further illuminate the some of the construction and material choices that could assist with realizing original features and periods of renovation. For example, while it is possible to identify original entrances it is not always evident whether the current fireproof doors are those that were installed at the time of construction.

West Elementary School (1949)  SITS # 32GF3636
The school is named for former superintendent, John C. West, who later became president of the University of North Dakota. Built in 1949, West Elementary was one of two public elementary schools constructed early in the postwar period (Fig. 3). The other, Lincoln Elementary School (1948) was destroyed in the 1997 Grand Forks flood. West Elementary was built for a cost of $375,000. The locations of these two early mid-century schools point to residential expansion between downtown and the University, and the near southside neighborhoods.

The original school design is attributed to Theodore Wells of Wells-Denbrook architectural firm; however, the only evidence for this attribution is to be found in School Board minutes of July 1948. The minutes suggests a cost and time saving measure of school planning, “It was further proposed that Mr. Theodore B. Wells, having completed his drawing for the Winship School, use the same plans and specification for the west end school at the university… " (Series 1, Vol. 8, p.69). The Wells-Denbrook firm designed the 1955 addition.

The recessed main entrance of the school faces east on N. 25th Street and overlooks University Park across this narrow neighborhood street. The school is a one story with a raised foundation and basement and a poured concrete foundation. Main level windows are grouped in various sets of two, three, four or five depending on the section of the school while basement windows are louvered. Although windows have been replaced the original openings are maintained.

It appears that West Elementary is the only school in this group that features the architectural use of glass block both within the gymnasium (Fig. 5) and on the south entrance (Fig. 5). Glass blocks above the entry door on the south end allow for more natural light to illuminate the hallway. This double door entrance is coupled with a glass panel above a concrete block panel to the left and while it is not known whether the doors themselves are original, the entrance arrangement is.

The exterior south wall features a decorative brick relief panel framed by stone on the west side of the entry. The east side of this entry as well as the west wall of the north wing both shows contrasting linear brick feature. The use of stone on this early mid-century school may be regarded a transitional design
element from the architect who was familiar with and practiced in earlier school and collegiate architecture. Interior window panels have been covered with wood panels and a dropped acoustic ceiling on the north wing. The east wing interior walls still have glass panels, but the glass appears to have been replaced.

Exposed brick can be found in the gymnasium surrounding the stage area, with a decorative long and short course brickwork similar to that found at Lewis and Clark. The other walls of the gymnasium, as well as the classroom wings feature concrete block. Several classrooms maintain built-in storage closets, sinks, coat hooks and bathrooms, and retain the steel posts and room-length heating and storage units. There is a library and a separate kitchen and lunchroom on the lower level.

The west wall of the west entrance shows three tall and narrow red brick inserts that suggest these may have been perhaps glass panels at one time. The brick is both a different color and texture to the rest of the exterior brick and can been seen from both the interior and exterior of the building.

EIFS surrounds the windows on the east classroom wing and from the windows to the eaves on the north classroom wing. The eaves on this wing show beams on the exterior that likely continue through the structure similar to that seen at Viking, however an acoustic tile ceiling now obscures the interior view (Fig. 15).

A contemporary playground on the southwest sides of the school is likely in the same position as an earlier play area with a lawn, mature trees and a basketball court on the paved area. There is a non-contributing annex on the west side of the building likely used for administrative purposes or classroom overflow at one time.

West Elementary is located close to the University of North Dakota and therefore, the neighborhood surrounding the school shows single family homes that pre-date the school, as well as some that are contemporary. The lot size is also somewhat smaller than the others in this group though the school itself is built in the modern style (Fig. 16).

**Lewis and Clark Elementary School (1953) SITS # 32GF3233**

The school and its addition were both designed by Samuel DeRemer's architectural firm in 1952 (Fig. 18). The first part of the school opened in the fall of 1953, with the north wing addition opening in 1955. Lewis and Clark Elementary School was built for a cost of $313,000 in the developing residential area to the south and west of Belmont, Roosevelt and Lincoln Elementary Schools.

The exterior consists of decorative brick with four rows of long brick interrupted by one course of short bricks. The exterior now includes panels of EIFS applied to several sections of the buildings surrounding the windows, around the entrances and on the upper two thirds of the south wall of the gymnasium. Panels of EIFS on the gymnasium now cover the original windows on the exterior and they
are also covered on the interior with paneling (Fig. 19). The wind-out metal windows are replacements however the window openings appear original.

The flat roof overhangs the deep recessed main entrance in the south-east corner supported by a tapered steel post on the south end of the eave and the south wall of the gymnasium on the other end. Access to the front door is by two concrete steps and an accessibility ramp. The latter is a later addition. Each entrance retains the original metal lettering of the school name (Fig. 20).

Exposed brick and large glass panels in the open entrance to the building blurs the transition between interior and exterior. The original glass panels above the hallway walls are a good example of how this design invited natural light to illuminate the interior hallways (Fig. 21).

Classroom features are similar to those in West, with built in storage including the combined heating and storage units that run the length of the room under the windows. Some classrooms serving the younger grades have bathrooms. Other original interior features include glazed ceramic tiles on the walls in the main hallway as seen at Valley Junior High School, a library on the upper level, and a separate kitchen and lunchroom on the lower level.

There is a paved parking lot between the north-east and south-west wings with a grass area beyond the lot on the north side (Fig. 22). The school overlooks Elks Park and pool to the east which is a typical and very deliberate decision of coupling green space and play areas with the school buildings (Fig. 23).

A painted mural on east wall of the gymnasium shows a scene of the school’s namesakes, pioneering explorers Meriwether Lewis and William Clark (Fig. 18). This wall is faced with large composite blocks on which the mural is painted. The mural was added in the 1980s and painted by Central High School student, Leanne Rotto for the North Dakota Centennial (Mitchell, 2019). The construction on the gymnasium uses concrete block and there differs from the brickwork facing the classroom wings.

Lewis and Clark is located in a modest, mostly single family home residential neighborhood, one block from the commercial zone of South Washington Street.

Valley Junior High School (1954) SITS # 32GF3634
As the growing population of grade-school children were coming of age and advancing out of the elementary education, it was necessary to address the need for another junior high school. South Junior High, built in 1931, served the south end neighborhoods. Thus, Valley Junior High School provided residents on the north and west sides with a much-needed school (Fig. 25-27).

Valley Junior High School was built in 1954 and opened in 1955, with early additions in 1957 and 1961, for a cost of approximately $500,000 (Fig. 28). The school initially served seventh, eighth, and nine grade students. In the mid 1990s, a reassignment of grades occurred, and ninth grade students were
moved to high schools, and sixth grade students joined the newly named Valley Middle School.

The local architectural firm, Grosz and Anderson, was responsible for the design of the first three phases. The Grand Forks Public Schools District had identified the site for the new junior high school several years prior and had made moves to plat the land and work with the city on the closure of alleys to ensure the lot size was adequate for future development.

A key feature of the planning was the inclusion of sports facilities - a playing field and locker room facilities that set this school apart from all other schools in the district (Fig. 29). Progress on the athletics features was delayed for a year or so because UND continued to use this land for temporary housing of returning veterans enrolled at the university. An agreement between Superintendent Schroeder and President West had allowed for the “hutments” to be placed on the undeveloped school land that would become the playing field. A change in presidency meant that the university was unprepared for a relocation or removal with no alternative housing arranged for the more than 100 veteran students who would be returning in the fall.

However, construction on the school building did proceed. The design is typical of the modern architecture common for schools of the period built in a series of phases as the needs of the school changed. It is a sprawling campus of varying elevations on a poured concrete foundation. A flat roof extends over the recessed main entrance on the south side with three double doors leading into the school (Fig. 28). The early phases of the school retain the original glazed ceramic tile like that used in the hallways and other interior spaces including the locker room which is the same tile as in the hallways at Lewis and Clark.

