



## **Building Staffing Capacity to Support Student Well-Being** **2021–23 Biennial Operating Budget Decision Package (DP)**

### **Agency/Program Recommendation Summary**

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction requests funding to implement the first of two research- and evidence-based phases of the Staffing Enrichment Workgroup’s recommendations. This first phase focuses on eliminating opportunity gaps by adjusting the prototypical school funding model. At the proposed staffing levels, school districts will be better positioned to meet the needs of all students by: increasing staffing ratios related to the safety and social emotional needs of students, funding additional professional development for school staff, increasing the allocation for school principals, and adding continuous learning coaches to the prototypical model no later than the 2024–25 school year.

### **Package Description**

#### **What is the problem, opportunity, or priority you are addressing with the request?**

Washington’s K–12 education system is working well for some, but not all, of Washington’s children. Opportunity gaps experienced by children across the state are evident in the academic, social, and economic outcomes of our education system.

The needs of students have changed significantly over the past several years and the model for supporting school districts has not kept up. The prototypical funding model, established in statute, is inadequate to meet the social emotional and safety needs of our students (including providing for high-quality ongoing professional development for educators) and is impacting educators’ ability to eliminate the opportunity gaps they see every day.

1. The prototypical funding model resources certain critical staff positions related to the social emotional health and safety of students at ratios below what is necessary to meet the needs of all students.
  - A. The American School Counselor Association has established an appropriate school counselor to student ratio of one counselor for 250 students (1:250). The prototypical funding model provides for 1:811 (elementary), 1:355 (middle), and 1:236 (high school). These initial values were based on research and analysis from the mid-1970s, without consideration for the evolution of student needs or more effective educational practices. Important policy changes to graduation requirements, career planning, high school and beyond planning, postsecondary transitions, and other secondary school requirements have far outpaced the high school counselor allocation.

- B. It currently takes 5,263 elementary students, 7,200 middle school students, or 6,250 high school students to generate funding for a full-time equivalent (FTE) school nurse. Schools across Washington are left without even part-time school nurses, or nurses who are available one day a week, at this level of funding. When a full-time nurse is available, fewer children check out of school during the day (Hill & Hollis, 2012). In addition to greater student attendance, the presence of a full-time nurse within in a school may substantially reduce the amount of time other school staff members spend dealing with student health issues (Baisch et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2014).
  - C. School psychologists serve many roles in school districts, including identifying and/or serving students with disabilities. Under the prototypical model currently, it takes 216,000 middle school students to generate funding for a single school psychologist. That is roughly the number of middle school students in the entire state of Washington. The prototypical funding model provides for one psychologist per 23,529 elementary students and one psychologist per 85,714 in high school (which is more students than in the entire senior class of 2019).
  - D. School social workers “are an integral link between school, home, and community in helping students achieve academic success” ([School Social Work Association of America](#)). They are provided for in the prototypical funding model at ratios of 1:9,524 (elementary), 1:72,000 (middle), and 1:40,000 (high school).
  - E. Research shows family engagement is an essential component of school improvement. Research also shows individual students are more likely to succeed in school when their families are engaged in their education. The disruption from the COVID-19 pandemic and the widespread civil unrest throughout the summer of 2020 only heightens the importance of schools building tight connections with the communities they serve. The prototypical school funding model provides 0.083 FTE parent involvement coordinators (referred to in this document as “family and community engagement coordinators”) to elementary campuses. No allocation or family and community engagement coordinators is provided to middle and high schools.
  - F. Districts across the country are rethinking how they increase the number of skilled and caring adults in school buildings in ways that will enhance the safety for all students and for all staff members. The current prototypical model provides for student and staff safety positions at rates even lower than school nurses at 1:5,063 for elementary, 1:4,696 for middle, and 1:4,255 for high school. This leaves entire districts without enough enrollment to generate even a single full-time equivalent adult to support safe schools for all.
2. The world our students are living in is rapidly changing, and educators must shift their own practices in order to truly support each and every student as they prepare for postsecondary pathways. If we do not resource school districts to provide high-

quality professional development, educators will not be given the tools and supports to continually improve their practice.

