

# Quality Education Council

---

Initial Report to the Legislature



January 2010



## Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i> .....	1
<i>Introduction</i> .....	4
<i>Recommendation #1: Overall K-12 Funding</i> .....	5
<i>Recommendation #2: Transfer to the New Funding System</i> .....	5
<i>Recommendation #3: Compensation, Local Levy, and Funding Formula Working Groups</i> .....	6
<i>Recommendation #4: Student Transportation</i> .....	6
<i>Recommendation #5: Maintenance, Supplies, and Operating Costs</i> .....	8
<i>Recommendation #6: New Teacher Support</i> .....	9
<i>Recommendation #7: Early Learning</i> .....	10
<i>Recommendation #8: Full Day Kindergarten</i> .....	10
<i>Recommendation #9: K-3 Class Size Reductions</i> .....	11
<i>Recommendation #10: Education Data Improvement System</i> .....	12
<i>Recommendation #11: Struggling Schools Oversight Fund</i> .....	13
<i>Recommendation #12: Technical Corrections to ESHB 2261</i> .....	13
<i>Recommendation #13: QEC 2010 Work Plan</i> .....	13
<i>Other Relevant information: Phase-in</i> .....	14
<i>Attachment A -- Baseline</i> .....	17
<i>Attachment B -- 2018 Values</i> .....	21
<i>Attachment C -- Cost Summary</i> .....	25



# Quality Education Council Draft Report

## Executive Summary

The QEC makes the following recommendations to the 2010 Legislature:

1. The 2010 Legislature is urged not to reduce the overall K-12 funding level in the 2010 Supplemental Operating Budget, including both basic and not-basic education allocations.

The Legislature should allocate at least 50% of any new state revenue to the implementation of the basic education program as established in ESHB 2261.

2. The 2010 Legislature should enact a law replacing current funding formulas with the new prototypical school funding formulas and the Baseline values designed by the Funding Formula Technical Working Group (FFTWG). The new formulas should be implemented effective September 1, 2011; the Baseline values should reflect the 2009-10 operating budget level (adjusted for typical inflationary measures). To the extent that districts need training for staff or system changes to implement the new prototypical funding model, the 2010 Legislature shall provide the necessary funding to assist with transfer to the new system.

3. The 2010 Legislature should:

- Amend RCW Chapter 43.41.398 to start the work of the Compensation Working Group immediately, with a report due November 30, 2010 and change the lead staff agency to OSPI.
- Start the work of the Local Finance Working Group (Laws of 2009, Chapter 548, Section 601, sub-section 2) immediately, with a report due November 30, 2010.
- Continue the Funding Formula Working Group (Laws of 2009, Chapter 548, Section 112, sub-section 2) to monitor early implementation of the prototypical school formula and provide technical advice to the QEC and OSPI.

In addition to its current tasks, the Local Finance Working Group should (1) examine local capacity to address facility needs associated with full-day kindergarten and K-3 class size recommendations, and (2) provide the QEC with an analysis on the productive use of local funds that become available due to the phase-in of state funding for pupil transportation and maintenance, supplies and operating costs (MSOC) funding. The 2010 Legislature should also adequately fund the study and analysis costs for the working groups and the QEC so that work can be completed in time for consideration by the 2011 Legislature.

4. The 2010 Legislature should amend RCW Chapter 28A.160 to implement the new Pupil Transportation funding formula starting in September 1, 2011, not 2013. In addition the Legislature should phase-in full funding of the new pupil transportation funding formula over a 3-year period beginning in 2011 and adopt this schedule in statute.
5. The 2010 Legislature should increase the Maintenance, Supplies, and Operating Costs (MSOC) factors in the prototypical school funding formula based on data collected by OSPI about costs incurred by school districts, phased in over a 3-year period beginning in the 2011-12 school year. MSOC values should be adopted in statute. The 2010 Legislature should adopt intent to keep allocations current based on inflation indices that are aligned with the items districts must purchase with MSOC resources and should adopt intent to update allocation for improvements in textbooks and curriculum and technology to represent the cost of textbooks aligned with state standards, emphasis on science improvements, and keeping use of technology in schools current with job-market skills.

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

- 49 6. The QEC and the Legislature should closely monitor the outcomes of the new Beginning Educator Support  
50 Team (BEST) program. The QEC will evaluate the effectiveness of the BEST pilot program following the  
51 submission of the November 1, 2010 program status report. If the program proves effective, sufficient  
52 funds should be phased-in beginning in school year 2011-12 to cover all first year teachers.  
53
- 54 7. The Legislature should include a Program of Early Learning for at-risk children aged 3 and 4 as part of the  
55 definition of Basic Education. In implementation of this recommendation, the Legislature should consider  
56 the recent related opinion of the State Attorney General, AGO 2009 No.8.  
57
- 58 8. The Legislature should continue incremental phase-in of full-day kindergarten according to the statutory  
59 schedule (high poverty schools first).  
60
- 61 9. The Legislature should prioritize class size reductions in the primary grades by providing a K-3 class size  
62 allocation of 15 students per classroom teacher in the prototypical school funding formula. The phase-in  
63 of class size reduction should begin in the 2011-12 school year and be targeted to high poverty schools  
64 first. Further, as future Legislatures phase in the recommendations for Early Learning, Full-day  
65 Kindergarten, and K-3 Class Size Reduction, the phase in should be designed to create a continuum of  
66 primary education age 3-third grade. The Department of Early Learning and Office of Superintendent of  
67 Public Instruction should create performance expectations for these early intervention resources and  
68 identify the data that will be used to monitor performance.  
69
- 70 10. The 2010 Legislature should continue implementation of Part II of ESHB 2261 (Education Data  
71 Improvement System) to assure availability of robust and high quality data. The QEC will monitor progress  
72 of the K-12 Data Governance Group during 2010 so that the final report fully addresses the data needed  
73 for financial and program accountability. The QEC will also supplement the Group's recommendation as  
74 needed. Finally, the QEC will develop and recommend a process for how to adequately fund and use  
75 research-based, empirical data analysis to analyze and drive evidence-based practices through the  
76 Education Research and Data Center (ERDC) and Data Governance Group.  
77
- 78 11. The 2010 Legislature, in adopting the new prototype school funding formulas should include a new  
79 component not contemplated in ESBH 2261 or by the FFTWG. The formulas should include a "Struggling  
80 Schools Oversight Fund" or "SOS Fund" to provide funding for school districts designated as requiring  
81 action by the State Board of Education to support transformation efforts in persistently low performing  
82 schools.  
83
- 84 12. The Legislature should consider correcting several technical issues of ESHB 2261:  
85
- 86 • Correct statutory references to Certificated Instructional Staff.
  - 87 • Correct effective dates for Pupil Transportation sections of the statute that are not sequenced  
88 with QEC recommendations to transfer to the new formula in 2011 instead of 2013.
  - 89 • Correct references to the funding base that drives Special Education funding so that there is no  
90 change in Special Education funding (increase or decrease).  
91
- 92 13. The QEC Work Plan for 2010 should focus on the following topics and result in recommendations to the  
93 2011 Legislature:
- 94 • The 2018 Staffing and Funding values for class size, school staff, district-wide support, Career and  
95 Technical Education (CTE), and MSOC in the prototypical school funding model.
  - 96 • Program delivery reforms and alternative funding methods for Learning Assistance Program  
97 (LAP)/Bilingual Programs.