Other specialized spaces include a purpose-designed music room with a stepped amphitheater arrangement and a clerestory window running the length of the room – perhaps a more suitable acoustic choice over floor to ceiling windows. The roof line of this part of the building mirrors the raking elevation of the floor indicating this space is original as was designed. A wood ceiling and steel beams can be seen in sections like those found at Viking. The chemistry lab is another subject-specific space that was discussed at length by the school board and is one of several rooms that retains the original interior windows. Built-in hallway lockers replace the closet and coat hooks seen at in the elementary schools. A grassy courtyard is surrounded by classrooms and offices on three sides (Fig. 30).

The exterior is clad in a buff brick with EIFS used on multiple buildings most commonly around the windows on the classroom wings. Dennis’ 2013 architectural survey notes that “many of the windows are original although the top portions have been covered”. The windows have a very strong horizontal placement that mimics the horizontal roofline, and good examples of the use of clerestory windows, as noted above. Multiple entrances provide examples of both deep eaves as well as double or triple sets of doors. All entrances appear to retain the original openings.
To the west of the school buildings is the athletics ground which then backs onto University Park (Fig. 25). Valley Junior High Schools shares the same neighborhood as West Elementary.

**Viking Elementary (1957) SITS # 32GF3635**

As neighborhoods continued to expand south, another elementary school was needed to accommodate expanding enrollments. Viking Elementary School opened in 1957 at a cost of $381,000, just five years after Lewis and Clark and only ten city blocks to the south (Fig. 27). Viking sits adjacent to Cox Park, managed by Grand Forks Parks District, and together they occupy two city blocks in this residential neighborhood (Fig. 30 - 31).

The school was designed by Samuel DeRemer’s architectural firm of DeRemer, Harrie, and Kennedy, which was also responsible for Lewis and Clark. The two schools share a basic design vocabulary with the recessed main entry, accessed by two steps, and is adjacent to the gymnasium, which sits between two wings of classrooms. The one-story east wing has a poured concreted foundation and flat roof that extends to create an eave the full length of the building (Fig. 32). The exterior is clad in red brick on the lower section with EIFS surrounding the long bank of sliding windows and up to and including the eaves.

Classrooms maintain a number of original features like those seen at the other schools including the wall to wall heating and storage units under the windows, bathrooms, sinks, coat hooks, bench seats and storage closets. Several classrooms retain the original steel posts and wood ceilings. Structural components such as steel beams remain visible on the interior and extend to the exterior further blurring the lines between inside and outside. The interior glass panels above the walls are now covered with paneling. Like seen at Lewis and Clark, there is a library on the upper level and a kitchen and lunchroom on the lower level. A temporary concertina wall in the lunchroom separates the space into distinct areas, and it was this room that, at one time, was used to create an emergency classroom to address overcrowding.

The north wing of classrooms sits on a raised foundation with sliding windows extending the full length of the building (Fig. 33). Like the east wing, the flat roof extends to create deep eaves and the beams visible on the interior extend under the eaves. The building exterior is clad in red brick with a more liberal use of EIFS from ground level to the eaves. The windows are replacements but retain the original openings.

The irregular L shape of the school, like that seen at Lewis and Clark, immediately overlooks a paved area used for recess and play, with mature trees and areas of grass. Between the set-back playground and Cox Park’s playing fields sits a water tower, further evidence of infrastructure installed to accommodate the city’s expansion.

**Ben Franklin (1960) SITS # 32GF3632**
The opening of the Grand Forks Air Force Base in 1957, and the city's continued population growth saw three new elementary schools open in 1960. One of these new schools, Ben Franklin was built just to the southeast of the University campus on the southside of the railroad tracks (Fig. 36). It served the neighborhoods around the major arterial roads of Columbia Road, DeMers Avenue, and South Washington Street.

Ben Franklin was designed by the architectural firm of DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy, and was built for a cost of $327,000. It is a mostly one-story building with a flat roof that extends to create overhanging eaves on the east and west sides. The recessed entry with steel supports faces east (Fig. 38), and a large paved lot covers the area between the building and road to south that includes playground equipment for a ball game.

Some of the earlier classrooms mirror the design of those seen at Viking retaining the original wood ceilings, steel beams and posts with bathrooms, sinks and storage spaces. These beams are visible crossing the hallways that are built floor to ceiling of concrete block.

Like all of the mid-century schools in this group, the building is asymmetrical and is clad in red brick with a poured concrete foundation. Banks of original wood framed windows are found along the south and east elevations (Fig 38 - 40) as well as some on the north west. The windows along the west addition are set in pairs. An interior courtyard sits in the middle of four different wings and is accessed from doors on two sides. While it is not possible to know whether all of the exterior doors are original, their openings appear to be.

The gymnasium is constructed using concrete block and like all of the schools in this nomination, served the dual purpose of a gymnasium and auditorium. The chimney is intact but has received repair at the top.

Like Valley JHS, Ben Franklin serves a larger student population and boasts a larger footprint on the city block. It received two additions (the first in 1963 and the later in 1987) but maintains a mid-century modern exterior while the interior spaces have undergone more remodeling to accommodate the changing student body.

Ben Franklin has an athletic field to the west and a playground on the north side and adjacent to a non-contributing annex with toilet facilities. The residential neighborhood immediately around the school is made up of mid-century era modest single-family homes.

Wilder Elementary School (1955 gymnasium; 1965 school)  SITS # 32GF3637

The first Wilder school opened in 1891 but burned down just a few years later. A new ten room school replaced the original building, opening in 1895. Continued growth required a second-story to be added in 1905. Named for a long-time school board member, William Leo Wilder, the school was among the
earliest in Grand Forks serving the near northside neighborhoods and sitting between downtown, a residential area and the major arterial of U.S. Highway 2, locally known as Gateway Drive (Fig. 41–42).

A Samuel DeRemer-designed gymnasium was added to the physical plant in 1955 at a cost of almost $49,000 (Fig. 43). However, the postwar population boom continued to put pressure on local schools, and eventually, the nineteenth-century school was replaced with a new, modern school in 1965, designed by Myron Denbrook of Wells-Denbrook, at a cost of around $260,000.

Wilder is a one-story building on a poured concrete foundation. The exterior is clad in a buff colored brick (referred to in the minutes as mottled brick) similar to that used at Valley Junior High School. It appears that an effort was made to integrate the look of the new school with the 1955 gymnasium. EIFS, has been used more minimally than at Lewis and Clark, Viking, and West. The low elevation school has a flat roof that extends to create a narrow eave on the west side. Rows of windows extend the full length of building. What is now the front of the school faces north-west on an irregular lot truncated by the intersecting Gateway Drive to the north. The original main entry has been closed and moved to the north elevation, which accounts for the lack of recessed entry as seen at the other schools. Wilder Elementary offers a good example for the use of clerestory windows (Fig. 44).

Wilder was significantly damaged during the 1997 flood and has since undergone interior remodeling. However, the gymnasium and the exterior of the school maintain the architectural integrity of mid-century architecture. The windows and door openings appear to be original. It is a smaller school with only one main building of classrooms and offices. Two non-contributing modern annexes likely serve additional school programming. Wilder is the only nominated school without a separate kitchen and lunchroom and so the gymnasium is set up each meal for this purpose (Fig. 45).

