

Background and Approach

The following document represents a proposed set of funding values for the Basic Education School Funding Model to be fully implemented by the 2018-19 school year. Adopting the 2018 Funding Values is a critical step to ensuring that the Quality Education Council (QEC) can develop an Implementation Plan by January 1, 2010, as required by ESHB 2261, and that the Funding Formula Technical Workgroup (FFTWG) has the policy guidance it needs to build the funding formulas and design a recommended Implementation Plan by December 1, 2009.

- The proposal is intended to spark discussion and debate and serve as a basis for adjustment by amendment.
- The proposal is structured according to the school model outlined in ESHB 2261 with preliminary structure decisions by the FFTWG.
- The funding values are largely based on the recommendations of the Basic Education Finance Task Force (BEFTF), with proposed adjustments only where we have better data, later research, or where there are significant holes between current practice and the task force recommendation.
- The current law funding values (as required in RCW 28A.150.260) are crosswalked into the new structure for illustration purposes only. The Crosswalk is preliminary; the FFTWG is still analyzing the OSPI staff proposal and will likely finalize the Crosswalk at their October 8, 2009 meeting. Once finalized, the Crosswalk for Current Operating Budget Funding Values will be completed using the same calculation methods.
- The FFTWG is analyzing some aspects of the funding formulas proposed here. Where their December recommendations change the formula approach to any of the following proposal the QEC should reconsider the matter at the December meeting or sooner. This proposal is not intended to pre-empt FFTWG recommendations, only provide the policy decisions on funding values the group needs to develop its Implementation Plan by December 1, 2009.
- School models are based on BEFTF sizes of 400, 432, and 600 respectively for elementary, middle and high school (per initial recommendation by FFTWG).
- Differences in funding values between the BEFTF and Dorn proposal are shaded.

I. Early Learning

- The proposal assumes the implementation of voluntary All-day Kindergarten for all schools by the 2018-19 school year as prescribed by ESHB 2261.
- Preschool will be addressed by the QEC later in the fall once the Early Learning workgroup has reported back to the Council.

II. Class Size and Classroom Teaching Assumptions

- As with the recommendations of the BEFTF, the class size recommendations are assumed to be for allocation purposes only.

Table 1: Class Size Recommendations (Funded Class Size Average by Grade and Type of Class)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2		Current Law		BEFTF		Dorn 9-29-09	
3		Non-high Poverty Schools	Poverty-Eligible Schools	Non-high Poverty Schools	>50% Free and Reduced Price Lunch	Non-high Poverty Schools	Poverty-Eligible Schools ¹
4	K-3 Class Size	25.23	NA	15	15	15	15
5	4-6 Class Size	27.01	NA	25	22	25	22
6	7-8 Class Size	28.70	NA	25	23	25	23
7	9-12 Standard Class Size	29.13	NA	25	22	25	23 ²
8	MS or HS Exploratory Voc	23.83	NA	19	19	19	19
9	MS or HS Preparatory Voc / Skills Center	24.24/20.76	NA	16	16	16	16
10	Lab Science	29.13	NA	19	19	19	19
11	AP/IB	29.13	NA	19	19	19	19

- In earlier versions of the proposal the BEFTF recommendation for Lab Science and AP/IB class sizes was incorrectly displayed as 16. The actual recommendation was a class size of 19.

Table 2: Student and Staff Schedule

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
2		Current Law			BEFTF			Dorn 9-29-09		
3		E	M	H	E	M	H	E	M	H
5	Instructional Blocks	NA			5	6	6	5	6	6
6	Teacher Course Load	NA			4	5	5	NA	5	5
7	Planning Time Expressed as %	NA			17%	17%	20%	15% ³	20%	20%

¹ The FFTWG is defining an eligibility trigger; this proposal assumes a trigger aligned with the FFTWG recommendation once complete.

² Could not identify research that would indicate the High School class size should be lower than Middle School class size.

³ Based on initial feedback from FFTWG, but subject to final recommendations.

