

## Center for the Improvement of Student Learning Correction, JF

**Agency:** 350 Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction  
**Budget Period:** 2007-09

### **Recommendation Summary Text:**

After the appropriation for the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL) and the Office of the Education Ombudsman (OEO) was split, CISL was left with an inadequate maintenance level budget amount. The percentage split was governed by the fiscal note and initially made sense due to the OEO's proportionally higher one-time costs. However, the split resulted in a maintenance level underfunding that prevents CISL from hiring all five FTEs as intended by the Legislature. As a result, CISL cannot operate at full capacity and must cut back in the amount of outreach and the number of people they can serve. This request is for an on-going addition of \$73,500 to the maintenance level budget, allowing CISL to operate at full capacity.

### **Fiscal Detail**

<b>Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>Total</b>
Center for the Improvement of Student Learning	001-01	\$0	\$73,500	\$73,500
<b>Total Cost</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>

<b>Staffing</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>Annual Avg.</b>
<b>Total FTEs Requested</b>	0	0	0

### **Package Description**

#### **Background**

The Center for the Improvement of Student Learning, created in 1993 and left without funding from the 2001 – 2003 biennium until 2007, manages many school district and community outreach programs. Outreach demands continue to increase (e.g, more requests to provide trainings and facilitation, more requests to create detailed parent outreach materials), while staffing has decreased by 1 FTE. This critical staff position was responsible for writing the bulk of division outreach materials and managing and creating content for the CISL Web site, which by law is designed to serve as a statewide clearinghouse of “best practices” information and tools. The loss of this position is dramatically limiting CISL’s outreach capabilities.

#### **Current Situation**

The Center currently operates understaffed and at partial capacity. The fiscal note for ESHB 3127 allots five FTEs to the office, which is currently receiving enough funding for only four FTEs.

	<b>2007 - 09 FTE</b>	<b>2008 Budget</b>
Original Fiscal Note (3127 E S HB)	5	\$422,254

## **Center for the Improvement of Student Learning Correction, JF**

Currently Budgeted	4	\$333,000
--------------------	---	-----------

### **Proposed Solution**

The requested funding will allow CISL to staff to the capacity intended by the Legislature, allowing CISL to match and surpass its previous outreach capabilities. Package funding will provide CISL with the ability to restore 1 FTE, matching and expanding upon its previous outreach capabilities. In addition, full funding will allow CISL to have increased flexibility and more ability to respond to increasing workloads and future legislative requests.

### **Contact person**

Erin Jones, Director, Center for the Improvement of Student Learning, 360-725-6164, erin.jones@k12.wa.us

### **Narrative Justification and Impact Statement**

#### **What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?**

CISL will return to producing a monthly newsletter, providing fresh content on its Web site, and more regularly promoting the best practices in outreach to parents and families that it is legislatively mandated to do. Not only will the amount of content produced increase, but new and existing content will reach more people.

#### **Performance Measure Detail**

CISL will use web data tracking to monitor the number of visitors to CISL's Web site, the number of downloads of newsletters/relevant articles, and more. The number of customers served through increased preparation and distribution of materials will also be measured.

#### **Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?**

CISL was reestablished for the express purpose of supporting school districts in their outreach to parents and communities who have traditionally been underserved by the education system. The legislation recreating CISL mandates that the organization serve as a clearinghouse of best practices and share information statewide that will improve and broaden family outreach. Additionally, the legislation directs the Center to "Identify strategies for improving the success rates of ethnic and racial student groups with disproportionate academic achievement, which coincides with the goals of OSPI's Strategic Plan. The funding package will restore CISL's ability to fully carry out its legislative mandate.

#### **Reason for change:**

The reason for this proposed budget change is to restore CISL's funding to the intended level in the original legislation.

#### **Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?**

## **Center for the Improvement of Student Learning Correction, JF**

Creating a world-class public education system is one of the Governor's priorities. In order to make that a reality, it requires more academic success for all students. CISL is responsible for promoting strategies to help eliminate the achievement gap and raise the bar for all of the State's students.

