

Coalition for Public Schools & Communities

FY17 LOCAL SCHOOL BUDGET ANALYSIS



Methodology and Criteria to Develop FY17 School Budget Tool: dcpsbudget.ourdcschools.org

Data source: Initial FY17 allocations by funding category (e.g. Enrollment, Special Education, At-risk) and detailed by position and/or item. Dated Feb. 16, 2016.

Budget allocations by school for FY16 and Total, special education, ELL, and early childhood budgeted enrollment by school for all dashboards that use FY16 data. Dated April 6, 2015

Comprehensive Staffing Models, Local School Budget Guides

http://www.dcpsdatacenter.com/budget_process.html#data

Total school budgets, FY 2017 and FY 2016: from above-cited spreadsheets with FY 2016 adjustment to include Council funding additions to Wilson HS (\$600,000 Per Pupil Funding Minimum) and Ballou HS (\$300,000 Specialty Funding).

Budget costs:

- Increase in cost of positions. Position costs, all of which are averages, include salary and fringe benefits for all positions, and for teachers, an average of some additional costs such as substitutes, IMPACT bonuses, and background checks. In addition to salary increases, costs can rise due to factors such as health insurance or increasing seniority of persons in specific position types. We matched positions from each year's spreadsheet, inserted the average cost per position for each year, to calculate the number of positions funded in each year, then multiplied the difference in cost per position by the number of FY 2016 positions. Categories of positions added in FY 2017 and those dropped after FY 2016 were not included since no cost increase would be incurred.
- Shifts from central to school budgets. After identifying the changes in cost of positions, we checked whether the remaining new and increased costs appeared in central accounts in the FY 2016 DCPS budget, available in detail at http://dccouncil.us/files/user_uploads/budget_responses/Q89Attachment_ApprovedRevisedBudget_Expend20152016.pdf or <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/s3o0tmubftxp2qc/AACPtQY9U0gJV8uXOysG5PEXa/D.C.%20Public%20Schools?dl=0> (scroll down to Q89). We also consulted the DCPS local school budget guides and information on specific programs on the DCPS website.
- Increase in enrollment-based resources. These are changes not attributable to the cost of positions, central account shifts, special programs and purposes at individual schools (e.g., afterschool programs, specialty schools, literacy initiative), or resources allocated per school building, e.g., principals, instructional coaches, Pathways, middle school clubs. Enrollment-

based resources are those allocated by enrollment under the DCPS Comprehensive Staffing Model (CSM), e.g., grade-level teachers, supplies and materials, counselors. CSM allocation criteria of this kind did not change from FY 2016 to FY 2017. Where money follows the students in this manner, increases or decreases are generated by enrollment change. For example, elementary and high school enrollments are projected to rise in FY 2017, and there are corresponding increases in the number of teachers for those grades. Projections show a small decline in the number of middle grades students, and there is a corresponding decrease in the number of teachers in those grades. An increase in school supplies corresponds to the overall projected enrollment increase. We checked this finding by calculating the increase in average per pupil funding at each school level (elementary, PreS-8, middle, high school) and multiplying by the increase (or decrease) in the number of students projected, and the result was close enough to confirm the finding.

- Programmatic increases and expanded services. These are increases for (1) special programs and purposes at individual schools identified as appropriate by the DCPS administration, such as afterschool programs, specialty schools, 5% cap on budget reductions etc., (2) expansions of CSM services, such as Pathways in the high schools, and (3) new schools (except for resources that closely follow students, increases that would occur without the opening of new schools). We identified these by comparison with FY 2016 budgets and by consulting the FY 2016 local school budget guide and appropriate sections of the DCPS website.
- Reductions. These are reductions in services and programs of the same kind as programmatic increases and expanded services as informed by the same sources.