3. Being a school principal requires skillful leadership of all building-level initiatives (academic and otherwise) as well as the recruitment, retention, and capacity building of staff. Principals are responsible for the health and safety of and academic and social-emotional growth for each student. School leadership and improved student achievement are connected (Wallace Foundation, 2011); and school leadership is second only to classroom instruction as an influence on student learning (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). The current prototypical model under-resources principal positions at 1 principal position per 319 students (all grade bands). This includes associate or vice principal positions.
4. Supporting student achievement requires continual improvement efforts that adjust to and meet the needs of educators and students. There is a significant body of research suggesting the work of continuous improvement coaches and instructional facilitators is beneficial to teacher retention, teacher-student interactions, and student achievement (Allen, et al., 2011; Elish-Piper & L’Allier, 2011; Gray & Taie, 2015; Lockwood, et al., 2010; Vanderburg & Stephens, 2010). This is an un-resourced need in the current prototypical model.

### **What is your proposed solution?**

This request has four major components related to increasing the basic education allocation to school districts through the prototypical school funding formula:

1. Increasing the allocation for social-emotional health and safety staff.
2. Providing more staff professional development focusing on racial literacy and cultural responsiveness to close persistent opportunity gaps.
3. Increasing the allocation for principals.
4. Providing an allocation for continuous improvement coaches.

Each of these components are addressed specifically in sub sections below.

### **Component 1: Social-Emotional Health and Safety Staff**

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) requests increasing staff allocations in the prototypical school funding model for school counselors, school nurses, social workers, psychologists, family engagement coordinators, and student and staff safety personnel.

Table 1 shows, under current law, how many full-time equivalent students are needed to generate a 1.0 FTE staffing unit for each of these positions.

**Table 1: Number of Student FTE Needed to Generate One Staff FTE**

Staff Position	Elementary	Middle	High
School Counselors	811	355	236
School Nurses	5,263	7,200	6,250
Social Workers	9,524	72,000	40,000
Psychologists	23,529	216,000	85,714
Student and Staff Safety	5,063	4,696	4,255

In order to provide more appropriate allocations that can ensure students are in healthy, safe, and productive learning environments, we propose increasing these values to those approved by voters in Initiative 1351. The increased funding levels should be phased in over three school years, with full implementation of the Workgroup’s recommendations implemented in the 2024–25 school year.

As a part of this staffing proposal, the Workgroup recommended that the current prototypical school size used to determine staffing levels should be revised to a standard 500 student FTE for all school types (elementary, middle, and high) to allow improved comparability between levels. This change is cost neutral. Table 2 describes values translated from the current prototypical school size to the new proposed standard of 500 FTE.

**Table 2: Transitional Prototypical Values**

Staff Position	Elementary		Middle		High	
	400	500	432	500	600	500
<b>Prototypical School Size</b>						
School Counselors	0.493	0.616	1.216	1.407	2.539	2.116
School Nurses	0.076	0.095	0.060	0.069	0.096	0.080
Social Workers	0.042	0.053	0.006	0.007	0.015	0.013
Psychologists	0.017	0.021	0.002	0.002	0.007	0.006
Family Engagement Coordinators	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Student and Staff Safety	0.079	0.099	0.092	0.106	0.141	0.118

Table 3 describes OSPI’s requested changes to the prototypical model as defined in I-1351, recommended by the Workgroup, and phased in across three school years.

**Table 3: Phase-in Values**

School Year	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
<b>Staff Position</b>	<b>Elementary (500 FTE)</b>		
School Counselors	0.619	0.622	0.625
School Nurses	0.307	0.519	0.731
Social Workers	0.165	0.277	0.389
Psychologists	0.058	0.094	0.130
Family Engagement Coordinators	0.485	0.868	1.250
Student and Staff Safety	0.395	0.691	0.988
<b>Staff Position</b>	<b>Middle (500 FTE)</b>		
School Counselors	1.710	2.012	2.315
School Nurses	0.389	0.708	1.028
Social Workers	0.039	0.070	0.102
Psychologists	0.011	0.019	0.028
Family Engagement Coordinators	0.386	0.772	1.157
Student and Staff Safety	0.341	0.576	0.810
<b>Staff Position</b>	<b>High (500 FTE)</b>		
School Counselors	2.383	2.650	2.917
School Nurses	0.282	0.484	0.687
Social Workers	0.044	0.075	0.106
Psychologists	0.018	0.029	0.041
Family Engagement Coordinators	0.278	0.566	0.833
Student and Staff Safety	0.439	0.761	1.083