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- Increased instructional hours as required under ESHB 2261.
  - Opportunity for 24 credits for graduation based on State Board of Education recommendations.
  - Research-based professional development.
  - Possible innovations to support student/school health.
  - Examination of the compensation system and transferring local collective bargaining to the state.\*  
(For discussion in January)
  - Review local levy authority and uses.
  - Consider and take advantage of work being done on the state's Race to the Top application.
  - Ongoing analysis of costs, expected results, supplanting policy, capacity, and a revenue or funding plan associated with the QEC recommendations.

109 In addition to the preceding recommendations, the QEC submits background information on the phase-in  
110 recommendations provided by the Funding Formula Technical Working Group, the Achievement Gap  
111 Oversight and Accountability Committee, and from National Board Certified Teachers from their 2009  
112 NBCT Policy Symposium. A cost summary is also provided.

113

114

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

## 115 *Introduction*

116

117 Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261 was passed by the 2009 Legislature as the next step of an education  
118 reform effort, following on the heels of the Basic Education Finance Task Force and Washington Learns before  
119 it. ESHB 2261 redefines the state's "Program of Basic Education" and requires the definition to be fully  
120 implemented by 2018. The legislation also implements a new finance structure based on prototype schools  
121 with the goal of increasing transparency. The bill also increases instructional hours, provides the opportunity  
122 for enhanced high school diploma requirements, adds full-day kindergarten and gifted education to the state's  
123 definition of basic education, and requires a new transportation funding formula.

124

125 In order to effectively implement and accomplish the goals of the legislation, several different working groups  
126 were created and existing entities tapped in order to provide both policy and technical recommendations to  
127 make the goals and intent of the bill become a reality. The legislation created the Funding Formula Technical  
128 Working Group, the Data Governance and K-12 Financial Data group, the Levies and Local Funds Work Group,  
129 and the Compensation Work Group to develop and help implement details of the bill. These four groups are  
130 temporary working groups which report to both the Legislature and the Quality Education Council (QEC), an  
131 education reform implementation and oversight body created by ESHB 2261. An Early Learning Advisory  
132 Council was created at the request of the Governor to develop a program of early learning for all children birth  
133 to five. Additionally, the State Board of Education was directed to continue their role in designing an  
134 accountability framework and the Professional Educator Standards Board was tapped to develop and adopt  
135 teacher performance standards.

136

137 The bill states that the purpose of the QEC is "to recommend and inform the ongoing implementation by the  
138 Legislature of an evolving program of basic education and the financing necessary to support such program."  
139 Statewide strategic recommendations are to be updated by the Council every four years, with the intent of  
140 informing the Legislature and Governor's educational policy and funding decisions, identifying measurable  
141 goals and priorities for the state's educational system for a ten-year period, and enabling the state to continue  
142 to implement an evolving "Program of Basic Education."

143

144 ESHB 2261 requires the QEC to report to the Legislature and Governor January 2010; the report is to include:

145

- 146 • Recommendations for resolving technical corrections to ESHB 2261 requiring legislative action during  
the 2010 session.
- 147 • Consideration of how to establish a statewide beginning teacher mentoring and support system.
- 148 • Recommendations for a program of early learning for at-risk children.
- 149 • A recommended schedule for the concurrent phase-in of changes to the instructional program of basic  
150 education and the funding formula and allocations to support the new instructional program of basic  
151 education established under this the act.
- 152 • A recommended schedule for implementing a new pupil transportation formula no later than  
153 September 1, 2013.

154

155 In response to ESHB 2261 requirements, the QEC makes the following 13 recommendations.

156

157

158

159

160

161

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

## **Recommendation #1: Overall K-12 Funding**

162  
163  
164 The 2010 Legislature is urged not to reduce the overall K-12 funding level in the 2010 Supplemental Operating  
165 Budget, including both basic and not-basic education allocations.

166  
167 The Legislature should allocate at least 50% of any new state revenue to the implementation of the basic  
168 education program as established in ESHB 2261.

## **Recommendation #2: Transfer to the New Funding System**

169  
170  
171 The 2010 Legislature should enact a law replacing current funding formulas with the new prototypical school  
172 funding formulas and the Baseline values designed by the Funding Formula Technical Working Group  
173 (FFTWG). The new formulas should be implemented effective September 1, 2011; the Baseline values should  
174 reflect the 2009-10 operating budget level (adjusted for typical inflationary measures).

175  
176 To the extent that districts need training for staff or system changes to implement the new prototypical  
177 funding model, the 2010 Legislature shall provide the necessary funding to assist with transfer to the new  
178 system.

179  
180 Attachment A includes the Baseline funding values that represent translation of current levels of funding to  
181 the new prototype values. The Baseline represents funding at the level required by the Basic Education Act,  
182 the enhanced funding level of today (operating budget), and I-728 funding levels of 2009-10.

### Problems these Recommendations Address

183  
184  
185 Funding formulas in effect for nearly 30 years are very simple yet they are not understandable to the public or  
186 even many school employees. Three staffing categories and a single dollar value for non-employee operating  
187 costs drive billions of dollars in funding per year but do not provide information on what the state funds for  
188 major elements of the school funding system: class size for example, or school staff for custodial services or  
189 health services, or the amount of state funding for textbooks or utilities.

190  
191 The new prototype school funding formulas will provide parents, school employees, the public and future  
192 Legislators with an easily understood set of formula elements for a theoretical school. Once implemented the  
193 new model will allow for school-level and district-level summaries that are more transparent because they  
194 utilize more commonly understood school elements and staffing categories.

### Phase-in and Specifics of the Recommendations

195  
196  
197 The FFTWG specifically addressed the timing for adoption of the Baseline and new formulas. The FFTWG  
198 concluded that the formulas should be restructured and that the new formulas can be successfully  
199 implemented within the timelines of ESBH 2261. However, the FFTWG reiterated that the timelines are close,  
200 and require immediate action in order for the formulas to be implemented September 1, 2011.

201  
202 The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has prepared a timeline for the work that must take  
203 place in order to implement the new formulas in 2011. The timeline identifies that if the 2010 Legislature  
204 does not enact the new formulas, then the earliest the new formulas could be in place would be September 1,  
205 2012. Therefore, the 2010 Legislature must either delay implementation by amending ESHB 2261 or adopt  
206 the new formulas; the 2010 Legislature must take action.

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

## 208 Cost Estimates for Recommendation

209 In order for OSPI to implement the new formulas September 2011, the office must a) re-program all of the  
210 databases that calculate the monthly funding allocation by district by formula, b) re-program all of the reports  
211 that the office posts to the web to identify how the funding allocation was generated for each formula. This  
212 reprogramming must take place in FY 2011 and is estimated to cost \$2.5 million. OSPI is pursuing a formal bid  
213 for this reprogramming; the bids are expected in spring 2010.

214 <http://www.k12.wa.us/QEC/pubdocs/FundingStructureTimeline.pdf>.

215

216 OSPI is also working to identify the cost to school districts of implementing the new prototype. Thus far, the  
217 prototype does not appear to require systemic changes to district expenditure reporting that would drive cost.  
218 The prototype categories are consistent with budget and expenditure categories that currently exist within  
219 the OSPI reporting requirements. The few new categories can be added within the existing structure.

220

## 221 Next Steps for the QEC

- 222 • Continue to monitor the specifics of adoption of the new funding formulas, including cost and timeline
- 223 for OSPI and school districts.
- 224 • Recommend legislation to implement the QEC report.
- 225 • Monitor alignment between the new funding system and efforts to improve accountability, improve
- 226 student achievement, close the achievement gap, and Race to the Top requirements.

