



#### Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education John A. Wilson Building | 1350 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, Suite 307 | Washington, DC 20004

August 11, 2020

DC Public Education Stakeholders,

The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME) is pleased to announce the release of the 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Study. This work was completed by Afton Partners, LLC during Fiscal Year 2020, following Mayor Muriel Bowser's allocation and the Council of the District of Columbia's approval of funding for a study on four key components of the UPSFF. Initiated in October 2019, the 2020 UPSFF Study includes in-depth analysis of the students covered by the at-risk weight, the consideration of school-level at-risk concentration funding, the structure of the English Language Learners (ELL) weight, and the cost drivers of the formula's foundation level.

The UPSFF is our single best tool for achieving funding equity for young people in the District of Columbia. This study—both its undertaking and its delivery—represents our community's commitment to providing all students with the resources they need to achieve success and build family-sustaining careers. This body of work will strengthen and ground conversations about the UPSFF and school funding among our city's education stakeholders for years to come.

The realities of our current situation are very different from when this work began nearly a year ago. We are reminded and driven to even greater urgency to address persistent challenges of anti-Black and racist systems that underlie too many of our institutions. Our community also faces the unforeseen challenge of educating students amidst a global public health crisis and its mounting economic and social impact. Ultimately, as we consider these challenges, the District is faced with a question: what can we do?

Equity is our guiding principle and demands we provide all students with what they need to achieve success in addition to an obligation to direct greater resources to those who need more. Grounded in an analysis of student achievement and a firm belief this moment provides a unique opportunity to reimagine and improve the ways we target education funding, this study aims to influence student outcomes we should expect to realize from the intentional allocation of resources. While our public education system celebrates significant growth in the past ten years, this study shows that there is much work to be done. Among the 2020 UPSFF Study's key findings:

- Among students designated at-risk, performance data shows that students specifically designated as over-age or CFSA are most significantly behind both students not designated at-risk and their at-risk student peers;
- Compared to those with a single at-risk factor, students with multiple at-risk factors tend to underperform on the PARCC standardized test; and
- For ELL students, the highest achievement gaps for math are in grades 6-8, following a significant decline in proficiency from grade 5 to 6; ELA gaps are highest in grades 6-10, with proficiency levels mixed for all grades.





#### Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education John A. Wilson Building | 1350 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, Suite 307 | Washington, DC 20004

Although the UPSFF does not explicitly include race as a formula component, it is evident some components of the formula are highly correlated with race in DC. The at-risk weight, for example, provides additional resources for students who meet at least one of the at-risk definition's characteristics, none of which are explicitly race-based. Practically speaking, however, we know this funding is most targeted toward black and brown students. It follows, therefore, that any change increasing the at-risk weight's allocation provides an increase for these students as well.

Recognizing that outcomes for these students have been unacceptable for far too long, we move forward with this understanding and embrace the opportunity to consider a series of options the study provides to direct resources to those that need it most. This study is more than a collection of analyses and alternatives for consideration; it is a chance for us to effect meaningful change and achieve true racial and economic justice.

It is our responsibility to get this formula right for the future of our city. I am both humbled by and eager for the work ahead. I look forward to engaging with you as we work to build a more equitable city for the students and families of the District of Columbia.

Sincerely,

Paul Kihn Computy Mayor for Education



### Supporting Strong Schools. Sustaining the Future.



### 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Study Part I: Executive Summary



June 2020 Updated September 4, 2020



### **Table of Contents**

### I. Executive Summary

- II. At-risk Student Need research, analysis and options
- III. At-risk Concentration research, analysis and options
- IV. ELL Weight Structure research, analysis and options
- V. Foundation Level Cost Drivers analysis

### VI. Appendix

- a. UPSFF study process and approach detail
- b. Additional background and research
- c. Additional student outcomes and data analysis





### **Executive Summary**





# This study seeks to identify opportunities to improve the District's student funding formula based on student outcomes data

The 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula ("UPSFF") study, awarded in October 2019, asked questions regarding the per-student **foundation level** funding LEAs receive for every student as well as the additional funds for each **at-risk and English-language learner ("ELL") student**.

To support this scope of work, Afton analyzed **student outcomes data**, documented **state and local practices** across the country, **analyzed spending**, and facilitated an **Advisory Group of local and national education experts**.