**Component 2: Professional Development**

OSPI requests additional days of professional development for certificated and classified staff in schools allocated through a percentage increase in salary and benefits. This increase phases in over three years, with the end result of six days for certificated instructional staff and classified staff, and three days for certificated administrative staff. Table 4 includes the total number of days, and Table 5 includes the percentage increase of salary and benefits necessary to accomplish the additional days.

**Table 4: Phase I – Professional Learning Days**

School Year
Certificated Instructional Staff
Classified Staff
Certificated Administrative Staff

*Note: The Phase II target value for professional learning is 10 days for each staff type.*

**Table 5: Phase I – Professional Learning Percentage of Salary and Benefits**

School Year	2022–23	2023–24	2024–25
Certificated Instructional Staff	2.20%	2.78%	3.33%
Classified Staff	1.67%	2.22%	3.33%
Certificated Administrative Staff	0.56%	1.11%	1.67%

*Note: The Phase II target value for professional learning is 5.56% for each staff type.*

The professional development would include, in part, mandatory learning focused on racial literacy and cultural responsiveness. This focus is necessary to accelerate the closure of persistent opportunity gaps. Training on these topics is critical for serving all students, regardless of race. Professional development for racial literacy will be expected of all district personnel statewide on an ongoing basis.

This request is aligned with phase I of the recommendations of the Workgroup. Funds for professional learning shall be allocated via a percentage increase in salary and benefits as shown in Table 5. This is an allocation, meaning professional learning does not need to be delivered in any specific modality or time increments.

Adding professional development for certificated and classified school district staff may not result in additional time in all instances. Some school district staff work based on year-round (i.e., 260-days) contracts. It is a recommendation that these staff participate in the essential professional development topics for the benefit of all students.

### **Component 3: Increase in Principal Allocation**

This proposal increases the allocation for principals within the prototypical school model to an overall ratio of 1 principal per 300 full-time equivalent students.

Table 6 shows the current prototypical funding model for principals with the cost-neutral shift to a standardized prototypical school size of 500 full-time equivalent students for elementary, middle, and high school.

**Table 6: Prototypical School Principal Allocation (Current Law and Based on 500 Student FTE)**

Staff Position	Elementary		Middle		High	
	400	500	432	500	600	500
Principals	1.253	1.567	1.353	1.567	1.880	1.567

Table 7 outlines the phased-in approach to achieve a ratio of 1 principal per 300 full-time equivalent students by the 2024–25 school year, based on a prototypical school size of 500 student FTE.

**Table 7: Principal Allocation Phase in Values Based on 500 Student FTE**

Grade Band	2022–23	2023–24	2024–25
Elementary	1.600	1.633	1.667
Middle	1.600	1.633	1.667
High	1.600	1.633	1.667

**Component 4: Continuous Improvement Coaches**

This request includes a proposal for a new staffing position within the prototypical school funding model defined as continuous improvement coaches. These coaches are critical to supporting classroom teacher implement research and evidence-based instruction with high fidelity. A continuous learning coach is a skilled educator who regularly delivers professional development consistent with the Washington State Professional Learning Standards (RCW 28A.415.432). In addition, this position will identify successful strategy needs and patterns between classrooms. School and district leaders must have timely information to organize supports and address areas of learning. Similarly, the state can learn through having continuous improvement coaches and sharing information accordingly.

Table 8 shows the proposed phase in of continuous improvement coaches by prototypical school level in each of the next three school years based on the current definitions of prototypical school size.