III. School Staffing (Certificated and non-Certificated Support)

Table 3: School Staffing Plan (Staff per Prototype)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
2		Current Law			BEFTF			Dorn 9-29-09		
3		E	M	H	E	M	H	E	M	H
4	Principals and other School Administration	.95	1.40	2.06	1.2	1.3	1.8	1.0	1.4	2.0
5	Teacher Librarians and Media Specialists	.66	.52	.52	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
6	Guidance Counselors and Parent Outreach	.49	1.12	1.89	0	1.0	1.5	.5	2.0	3.5
7	Student Health, Social Workers and Other	.14	.08	.32	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
8	Professional Development Coach	.08	.10	.16	.5	.5	.75	.5	.5	.75
9	Instructional Aides	1.26	.48	.68	0 ⁴	0	0	2	1	1
10	Office Support (Secretaries, Data, Enrollment); Non-instructional aides	2.74	1.65	3.52	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5
11	Maintenance (Custodians, Building, Grounds)	1.67	3.18	3.64	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
12	Student, Staff, and Facility Security	.18	.34	.39	1.0	1.0	1.0	0	.75	1.25
13	Total	8.17	8.87	13.18	11.70	12.80	14.05	13.00	15.15	18.00

⁴ Task Force recommended that Instructional Aides could be employed by school districts by using the allocation for Classroom Teachers if the unique requirements of a school required aides.

IV. Central Administration (Districtwide Support)

Table 4: Central Administration Staffing (Staff per 1,000 Students)

1	2	3	4	5
2		Current Law	BEFTF	Dorn 9-29-09
3	Warehouse, Laborer, Mail	.96	Task Force recommended Central Administration be funded as a % of all other basic staff in the model. ⁵	.96
4	Supervisors, Finance, Personnel, Communications	4.86		4.86
5	Certificated Administrators	1.00		1.00
6	Vocational Central Admin	1.01		1.01
7	Technology	2.75		2.75
8	Transportation Central Admin	0		.38
9	Total	10.59		10.97

- The FFTWG has formed an ad hoc group to identify a formula mechanism. The QEC should revisit this recommendation once the FFTWG recommendation is known. The aspect of this proposal that provides guidance to the group is: a) that Central Administration not be reduced from current funding levels; and b) that the funding level be increased to include administration for Pupil Transportation. The transportation formula adopted by ESHB 2261 does not allow for or include an administrative component. In a system that requires attention to student safety as they travel 100 million miles per year, administration is a critical state responsibility.

⁵ The FFTWG is reviewing this formula with a small group of district finance officers. The proposed method will ensure that districts are at least funded at their current level for administration. Once the FFTWG finalizes their recommendation, this proposal component should be revisited.

V. Struggling Students

Table 5: Allocations for Struggling Students (Elementary, Middle, and High School Students)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
2		Current Law			BEFTF			Dorn 9-29-09		
3		Add'l Hrs per Week	Number Weeks	Class Size	Add'l Hrs per Week	Number Weeks	Class Size	Add'l Hrs per Week	Number Weeks	Class Size
4	Extended Day Tutoring	Crosswalk Not Complete			2		5	2		5
5	Extended Year Tutoring				10	4	10	10	4	10

- Proposal mirrors BEFTF assumptions and current law with regard to student eligibility: Formula driver is based on the percent of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch; districts will serve any student that is struggling, regardless of income; and the program is a categorical program (funds generated by the formula can only be expended on struggling students).

VI. English Language Learners (ELL)

Table 6: Additional Classroom Teachers for ELL Student Support

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2		Current Law		BEFTF		Dorn 9-29-09	
3		Elementary	Middle/High	Elementary	Middle/High	Elementary	Middle/High
4	Percent of Time in ELL Classroom	Crosswalk Not Complete		20%	17%	20%	17%
5	Class Size in ELL Classroom			8	8	8	8

- Proposal mirrors BEFTF assumptions and current law with regard to student eligibility: Formula driver is based on the headcount of students tested as non-English proficient; and the program is a categorical program (funds generated by the formula can only be expended on the ELL program).