This work has identified students that have consistently shown the greatest needs over time. Consequently, this study includes **several options to modify the UPSFF** that may more effectively target funds to these students. This study also highlights cost drivers of the UPSFF foundation level for consideration in future city funding decisions.

The suggested options to refine the UPSFF range from small adjustments to the existing formula to entirely new categories of funding. The options included herein align to the structure of the UPSFF, which allocates funds to Local Education Agencies ("LEAs") based on student need in a transparent, simple, and flexible framework.

Several funding options are included in this report based on the outcomes of detailed analyses, supported by local and national experts





# The UPSFF allocates funds to each student in DC based on their individual needs, regardless of the school they attend.

UPSFF was designed to be a flexible, equitable formula with minimal restrictions on use that **allows LEAs to determine how to use these dollars to best support their students.** Our approach acknowledges research that LEA and school-level decision-making, rather than a particular set of resources, is central to driving outcomes.<sup>1</sup>

With the goal of improving outcomes, increased weights would generate additional funding for groups of students that have shown the greatest needs in DC. The funding would remain flexible but send a signal that in receiving this money **LEAs and schools are responsible for raising outcomes** for targeted groups of students.<sup>2</sup>

Consequently, this report recommends coupling any incremental funding with **robust measurement of student outcomes for these groups.**<sup>3</sup>

**Communicating the desired outcomes for each group alongside the funding to LEAs** will be critical in signaling to LEAs and schools that it is their responsibility to ensure progress.<sup>4</sup>

The report acknowledges that there is **no empirical means of determining the "right amount" to spend**<sup>5</sup> on any student type and total available funding is constrained. So, **funds generated by and for particular categories of students can and should be combined with other funds** to best serve those students.

Sources

- . Bloom, Nicholas, Renata Lemos, Raffaella Sadun, and John Van Reenen. Does Management Matter in Schools? NBER Working Paper No. 20667. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2014.
- 2. Derby, Elena, and Marguerite Roza. California's Weighted Student Formula: Does It Help Money Matter More? Rapid Response Series. Seattle, WA: Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University, 2017.
- 3. Roza, Marguerite, Funding Student Types: How States Can Mine Their Own Data To Guide Finance Policy on High-Needs Students. Seattle, WA: Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University, 2017
- 4. Roza, Marguerite. Funding for Students' Sake: How to Stop Financing Tomorrow's Schools Based on Yesterday's Priorities. Seattle, WA. Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University, 2019.

5. Roza, Marguerite. Funding Student Types: How States Can Mine Their Own Data To Guide Finance Policy on High-Needs Students. Seattle, WA: Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University, 2017.

Any change to the UPSFF should ensure flexibility and be coupled with robust accountability processes and data to measure outcomes



5



### This study has identified multiple options to update ELL and atrisk student weights, while also considering cost drivers for the foundation level

At-risk student need: This report details multiple options for better targeting segments of the District's at-risk student population that are particularly low-performing, including students designated as high school over-age and/or those placed in foster care by the Child and Family Services Agency ("CFSA"), as well as those experiencing multiple at-risk factors.

**At-risk concentration funding**: Though research on "concentration funding" or a "nonlinear" exponential increase in per pupil funding based on the concentration of at-risk students at schools is inconclusive, this report presents several options for DME consideration

**ELL formula**: National experts and local practitioners, as well as analysis of student-level PARCC testing data, favor consideration of multiple options to "tier" funding (or allocate differentiated amounts) by **grade level** and for **students with limited or interrupted formal education** ("SLIFE").

**Foundation**: DCPS and sample public charter schools studied spent \$22.4K per pupil in FY19, an increase of 4.1% on average from FY16 to FY19. The increases were driven primarily by personnel costs, representing 75% of total spending, and more specifically employees represented by a collective bargaining agreement ("CBA"), which reflect 91% of all DCPS employees.