Each of these schools is described as having a high degree of historic integrity and are eligible for a National Register listing as a thematic approach to mid-century schools under Criteria A and C.
Associated Property Types

This MPDF addresses six mid-century public schools in Grand Forks built between 1949 and 1965. Of the total twelve elementary and junior high schools built during this period, these six schools are believed to be eligible under a thematic nomination for mid-century architecture. These schools maintain the typical architectural design and features of the American mid-century modern design. Furthermore, they represent a point in time when public education nationally was undergoing a significant transformation and reflected locally in these school buildings. Traditional standardized teacher-delivered lessons gave way to a student-centered flexible and holistic approach to education advancing the United States’ embrace of progressive educational movements.

Mid-century schools, unlike the two- and three-story school buildings of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, were sprawling, asymmetrical, mostly one-story campuses that were more accommodating to the emerging educational principles in the postwar era. Emphasizing flexible learning spaces and child-centered priorities, the modern school plan featured specialized functions such as auditoriums, cafeterias, health services and a greater harmony between interior and exterior.

In Grand Forks, it is possible to follow the development of neighborhoods by looking at school construction. Small elementary schools served young students in close proximity to their residences. West and Lewis and Clark Elementary schools were the first two extant grade schools in the Grand Forks Independent District #1 building program that demonstrate the postwar growth phase of neighborhoods from the established downtown to the immediate west and south. Valley Junior High School (now Valley Middle) served the growing population on what was the north-west side of the city in easy walking distance from three elementary schools. Viking Elementary represents another significant residential development to the south of the newly opened Lewis and Clark Elementary School showing that Grand Forks was expanding rapidly. It was the third new elementary school to be built in less than a decade between downtown, Washington Street and 24th Avenue South. A new Wilder School was built adjacent to and replaced the older school on the near northside. Further expansion to the west led to a new elementary school, Ben Franklin, that served the expanding neighborhoods between three main arterial roads and close to the University.

Property Type - School Building

This thematic nomination includes only schools. No other civic buildings are included.

Mid-century school design responded to multiple factors including a postwar sense of renewal and progress, the need for flexibility in learning spaces, evolving educational philosophies and priorities, and the need for cost and construction efficiency.

Design features characteristic of this period are low-elevation asymmetrical buildings with a horizontal...
orientation occupying larger lots of land, flat roofs with overhanging eaves. There is an emphasis on maximizing natural light through rows of windows, clerestories and large glass panels that invited harmony between the interior and exterior courtyards and landscaping in neighborhood settings. Building exteriors are dominated by brick with horizontal rows of windows with steel posts frequently found supporting the eaves over the recessed entries. Foundations were of poured concrete.

The nominated Grand Forks mid-century schools exhibit and maintain many of the physical modern architectural features. Additionally, they were located in developing residential neighborhoods adjacent to public parks and playgrounds.

This thematic nomination includes two subtypes: Elementary and Junior High Schools.

**Subtype: Elementary/Grade Schools**

The function of elementary schools was primary education serving students from Kindergarten to Fourth, Fifth or, in the case of Grand Forks, Sixth grade. The design of the mid-century elementary school was welcoming and less intimidating than earlier schools, giving greater consideration to the young child's experience. The asymmetrical construction allowed for the addition of distinct functional spaces and multipurpose spaces such as cafeterias for serving hot lunches, gymnasiums, auditoriums and sometimes health clinics. Mobile desks and chairs allowed for reconfiguration of classroom uses to facilitate collaborative learning. Classrooms often included built in shelving for storage of classroom resources and a sink for convenient washing up. Elementary schools were built on large lots of land in residential neighborhoods. Grand Forks' Public Schools District took advantage of urban planning in concert with the Parks District selecting school sites adjacent to public parks, sharing playground facilities and green space.

**Subtype: Junior High/Middle Schools**

The function of junior high schools was the bridge between primary and secondary education to guide students to more advanced curricula. Junior high schools varied in terms of the grades they served depending on the District. They might include students as young as the Fifth grade and through to the Ninth grade. By the late 1950s, Grand Forks Independent District #1 had three accredited public high schools, or schools offering some high school classes, which included the South and Valley junior high schools. These schools included students in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades until enrollment shifts saw grade changes to better accommodate pupils between elementary, junior and high schools. Valley Junior High School transitioned to Valley Middle School in the mid 1990s when the ninth-grade students moved to the high schools. Sixth grade students joined Valley Middle School in 1999.

Specialized subjects, such as Chemistry, required specialized spaces and equipment. Gymnasiums and auditoriums, cafeterias, and music rooms were also standard in junior high schools. Home
Economics and Shop provided students practical skills, and an emphasis on athletic competition saw the junior high schools add playing fields to their campuses with locker room facilities. Valley Junior High School was the first in the District to include a football field in its initial planning and soon after it added a hockey pen on the field for the winter months.

**Significance**

The mid-century schools within this MPDF are eligible for inclusion as a thematic nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. These six schools meet the requirement of Criterion A in the area of education for their association with events that marked a significant shift in American educational principles and philosophies of the post-World War II period. Additionally, these buildings maintain the historic integrity of mid-century modern architecture that meet the requirement under Criterion C.

The nominated Grand Forks’ mid-century schools were designed by some of the most prominent architects in North Dakota thereby emphasizing their local significance as well as marking a period of important national growth and change.

Theodore Wells, one of the state’s most prolific and best-known architects, is responsible for many of the institutional, civic and residential buildings both locally and around the region including some of the Collegiate Gothic style buildings on the campus of the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks. In 1947, Wells partnered with Myron Denbrook creating the Wells-Denbrook architectural firm. The younger Denbrook, studied at the University of Washington at the time mid-century style was becoming popular, and he undoubtedly had an influence on many of the firm’s designs during this period. According to Martens’ historical context study, Wells and Denbrook worked together on more than 400 projects between 1948 and 1964 including residential properties, churches, schools and university buildings, private businesses, banks, gymnasiums, auditoriums as well as their own 1954 office building and studio which was recently added to the NRHP (2015, 85-93; 2014). Their work can be seen throughout North Dakota and western Minnesota. Wells and/or Denbrook are credited with West Elementary School and its addition, Lewis and Clark Elementary School’s addition and Wilder Elementary School’s new modern school.

Samuel Teel DeRemer is the son of architect Joseph Bell DeRemer. The older DeRemer is perhaps best known for North Dakota’s State Capitol in Bismarck and the art deco United Lutheran Church in Grand Forks. Samuel’s firm DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy is responsible for Lewis and Clark Elementary School, Viking Elementary School and addition, Ben Franklin Elementary School and addition and Wilder’s gymnasium. Sam DeRemer had spent several of his early school years in Grand Forks before his family relocated to Los Angeles. Following his graduation, he attended junior college and the University of California, Berkley from which he earned his degree in Architecture. He served in France during WWI eventually returning to Grand Forks in 1926 and joining his father’s newly opened architecture firm. He took over the firm in 1944 working independently until partnering with William
Harrie and Robert Kennedy in 1955.

In November 1952, the Board approved the request to contract Grosz and Anderson to draw up plans and specifications for Valley Junior High School. Of the schools in this nomination, Valley Junior High School is the only one designed by the firm, but it was likely the most complex with accommodation needed for functional spaces that aligned with the curriculum, such as art, chemistry, shop, home economics and music. Grosz and Anderson is also responsible for the original design of the University of North Dakota's Modernist-influenced Memorial Union building (1951) which was later embellished with Collegiate Gothic elements by Wells-Denbrook to provide more aesthetic cohesion with other buildings on the core campus. Almost full circle then, Grosz and Anderson designed the 1978 addition to the 1931 South Junior High School originally designed by Theodore Wells.

These architects served as important interpreters of the Modern style in the state and in the Red River Valley in particular. Steve Marten's encyclopedia report on the influence of Wells-Denbrook in the region reveals the shift in style in the post-war period and this group of schools represented a key space for introducing the community to the new design language, aesthetics, and principles. Samuel DeRemer's published address in The Improvement Bulletin demonstrated the willingness of these architects to communicate these ideas on a regional scale.