**Table 8: Phase in Values Using Current Prototypical School Size**

Continuous Improvement Coach	2022–23	2023–24	2024–25
Elementary School (400FTE)	0.333	0.666	1.000
Middle School (432 FTE)	0.333	0.666	1.000
High School (600 FTE)	0.333	0.666	1.000

Table 9 translates the values shown in Table 8 to the proposed definition of prototypical school size of 500 student FTE.

**Table 9: Phase in Values Using Prototypical School Size of 500**

Continuous Improvement Coach	2022–23	2023–24	2024–25
Elementary School (500 FTE)	0.417	0.833	1.250
Middle School (500 FTE)	0.386	0.772	1.157
High School (500 FTE)	0.278	0.556	0.833

**What are you purchasing and how does it solve the problem?**

This request phases-in enhanced staffing levels that prioritizes research- or evidence-based strategies to reduce opportunity gaps between student groups and strengthen support for all school and district staff. School districts will be able to hire additional principals, school counselors, school nurses, social workers, psychologists, family engagement coordinators, and student and staff safety personnel, as well as continuous improvement coaches. In addition, this request adds professional development for all staff with a specific focus on racial literacy and cultural responsiveness.

The investments are specifically chosen as the right mix of increased capacity that will result in improved social-emotional well-being and academic outcomes for all students, shrinking opportunity gaps. Building-level leadership (principals) work in tandem with school counselors, school nurses, school social workers, school psychologists, family engagement coordinators, and with student and staff safety to provide the necessary support. Additional professional learning days will benefit students through changes in practices.

Table 10 shows how enhanced staffing and professional development days will be phased in over three school years.

**Table 10: Statewide Cost by Component**

<b>Decision Package Component</b>	<b>SY 2021–22</b>	<b>SY 2022–23</b>	<b>SY 2023–24</b>	<b>SY 2024–25</b>
Social Emotional Health & Safety Staff	\$0	\$122,014,000	\$249,158,000	\$385,828,000
Professional Development	\$0	\$72,817,000	\$127,507,000	\$196,478,000
Continuous Improvement Coach	\$0	\$239,745,000	\$475,041,000	\$730,152,000
Increase in Principal Allocation	\$0	\$12,512,000	\$25,556,000	\$39,553,000
<b>School Year Totals</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$447,088,000</b>	<b>\$877,262,000</b>	<b>\$1,352,011,000</b>
	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2025</b>
<b>Fiscal Year Totals</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$346,400,000</b>	<b>\$679,800,000</b>	<b>\$1,240,400,000</b>
	<b>2021–23</b>		<b>2023–25</b>	
<b>Biennium Totals</b>	<b>\$346,400,000</b>		<b>\$1,920,200,000</b>	

**What alternatives did you explore and why was this option chosen?**

Alternatives outside of adjustments to the prototypical school funding formula were not discussed as it was the specific legislative charge of the Workgroup to recommend



changes within the structure of that formula. The Workgroup considered alternatives with respect to which staffing ratios should be increased to meet the target of reduced opportunity gaps and strengthened supports for educators as part of their work. [Artifacts of those discussions can be found on the OSPI website.](#)

## **Performance Measures**

### **Performance outcomes:**

This request aims reduce opportunity gaps for all students and ensure each student is prepared for postsecondary success. These impacts are measured through Washington's Report Card and the Washington School Improvement Framework.

We also expect to see increases in the numbers of:

- school districts supporting a meaningful High School and Beyond Plan,
- students who graduate on-time career and college ready, and
- students enrolling in post-graduation training opportunities.

OSPI tracks data for the following related performance outcomes:

- College-ready transcripts
- Post-secondary enrollment for 4- and 2-year colleges
- Post-secondary remediation rates for math and English
- Dual credit programs
- Graduation rates
- 9th grade success rates
- SAT and ACT scores
- Financial aid for college

## Fiscal Details (Funding, FTEs, Revenue, Objects)

Operating Expenditures	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Fund 001	\$0	\$346,000,000	\$679,000,000	\$1,239,000,000
Fund 17F	\$0	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$1,400,000
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$346,400,000</b>	<b>\$679,800,000</b>	<b>\$1,241,000,000</b>
<b>Biennial Totals</b>	<b>\$346,400,000</b>		<b>\$1,920,800,000</b>	
Staffing	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
FTEs	0	0	0	0
<b>Average Annual</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	
Revenue	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Fund 001	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Biennial Totals</b>	<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$0</b>	
Object of Expenditure	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Obj. N	\$0	\$346,400,000	\$679,800,000	\$1,241,000,000

### Assumptions and Calculations

#### Expansion or alteration of a current program or service:

This proposal seeks to increase existing funding for social emotional health staff, principals, and continuous improvement coaches through the prototypical school funding model. In addition, this adds additional professional development to the current salary allocation funding.