Unfunded mandate: LEAP release time. Next year DCPS is expanding what was previously a pilot program for professional development and collaboration among teachers at each school. According to DCPS documents, core content teachers (those who teach math and/or ELA in elementary and middle schools, or who teach Math, ELA, Science, or Social Studies in high schools), as well as Special Education (SPED) and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers, will be part of content-specific teams at their schools. These teams will engage in a weekly cycle of lesson planning, content knowledge development, formative observations, and student work analysis – all tied to the DCPS curriculum. Teams are content-specific—math and English/language arts in grades 1-8, and the four core high school subjects.

Each team is to be led by an assistant principal, instructional coach, or Teacher Leader. Assistant principals are expected to devote 75% of their time to these responsibilities, instructional coaches 100%, while Teacher Leaders will spend at least 50% of their time teaching, with the rest spent on LEAP responsibilities. LEAP responsibilities include weekly observations and feedback to teachers, weekly team meetings, and support for teachers individually in planning, content development, and data analysis. Teachers per team: Assistant Principal-led, 5-7; instructional coach, 8-10, Teacher Leader with 50% release time, 3-4.

Except for pilot project schools, which received some FY 2017 funding for teacher leaders, the budget provides no funding to support additional staff to carry out some of the work that assistant principals were previously performing nor teachers to cover the classrooms of Teacher Leaders while they are out on release time performing LEAP functions.

To estimate the cost of the program to local schools, we simulated the team design process for FY 2016, using submitted budgets to ascertain the number of teachers required to be assigned to teams and the availability of assistant principals and instructional coaches to lead them. We then determined how many teachers remained in teams without leaders and calculated the number of teachers needed to cover release time. (The calculation is the number of teachers without team leaders divided by 10,

assuming that each team will consist of one leader and four other teachers with half-time coverage of the teacher leader’s classes. If 10 teachers need leaders, one teacher FTE is required for release time.) We multiplied the number of additional teachers needed by the average teacher cost, then subtracted the funding provided to the pilot project schools. We did not attempt to cost out coverage of assistant principals’ current activities. To check this estimate, we also projected the funding given the pilot schools to all schools, and the result was similar.

NOTES:

NAF Academies. In FY 2015 NAF Academies were opened at 7 schools (8 academies, since McKinley has two), and were funded from central accounts with a grant from OSSE, plus about \$300,000 from other sources. OSSE documents submitted to the Council say that OSSE’s funding source was local, i.e., not a federal grant, and that the purpose of the grant was “seed money” for the Academies. In FY 2016 accounts for the 7 schools were moved onto the local school budgets, except for the NPS, which remained funded from a central account. Ballou was given a new Academy, funded from the central account. The OSSE grant, reduced from FY 2015, covered about 40% of the total cost at the schools.

In FY 2017 all costs appear in the local school budgets, with the costs of Ballou and all NPS moved from central accounts, plus the two new academies at Woodson.

| | No. academies | Central | LSB | Total | OSSE contribution | Director cost/acad | Coordinator cost/acad | NPS cost/acad |
|---------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| FY 2015 | 8 | \$1,988,619 | \$0 | \$1,988,619 | \$1,667,965 | | | |
| FY 2016 | 9 | \$966,487 | \$1,308,619 | \$2,275,106 | \$905,000 | \$101,790 | \$99,697 | \$85,000 |
| FY 2017 | 11 | | \$2,965,735 | \$2,965,735 | ? | \$125,846 | \$99,697 | \$85,000 |

Factors moving from FY 2016 to FY 2017:

- Shift from central to LSB accounts
- Increase in Director cost
- Addition of two academies at Woodson HS.

New schools. In fall 2016 DCPS will open two new schools, Macfarland Middle School, opening with 6th grade only and Empowering Males single sex high school, opening with 9th grade only. Each will serve one grade only in this first year, but will still need staff that would serve more students at schools with full grade complements, such as librarians, counselors, or school psychologists ordinarily assigned by enrollment cut-offs of several hundred students. We therefore count the cost of these, as well as functions always assigned by building, such as principals, custodial staff, attendance counselor, as new program costs. We did not include the costs of allocation that closely follow students, such as grade-level teachers and school supplies, since these would be incurred no matter what school the students attend.