227

## 228 ***Recommendation #3: Compensation, Local Levy, and Funding***

### 229 ***Formula Working Groups***

230

231 The 2010 Legislature should:

- 232 • Amend RCW Chapter 43.41.398 to start the work of the Compensation Working Group immediately,
- 233 with a report due November 30, 2010 and change the lead staff agency to OSPI.
- 234 • Start the work of the Local Finance Working Group (Laws of 2009, Chapter 548, Section 601 (2))
- 235 immediately, with a report due November 30, 2010.
- 236 • Continue the Funding Formula Working Group (Laws of 2009, Chapter 548, Section 112 (2)) to monitor
- 237 early implementation of the prototypical school formula and provide technical advice to the QEC and
- 238 OSPI.

239

240 In addition to its current tasks, the Local Finance Working Group should (1) examine local capacity to address  
241 facility needs associated with full-day kindergarten and K-3 class size recommendations, and (2) provide the  
242 QEC with an analysis on the productive use of local funds that become available due to the phase-in of state  
243 funding for pupil transportation and maintenance, supplies and operating costs (MSOC) funding.

244

245 The 2010 Legislature should also adequately fund the study and analysis costs for the working groups and the  
246 QEC so that work can be completed in time for consideration by the 2011 Legislature.

## 247 ***Recommendation #4: Student Transportation***

248

249 The 2010 Legislature should amend RCW Chapter 28A.160 to implement the new Pupil Transportation funding  
250 formula starting in September1, 2011, not 2013.

251

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

252 In addition the Legislature should phase-in full funding of the new pupil transportation funding formula over a  
253 3-year period beginning in 2011 and adopt this schedule in statute.

254

## 255 Problems this Recommendation Addresses

256 The current funding formula is based on simple radial mileages, not taking into account real driving miles (e.g.,  
257 mountains, detours or windy roads). The formula does not provide funding based on actual mileage, leaving  
258 schools required to transport students but unable to be compensated for the real cost. Rural districts are  
259 especially impacted. The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC), in their 2006 study, confirmed  
260 that the state was significantly underfunding pupil transportation. In the 2008-09 FY district were  
261 underfunded by \$115 million. In the 2009-10 school year, underfunding is projected to be \$130 million.

262

263 The Office of Financial Management (OFM), with the help of consultants, developed a new pupil  
264 transportation funding model which was then adopted in ESHB 2261.

265

266 To support the implementation of the new funding formula adopted in ESHB 2261, OSPI needs to build a  
267 Geographic Information System (GIS) that allows districts to input data on bus routes and stops; input, review  
268 and approve student counts; calculate and apportion funds back to districts; and provide reports and auditing  
269 capabilities.

270

271 OSPI has identified that the new system can be built in one year; with an appropriation beginning July 1 of any  
272 fiscal year, OSPI can implement the new formula the following September 1. Therefore, with an appropriation  
273 in FY 2011 OSPI can deploy the new system September 1, 2011.

274

275 The FFTWG and the QEC found no technical reason why funding for pupil transportation should be delayed  
276 until September 1, 2013 as intended in ESHB 2261. Pupil Transportation is a Basic Education program and  
277 opting to partially fund the program when the system is ready to move to a new formula is not appropriate  
278 state policy.

279

## 280 Phase-in and Specifics of the Recommendations

281 The next step is to build the GIS data collection and reporting system to support the new funding model.

282

283 The GIS system will be a web-based online system for districts to submit school bus operation data for review  
284 and analysis by OSPI. Secondly, the system will manage the calculation and disbursement of school bus funds  
285 back to school districts based on the new formula presented by OFM and selected by the Governor. Finally,  
286 this package will fund the conversion of existing data to the new SQL environment for research and audit  
287 purposes.

288

289 Once, the new system is in place, the Legislature can begin phasing-in additional funding for student  
290 transportation beginning in the 2011-12 SY and ramping up to full funding for the 2013-14 SY.

291

## 292 Cost Estimates for Recommendations

293

- The cost of this new GIS system is \$806,000 for the 2011 FY.
- The cost to fully fund pupil transportation is estimated at \$150 million for the 2011-12 SY.
- The cost for phase-in in FY 2012 is about \$40.1 million.
- For a cost summary, see Attachment C – Cost Summary.

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

## Next Steps for the QEC

- Monitor development of the OSPI reporting, calculation, and data system.
- Monitor phase-in of the new formula funding.

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

## **Recommendation #5: Maintenance, Supplies, and Operating Costs**

The 2010 Legislature should increase the Maintenance, Supplies, and Operating Costs (MSOC) factors in the prototypical school funding formula based on data collected by OSPI about costs incurred by school districts, phased in over a 3-year period beginning in the 2011-12 school year. MSOC values should be adopted in statute.

The 2010 Legislature should adopt intent to keep allocations current based on inflation indices that are aligned with the items districts must purchase with MSOC resources and should adopt intent to update allocation for improvements in textbooks and curriculum and technology to represent the cost of textbooks aligned with state standards, emphasis on science improvements, and keeping use of technology in schools current with job-market skills.

### Problems this Recommendation Addresses

The state currently allocates \$511.60 per student for Non-employee Related Costs (NERC). These funds are the primary state funding source for operating costs such as utilities, insurance, technology and textbooks. This amount only covers 47% of basic education expenditures on NERC (\$1,083 per student).

For 46 districts serving 17,000 students, their entire NERC allocation must be dedicated to paying utilities and insurance. These districts have no remaining state resources for the most basic of costs associated with a school system: textbooks, paper/pencils, instructional technology, restroom supplies, and facilities maintenance. If utility costs continue to rise, more districts will find themselves spending their entire NERC allocation on keeping the lights on and the building warm.

Of the \$1,083 expended per pupil, districts spend an average of \$122 on textbooks and curriculum consumables (e.g., workbooks; not supplies). In contrast, the state provides \$57.70 per pupil for all instructional materials. Therefore, the state funds a curriculum replacement cycle of 18 years. OSPI data from 2008 identifies that only about 5 percent of elementary students are using math curriculum on the state's recommended menu.

In addition, when the NERC formula was implemented over 20 years ago, technology was not a funding consideration. Districts in our state must augment NERC funding with local technology bonds and levies in order to provide students access to computers. If they are unable to find local dollars, students must go without critical instructional technology.

Finally, school districts are obligated by law to ensure that all school buildings are properly heated, lighted, ventilated and maintained in a sanitary condition. Proper facilities maintenance requires both routine and preventative action. However, the state only allocates \$72.35 per student for facilities maintenance supplies; districts spend \$161 per student.

### Phase-in and Specifics of the Recommendations

The Funding Formula Technical Working Group (FFTWG) recommends the early implementation of MSOC. The FFTWG argues that early investment in MSOC will provide fiscal relief for districts and allow local funds to be reinvested in priority areas. In addition, the FFTWG recommended that additional studies be conducted to determine the true cost of MSOC. For example, more research needs to be conducted to determine the adequate allocation for facilities maintenance.

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

347 In line with the FFTWG, the QEC recommends a three-year phase in of MSOC beginning in 2011. This  
348 recommendation balances the need to address evidence of underfunding with the need for future analysis of  
349 district expenditures and consideration of possible efficiencies and best practices.

350

## 351 Cost Estimates for Recommendations

352 The total cost to implement MSOC in the 2011-12 school year is \$619.7 million. To phase-in the allocation  
353 over three years translates into a \$165.3 million cost for the 2012 FY.