Each option included in this report has been evaluated for implementation considerations, funding goals and quantified using a long-term UPSFF forecast model



### To arrive at options for consideration, this study evaluated student-level outcomes data, performed national research on best practices, and consulted with local and national experts

- 1. Analysis of student outcomes data: Afton performed detailed school and student-level analysis on PARCC math and ELA outcomes data as well as WIDA data from FY15 to FY19. The results of these analyses helped guide options considered by the Advisory Group and are documented herein.
- 2. National benchmarking and expertise: Afton and a team of national experts reviewed state and local methodologies for funding student needs and identified unique or emerging practices for future consideration.
- **3. Consultation of local experts and practitioners**: An Advisory Group of local experts was formed to advise upon and stress test potential options for the UPSFF. Seven Advisory Group meetings were held from November 2019 through January 2020.
- **4. Interviews with sample LEAs and schools**: Afton performed structured interviews with high-performing schools and LEAs to understand effective pedagogical strategies for students with the greatest needs.
- **5. Review of detailed financial data**: Afton analyzed historical spending data for a sample of Public Charter Schools and DCPS to identify cost drivers for the foundation analysis.
- 6. Utilization of a UPSFF forecasting tool: Afton developed a five-year forecast model to understand the potential cost and LEA-level impact of each option.

All UPSFF options considered are also evaluated through the lens of student-based funding goals, including transparency, simplicity and impacting the students who need the most support



7



### At-risk student need findings and options





### This study identifies multiple options to support segments of atrisk students whose performance gaps have increased compared to their at-risk and not at-risk peers from FY15 to FY19

- 1. Like most states, the District funds all at-risk students **at the same level**, though some students have demonstrated greater needs than others. However, unlike most states, the District has **five components to the at-risk weight** Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), homeless, CFSA and high school over-age students. For the purposes of this study, students designated as receiving either TANF or SNAP assistance are classified as "Direct Certification" students.
- Student outcomes data, as well as LEA interviews and advisory group feedback, highlights additional needs for high school over-age students (and possibly CFSA), as well as students with 2 or 3 at-risk factors. These groups lag both at-risk and not-atrisk peers.
- 3. Schools in the District with higher performing at-risk student populations have invested in **technology and data, extended day, extended year, after school activities** and **social-emotional supports** to support at-risk students.
- 4. Additionally, a small number of urban school Districts are beginning to adopt more nuanced strategies to support at-risk students, including the **equity index** used in Chicago and **opportunity index** used in Boston. Though these funding mechanisms offer a potentially more personalized approach to at-risk funding, they may be better suited for implementation on the LEA-level.

Note: High performing schools as identified by Empower K-12, which publishes an annual list of schools that "beat the odds" given their mix of student needs and demographics.





# In FY19, nearly 39,000 of DC students (over 45% of all students) were designated as "at-risk", with the largest numbers in KG, 1<sup>st</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades



58% of 9<sup>th</sup> grade students are designated as at-risk, compared to an average 44% of students in grades PK - 8. High School grades have a higher percentage of at-risk students, driven largely by the additional at-risk factor of over-age, which applies only to students in grades 9-12. 1/3 of all 9<sup>th</sup> graders are designated as over-age.



# Most students were designated as "at-risk" in FY19 due to their family's eligibly for SNAP or TANF federal programs



### Historically, each at-risk student has been funded the same. In FY19, with an incremental \$2,387 per pupil - UPSFF weight of 0.224

#### Notes

Actual (not budgeted) UPSFF enrollment – excludes Adult and Alternative Students

 Bar chart categories are <u>not mutually exclusive and include students with multiple factors</u>. Students with multiple factors are counted in each relevant factor category.



Over the last six years, per pupil funding for at-risk students has increased 19%, primarily due to increases in the foundation level of the UPSFF



GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

> Historical UPSFF At-Risk Funding Rates \$ Per Pupil



Note: FY17 FY18 funding amounts reflect the retroactive increases stemming from the 2017 Washington Teachers' Union (WTU) contract agreement.

AFTON 12



This study includes several options to provide additional supports to sub-sets of at-risk students that have shown a higher relative need based on student outcomes

QuestionShould the UPSFF include a funding weight basedfrom RFAon higher relative need for certain characteristics?