VII. Professional Development

Table 7: Extra Support for Professional Development

- Formula drivers are based on the number of Certificated Instructional Staff allocated; districts can use resources for classified instructional support staff also.

1	2	3	4	5
2		Current Law	BEFTF	Dorn 9-29-09
3	Learning Improvement Day	1	10	10
4	1 Mentor for every [redacted] teachers in their first 3 years of teaching	0	3	Unknown at this time

VIII. Materials, Supplies and Operating Costs

Table 8: Allocation per Student FTE (Based on 2007-08 School Year Data and Costs)

1	2	3		5	6	7
2		Current Law	District Expenditures on Basic Education Elements	BEFTF (Amounts proposed do not line up with FFTWG structure)	Dorn 9-29-09 (see notes below)	Proposed Inflation Factor
3	Technology	\$53.75	\$113.80	\$200	\$223	Basket of Goods
4	Textbooks and Consumable Curriculum	\$57.70	\$122.17	\$155	\$190	Basket of Goods
5	Library and Other Supplies	\$122.52	\$259.39	Included above	\$260	Implicit Price Deflator
6	Professional Development	\$8.82	\$18.89	\$103	\$103	Implicit Price Deflator
7	Utilities/Insurance	\$146.05	\$309.21	\$216	\$309	Weighted for Utilities Index and Insurance Index
8	Central or Districtwide Support	\$50.12	\$98.64	\$310	\$99	Implicit Price Deflator
9	Facilities Maintenance	\$72.35	\$160.66	\$102	\$161	Implicit Price Deflator
10	Total	\$511.42	\$1,082.76	\$1,086	\$1,345	

MSOC Notes re: Dorn Proposal Specifics

1. Each component of MSOC will inflate with the measure that is most closely related to the actual cost growth of that basket of goods or item, as identified by column 6. Additional research is needed, and the QEC should conduct a formal study of the inflation options and outcomes.
2. Textbooks and Consumable Materials is based on an OSPI model which documents the costs of textbooks and consumable supplies. The amount is based on the following assumptions: a) model amounts are driven by materials on the state curriculum menu; where no menu exists, by the most commonly purchased products; b) districts will replace textbooks every 6 years; c) consumable curriculum materials will be replaced annually; d) science kits will be re-purchased every 6 years and replenished annually in years 1-5 through the Leadership and Assistance for Science Education Reform (LASER) program.

3. The Textbook and Consumable Materials model shall be an annual update for the Quality Education Council, by review and formal adoption.
4. The Technology allocation is based on an OSPI model which calculates the cost per student based on a market basket of technology goods and assumed replacement cycles. The amount is based on the following assumptions: a) computer to student ratios at elementary, middle, and high school replaced every 6 years; b) a specific set of equipment for each classroom replaced on a 5 year cycle; c) a specific allocation per student for set of equipment for administrative and districtwide support.
5. The Technology model shall be an annual update for the Quality Education Council, by review and formal adoption.
6. Facilities Maintenance requires additional research in order to identify the funding level to maintain facilities to state and industry standards. Research is dependent on the completion of the facilities inventory currently being piloted by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee. The MSOC and staffing allocations proposed here are intended to identify the minimum immediate level until additional research provides updated information.

IX. Not Yet Addressed; For Future Consideration of the Quality Education Council

1. Student Schedule aligned with Core 24 (e.g., how many lab science courses assumed out of 24 High School course periods).
2. Vocational and Skills Center, LAP and ELL MSOC.
3. Gifted Education.
4. Special Education Funding Mechanism.
5. Early Learning.
6. Mentoring and Induction Program.
7. Central Administration.
8. Eligibility Criteria for High Poverty Schools Class Size Reduction.
9. Rounding adjustments to match current funding.
10. Education funding for students in county and state detention centers, jails, and prisons.