354

355 For a cost summary, see Attachment C – Cost Summary.

356

## 357 Next Steps for the QEC

- 358 • Request studies that evaluate the true cost of MSOC and appropriate inflationary rates for each of the
- 359 budget elements.
- 360 • Develop legislative intent to develop a curriculum allocation that reflects the cost of purchasing
- 361 materials aligned with state standards. There should be a particular emphasis on science materials
- 362 aligned with the state science curriculum menu.
- 363 • Develop legislative intent to align technology tools and instruction needs with current job-market
- 364 skills.

365

## ***Recommendation #6: New Teacher Support***

366

367 The QEC and the Legislature should closely monitor the outcomes of the new Beginning Educator Support  
368 Team (BEST) program. The QEC will evaluate the effectiveness of the BEST pilot program following the  
369 submission of the November 1, 2010 program status report. If the program proves effective, sufficient funds  
370 should be phased-in beginning in school year 2011-12 to cover all first year teachers.

371

## 372 Problems these Recommendations Address

373 Current, funds appropriated for the State's program of new teacher mentoring and induction (BEST) are only  
374 sufficient to fund programs in 16 districts; serving only 207 of the more than 1,300 first year teachers in the  
375 state.

376

377 Research suggests that teachers who do not have access to mentoring and induction are twice as likely to  
378 leave the profession within the first three years of teaching. Teachers who participate in induction and  
379 mentoring programs are more likely to stay in the profession.

380

381 Research also suggests that high quality induction programs greatly enhance teaching practice during the  
382 initial years of a teacher's career. Teachers are better equipped to address classroom management  
383 challenges, which then allows them to focus on instruction. Further, many new teachers work in high needs  
384 schools where students struggle at higher than average rates and these students stand to benefit the most  
385 from having highly qualified and well-trained teachers.

386

387 This recommendation will extend access to the BEST program, or an improved program design, to beginning  
388 educators across the state; helping to ensure that all first year teachers have the support they need to  
389 positively impact student achievement.

390

## 391 Phase-in and Specifics of the Recommendations

392 The QEC recommends that beginning in the 2011-12 school year the Legislature should allocate funding to  
393 include all first year teachers in the BEST program. Funding in subsequent years should be sufficient to  
394 support new teachers in their 2<sup>nd</sup> - 3<sup>rd</sup> years of teaching.

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

395  
396  
397  
398  
399

## Cost Estimates for Recommendation

For a cost summary, see Attachment C – Cost Summary.

400  
401

## ***Recommendation #7: Early Learning***

402 The Legislature should include a Program of Early Learning for at-risk children aged 3 and 4 as part of the  
403 definition of Basic Education. **In implementation of this recommendation, the Legislature should consider the**  
404 **recent related opinion of the State Attorney General, AGO 2009 No. 8.**

405

### Problems these Recommendations Address

406 Children from low-income backgrounds often come to school less prepared to learn than their more affluent  
407 peers. Children who enter school at a disadvantage struggle to keep up, let alone catch-up. The research is  
408 clear on the importance of early learning for school readiness. Furthermore, investing in early learning for at-  
409 risk children is a fundamental strategy to close the achievement gap. Investing in an effective early learning  
410 program should result in net cost savings to the school system through less time and effort spent on  
411 remediation, and improved outcomes for students.

412

413

414

### Phase-in and Specifics of the Recommendations

415 For the purposes of determining eligibility for the proposed program of early learning “At-risk” is defined as  
416 eligibility for the Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) program. Services provided to  
417 students shall remain the same as those provided by the current ECEAP program until there is agreement on  
418 an alternative proposal for services for this population of children. These services shall be implemented  
419 through a combined school and community-based delivery system, and shall be delivered by approved  
420 providers. In addition, the program shall be governed collaboratively by the Superintendent of Public  
421 Instruction and the Department of Early Learning.

422

423

424

The QEC recommends that the proposed program of early learning be phased-in over a 3-year period  
beginning in the 2011-12 school year to cover all eligible children who voluntarily choose to participate.

425

426

### Cost Estimates for Recommendation

427 Cost estimates represent the additional cost to expand access to services like those provide through ECEAP to  
428 all income eligible children in the state. The cost to fully fund a program of early learning in the 2011-12 school  
429 year beyond current ECEAP/Head Start is \$54.4 million. The cost of a phasing in funding beginning in 2012  
430 fiscal year is \$8.7 million. For a summary, please see Attachment C – Cost Summary.

431

432

433

## ***Recommendation #8: Full Day Kindergarten***

434

435

The Legislature should continue incremental phase-in of full-day kindergarten according to the statutory  
schedule (high poverty schools first).

436

437

### Problems this Recommendations Addresses

439 Current state funding provides for full-day kindergarten for 20% of students in the state. In order to sustain  
440 the gains made by investing in quality early learning programs, and best prepare students to be successful

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

441 kindergarten programs need to be enriched throughout the state. This is especially true for low-income  
442 children who begin kindergarten behind more often than their more affluent peers. These children need to  
443 engage in more than 450 hours of instruction per year if they are not only going to catch up, but also gain the  
444 skills they need to be successful in future grades.

445  
446 This recommendation will help to ensure that all children have access to quality early childhood education  
447 programs. In addition, the phase in structure will help to ensure that the students who need additional  
448 support most have access to it first.

## 449 Phase-in and Specifics of the Recommendations

450 In order to give districts time to address capital and staffing capacity, the QEC recommends that funding for  
451 full day kindergarten continue to be phased in, beginning with high poverty schools, and that full funding be  
452 phased in by 2018.

## 453 Cost Estimates for Recommendation

454  
455 The cost to cover to fully fund full-day kindergarten programs for all students in 2018 is estimated at \$181.5  
456 million dollars. The cost of the proposed phased in implementation of funding in the 2011-12 school year is  
457 \$20.7 million.

458  
459 For a cost summary, please see Attachment C – Cost Summary.

## 461 ***Recommendation #9: K-3 Class Size Reductions***

462  
463 The Legislature should prioritize class size reductions in the primary grades by providing a K-3 class size  
464 allocation of 15 students per classroom teacher in the prototypical school funding formula. The phase-in of  
465 class size reduction should begin in the 2011-12 school year and be targeted to high poverty schools first.

466  
467 Further, as future Legislatures phase in the recommendations for Early Learning, Full-day Kindergarten, and K-  
468 3 Class Size Reduction, the phase in should be designed to create a continuum of primary education age 3-  
469 third grade. The Department of Early Learning and Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction should create  
470 performance expectations for these early intervention resources and identify the data that will be used to  
471 monitor performance.

## 472 Problems these Recommendations Address

473 Currently, state Basic Education funding provides for a class size in grades K-3 of 25 students. However,  
474 research conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy and other scholars conclude that there  
475 are significant, positive student achievement gains associated with reducing class sizes in primary grades.  
476 Evidence also shows that these gains persist over time.

477  
478 Research also suggests that there are even greater gains to be made in terms of closing the achievement gap  
479 and increasing graduation rates for low-income students by investing in K-3 class size reductions.  
480 Washington's low income students consistently score lower on state assessments and drop out of high school  
481 at higher rates than their more affluent peers. Investing in smaller classes for these students will help to  
482 ensure that they receive the one-on-one attention they need to excel.

## 483 Phase-in and Specifics of the Recommendations

484  
485 The QEC's recommended phase in of funding for K-3 class size reduction recognizes that districts need time to  
486 address capital needs and adapt instruction in primary grades to prevent erosion of the positive impact of full-  
487 day K and 3 and 4 year olds interventions. To that end the QEC proposes a phase in schedule that will allow  
488

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

489 districts to put the proper systems in place needed to ensure the most efficient and productive use of new  
490 resources.