### Key Decisions and Options to Modify UPSFF

#### Decision 1: Should the UPSFF weight for at-risk students be updated?

### Decision 2: If yes, which students should be targeted and what options for changing the formula exist?

- A. Increase funding for over-age, CFSA or both
- B. Fund intervention prior to high school to mitigate risk of over-age designation
- C. Increase funding for students with 2+ at-risk characteristics
- D. Increase funding for students with 3+ at-risk characteristics
- E. Increase high school base amount (all HS students, not just at-risk)
- F. Increase to high school at-risk amount (only HS at-risk students)

### Decision 3: Should the change be funded with redistributed or incremental funding?

- A. <u>Redistributed funding</u>: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for by decreasing weights on the "all other" at-risk student category, or through changes to the foundation amount
- B. <u>Incremental funding</u>: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for with incremental/new funds available over time

Risks, opportunities and implementation considerations, as well as quantified impact for each of these options is included in the 'At-Risk Student Needs' section of this report





<u>At-risk student data</u> – Though the proficiency gap has increased for all at-risk students, over-age and CFSA students have had the most significant performance gaps compared to other students.



Looking at all grade levels, <u>over-age students</u> underperform other at-risk peers. This group only applies to <u>High School students</u>, however.

AFTON



<u>At-risk student data</u> – Looking at High School students only, over-age students underperform other at-risk student groups. CFSA students, with significantly fewer students and test takers than other at-risk student groups, also underperform.





3 Year Performance (FY15, FY18, FY19) 2 Year Performance (FY18 & FY19)





### <u>At-risk student data</u> – Additionally, students with more at-risk factors tend to have larger proficiency gaps compared to students with fewer or no at-risk factors

By Count of At-Risk Factors - All Grades



FY19 reported n<10 students with 4 Factors, none of which record a test score;</li>

Enrollment reflects Actual (not budgeted) UPSFF enrollment and excludes Adult and Alternative students



### At-risk concentration findings and options





### National research on the impact of concentration funding is inconclusive, and support for this school-level weight is mixed

- 1. Student outcomes in the District are **closely aligned to concentration levels of schools**, meriting the consideration of an additional weight for highconcentration schools
- 2. However, national research and recent studies have been **inconclusive on the impact of concentration funding** on student outcomes
- 3. Implementation of concentration funding would require adding a **school-level weight to the at-risk component of the UPSFF.** Other school-level weights in the UPSFF, such as for SPED and residential programs, are program- (and site-) specific and do not change materially year over year. A school-level concentration weight could change each year based on student demographics and needs.
- 4. The Advisory Group generally expressed concern about adding another **school-level weight** to the funding formula. However, some members supported a **sliding scale methodology** if concentration were considered.





# Based on national research and benchmarking, multiple options exist for the DME to implement concentration funding

### Question from RFA

Should the UPSFF include a funding weight for school-level at-risk concentration (i.e. funding students in schools with a higher at-risk concentration more than students in schools with a lower concentration)?

### Key Decisions and Options to Modify UPSFF

Decision 1: Should the UPSFF add additional funding for high-at-risk concentration schools?

Decision 2: If yes, which schools should be targeted and what options for changing the formula exist?

- A. <u>Qualification level for at-risk funding</u> establish a minimum at-risk threshold for at-risk funding, allocate all at-risk funding to schools above the minimum threshold.
- B. <u>Tiered funding</u> incremental funding for schools above a certain threshold
- C. <u>Emulate the Community eligibility provision for school food</u> as defined in the RFA, this would treat schools above a certain threshold as having 100% at-risk students
- D. <u>Sliding scale</u> additional per pupil funding as concentration level increases

#### Decision 3: Should the change be funded with *redistributed* or *incremental* funding?

- A. <u>Redistributed funding</u>: reallocate existing funding levels based on concentration levels of schools, through changes to at-risk funding pool or foundation level
- B. <u>Incremental funding</u>: support concentration funding based on availability of new funds

Risks, opportunities and implementation considerations, as well as quantified impact for each of these options is included in the 'At-Risk Concentration' section of this report





# State definitions of high concentrations of at-risk students varies significantly, as do funding mechanisms

Sixteen states have implemented concentration funding with an **array of funding structures and eligibility levels** 

- Eligibility for concentration funding ranges from 5% (in Nebraska) to over 80% (North Carolina)
- Funding mechanisms include:
  - **Tiered funding** (*Arkansas, California*) based on concentration levels (i.e. all schools above a certain threshold receive additional per pupil funding)
  - A "sliding scale" methodology (Ohio, Minnesota), where schools receive additional per pupil funding as concentration increases. Utilizing this methodology would result in students in each school receiving a different funding amount based on the concentration level at their school.
  - Mixed tiered funding and sliding scale (Massachusetts) per pupil funding based on poverty "decile" of the district (12 deciles implementing for FY21). Utilizing this methodology would result in students in schools with similar concentration levels receiving the same funding amount per pupil. In Massachusetts, multiple schools are in each "tier" and receive funding levels based on a range of concentration, rather than each school receiving a different per pupil amount (such as a full sliding scale)





# Math PARCC test results for <u>all students</u> are correlated to school-level at-risk concentration...



School-level all-student proficiency rates are generally higher at schools with a smaller concentration of at-risk students and are generally lower at schools with a higher concentration of at-risk students.

