

Increasing Core Administration Support AK

Agency: 350 Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Budget Period: 2015-17

Recommendation Summary Text:

Article III, Section 22 of the Washington State Constitution gives responsibility “over all matters pertaining to public schools” to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). OSPI’s core administrative funding was significantly reduced during the recent recession. The reduction eliminated many positions dedicated to core functions. The Superintendent requests funding be restored for 4.0 FTEs to meet minimum basic education accountability and program oversight needs.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Basic Education Staff Increase		\$0	\$537,000	\$537,000
Total Cost		\$0	\$537,000	\$537,000

Staffing		FY 2016	FY 2017	Annual Avg.
Basic Education FTEs		0.0	4.0	4.0
Total FTEs		0.0	4.0	4.0

Package Description

Background

Washington’s Kindergarten through 12th (K-12) grade education system has been in a state of constant reform since State Superintendent Randy Dorn took office in 2009. The State has new learning standards and assessments, revised graduation requirements, improved principal/teacher evaluations, revamped school district funding, and many other substantive reforms. The scope and depth of organizational change expected of this complex, statewide system in an eight-year period has been extraordinary.

As the state agency constitutionally responsible for supervising all matters pertaining to public schools, a broad array of stakeholders look to OSPI to:

- Manage the implementation of the state’s K-12 education reform initiatives with fidelity while also maintaining the stability and efficacy of the system as a whole;
- Coordinate the implementation of multiple reforms according to sensible, doable plans;
- Explain key connections between on-going core functions and multiple new initiatives; and
- Support the changes required of school districts and other organizations with knowledge, information on best practices, appropriate and timely communications, data analysis, and other resources.

Increasing Core Administration Support AK

The more challenging and complex the system and system reforms, the greater the need for these supervisory functions at an overarching level. Despite a greater than ever need for strong OSPI leadership and support, the agency's administrative allocation has significantly declined. During the eight-year period from FY 2008 to FY 2016, OSPI's annual base administrative funds were reduced by \$2.9 million (24%) and the positions supported by these funds dropped from 123 to 102 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff.

Current Situation

While the demand for OSPI's services and support have increased, resources for the agency's core administrative functions have decreased and positions have been cut impeding the agency's ability to provide high quality support to school districts and other stakeholders.

Proposed Solution

OSPI is requesting funding for 4.0 FTEs that have been identified as critical agency functions that the agency is unable to fund from existing resources. The positions are itemized in the following table:

Requested FTE	Position
1.0	Learning Assistance Program (LAP) Program Supervisor
1.0	Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) Program Supervisor
1.0	Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS) Support
1.0	Help Desk Support

LAP and TBIP (2.0 FTE) – Additional staff are needed to provide districts with requested technical assistance and perform onsite monitoring to meet legislative accountability expectations.

Technology staff (2.0 FTE) – Funding is requested to continue to support timely collecting, processing, and maintenance of data in CEDARS.

Contact Person

JOLynn Berge, Chief Financial Officer
360-735-6292, jolynn.berge@k12.wa.us

Increasing Core Administration Support AK

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

OSPI expects to see greater program accountability for state funded programs and provisos.

OSPI expects a higher level of support and coordination from the state level to the educational service districts and school districts. School districts receiving increased support will be able to focus more of their time and resources on the education of students at the local level. Policy-makers will see a more coordinated approach to program delivery and measurement of student outcomes.

Performance Measure Detail

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

Yes. One of the Superintendent's priorities is full-funding of basic education, which includes having enough resources at OSPI to support the school districts and other stakeholders.

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

Yes, the Governor's Goal 1: World-class education.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities? If so, describe.

Yes, this decision package supports the Governor's priority to provide every Washingtonian a world-class education that prepares him or her for a healthy and productive life, including success in a job or career, in the community and as a lifelong learner. Providing OSPI with the staff needed to provide coordination and share best practices at a state-wide level as well as better track student achievement fulfills this priority.

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

There are numerous K-12 education stakeholders and initiatives that rely on the smooth operation of OSPI's core functions.

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

The agency continues to shift available resources to the highest priority responsibilities and issues. However, with increasing responsibilities and decreasing core staff and resources the alternatives are about mitigating negative impacts to essential services rather than having a solution to the underlying problem.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

The agency will continue to do its best to meet stakeholder demands. Some stakeholder needs may not be met.

Increasing Core Administration Support AK

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

There is no relationship to the state's capital budget.

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

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions:

Revenue Calculations and Assumptions:

N/A

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions:

2.0 Program Supervisors @ \$76,000

1.0 CEDARS ITS 5 @ \$84,816

1.0 Help Desk ITS 4 @ \$76,814

Object Detail

		FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
A	Salary and Wages	\$0	\$314,288	\$314,668
B	Employee Benefits	\$0	\$149,816	\$149,816
C	Contracts	\$0	\$0	\$0
E	Goods/Services	\$0	\$26,448	\$26,448
G	Travel	\$0	\$26,448	\$26,448
J	Equipment	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000
N	Grants	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Interagency Reimbursement	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Objects		\$0	\$537,000	\$537,000

Expenditures & FTEs by Program

Activity Inventory Item	Prog	Staffing			Operating Expenditures		
		FY 2016	FY 2017	Avg	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
A002 Administration	010	0	4.0	4.0	\$0	\$537,000	\$537,000
Total Activities		0	4.0	4.0	\$0	\$537,000	\$537,000

Increasing Core Administration Support AK

Six-Year Expenditure Estimates

Fund	15-17 Total	17-19 Total	19-21 Total
General Fund – State	\$537,000	\$1,034,000	\$1,034,000
Expenditure Total	\$537,000	\$1,034,000	\$1,034,000
FTEs	4.0	4.0	4.0

Which costs and functions are one time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

Of the total costs identified \$20,000 are for one-time equipment costs associated with hiring new staff. The remainder of the cost are assumed to be ongoing. Staffing cost will remain relatively constant at a total of \$1,034,000 per biennium.