Despite the different architects, the schools exhibit typical mid-century architecture and construction and form a coherent group of buildings. They parallel changes in educational philosophy and trace a growing emphasis on efforts to educate both the mind and body of children in flexible and dynamic spaces. Significantly, the greenspaces adjacent to these buildings are generally preserved and have escaped infilling so far. As a result, it remains possible to recognize the interplay between the schools and their immediate environments which forms a key principle to the design choices common to mid-century modern architecture. The vistas visible from the windows of the schools, the location of doors, and the arrangement of the buildings, all continue to emphasize the fluid relationship between the interior and exterior of the building. Moreover, the location of these schools in neighborhoods where many mid-century churches, homes, and businesses – including the Wells-Denbrook studio - continue to stand (many in remarkable degrees of preservation) presents a distinctive architectural context for these buildings. As a result, these schools continue to make manifest the design and philosophies that shaped their construction. The mid-century modern schools of Grand Forks, North Dakota provide a clear example for how the community responded to the postwar population boom. They reflect the national call by policy makers, educational professionals, and architects for a significant school building program and embodied new, influential and historically persistent ideas about the relationship between education and the community. The mid-century schools in Grand Forks, North Dakota, preserve a window into the larger national story of changing populations, attitudes, technologies and priorities.
Geographical Data

The geographical boundaries of this nomination are Grand Forks’ city boundaries. Each of the schools in this thematic nomination are within the city limits. They are bound by Highway 2/Gateway Drive to the north, the Red River of the North to the east, 24th Avenue South to the south, and Columbia Road to the west (Fig. 7).

West Elementary School is located at UTM 644703.76 Easting, and UTM 5309848.95 Northing at 615 N. 25th Street. It occupies Lots 1,2,3,4, and East 36’ of B 01, Lot 5 in Westwood Subdivision.

Lewis and Clark Elementary School is located at UTM 646346.06 Easting, and UTM 5308057.66 Northing at 1100 13th Ave. South. It occupies a piece of land 300’ x 347’ B3 Gustafson’s Addition.

Valley Junior High School is located at UTM 645285.81 Easting, and UTM 5309750.75 Northing at 2100 5th Avenue North. It occupies unplatted parts – Grand Forks Twp. 151-50 north of and adjacent to Kelsey’s 2nd Addition except nearly 60’.

Viking Elementary School is located at UTM 646631.42 Easting, and UTM 5306828.28 Northing at 809 22nd Ave. South. It occupies Lot 3 Blk A Cox’s (replat 17 and 18).

Ben Franklin Elementary School is located at UTM 645245.84 Easting, and UTM 5308450.46 Northing at 1016 S. 20th Street. It occupies Lot 1 B17 Westward Acres Sub-Division.

Wilder Elementary School is located at UTM 646148.49 Easting, and UTM 5310684.88 Northing at 1009 N. 3rd Street. It occupies all of the block, part of B46 Partly Lots McCormack’s 1st and 2nd Addition.
This table includes the street addresses and SITS # for each of the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>SITS #</th>
<th>Original Date</th>
<th>Original Architect</th>
<th>Alterations, Additions</th>
<th>Additions Architect/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Elementary School</td>
<td>615 N 25th Street</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>58202</td>
<td>32 GF 3636</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Attributed to Theodore Wells</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Wells-Denbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis and Clark Elementary School</td>
<td>1100 13th Avenue St</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>58201</td>
<td>32 GF 3633</td>
<td>1952/53</td>
<td>Samuel T. De Remer</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Wells-Denbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Junior High School</td>
<td>2100 5th Avenue N</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>58202</td>
<td>32 GF 3634</td>
<td>1954/55</td>
<td>Grosz and Anderson</td>
<td>1956/57</td>
<td>Grosz and Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder Elementary School</td>
<td>1009 N. 3rd Street</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>58202</td>
<td>32 GF 3637</td>
<td>1955 (Gym)</td>
<td>De Remer</td>
<td>1965 (School)</td>
<td>Myron Denbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

The *Six Mid-Century Schools in Grand Forks, North Dakota MPDF* began as an historic architectural survey conducted in 2013 by M.L. Dennis Consulting in conjunction with the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission. Twelve potential schools built between 1949 and 1965 were evaluated and of those, the survey identified six to be potentially eligible for a thematic nomination. M.L. Dennis Consulting conducted an Intensive Level Survey and each property was evaluated to determine whether it retained sufficient historic integrity to convey its historic and architectural significance. All schools received additions during the period of significance and are therefore considered historic and do not compromise the original integrity.

The Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission received funding to complete the MPDF nomination to the National Register of Historic Places for Grand Forks mid-century schools. The 2013 survey was used as the basis for this MPDF with further archival research and field documentation undertaken in preparation of the nomination.

The Elwyn B. Robinson Special Collections at the University of North Dakota’s Chester Fritz Library is the official repository for the Grand Forks Public Schools District records as well as local architects, Theodore Wells, and Joseph Bell and Samuel DeRemer. The Architectural Studies Library at North Dakota State University provided additional foundational resources. Primary and secondary sources were used to develop the Statement of Historical Context. Primary sources include journal articles, newspaper articles, magazine articles, photographs and archival collections. Additionally, the former principal of Lewis and Clark contributed information about the mural on the east side of the building. The primary research was supplemented with secondary sources concerning national and local architectural, historical, educational and social trends.

Field documentation for the six schools involved surveying the exterior of the buildings to ground-truth the survey data and to examine whether any substantial alterations had occurred since the survey was conducted. Observations were done and photographs taken of school interiors.
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Photo Log

Figure 1: Washington School opened in 1907 and served the near northside neighborhood. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 2: Belmont School opened in 1883 and served the near southside neighborhood. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 3: West Elementary School. Main entry - east elevation. Architect – attributed to Theodore Wells. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 4: West Elementary School brick and masonry relief and glass block, south elevation. Architect – attributed to Theodore Wells. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 5: West Elementary gymnasium showing glass block windows. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 6: Interior view of glass block on south elevation of West Elementary. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 7: Hallway of a Grand Forks elementary school photographed in 1983 showing interior glass panels designed to maximize natural light in all parts of the building. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 8: Grade 2 classroom at Viking Elementary School (1957). Movable furniture allowed for flexible configuration of learning spaces such as group work. Architects DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 9: First grade classroom at Ben Franklin Elementary School (1960) showing flexible learning configurations and specialized spaces including easels and a washup sink for art, a groupwork table and a reading loft (upper rear). Architects DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 10: Side view of reading loft in First Grade classroom at Ben Franklin Elementary School also showing closet area. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 11: USGS map of city boundary of nominated schools.

Figure 12: West elevation of West Elementary School. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 13: East elevation of West Elementary School facing University Park. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
Figure 14: Annex on northwest corner of West Elementary School. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 15: West Elementary School north elevation. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 16: Aerial view of West Elementary School. University Park appears opposite the school to the east of North 25th Street.

Figure 17: USGS map of West Elementary School to the northwest of University Park.

Figure 18: Lewis and Clark Elementary, east elevation showing recessed main entry and mural on the east wall. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 19: Mural on the east elevation that shows windows in place before the EIFS was applied. The mural was applied in the 1980s. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 20: Metal lettering that appears at each entrance of the school. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 21: Lewis and Clark Elementary hallway showing glazed ceramic tile and interior window panels. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 22: Lewis and Clark Elementary Schools view from the northwest corner. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 23: Aerial view of Lewis and Clark Elementary School adjacent to Elks Park.

Figure 24: USGS map of Lewis and Clark Elementary School to the west of Elks Park.

Figure 25: Aerial of Valley Middle School (Valley Junior High School) with University Park to the left.