AFTON 21



### ...and Math PARCC test results for <u>at-risk students only</u> are also correlated to school-level at-risk concentration, though the correlation is not as strong



Though at-risk student performance tends to decline as concentration increases, the correlation is stronger when measuring total-student performance.





### ELL formula findings and options



### This study identifies multiple options to "tier" funding for ELL students, including at the grade level, by proficiency level and new to the country status

- 1. Similar to most states, the District funds all English Language Learner ("ELL") students at the same level, regardless of demonstrated student need. However, several large, urban school districts and two states fund ELL students based on grade band and proficiency level
- The number of ELL students in the District has increased by 50% from FY15 to FY20, 2 while funding in total dollars has increased by over 70% in that time. The achievement gap has also improved during that time, particularly for elementary school students in math.
- 3. This study has identified multiple options to tier funding of students based on grade band, while local and national practitioners also support incremental funding for students with limited or interrupted formal education ("SLIFE"). Additionally, student outcomes data reflect additional needs for students with low proficiency scores, though implementing a proficiency-based weight is more common for LEAs than States.
- 4. Implementation will require developing **common definitions for student need**, consistent data collection methodologies from all LEAs, as well as coordination with OSSE on any forthcoming changes to ELL exit requirements due to changes in the rigor of the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment exam ("WIDA"\*).



Students designated as ELL have increased by 50% from FY15 to FY20. This growth has impacted <u>DCPS most significantly</u>, with ELL students representing 15% of the total student population in FY20.



Note:

- 1) All data pulled from Enrollment Audit Reports at: <u>https://osse.dc.gov/page/data-and-reports-0</u>
- 2) FY15 excludes 14 ELL students at OSSE Managed Washington Hospitality Foundation

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DME 🗲





# Annual total UPSFF funding for ELL has increased 71% from FY15 actual to FY20 projected; at the same time total ELL students have increased 50%



Notes

- Funding is not adjusted for inflation.
- Funding data uses actual charter funding from OSSE and DCPS budgeted funding from budget books FY17 and FY18 reflect rate adjustments (per Foundation Level letter) due to retroactive WTU increases.

• Enrollment data pulled from Enrollment Audit Reports at: https://osse.dc.gov/page/data-and-reports-0



### More than half of ELL students are in grades PK to 3, though the number of students significantly increases in 9<sup>th</sup> grade



Source data – ELL student-level data from DME & OSSE

• Data Filters: FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.





### This study has identified and quantified several options to "tier" funding for ELL students

QuestionShould the English Language Learner weight be tiered, reflectingfrom RFAdiffering costs by service needs, and along what line of differentiation?

### Key Decisions and Options to Modify UPSFF

Decision 1: Should the UPSFF weight for ELL students be updated?

#### Decision 2: If yes, which students should be targeted and what options for changing the formula exist?

- A. Grade Level 1 Tiered funding for ES, MS, HS students
- B. Grade Level 2 Tiered funding for PK-8, HS students
- C. Grade Level 3 Tiered funding for PK-5, 6-12 students
- D. Proficiency targeted funding for lowest WIDA test scores
- E. Combination of grade levels and proficiency
- F. Additional funding for students designated as "new to country"
- G. Additional funding for students identified as SLIFE

#### Decision 3: Should the change be funded with redistributed or incremental funding

- A. <u>Redistributed funding</u>: new UPSFF ELL categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for by decreasing weights on currently existing ELL student categories, or through changes to the foundation amount
- B. <u>Incremental funding</u>: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for with incremental/new funds available over time

Risks, opportunities and implementation considerations, as well as quantified impact for each of these options is included in the 'ELL Weight Structure' section of this report







