

WSS/ School Allocations Workgroup 2019-20 School Year

April 27, 2018 – 11:00 AM

Attendees: JoLynn Berge, Linda Sebring, Sara Bonneville, Michael Tolley, Pam Faulker, Eric Anderson, Anna Cruz, Erika Ayer, Jeff Clark, Paula Montgomery, Debbie Nelsen, Pat Sander.

Agenda:

1. FRL enrollment by race/ethnicity over time – Eric Anderson
2. Budget staffing for Title I and LAP at estimated actual cost – Pam, Faulkner
3. CTE allocations
4. Equity & discretionary funding (per-pupil) by grade level

1. Eric Anderson & Anna Cruz

- Analysis of change in number of FRL qualifying students
- Is there a more profound drop due to immigrant issues.
- Net change in total FRL percentage: 39% in 2013-14, 30% in 2017-18 for all students
- Slightly steeper change for Hispanic students only: 64.9% to 52.8% decline.
- How does this compare to overall enrollment of these groups
 - o Will have to look at that data
- Page 2 – data on students that show up in 2 consecutive years
 - o FRL in one year and not in the next – about 120 student drop.
- What is data set ... power school flag? ... will have to confirm
- What about looking at same students as they transition from grade bands? There is belief that kids tend to drop out of FRL program as they transition to MS and HS grades
- Noted there was a change in how info communicated to parents for enrolling in FRL; the on-line process may have some impact on lower FRL enrollment.
- Direct certified ... some kids automatically enrolled
- Issue is with paper qualifiers
- Is there time to get more data before next meeting on May 22?

2. Budget Title I and LAP staff at actual cost

- Title I and LAP often staff Interventionists, who tend to be more costly
- When reconciled at end of year, this can throw the rank-order allocations of dollars per school out of compliance with poverty ranking.
 - o This can be an audit issue.
- What does it mean, to budget at Actual \$?
- Background
 - o Why we (the district) went to Average Salary for budget?
 - o Why is the state looking more closely at actual expenditures for compliance?
- Discussion: view this as good news, will give high poverty schools more “buying power”
 - o Some schools will lose “buying power” if actual staff cost is greater than average salary.

- What if move cut-point for Title I funding up to 50%? More \$ to fewer schools, with LAP \$ to fill in at schools no longer receiving Title I.
- Issue that LAP funding is less flexible.
- Additional discussion (for 2019-20):
 - Senior staff more costly to the district, although new state funding is not based on experience and does not compensate district for having staff with greater experience. Will this affect future hiring decisions?
 - Levy used to back-fill for hiring of more experienced staff? Tight times
- Suggestions and Comments
 - Do not allow switching (changing people to different positions in order to “find savings” between average and actual salary staff) after positions are staffed
 - Per the large district roundtable, everyone else is budgeting at actual costs.
 - Is there a choice? ... not if we want to be in compliance
 - Align with Levy grant from City?
 - Explore cost of moving Title I cut-point ... how much to make up the difference with LAP?
 - Mid-range group, 30-50% poverty – still has difficult time managing with lesser support
 - Support for this idea expressed
 - Need data ... which schools would gain/lose \$
 - Keep looking – come back in May with more info.
 -
- **(New Topic) – Why do schools come in and drop out of Title I funding?**
 - Why do FRL % changes affect Title I and LAP funding so much
 - E.G., Mercer MS did not get Title I funding for 2018-19 because they dropped to 58.5% from 62.8% in the prior year.
 - What can be done to stabilize?
 - Title / LAP review of FRL levels by school

3. CTE Allocations

- Asst Supt for Finance/Budget (JoLynn) proposing a WSS subcommittee be formed to explore breaking-out funding for CTE students/programs from the total basic ed funding in the WSS now.
 - To better align budgets with funding source
- Currently, all student AAFTE is combined together and allocations are made without distinguishing between Regular Ed and CTE.
 - Not aligned to district funding for CTE.
- Need secondary principals to participate
- Opportunity for gap-closing, for being intentional.
- Proposing a phase 1 and Phase 2 ... Funding / Program
- Discussions
 - “Red Alert” situation ... fantastic opportunity to align with core mission
 - We don’t know what we are doing and why (re: CTE)
 - Support for establishing a committee to come back with some analysis and recommendations by the time 19-20 rolls out (October/November?)
 - Career connected learning is probably going to be a board priority.

4. Per-Pupil Allocations

- Review of materials provided, comparison of per-pupil (per-pupil based on total enrollment projection, not Equity Dollars)
 - o Specifically elementary grades ... is it too low?
- Looking at comparison data with other districts, we (SPS) are 4th highest out of 16 largest districts for Elementary funding
 - o (ed. note: speaker said “4th highest”, but materials show that we are 5th highest in Elem per-pupil allocations of the 16 districts compared).
 - o Have to look at the details as to what each district expects schools to pay from that funding source.
- Small Elementary schools that are not high poverty can be put in a bind with very little discretionary funding from the per-pupil allocations.
- Discussions:
 - o Stipends; technology costs for doc camera supplies, etc.; S-back testing, mouses and headphones; S-back test coordinator stipend costs – who should pay?
- Equity lens – look at individual school costs
 - o Communication costs vary from building to building; more languages, more translations ...
- What about a “floor” (minimum funding level)?
 - o Would need to look at school-by-school; not all schools need the same floor.
- More work to do:
 - o Floor for elementaries
 - o Lift for elementary, to get within top 5
 - (ed. note: speakers said “to get within top 5”, however the materials show that we are already the 5th highest per pupil allocation to elementary schools).
 - o What is the equity lens in this?
 - There is a base allocation to everyone & the equity component is provided by other funding calculation (e.g. Equity Dollars).
 - o How do other districts handle communication piece? Who pays for IEP translations?

Next Steps:

- Follow-up from Anna & Eric
- Follow-up from Pam on Title I and LAP
- CTE work

Adjourn: 12:30 PM

Next meeting:

- ~~May 22 ... May 30, 2 PM~~ ... June 25, 2:00 PM