Figure 26: Closer aerial view of Valley Middle School campus.

Figure 27: USGS map of Valley Junior High School to the east of University Park.

Figure 28: South elevation of Valley JHS with recessed entrance under an overhanging eave. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 29: Boys locker room at Valley JHS. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 30: Interior courtyard at Valley JHS, flanked by classrooms and office space on three sides. Photo S. Caraher 2019
Figure 31: Viking Elementary entrance and gymnasium. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 32: Viking Elementary east elevation facing south with overhanging and buttressed eave. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 33: Viking Elementary north wing on a raised foundation. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 34: Aerial view of Viking Elementary School adjacent to Cox Park.

Figure 35: USGS map of Viking Elementary School adjacent to Cox Park.

Figure 36: Aerial view of Ben Franklin Elementary School adjacent to Ben Franklin Park.

Figure 37: USGS map of Ben Franklin adjacent to Ben Franklin Park.

Figure 38: Ben Franklin Elementary School recessed main entrance on east elevation. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 39: Original wood framed windows at Ben Franklin Elementary. Photo S. Caraher 2019.

Figure 40: Original windows on south elevation at Ben Franklin. Photo S. Caraher 2019.

Figure 41: Aerial view of Wilder Elementary School with Gateway Drive (Hwy 2) to the north.

Figure 42: USGS map of Wilder Elementary School.

Figure 43: New Wilder Elementary School (1965) abuts the 1955 gymnasium. Note: this is not the original entrance. This is a good example of a clerestory window directly under the eaves. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 44: East elevation of Wilder Elementary School showing clerestory windows, full glass panels adjacent to door to the right. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 45: Wilder Elementary is the only school of those nominated that does not have a separate kitchen and lunchroom. Meals are served in the gymnasium. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
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Figure 3: West Elementary School (1949) Main entry - east elevation. Architect – attributed to Theodore Wells. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 4: West Elementary (1949) brick and masonry relief and glass block, south elevation. Architect – attributed to Theodore Wells. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.
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Figure 5: West Elementary gymnasium showing glass block windows. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 6: Interior view of glass block on south elevation of West Elementary. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
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Figure 7: Hallway of a Grand Forks elementary school photographed in 1983 showing interior glass panels designed to maximize natural light in all parts of the building. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 8: Grade 2 classroom at Viking Elementary School. Movable furniture allowed for flexible configuration of learning spaces such as group work. Architects DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)
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Figure 9: First grade classroom at Ben Franklin Elementary School showing flexible learning configurations and specialized spaces including easels and a washup sink for art, a groupwork table and a reading loft (upper rear). Architects DeRemer, Harrie and Kennedy. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)

Figure 10: Side view of reading loft in First Grade classroom at Ben Franklin Elementary School also showing closet area.
Figure 11: USGS map of city boundary of nominated schools as listed below.

1. West Elementary School
2. Lewis and Clark Elementary School
3. Valley Junior High School
4. Viking Elementary School
5. Ben Franklin Elementary School
6. Wilder Elementary School
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Figure 12: West elevation of West Elementary School. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.  

Figure 13: East elevation of West Elementary School facing University Park. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 43

Figure 14: Annex on northwest corner of West Elementary School. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 15: West Elementary School north elevation. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.
Figure 16: Aerial view of West Elementary School. University Park appears opposite the school to the east of North 25th Street.

Figure 17: USGS map of West Elementary School to the northwest of University Park.
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Figure 18: Lewis and Clark Elementary, east elevation showing recessed main entry and mural on the east wall. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 19: Mural on the east elevation that shows windows in place before the EIFS was installed. The mural was painted in the 1980s. (Orin G. Libby Special Collections, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks)
Figure 20: Metal lettering that appears at each entrance of the school. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 21: Lewis and Clark Elementary hallway showing glazed ceramic tile and interior window panels. Photograph S. Caraher, 2019.
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Figure 22: Lewis and Clark Elementary Schools view from the northwest corner. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 23: Aerial view of Lewis and Clark Elementary School adjacent to Elks Park.
Figure 24: USGS map of Lewis and Clark Elementary School to the west of Elks Park.

Figure 25: Aerial of Valley Middle School (Valley Junior High School) with University Park to the left.
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Figure 26: Closer aerial view of Valley Middle School campus.

Figure 27: USGS map of Valley Junior High School to the east of University Park.
Figure 28: South elevation of Valley JHS with recessed entrance under an overhanging eave. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 29: Boys locker room at Valley JHS. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
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Figure 30: Interior courtyard at Valley JHS, flanked by classrooms and office space on three sides. Photo S. Caraher 2019

Figure 31: Viking Elementary entrance and gymnasium. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
Figure 32: Viking Elementary east elevation facing south with overhanging and buttressed eave. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 33: Viking Elementary north elevation showing raised foundation. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
Multiple Property Submission
Name of Property
Grand Forks, ND
County and State
Six Mid-Century Schools in Grand Forks, ND
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Figure 34: Aerial view of Viking Elementary School adjacent to Cox Park.

Figure 35: USGS map of Viking Elementary School adjacent to Cox Park.
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Figure 36: Aerial view of Ben Franklin Elementary School adjacent to Ben Franklin Park

Figure 37: USGS map of Ben Franklin adjacent to Ben Franklin Park
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Figure 38: Ben Franklin Elementary School recessed main entrance on east elevation. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 39: Original wood-framed windows at Ben Franklin Elementary. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
Figure 40: Original wood-framed windows on south elevation at Ben Franklin. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.

Figure 41: Aerial view of Wilder Elementary School with Gateway Drive (Hwy 2) to the north
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Figure 42: USGS map of Wilder Elementary School

Figure 43: New Wilder Elementary School (1965) abuts the 1955 gymnasium. Note: this is not the original entrance. This is a good example of a clerestory window directly under the eaves. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
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Figure 44: East elevation of Wilder Elementary School showing clerestory windows, full glass panels adjacent to door to the right. Photo S. Caraher 2019.

Figure 45: Wilder Elementary is the only school of those nominated that does not have a separate kitchen and lunchroom. Meals are served in the gymnasium. Photo S. Caraher, 2019.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Grand Forks School Board
FROM: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
SUBJECT: County Superintendent of Schools Position
DATE: September 9, 2019

The Grand Forks County is in the process of employing a county superintendent of schools. Two applications were received. They are attached for your information. The Grand Forks County Commission would like to appoint Dr. Steve Swiontek to the position. According to North Dakota Century Code 15.1-11-01, a majority of the school board presidents representing school districts having their administrative headquarters in Grand Forks County, must approve the individual that is hired.

Administrative recommendation is to approve the appointment of Dr. Steve Swiontek as Grand Forks County Superintendent of Schools.
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August 21, 2019

Mr. Bill Palmiscno 
Grand Forks School Board President 
PO Box 6000 
Grand Forks, ND  58206-6000 

RE: County Superintendent of Schools Position 

Dear School Board President:

Grand Forks County received two applications for the County Superintendent of Schools position. The Grand Forks County Commission would like to appoint Dr. Steve Swiontek to the position. According to NDCC 15.1-11-01, a majority of the school board presidents representing school districts having their administrative headquarters within Grand Forks County must approve.