491  
492 The QEC recommends that the Legislature provide funding to phase in class size reductions in grades K-3 over  
493 a 5-year period beginning in the 2011-12 school year, starting with the highest poverty schools.

494

## 495 Cost Estimates for Recommendation

496 The total cost of fully implementing class sizes reductions in all K-3 classes to a ratio of 15 students to one  
497 teacher is estimated at \$645.5 million. The cost of implementing phase one reductions in fiscal year 2012  
498 (2011-12 school year) is estimated at \$103.3 million.

499

500 These cost estimates represent the funding needed to hire additional certified teaching staff to cover the  
501 increase in the number of classes resulting from the average class size reduction. These estimates do not  
502 address the capital cost associated with any new construction that may be required to meet the demand for  
503 classrooms.

504

505 For a cost summary, please see Attachment C – Cost Summary.

506

## 507 Next Steps for the QEC

- 508 • Monitor the specific phase-in plan for K-3 class size reductions over the next 5 years.
- 509 • Monitor the Local Finance Working Group and OSPI efforts to assess the local capacity to address  
510 facility needs associated with K-3 class size recommendations.

## 511 ***Recommendation #10: Education Data Improvement System***

512

513 The 2010 Legislature should continue implementation of Part II of ESHB 2261 (Education Data Improvement  
514 System) to assure availability of robust and high quality data.

515

516 The QEC will monitor progress of the K-12 Data Governance Group during 2010 so that the final report fully  
517 addresses the data needed for financial and program accountability. The QEC will also supplement the  
518 Group's recommendation as needed.

519

520 Finally, the QEC will develop and recommend a process for how to adequately fund and use research-based,  
521 empirical data analysis to analyze and drive evidence-based practices through the Education Research and  
522 Data Center (ERDC) and Data Governance Group.

523

## 524 Problems these Recommendations Address

525 True accountability requires the ability to monitor what is working and what is not working in terms of the  
526 state's investment in improving student achievement. This requires the capacity to collect, analyze and use  
527 data to make decisions. The K-12 Data Governance Group interim report (November 2009) indicates that  
528 many desired elements of the comprehensive education data system, outlined in ESHB 2261, are currently  
529 being collected this year for the first time through Comprehensive Education Data and Research System  
530 (CEDARS). However, more work is needed on the gap analysis and plan for full implementation of the system.

531

532 These recommendations are made to reinforce the importance of data for policymakers and the fact that  
533 investments must be sustained in order to complete the overhaul of our data collection and data use in  
534 decision-making.

535

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

536 Cost Estimates for Recommendation  
537 Retain current resources for ERDC and ESHB 2261 data governance.

538  
539 Next Steps for the QEC

- 540
- Continue monitoring the progress of the Data Governance Group and provide guidance as they develop their report to the QEC in fall 2010.
  - Continue monitoring the ERDC and its progress in meeting legislative mandates.
- 541  
542

## 543 ***Recommendation #11: Struggling Schools Oversight Fund***

544  
545 The 2010 Legislature, in adopting the new prototype school funding formulas should include a new  
546 component not contemplated in ESBH 2261 or by the FFTWG. The formulas should include a “Struggling  
547 Schools Oversight Fund” or “SOS Fund” to provide funding for school districts designated as requiring action  
548 by the State Board of Education to support transformation efforts in persistently low performing schools.  
549

## 550 ***Recommendation #12: Technical Corrections to ESHB 2261***

- 551
- Correct statutory references to Certificated Instructional Staff.
  - Correct effective dates for Pupil Transportation sections of the statute that are not sequenced with QEC recommendations to transfer to the new formula in 2011 instead of 2013.
  - Correct references to the funding base that drives Special Education funding so that there is no change in Special Education funding (increase or decrease).
- 552  
553  
554  
555

## 556 ***Recommendation #13: QEC 2010 Work Plan***

557  
558 The QEC Work Plan for 2010 should focus on the following topics and result in recommendations to the 2011  
559 Legislature:

- 560
- The 2018 Staffing and Funding values for class size, school staff, district-wide support, Career and Technical Education (CTE), and MSOC in the prototypical school funding model.
  - Program delivery reforms and alternative funding methods for Learning Assistance Program (LAP)/Bilingual Programs.
  - Increased instructional hours as required under ESHB 2261.
  - Opportunity for 24 credits for graduation based on State Board of Education recommendations.
  - Research-based professional development.
  - Possible innovations to support student/school health.
  - **Examination of the compensation system and transferring local collective bargaining to the state.\***  
(For discussion in January)
  - Review local levy authority and uses.
  - Consider and take advantage of work being done on the state's Race to the Top application.
  - Ongoing analysis of costs, expected results, supplanting policy, capacity, and a revenue or funding plan associated with the QEC recommendations.
- 561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574

575 **Prototype Funding Values:** Attachment B contains staffing and funding values for the new school prototype.  
576 Several of the values are addressed by the recommendations of this report and are indicated in bold. Where  
577 such values are not specifically identified in above recommendations, the QEC has identified provisional  
578 funding values for discussion during 2010 (indicated by gray cell shading). The provisional funding values will  
579 be reviewed and modified based on input from technical working groups and expert analysis for the QEC.

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

580

581 **Learning Assistance and Transitional Bilingual Instruction Programs (TBIP):** The Basic Education Finance Task  
582 Force identified new funding levels and funding formulas for the LAP and TBIP programs; the FFTWG has  
583 revised the funding formula design in its recommendations for the 2010 Legislature and QEC. However, the  
584 outcomes of current programs deployed in school districts have not been reviewed. Further, the Task Force  
585 and FFTWG did not review the drivers of funding allocations (e.g., program eligibility). Also, as of  
586 development of these recommendations, the Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee  
587 (AGAOC) had not yet completed its recommendations regarding these programs.

588

589 Therefore, the QEC will conduct a more comprehensive review of these two programs: funding drivers and/or  
590 program eligibility, programmatic design and associated outcomes, future funding levels needed. The QEC  
591 looks forward to the recommendations of the AGAOC and other interested parties.

592

## ***Other Relevant information: Phase-in***

593

594 ESHB 2261 requires the Quality Education Council to develop a phase-in plan for the new program of  
595 basic education with full implementation by the 2018-19 School Year. In light of this mandate, OSPI  
596 created a budget tool to gather input from education experts and key stakeholder groups. These  
597 groups included the National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) Symposium members, the Funding  
598 Formula Working Group, and the Achievement Gap Oversight and Advisory Committee (AGOAC).

599

600 More detailed information about the recommendations and the budget tool can be found at  
601 <http://www.k12.wa.us/QEC/Resources.aspx>.

602

### Methodology

604 Individual members from the NBCT Symposium, FFTWG, and the AGOAC participated in a  
605 prioritization exercise that forced choices among investments in prototype elements. This exercise  
606 prioritized elements outlined in the prototype school model, including categorical programs for  
607 transition bilingual instruction, learning assistance, and highly capable programs. The relative size of  
608 the investment assumed for each element was based on the proposed ending values presented by  
609 the Superintendent Dorn to the Quality Education Council (QEC). Even if these are not the final  
610 ending values adopted by the QEC or the Legislature, the relative size of the new investments will  
611 likely be similar to the relative sizing used in the budget tool. The prioritization tool limited members  
612 to equal investments in each of the eight years.