#### Detailed assumptions and calculations:

All costs related to adjustments to the prototypical school funding model used caseload forecast enrollment assumptions and salary and benefit values currently approved in the biennial budget.

#### Workforce assumptions:

There are no additional agency staff requested in this request. Staff allocations being recommended are, with the exception of those for which compliance is proposed or

required, for allocation purposes only. The local school districts will determine how to best utilize the additional staffing resources to best meet the needs of their community.

### **How is your proposal impacting equity in the state?**

This proposal addresses student equity by increasing the allocation for staff specifically targeted for assessing and addressing the social emotional needs of students. The intended outcome is ensuring all students have access to essential supports to reduce the persistent opportunity gap.

### **Strategic and Performance Outcomes**

#### **Strategic framework:**

This request supports the Results Washington goals related to K–12 education because the request aims to increase the number of students who graduate and reduce opportunity gaps for all students. In addition, this request supports OSPI’s strategic goal of ensuring all students have multiple pathways to high school graduation.

### **Other Collateral Connections**

#### **Intergovernmental:**

School districts would welcome additional resources to provide comprehensive supports to students. Additional support could facilitate and improve community partnerships. School district fiscal and educational leaders were part of the workgroup which lead to the final recommendations.

#### **Stakeholder response:**

The Washington School Counselor Association and the School Nurse Organization of Washington support the Workgroup’s proposal that increases funding for school counselors and nurses in the basic education program.

#### **Legal or administrative mandates:**

The components of this request related to family engagement are prompted by OSPI’s goal to help school districts respond to a number of legislative changes in recent years that call for partnering with families to support student success. An example of these changes include the following:

- Inclusion of “communicating and collaborating with parents and school community” and “partnering with the school community to promote student learning” among the eight criteria used to determine the effectiveness of our teachers and principals as part of our [Teacher/Principal Evaluation Program \(TPEP\)](#) improvements made as a result of Senate Bill 6696 (2010).
- Adoption of [House Bill 1723](#) (2013), which allows district to use up to the first three days of the beginning of the school year to meet with parents and families as required in the family connection component of the [Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills \(WaKIDS\)](#).

- Adoption of [Senate Bill 5946](#) (2013), which requires schools to provide parents of students in grades K–4 who are not reading at grade level with strategies to assist with improving their reading skills at home, and to meet with the families of 3rd grade students who are reading at the level of “below-basic” to identify intensive strategies for improvement.
- Adoption of [changes to the state’s discipline policies](#) that require school districts to provide families with the opportunity to provide meaningful input on and have the opportunity to participate in a culturally responsive reengagement plan following a long-term suspension or expulsion.
- Adoption of a series of recommendations put forward by the state’s [Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee \(EOGOAC\)](#) between 2010 and 2017 which call for increasing family and community engagement as a strategy for closing educational opportunity gaps and improving student learning. The most recent of which is House Bill 1541 (2016).

**Changes from current law:**

Revisions will be needed to RCW [28A.150.260](#) to increase existing ratios. OSPI also request to change the title of “parent involvement coordinator” in the prototypical model to “family and community engagement coordinator,” which is a more appropriate representation of the roles of this position.

**State workforce impacts:**

Not applicable.

**State facilities impacts:**

None.

**Puget Sound recovery:**

Not applicable.

**Other Documents**

**Reference documents:**

[Staffing Enrichment Workgroup Recommendations Report \(2019\)](#)

**Information technology (IT) addendum:**

**Does this decision package include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software (including cloud-based services), contracts, or IT staff?**

G.  No

H.  Yes