I have enclosed the two applications received. Please notify the Grand Forks County Commission of your decision as soon as possible. You can email your response to debbie.nelson@gfcouny.org. My phone number is 701-780-8201 if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Debbie Nelson 
Finance and Tax Director
July 22, 2019

Grand Forks County Finance and Tax Office
151 South 4th Street
Grand Forks, ND 58201

Dear Grand Forks County Commissioners,

Enclosed you will find my application for the Grand Forks County Superintendent of Schools. I believe I am an excellent candidate for this position as I have been a successful school superintendent for more than 17 years, 14 of those years in the State of North Dakota and three years as a superintendent in Minnesota. If I am fortunate enough to be named to this position, I would like to look at forming a consortium to work with schools in the county to write Home Land Security grants in order to improve the safety and security of county schools.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Steve Swiontek
Grand Forks County
Heart of the Red River Valley

Grand Forks County Superintendent of Schools
Application Form

Thank you for your interest in the Grand Forks County Superintendent of Schools position. Use this form to provide us useful information about yourself to ensure the best match between you and Grand Forks County. The following information will be shared with the Grand Forks County Commission and Grand Forks County School Boards, according to NDCC 15.1-11.

**Name:**       Dr. Steve Swiontek

**Contact phone number:**       701-739-8900

**Address:**       806 Lafayette Rd., Devils Lake, ND 58301

**Email Address:**       sswiontek@gondtc.com or steve.swiontek@k12.nd.us

**Briefly describe why you would like to be the County Superintendent of Schools:**

_I have been a school administrator for over 30 years and I enjoy working in the field of education. It has been interesting, enjoyable, challenging and rewarding. There are several aspects of the County Superintendent that I have a great deal of experience in and I believe I can improve the efficiency of the position. In addition, I believe I know most if not all the public-school superintendents in Grand Forks County._
Superintendent of Schools Qualifications:

Baccalaureate Degree from a regional or national accredit institution of higher education approved for teacher education.

✓ Where: Mayville State University
   When: 1979

✓ Master’s Degree:
   Where: Northern State University – Aberdeen, SD
   When: 1985

✓ Doctorate Degree:
   Where: University of North Dakota
   When: 2009

✓ North Dakota professional teaching license
   Where: North Dakota Education Standards and Practices Board
   License: 000032086
   When: 1979 to present (Life Certificate)

✓ Experience teaching at an approved elementary, middle, or secondary school.
   Where: North Border High School – Sec. Science
   When: 2016-17

OR

County Superintendent of Schools Designee

If the candidate does not meet the above qualifications, the candidate can apply as a County of Schools Designee.

☐ I am applying as a County Superintendent of Schools Designee.

What other skill(s) do have that you think would be useful as the County of Superintendent of Schools Designee?

I am not applying as a designee; however, I would like to list a few of my skills. These skills include but are not limited to: a good understanding of school systems in the state and the county; a working network with other school administrators in the county and the state; experience in working with the state legislature and legislators, a good knowledge of taxation, good communications skills, the ability to work with all people, and excellent budgeting skills.
If you are selected for the County Superintendent of Schools or the County Superintendent of Schools Designee, you will perform all statutory duties of the County Superintendent of Schools.

Your signature: ___________________________ Date: 7-22-2019

APPLICATIONS MUST BE RETURNED TO THE GRAND FORKS COUNTY FINANCE AND TAX OFFICE, 151 SOUTH 4TH STREET, GRAND FORKS, ND BY JULY 31ST, 2019. CALL 701-780-8201 WITH ANY QUESTIONS.
Grand Forks County Superintendent of Schools
Application Form

Thank you for your interest in the Grand Forks County Superintendent of Schools position. Use this form to provide us useful information about yourself to ensure the best match between you and Grand Forks County. The following information will be shared with the Grand Forks County Commission and Grand Forks County School Boards, according to NDCC 15.1-11.

Name: _Kasey Young_

Contact phone number: 701-215-1082

Address: 945 41st street NE, Northwood, ND, 58267
Mailing Address: PO BOX 13476, Grand Forks, ND, 58208

Email address (please write it carefully): kaseyyoung22@yahoo.com

Briefly describe why you would like to be the County Superintendent of Schools:

The position is related to the K-12 advising for teachers I conduct at UND and it looks like an position my skills set would be well suited for.

Superintendent of Schools Qualifications:

☐ Baccalaureate Degree from a regional or national or national accredit institution of higher education approved for teacher education.

Where? University of North Dakota

When? 2005-BS Wildlife Biology; 2009 MS Kinesiology; December 2019 Ph.D.

☐ North Dakota professional teaching license

Where______________________________

When_______

☐ Experience teaching at an approved elementary, middle, or secondary school.
OR

County Superintendent of Schools Designee

If the candidate does not meet the above qualifications, the candidate can apply as a County Superintendent of Schools Designee.

☐ I am applying as a County Superintendent of Schools Designee. According to NDCC 15.1-11-02. All statutory duties of the County Superintendent of School will be designed.

What other skill(s) do you have that you think would be useful as the County Superintendent of Schools Designee?

I have experience with teaching at the university level, coaching at the high school level and currently advise K-12 physical education students at UND. I am proficient with Microsoft office, conducting statistical analysis using SPSS and Excel and I am good at developing data driven reports for multiple audiences.

If you are selected for the County Superintendent of Schools or the County Superintendent of Schools Designee, you will perform all statutory duties of the County Superintendent of Schools.

Your signature: __________________________ Date: 7/30/19

APPLICATIONS MUST BE RETURNED TO THE GRAND FORKS COUNTY FINANCE AND TAX OFFICE, 151 SOUTH 4TH STREET, GRAND FORKS, ND BY JULY 31ST, 2019 CALL 701-780-8201 WITH ANY QUESTIONS
Kasey T. Young  
2751 2nd Avenue North, Hyslop Sports Center Room 105, Grand Forks, ND, 58202 (Office)  
701-777-2981, 701-215-1082 (Cell), kasey.young@und.edu

Academic Positions
Instructor University of North Dakota  
Department of Kinesiology  
and Public Health Education  
July 2009-Current

Education
Ph.D ABD University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Anticipated Graduation Date  
December 2019, Higher Education- Test and Measures

M.S University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, May 2009, Kinesiology- Major area  
Fitness and Wellness

B.S University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Wildlife Biology, May 2005

Research Interests
Motivation and constraints in campus recreational programming, training and retention of  
aquatic lifesaving techniques, injury prevention, injury prevalence in aquatic, sport, recreation  
and physical activity settings, ethnic and cultural constraints for participation in recreation and  
quantitative research methods.

Professional Experience
Sport and Exercise Credit Classes Coordinator/Academic Advisor/ Instructor  
I oversee the operations of the Sport and Exercise Credits Classes (SECC)(recreational/physical  
activity promotion program) including the recruitment, hiring and dismissal of instructors,  
oservation of budget, safety of classes, equipment purchases, equipment maintenance,  
instructor training, studio repair reporting and marketing of programs. In addition, I coordinate  
with community providers, scheduling of studios, gyms, pool and shared space in conjunction  
with the UND Athletics department. I advise approximately 250 Kinesiology, Rehabilitation and  
Human Services and Public Health Education students in academic planning and career  
planning, maintain academic records and enter degree planning into Degree Map to ensure  
timely graduation and I use Starfish retention software to track academic progress of my  
students to assist with retention of student in the program. I currently teach Prevention, Care  
and Legal Issues for Injury, Water Safety Instruction, Lifeguarding and CPR & First Aid.  
August 2008-Current  
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Kinesiology and Public Health Education  
Department

Aquatics Training Coordinator & Waterpark Supervisor
Conduct and maintain the training of all lifeguard staff for the Splathers of the South Seas waterpark 40,000 sq foot waterpark. Hire, discipline and dismiss waterpark staff, maintain records to comply with Ellis and associates training requirements and conduct monthly trainings.
April 2007-August 2008
Grand Forks, ND, Canad Inns

**Assistant Aquatics Director & Special Events Operator**
Conduct and maintain the training of all lifeguard staff for the Hyslop Sports Center pool, schedule special events, hire, discipline and dismiss lifeguard staff. Oversee the operation of swimming events including: event set up, timing equipment, supervision, safety, maintaining of equipment and assisting event personal with planning.
August 2005-April 2007
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Athletics Department