613

### Phase-in Recommendations

615 The implementation of individual elements in these generally fell within one of the following groups:  
616 (1) elements that should be funded in the first four years of the implementation schedule, (2)  
617 elements that should be funded proportionately throughout the implementation schedule, and (3)  
618 elements that should be funded in the second four years of implementation schedule. The results  
619 are depicted in the Table 1 below. The twenty budget items are broken up into seven general  
620 categories. The last three columns indicate each of the group's recommendations (F=first four years;  
621 I=incremental; S=second four years; N/A=not applicable). Dark shaded cells represent areas of  
622 unanimous agreement. Light shaded cells are areas of moderate agreement. Finally clear cells are  
623 areas with no agreement or where only one group provided recommendations.

624

# Quality Education Council Draft Report

625  
626

**Table 1: Implementation Recommendations**

Category	#	Budget Elements	FFTWG	NBCT	AGOAC
<b>Class Size Reduction</b>	1	Reduce Class Size for High Poverty Schools	I	F	I
	2	Reduce Class Size for all Grades	S	F	S
	3	Reduce Class Size Further for Career and Technical Education, Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate, & Lab Sciences	S	S	S
<b>Early Learning</b>	4	All-day Kindergarten	I	F	F
	5	Early Learning programs for at-risk youth	S	F	F
<b>Professional Development</b>	6	9 New Learning Improvement Days	I	I	S
	7	Mentor Program for New Teachers	F	F	F
<b>Struggling Students</b>	8	New Staffing for Learning Assistance Program	I	S	F
	9	New Staffing for Transitional Bilingual Program	F	S	F
<b>Certificated Instructional Staff</b>	10	Increase Librarians/ Media Specialists	S	S	S
	11	Increase Guidance Counselors	F	S	F
	12	Increase Health Services Staff (School Nurses & Social Workers)	S	S	F
	13	Instructional Coach	F	I	I
<b>Classified Staff</b>	14	Instructional Aides	I	S	I
	15	Office Support (Secretaries, Data, Enrollment); non-instructional Aides *	F	N/A	N/A
	16	Maintenance (custodians, buildings, grounds) *	S	N/A	N/A
	17	Student, Staff, and Facility Security *	F	N/A	N/A
<b>Materials, Supplies and Operating Costs (MSOC)</b>	18	Textbook and Consumable Curriculum	F	I	F
	19	Technology	F	S	I
	20	Library, Professional Development, Utilities & Insurance, District-wide Support, Facilities & Maintenance *	F	N/A	N/A

627 \*The NBCT and AGOAC did not include these elements in their budget tool.

628  
629

*First Four Years*

630 All three groups recommended early phase-in of a mentoring program for new teachers. Two out of  
631 the three groups also recommended implementing increased resources for the Early Learning  
632 category, the Transitional Bilingual Program, guidance counselors, and technology. The FFTWG also  
633 recommended early phase of office support staff, security staff, and the other MSOC categories.

634  
635

*Incremental*

636 Two out of the three groups recommended an incremental phase-in of class size reduction for  
637 poverty students, learning improvement days for teachers, instructional coaches, and instructional  
638 aides.

639  
640

*Second Four Years*

641 All three groups strongly recommended delayed phase-in of librarian/ media specialists and reduced  
642 class size for Career and Technical Education, Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate, &

## Quality Education Council Draft Report

---

---

643 Lab Sciences. Two out of the three groups recommended delayed phase-in of reduced class size for  
644 all grades, and increased health services staff. The FFTWG also recommended late phase-in of  
645 maintenance staff.

646

### 647 *No Agreement*

648 The groups did not agree on the phase-in of the Learning Assistance Program and technology.

649

### 650 Rationale

651 Each of the three groups that participated in this budget exercise provided their own unique  
652 perspective on the phasing of the budget elements. Generally, members tried to implement those  
653 items that would have a significant impact on student academic performance and closing the  
654 achievement gap. For example, many believed that supporting and improving the quality of new  
655 teachers was an important initial investment because of the link between teacher quality and  
656 student achievement. Both the FFTWG and the AGOAC also considered the capacity of school  
657 districts to absorb additional resources. Those strategies such as class size reduction that required  
658 significant investments in facility space or additional qualified staff were phased in incrementally or  
659 in the second four years. Detailed explanations of their rationale are identified in Appendix XX and XX  
660 of this document.

661

### 662 Next Steps for the QEC

663 • Develop a phase-in plan that fully implements the new program of Basic Education by 2018.

664 This plan will take into consideration the input from the FFTWG, NBCT, and AGOAC.

665

## Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment A -- Baseline

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	<b>28A.150.260 (Basic Education Act)</b>			<b>2009-10 Operating Budget</b>			<b>I-728 Funding Included</b>			
1	<b>A. Base School and District Staffing</b>						Funded level Displayed: <b>\$ 128,648,338</b>			
2	<b>Class Size Assumptions</b>	<b>2007-08 Enrollment</b>	<b>Non-High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>2007-08 Enrollment</b>	<b>Non-High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>2007-08 Enrollment</b>	<b>Non-High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>High Poverty Schools</b>
3	Class Size K-3	266,244	25.23	Same	266,244	23.11	Same	266,244	<b>22.24</b>	Same
4	Class Size Grade 4	76,652	27.00	Same	76,652	23.11	Same	76,652	<b>22.33</b>	Same
5	Class Size 5-6	152,241	27.00	Same	152,241	27.00	Same	152,241	<b>26.23</b>	Same
6	Class Size 7-8	155,234	28.53	Same	155,234	28.53	Same	155,234	<b>27.70</b>	Same
7	Class Size 9-12	255,241	28.74	Same	255,241	28.74	Same	255,241	<b>27.87</b>	Same
8	CTE (exploratory and preparatory)	53,933	26.57	Same	53,933	26.58	Same	53,933	26.58	Same
9	Skills Centers	3,884	22.76	Same	3,884	22.76	Same	3,884	22.76	Same
10	<b>School Level</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>
11	Prototypical School Size	400	432	600	400	432	600	400	432	600
12	<b>School Level</b>	<b>Elementary (Staff per 400)</b>	<b>Middle (Staff per 432)</b>	<b>High (Staff per 600)</b>	<b>Elementary (Staff per 400)</b>	<b>Middle (Staff per 432)</b>	<b>High (Staff per 600)</b>	<b>Elementary (Staff per 400)</b>	<b>Middle (Staff per 432)</b>	<b>High (Staff per 600)</b>
13	Principal/School Admin	1.253	1.353	1.880	1.253	1.353	1.880	1.253	1.353	1.880
14	Teachers (all grades averaged for display purposes only)	17.754	18.169	25.050	19.103	18.169	25.050	<b>19.703</b>	<b>18.712</b>	<b>25.833</b>
15	Librarian/Media Specialist	0.663	0.519	0.523	0.663	0.519	0.523	0.663	0.519	0.523
16	Counselor	0.493	1.116	1.909	0.493	1.116	1.909	0.493	1.116	1.909
17	Health and Social Services	0.135	0.068	0.118	0.135	0.068	0.118	0.135	0.068	0.118
18	Professional Development Coaches	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.204</b>	<b>0.283</b>
19	Instructional Aides	0.917	0.685	0.638	0.936	0.700	0.652	0.936	0.700	0.652
20	School Office/Other Aides and Support	1.971	2.277	3.201	2.012	2.325	3.269	2.012	2.325	3.269
21	Student and Staff Security	0.077	0.090	0.138	0.079	0.092	0.141	0.079	0.092	0.141
22	Custodians	1.622	1.902	2.903	1.657	1.942	2.965	1.657	1.942	2.965
23	<b>Career and Technical Education</b>	<b>Staff per 100</b>			<b>Staff per 100</b>			<b>Staff per 100</b>		
24	CTE Admin & Other Support	0.612			0.612			0.612		
25	CTE Teachers	4.516			4.516			4.516		
26	<b>Skills Centers</b>	<b>Staff per 100</b>			<b>Staff per 100</b>			<b>Staff per 100</b>		
27	Skills Centers Admin & Other Support	0.715			0.715			0.715		
28	Skills Center Teachers	5.273			5.273			5.273		
29	<b>District-wide Support</b>	<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>			<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>			<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>		
30	Technology	0.615			0.628			0.628		
31	Facilities, Maintenance, Grounds	0.197			0.201			0.201		
32	Warehouse/Laborers/Mechanics	1.904			1.944			1.944		

## Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment A -- Baseline

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		<b>28A.150.260 (Basic Education Act)</b>			<b>2009-10 Operating Budget</b>			<b>I-728 Funding Included</b>		
33	<b>Central Admin</b>	<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>			<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>			<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>		
34	Supervisors/Finance/Personnel/Comm.	0.757			0.773			0.835		
35	Office Clerical - Central Admin	1.729			1.765			1.858		
36	Certificated Administrators	0.867			0.867			0.905		
37	<b>As a percent</b>									
38	Total Central Admin	5.30%			5.35%			5.29%		
39	Certificated Split	25.86%			25.46%			25.163%		
40	Classified Split	74.14%			74.54%			74.837%		
41	<b>Learning Improvement Days</b>	<b>Days Funded</b>			<b>Days Funded</b>			<b>Days Funded</b>		
42	Teachers	1			1			1		
43	Librarian/Media Specialist	1			1			1		
44	Counselor	1			1			1		
45	Health and Social Services	1			1			1		
46	Professional Development Coaches	1			1			1		
47	Instructional Aides	0			0			0		

	1	2	3	4
		<b>28A.150.260 (Basic Education Act)</b>	<b>2009-10 Operating Budget</b>	<b>I-728 Funding Included</b>
1	<b>B. Basic Education Categorical Programs</b>			
2	<b>Learning Assistance Program</b>			
3	Instructional hours per week in class sizes of 15	1.303 hours (approx. 1 hr, 18 min)	1.303 hours (approx. 1 hr, 18 min)	1.303 hours (approx. 1 hr, 18 min)
4	Instructional hours during vacation in class sizes of 15	0	0	0
5	Maintenance, supplies and operating costs per student	0	0	0
6	Administration percentage	0	0	0
7	Hold Harmless – Discontinued Concentration Factors	Approx. \$23 million	Approx. \$23 million	Approx. \$23 million
	1	2	3	4
		<b>28A.150.260 (Basic Education Act)</b>	<b>2009-10 Operating Budget</b>	<b>I-728 Funding Included</b>
9	<b>Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program</b>			
10	Instructional hours per week in class sizes of 15	4.826 hours (approx. 4 hrs, 50 min)	4.826 hours (approx. 4 hrs, 50 min)	4.826 hours (approx. 4 hrs, 50 min)
11	Instructional hours during vacation in class sizes of 15	0	0	0
12	Maintenance, supplies and operating costs per student	0	0	0
13	Administration percentage	0	0	0
14	Factors for age and complexity of population	0	0	0

## Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment A -- Baseline

15	<b>Highly Capable Program</b>			
16	Instructional hours per week in class sizes of 15	2.196 hours (approx. 2 hrs, 12 min)	2.196 hours (approx. 2 hrs, 12 min)	2.196 hours (approx. 2 hrs, 12 min)
17	Instructional hours during vacation in class sizes of 15	0	0	0
18	Maintenance, supplies and operating costs per student	0	0	0
19	Administration percentage	0	0	0
20	Funding floor for small programs	0	0	0
21	<b>Special Education Program</b>			
22	Birth – Pre-K (Percent of Base Staff and MSOC Allocations)	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%
23	K-Age 21 (Percent of Base Staff and MSOC Allocations)	93.09%	93.09%	93.09%
24	<b>C. Other Basic Education Funding Requirements</b>			
25	<b>MSOC</b>	All Grades	All Grades	All Grades
26	Technology	51.88	53.77	53.77
27	Curriculum	55.70	57.72	57.72
28	Library and Other Supplies	118.27	122.56	122.56
29	Professional Development	8.61	8.95	8.92
30	Utilities/ Insurance	140.99	146.10	146.10
31	Central District-wide Support	48.38	50.14	50.14
32	Facilities Maintenance	69.84	72.37	72.37
33	Total Expended Per Student	\$ 493.70	\$ 511.60	\$ 511.60
34	Percent funded	47%	47%	47%
35	<b>Pupil Transportation</b>			
36	Pupil Transportation (09-10 Budgeted)	About 62.5% of full funding	About 62.5% of full funding	About 62.5% of full funding
37	<b>All-day Kindergarten</b>			
38	All-day Kindergarten (08-09 Basis)		21% of schools	21% of schools
39	Early Learning for at-risk 3 and 4 year olds	??	??	??
40	<b>Instructional Hours</b>			
41	Elementary (1-6)	Formulas assume 1,008 hours	Formulas assume 1,008 hours	Formulas assume 1,008 hours
42	Secondary (7-9)	Formulas assume 1,080 hours	Formulas assume 1,080 hours	Formulas assume 1,080 hours
43	<b>Salary; Partially or Fully Funded</b>			
44	Certificated Instructional Staff	Partial, % to be determined	Partial, % to be determined	Partial, % to be determined
45	Classified Staff	Partial, % to be determined	Partial, % to be determined	Partial, % to be determined
46	Certificated Administrative Staff	Partial, % to be determined	Partial, % to be determined	Partial, % to be determined

*Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment A -- Baseline*

# Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment B – 2018 Values

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	<b>K-12 Funding (I-728 Included)</b>			<b>2018 Funding Values: Final &amp; Provisional</b>			
1	<b>A. Base School and District</b>			I-728 Funded level assumed: <b>\$ 128,648,338</b>			Provisional Discussion Values are shaded
2	<b>Class Size Assumptions</b>	<b>2007-08 Enrollment</b>	<b>Non-High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>2007-08 Enrollment</b>	<b>Non-High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>High Poverty Schools</b>
3	Class Size K-3	266,244	<b>22.24</b>	Same	266,244	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
4	Class Size Grade 4	76,652	<b>22.33</b>	Same	76,652	25	22
5	Class Size 5-6	152,241	<b>26.23</b>	Same	152,241	25	23
6	Class Size 7-8	155,234	<b>27.70</b>	Same	155,234	25	23
7	Class Size 9-12	255,241	<b>27.87</b>	Same	255,241	25	23
8	CTE (exploratory and preparatory)	53,933	26.58	Same	53,933	19	19
9	Skills Centers	3,884	22.76	Same	3,884	16	16
10	<b>School Level</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>
11	Prototypical School Size	400	432	600	<b>400</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>600</b>
12	<b>School Level</b>	<b>Elementary (Staff per 400)</b>	<b>Middle (Staff per 432)</b>	<b>High (Staff per 600)</b>	<b>Elementary (Staff per 400)</b>	<b>Middle (Staff per 432)</b>	<b>High (Staff per 600)</b>
13	Principal/School Admin	1.253	1.353	1.880	1.3	1.4	1.9
14	Teachers (all grades averaged for display only)	<b>19.703</b>	<b>18.712</b>	<b>25.833</b>	(generated by class size above)		
15	Librarian/Media Specialist	0.663	0.519	0.523	1.0	1.0	1.0
16	Counselor	0.493	1.116	1.909	0.5	2.0	3.5
17	Health and Social Services	0.135	0.068	0.118	1.0	1.0	1.0
18	Professional Development Coaches	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.204</b>	<b>0.283</b>	0.6	0.7	1.0
19	Instructional Aides	0.936	0.700	0.652	2.0	1.0	1.0
20	School Office/Other Aides and Support	2.012	2.325	3.269	3.0	3.5	3.5
21	Student and Staff Security	0.079	0.092	0.141	0.0	0.7	1.3
22	Custodians	1.657	1.942	2.965	1.7	2.0	3.0
23	<b>Career and Technical Education</b>	<b>Staff per 100</b>			<b>Staff per 100</b>		
24	CTE Admin & Other Support	0.612			0.7		
25	CTE Teachers	4.516			4.5		
26	<b>Skills Centers</b>	<b>Staff per 100</b>			<b>Staff per 100</b>		
27	Skills Centers Admin & Other Support	0.715			0.7		
28	Skills Center Teachers	5.273			5.3		
29	<b>District-wide Support</b>	<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>			<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>		
30	Technology	0.628			2.8		
31	Facilities Security, Maintenance, Grounds	1.813			4.0		
32	Warehouse/Laborers/Mechanics	0.332			1.9		