### **Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?**

Yes, this decision package will make key contributions to statewide results by identifying and promoting strategies to help reduce gaps in student achievement. Reducing gaps in student achievement is a high priority in the Priorities of Government process.

### **What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?**

Should the Legislature implement funding increases that might arise out of suggestions from the Basic Education Finance Task Force, districts and schools would be able to better use and implement the research, best practices, and recommendations provided by CISL given increased resources.

### **Impact on Clients and Services**

Fully funding CISL will positively impact students and parents by giving districts and schools increased access to information and materials on education research and improvement.

### **Impact on Other State Programs**

### **What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?**

The existing staff has made significant efforts to fill in gaps caused by this loss. One member of the staff has taken on limited Web maintenance responsibility, and an intern has been used to assist with the most critical writing projects. These stop-gap measures are unsustainable. Currently, there is no on-staff expertise to completely handle the responsibilities previously performed by the staff writer and Webmaster.

### **What are the consequences of not funding this package?**

If CISL does not receive this additional funding, it will maintain the status quo – essentially amounting to a 25% loss of staffing. The organization will need to permanently streamline its operations, reducing the scope of many of its outreach activities and thereby reducing its impact in helping school districts more effectively reach underserved families and communities.

### **What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?**

None.

### **What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?**

None.

## Center for the Improvement of Student Learning Correction, JF

### **Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions:**

For FY 2007, the Legislature appropriated \$1,330,053 to OSPI for the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL) and for the Office of the Education Ombudsman (OEO). The division of this money was \$430,053 and \$900,000 respectively. This works out to 32% for CISL and 68% for OEO.

For the 2007-09 biennium, OFM, House and Senate staff looked at the fiscal note total for these two offices combined (\$1,830,106) and applied a percentage of 36% for CISL. At the time, OSPI agreed that the fiscal note should govern the split. But it was the dollar amount identified in the fiscal note that was necessary to calculate maintenance level; applying the first biennium split to the maintenance level underfunds CISL. The OEO budget had a large portion of one-time costs, not proportionate to the one-time costs for CISL. The OEO one-time costs were associated with starting up new offices in multiple places, and the CISL one-time costs were associated with traditional equipment purchases. Based on the fiscal note, the correct split of the \$1,830,106 should have been 43% for CISL and 57% for OEO. Now that the offices are completely separate, the percentage split is only important when calculating the amount for CISL. The amount required for CISL to operate as intended is \$73,500 more than the \$333,000 in the budget for a total of \$406,500 for the 2009 fiscal year. The table below shows what the Legislature intended to fund with the original fiscal note compared to the funding CISL actually receives as a result of the split.

### **Object Detail**

		<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>Total</b>
A	Salary and Wages	\$0	\$60,000	\$60,000
B	Employee Benefits	\$0	\$13,500	\$13,500
C	Contracts	\$0	\$0	\$0
E	Goods/Services	\$0	\$0	\$0
G	Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
J	Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
N	Grants	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Interagency Reimbursement	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Objects</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>

### **Expenditures & FTEs by Program**

<b>Activity Inventory Item</b>	<b>Prog</b>	<b>Staffing</b>			<b>Operating Expenditures</b>		
		<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>Total</b>
A002 Administration	055	0	0	0	\$0	\$73,500	\$73,500
<b>Total Activities</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>

## Center for the Improvement of Student Learning Correction, JF

### **Six-Year Expenditure Estimates**

<b>Fund</b>	<b>07-09 Total</b>	<b>09-11 Total</b>	<b>11-13 Total</b>
General Fund – State	<b>\$73,500</b>	<b>\$147,000</b>	<b>\$147,000</b>
<b>Expenditure Total</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>	<b>\$147,000</b>	<b>\$147,000</b>
<b>FTEs</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### **Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs:**

All costs are ongoing.

### **Budget impacts in future biennia:**

Future cost-of-living adjustments and/or adjustments to state employee benefits will impact maintenance costs.