**UND Volunteer Assistant Diving Coach**
Train springboard diving in a safe manner, conduct dryland and trampoline training, conduct water practices, and travel as needed.
August 2007-Current
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Athletics Department

**Crookston High School- Diving Coach**
Teach diving to high school students, travel, and oversee students during practice and competitions to ensure participant safety. (1 Minnesota State meet qualifier)
August 2005-December 2005
Crookston, MN

**Grand Forks Central-Diving Coach**
Teach diving to high school students, travel, and oversee students during practice and competitions to ensure participant safety. (2 North Dakota state meet qualifiers)
December 2006-April 2006
Grand Forks, ND

**Graduate Teaching and Research Assistant**
Teach Intro to Wellness, Walking and Aquatics classes. Assist the department chair in research projects including the development of tables, compiling of data, researching articles and description write ups.
August 2006-May 2008
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Kinesiology and Public Health Education Department

**Part Time Custodian**
Event clean up, special event set up and general care of facility.
August 2003-August 2005
Ralph Englstad Arena, Grand Forks, ND

Aquatics Instructor and Lifeguard
Teach swimming and diving lessons and lifeguard as required at the Hyslop Sports Center.
August 2005-2017
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Athletics Department

General Laborer
General Lawn care, remodeling of properties, painting and storm clean up as required.
August 2000-August 2003
Stonehaven Farms
Tonganixie, KS

Aquatics Instructor and Senior Lifeguard
Teach swimming and diving lessons and lifeguard as required at Lawrence Parks and Recreation facilities, oversee the daily operations and safety of the aquatic center, maintain lifeguard schedules and lifeguard as required.
July 1998-August 2003
Lawrence, KS, Lawrence Parks and Recreation

Research Projects
2016-Current Constraints to enrolling in elective physical activity classes during university studies (Dissertation)
A quantitative research study of constraints university students face when deciding to enroll in university physical activity classes during their studies. Anticipated Completion Date-August 2017

Publications


Awards
Nominated for outstanding academic adviser 2014, 2015, 2016 & 2017
Nominated for valuable staff professional award 2012, 2013
2006 American Red Cross Instructor Trainer of the Year-Red River Valley Chapter
2004 NCAA division II 1 meter diving champion
Seven time all American in NCAA division II diving
Four time varsity letter winner
Four time NCC conference champion
NCC outstanding diver 2003-2004
Academic achievement award fall 2003
Twelve time NCC diver of the week
4-H Key Award Recipient
Wildlife Habitat State Judging Contest First place individual 1996
Wildlife Habitat State Judging Contest Third place individual 1995

Committees Served
Blackboard Grade Integration With Campus Solutions Committee
Education and Human Development Diversity and Inclusion Committee (Fall 2018)
School Health Education Program Development Committee (2015-2016)
Coaching Minor Revision Committee (2016)
Athletic Appeals Committee (2012)
Education Building Room Assignment Committee (2011-2012)
Graduate Curriculum Committee –Student Representative (2007)
Academic Self Study-Academic integrity subcommittee (2010-2011)
Stiles, Watson and Brinkert Retirement Committee (2010)
Athletic Self Study Committee (2010)
Staff Senate Member (2012-2015 term)
  ○ Staff Development Committee Member
Starfish Academic Retention Software Tenant Administrator

Equipment Experience
Daktronics Omnisport 2000
Daktronics Omnisport Swimming
Daktronics Omnisport Diving
Daktronics Venus computer and accompanying Daktronics Scoreboard
Toro 327 Lawn Mower

Software Experience
Blackboard learning management (instructor, organization and student advising sites)
Oracle Campus Solutions (Student transcripts, class rosters and course schedules)
Oracle People Soft HRMS/finance software (finance, job positions, payroll, and budget reporting)
Microsoft Office (Word, PowerPoint, Excel, Publisher, Access and Outlook)
SPSS statistical package
R statistical package
SAS-structural equation modeling
Course leaf- course management system
Starfish Software, for retention and tracking advisee’s progress
Degree Map (program of study planning software)
HyTeck Meet Management
Dive meets

Training and Certifications
Aquatic Facility Operator (AFO) Expires December 2022
Certified Pool Operator (CPO) Expires May 2021
Lifeguard Instructor Trainer (LGIT)
Water Safety Instructor Trainer (WSIT)
CPR, Oxygen Administration & First Aid Instructor Trainer
CPR and First Aid Responding to Emergencies Instructor
Water Safety Instructor (WSI)-
Lifeguard Instructor (LGI)
CPR for the Health Care Provider, Oxygen Administration & First Aid Responding to Emergencies
Instructor
National Safety Council CPR and First Aid Instructor (Expired)
Ellis and Associates Lifeguard Instructor (Expired)
Lifeguarding
Water Park Lifeguarding
Water Front Lifeguarding
CPR/AED/Oxygen Administration for the Professional Rescuer
Standard First Aid
Open Water Scuba Diver Level 5
  Certified diver in: Night/limited visibility, Dry Suit, Nitrox, Boat diving, Navigation, Deep
  Diving, Equipment Techniques, and Stress and Rescue.
Interrater reliability training
USA Diving Safety certified

Teaching
KIN 240 Introduction to Wellness (Undergraduate)
This course provides an overview of the 7 dimensions of Wellness and their application to
everyday life

KIN 108I Beginning Walking (Undergraduate)
This course provides an overview of the benefits of fitness walking and how to develop a fitness
walking plan to improve health.

KIN 207 Prevention and Care of Physical Activity Injuries (Undergraduate)
This course provides an epidemiologic overview of injuries that occur in physical activity and
how to prevent, care and manage risk associated with physical activity, sports and recreation.
KIN 309 Water Safety Instruction (Undergraduate)
This course provides an overview of the American Red Cross water safety programs including: swimming lessons and general water safety. Course results in ARC water safety instructor certification

KIN 224C Movement Performance and Analysis of Swimming (undergraduate)
This course provides an overview of hydrodynamics of swimming and diving and how to analyze technique to improve swimming and diving performance.

KIN 224D Movement Performance and Analysis of Lifeguarding (Undergraduate)
This course provides an overview of the American Red Cross lifeguarding programs including: waterpark, lifeguarding and waterfront lifeguarding. Course results in ARC lifeguard instructor certification

KIN 110 CPR and First Aid (Undergraduate)
This course provides certification in CPR for the Healthcare Provider, Oxygen Administration and First Aid Responding to Emergencies. Can include wilderness first aid,

KIN 104D beginning Lifeguarding (Undergraduate)
This course provides certification in Lifeguarding, CPR for the Healthcare Provider, Oxygen Administration and First Aid Responding to Emergencies. Can include Waterpark Lifeguard or Water Front Lifeguard

References
Dr. Dennis Caine
Professor Emeritus for Physical Education
Exercise Science and Wellness Department
Dennis.caine@und.edu
701-330-0905

Daniella Irl
Senior Associate Athletic Director
University of North Dakota Athletics
2751 2nd Ave North Stop 9013 Grand Forks ND, 58202
Daniella.irle@athletics.und.edu
701-777-4036

Dr. William Siders
Research Associate and Adjunct Professor
Human Nutrition Research Center
701-795-8430
wsiders@gra.midco.net
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Terry Brenner, Superintendent of Schools
FROM: Scott J. Berge, Business Manager
SUBJECT: Appointment of School Board Member
DATE: September 9, 2019

In accordance with North Dakota Century Code 15.1-09-05 and School Board Policy 8120, applications have been accepted to fill the vacancy that resulted from the resignation of Chris Douthit. One application was received from Jeff Manley. The application is attached. The process to fill a vacancy is guided by NDCC 15.1-09-05 and School Board Policy 8120. The appointee will fill the seat until the next regular election, which will take place on June 9, 2020.