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<b>I-728 Funding Included</b>			<b>Final</b>		
33	<b>Central Admin</b>	<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>		<b>Staff per 1,000 Students</b>		
34	Supervisors/Finance/Personnel/Comm.	<b>0.835</b>		0.984		
35	Office Clerical - Central Admin	<b>1.858</b>		2.081		
36	Certificated Administrators	<b>0.905</b>		0.998		
37	<b>As a percent</b>					
38	Total Central Admin	5.29%		5.59%		
39	Certificated Split	25.163%		24.561%		

# Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment B – 2018 Values

40	Classified Split	74.837%			75.439%	
----	------------------	---------	--	--	---------	--

41	Learning Improvement Days	Days Funded		Days Funded	
42	Teachers	1		1	
43	Librarian/Media Specialist	1		1	
44	Counselor	1		1	
45	Health and Social Services	1		1	
46	Professional Development Coaches	1		1	
47	Instructional Aides	0		0	

	1	2	3
		<b>K-12 Funding (I-728 Included)</b>	<b>2018 Funding Values: Final &amp; Provisional</b>
1	<b>B. Basic Education Categorical Programs</b>		
2	<b>Learning Assistance Program</b>		
3	Instructional hours per week in class sizes of 15	1.303 hours (approx. 1 hr, 18 min)	1.303 hours (approx. 1 hr, 18 min)
4	Instructional hours during vacation in class sizes of 15	0	0
5	Maintenance, supplies and operating costs per student	0	0
6	Administration percentage	0	0
7	Hold Harmless – Discontinued Concentration Factors	Approx. \$23 million	Approx. \$23 million

	1	2	3
		<b>I-728 Funding Included</b>	<b>Current Funding Level</b>
9	<b>Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program</b>		
10	Instructional hours per week in class sizes of 15	4.826 hours (approx. 4 hrs, 50 min)	4.826 hours (approx. 4 hrs, 50 min)
11	Instructional hours during vacation in class sizes of 15	0	0
12	Maintenance, supplies and operating costs per student	0	0
13	Administration percentage	0	0
14	Factors for age and complexity of population	0	0

15	<b>Highly Capable Program</b>		
16	Instructional hours per week in class sizes of 15	2.196 hours (approx. 2 hrs, 12 min)	2.196 hours (approx. 2 hrs, 12 min)
17	Instructional hours during vacation in class sizes of 15	0	0
18	Maintenance, supplies and operating costs per student	0	0
19	Administration percentage	0	0
20	Funding floor for small programs	0	0

21	<b>Special Education Program</b>		
22	Birth – Pre-K (Percent of Base Staff and MSOC Allocations)	1.15%	1.15%
23	K-Age 21 (Percent of Base Staff and MSOC Allocations)	93.09%	93.09%

24	<b>C. Other Basic Education Funding Requirements</b>		
25	<b>MSOC</b>	All Grades	All Grades*
26	Technology	53.77	<b>\$113.80</b>
27	Curriculum	57.72	<b>\$122.17</b>
28	Library and Other Supplies	122.56	<b>\$259.39</b>
29	Professional Development	8.92	<b>\$18.89</b>
30	Utilities/ Insurance	146.10	<b>\$309.21</b>
31	Central District-wide Support	50.14	<b>\$106.12</b>
32	Facilities Maintenance	72.37	<b>\$153.18</b>
33	Total Expended Per Student	\$ 511.60	<b>\$1,082.76</b>
34	Percent of Funding	<b>47%</b>	<b>Fully Funded*</b>

\*Dollar amount to be updated for inflation and costs of textbooks and technology

## Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment B – 2018 Values

35	<b>Pupil Transportation</b>		
36	Pupil Transportation (09-10 Budgeted)	About 62.5% of full funding	<b>Fully Funded</b>
37	<b>Early Learning Programs</b>		
38	All-day Kindergarten (08-09 Basis)	21% of schools	<b>Fully Funded</b>
39	Early Learning Program for at-risk 3 and 4 year olds	??	<b>Fully Funded</b>
40	<b>Instructional Hours</b>		
41	Elementary (1-6)	Formulas assume 1,008 hours	1,008 hours
42	Secondary (7-9)	Formulas assume 1,080 hours	1,080 hours
43	<b>Salaries; Fully or Partially or Funded</b>		
44	Certificated Instructions Staff	Partial; % to be determined	Fully Funded
45	Classified Staff	Partial; % to be determined	Fully Funded
46	Certificated Administrative Staff	Partial; % to be determined	Fully Funded

***Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment B – 2018 Values***

## Quality Education Council Draft Report: Attachment C

<b>Costed Item</b>	<b>Length of Phase-in</b>	Approximate Fiscal Year Cost Estimates						
		<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>
Student Transportation (Rec 4)	3 years	\$40.1M	\$93.1M	\$80.2M	\$160.2M	\$165.8M	\$171.6M	\$177.6M
MSOC (Maintenance, Supplies & Operating Costs) (Rec 5)	3 years	\$165.3M	\$383.4M	\$598.6M	\$659.3M	\$682.4M	\$706.3M	\$731.0M
New Teacher Support -- BEST (Rec 6)	3 years costed*	\$17.3M	\$26.8M	\$31.0M	\$32.6M	\$33.8M	\$35.0M	\$36.2M
Early Learning (Rec 7)	3 years	\$8.7M	\$24.0M	\$80.2M	\$59.9M	\$62.0M	\$64.1M	\$66.4M
Full Day Kindergarten (Rec 8)	7 years	\$20.7M	\$48.1M	\$75.1M	\$102.0M	\$128.8M	\$155.6M	\$182.4M
K-3 Class Size Reductions (Rec 9)	5 years	\$103.3M	\$239.6M	\$374.1M	\$507.7M	\$641.3M	\$686.8M	\$710.8M
TOTALS	-	<b>\$355.5M</b>	<b>\$815.1M</b>	<b>\$1,239.4M</b>	<b>\$1,521.7M</b>	<b>\$1,714.1M</b>	<b>\$1,819.4M</b>	<b>\$2,309.2M</b>

\*QEC does not indicate phase-in time-period at this time.