The applicant was invited to attend the school board meeting. Per School Board Policy 8120, the applicant may make a statement to the school board, if they choose, and school board members may discuss application information with an applicant at the meeting.

Administrative recommendation is that because there is only one application, the School Board forgoes voting by ballot and proceeds with a roll call vote on the applicant. The applicant would be appointed if they receive a simple majority vote of the quorum.
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Policy 8120

STEPS in Filling a Board Vacancy

Step 1 - When a vacancy on the school board occurs, the Business Manager shall notify the county superintendent that a vacancy exists on the school board. The board will make public announcement of such vacancy and request that individuals interested in being considered for board service apply at the school board business office. The board will establish an application period, which will be no less than two and no more than six weeks, and will have clearly stated beginning and closing dates.

Step 2 - Interested individuals will complete an “application to be considered.” The completed applications will be supplied to each board member. Applicants will be invited to attend the school board meeting at which the appointment would be made.

Step 3 - At a school board meeting, the Business Manager will report all applicants by name. Applicants may make a statement to the school board if they choose. School board members may discuss application information with an applicant at the same school board meeting.

Step 4 - If there are more than two applicants, one or more votes will be used to reduce the field to two finalists. Each board member present must vote for two candidates in this initial process. When the field is limited to two, another vote will be taken with each board member having only one vote. When any applicant secures a simple majority vote of the quorum, the appointee will have been determined.

A. INITIAL PHASE: Limiting the Field to Two Finalists

1. Each board member present must vote for two candidates on the first ballot. The two candidates with the largest number of votes will be advanced to the final phase of voting.

2. If a tie occurs for one of the two finalists on the first ballot, succeeding ballots will be taken until two finalists have been selected. Succeeding ballots will have board members selecting from only the candidates involved in the tie on the previous ballot.

B. FINAL PHASE: Selecting the Appointee From Among the Final Two Candidates

1. Each board member present will vote for only one candidate from among the two finalists. When a candidate receives a simple majority vote of the quorum, the appointee will have been determined.

2. If neither of the two finalists receives a simple majority on the first ballot, the board will vote a second and a third ballot, if necessary. After the third ballot with no simple majority, the appointment must be decided by a drawing of names. A candidate involved in a tie vote may withdraw their name from consideration if the candidate is willing to sign a statement to that effect in the presence of the school board.

Adopted 7-8-75
Amended 1/97, 6-10-13, 11-23-15, 9-10-18
Legal Reference: NDCC 15.1-09-05, 15.1-09-16

Mission Statement:
Grand Forks Public Schools will provide an environment of educational excellence that engages all learners to develop their maximum potential for community and global success.
15.1-09-05. School board - Vacancies - Appointments.

1. The business manager of a school district shall notify the county superintendent that a vacancy exists on the school board.

2. The board of a school district shall fill by appointment or special election any vacant seat on the board. The term of an individual selected by appointment or special election to fill a vacancy extends until a successor is elected and qualified at the next annual election. If a school board fails to fill a vacancy by appointment or fails to call a special election to fill a vacancy within sixty days from the time the vacancy occurred, the county superintendent shall call a special election to fill the vacancy. The election must be conducted in the same manner as the annual school district election.

3. If a vacancy reduces the membership of a school board to less than a quorum, the state board of public school education shall appoint to the school board as many individuals as necessary to achieve a quorum. The school board then shall fill the remaining vacancies. After the vacancies have been filled, any individual appointed by the state board shall resign and the school board shall fill the vacancy in accordance with this section. After resigning, the individual who had been appointed by the state board may be reappointed by the school board to fill the vacancy.

4. A vacancy may be declared for any reason set forth in section 44-02-01.

5. The business manager shall certify any appointment made under this section to the county superintendent of schools.
APPLICATION FOR POSITION ON GRAND FORKS SCHOOL BOARD DUE TO VACANCY

(To be eligible, applicants must be a citizen of the United States, eighteen years or older, and have resided in the Grand Forks Public School District for at least (30) days immediately preceding any appointment.)

NAME _______________________________ Jeff Manley
ADDRESS ____________________________________________________________ 923 Cherry St Grand Forks, ND 58201
EMAIL ADDRESS ______________________________________________________ jmanley@gra.midco.net PHONE # ________________ 701-740-9645

Please attach references and any other documents (such as letters of recommendation) you feel might be relevant to your application to serve on the board. Please use a separate sheet if your answers are longer than the blanks allow.

1. Explain why you would like to serve on the Grand Forks School Board.
   I want to help K-12 achieve the best scores possible. I would like the Grand Forks School System to be a model system that other schools look up to and want to emulate.
   I want to help get the most for the publics dollar. The school system has very limited revenue coming in from the community and state. We have to spend that wisely and be transparent to the community so they can see that are spending wisely.

2. What personal attitudes and skills would you bring to the school board?
   I value everyones opinion. I listen and understand well. I lead by example.

3. What (if any) are your educational priorities for Grand Forks Public Schools’ students?
   We should make sure that students understand the importance of good grades and to strive to become the best they can be.

4. In your opinion, what is the role of a school board and its members?
   We have to provide direction for the administrators while allowing them freedom to perform their duties. We have to assist the community in understanding the importance of k-12 education.

5. How involved in the activities of the school board are you willing to be?
   I enjoy participating in school activities, so I am very willing to be as active as needed.
6. The role of a board member is vast, complex and requires time. Given the aforementioned, how might you budget your professional and personal life to attend school board meetings (2 times per month in most cases), attend school board committee meetings outside of regular school board meetings (Finance, Negotiations, Policy, Community/Neighborhood, school functions), and attend applicable state and, periodically, national conventions? Please be specific in your response.

I have a very flexible professional and personal life. My employer allows leave at almost any time as long as projects are completed on time. My son is a senior in high school which also allows greater amount of flexibility now that he is older. My wife is also very understanding of my desires to be a leader.

7. Do you have any special projects, programs, or emphasis you would like to address as a school board member? If yes, please explain.

I would like to make sure that the student have the tools they need to get the most from their K-12 education. From the basics of pencils and paper to the more specialized such as graphing calculators, science class materials, physical education products, etc.

8. List any education, work experience, government body (board) experience, or other experience, special skills, accomplishments, awards, community involvement, or volunteer work that you think would be relevant and valuable to the school board. Please use a separate sheet if your answers are longer than the blanks allow.

I am currently employed by Altru Health System as a Supervisor of both the Data Analytics team and the Integration Services team. I attend quarterly Altru Health Systems Leadership Development Institute. I was a member of the Lewis and Clark PTO as well as the Schroeder PTO while my son was a student at those schools.

9. Highest grade-level completed 

I hereby declare my intention to be an applicant for appointment as a member of the School Board of Grand Forks Public School District #1 to fill the seat of a mid-term vacancy until the next regular election, which will take place on June 9, 2020. I affirm that I am a citizen of the United States, eighteen years or older, and I have resided in the Grand Forks Public School District for at least (30) days immediately preceding any appointment. I certify that the information in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct.

Signature

9/3/2019
Date

Submit your application in person or mail to:

Scott J. Berge, Business Manager
Grand Forks Public Schools
Mark Sanford Education Center
PO Box 8000 (58206-8000)
2400 47th Avenue South (58201-3405)
Grand Forks, ND

At application must be received by 4:00 p.m. on September 9, 2019.

Please note: The applicant is invited to attend the September 9, 2019, school board meeting, at which the appointment is expected to be made. At the school board meeting, the applicant may make a statement to the school board if he/she chooses. School board members may discuss application information with the applicant at the same school board meeting.