### MATH FY19 ONLY

FY19 ONLY - MATH			
	Proficient 4+		
Grade Level	Not or No Longer ELL	ELL	Deviation from Not ELL
Gr3	42.9%	35.9%	-7.0%
Gr4	40.4%	25.6%	-14.8%
Gr5	34.0%	20.3%	-13.7%
Gr6	24.7%	7.4%	-17.3%
Gr7	28.6%	8.6%	-19.9%
Gr8	26.2%	6.5%	-19.7%
Gr9	20.2%	5.2%	-14.9%
Gr10	13.7%	3.5%	-10.2%
Gr11	3.3%	10.0%	6.7%
Gr12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

#### Notes:

- ELL students counted: FY15 FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.
- Including Valid PARCC scores only

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- PARCC scores used for valid scores reported from students in UPSFF grade levels 3-12 only
- There are significantly fewer test takers (and data points) for grades 11 and 12







#### Notes:

- ELL students counted: FY15 FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.
- Including Valid PARCC scores only; excludes ELL students with NO WIDA scores reported.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PARCC scores used for valid scores reported from students in UPSFF grade levels 3-12 only



### **Foundation Analysis**



# What are the actual cost drivers experienced by LEAs operating in the District of Columbia?

- **1. Total spending**. In FY19, all LEAs included in this study spent \$22.4K per pupil.
  - DCPS spent on average \$21.1K per pupil, while the sample PCS LEAs spent \$23.9K per pupil, or a difference of \$2.8K in FY19. This differential is primarily due to charter spending on facility financing costs which DCPS does not incur.
  - Charter schools received an additional allotment of approximately \$3.1K per pupil to offset this cost
- Growth in spending. Per pupil spending has increased from \$19.9K to \$22.4K from FY16 to FY19, or a compounded annual growth rate ("CAGR") of 4.1% per year.
  - Per pupil spend at DCPS and sample charter networks increased at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 4.6% and 3.4% per year, respectively, from FY16 to FY19
  - These increases in spending were primarily driven by increased personnel costs
  - 91% of DCPS employees are a part of a collective bargaining agreement, with nearly
    60% of FTEs represented by the Washington Teachers Union (WTU)



# What are the actual cost drivers experienced by LEAs operating in the District of Columbia?

- **3. Personnel vs. Non-Personnel spending.** When looking at all LEAs included in the study, and excluding facility rent, debt service and depreciation primarily impacting PCS spending, the LEAs included in this study spent 75% on personnel and 25% on non-personnel.
  - In FY19, DCPS spent nearly 80% on personnel, while PCS spent approximately 70% over the same time period
  - About half of personnel spend has been on Classroom Teacher FTE for both DCPS and PCS
  - The PCS included in this study were more likely to contract out some services that DCPS performed with in-house staff (including some special education services)
- **4.** Average teacher salary. For the LEAs included in this study, the average teacher salary grew from \$70.0K to \$80.2K from FY16 to FY19, or a compound annual growth rate of 4.7%.
  - DCPS spends approximately 20% more on average teacher salaries than the sample charter networks (base salary only)
  - Both PCS and DCPS experienced a large increase in average teacher salaries in FY19, with an increase of 11.7% and 11.5%, respectively
  - The outcomes of teacher contract negotiations at DCPS, which included a "retroactive" compensation component, materially impact increased personnel costs



### How do cost drivers differ for various school models (i.e. duallanguage schools, schools with CTE programs, and dualenrollment schools)?

To answer this question, Afton analyzed and compared spending, student need, student outcomes, enrollment and capacity utilization at whole school programs at DCPS compared to schools with no programs.

DCPS allocated incremental FTEs for four program types: Career and Technical Education ("CTE"), International Baccalaureate ("IB"), Global Studies and Schoolwide Enrichment Model ("SEM"). The remaining differences in per pupil spending at DCPS is primarily driven by enrollment and student need.

In comparing school-level per-pupil spend, factors such as school size, student need, and facility utilization rates have a direct impact on reported per pupil spend. Regardless of program offered, smaller schools, schools serving a higher needs population, and schools with a lower facility utilization rates tend to spend more, on a per pupil basis.

Generally, with a few exceptions, school programs with lower per pupil spend serve a lower proportion of at-risk students and perform better on PARCC tests.




## How should the UPSFF take these costs into account (i.e. changes to the foundation level, changes to weights, or both)?

- 1. In order to address cost pressures experienced by LEAs, the city can either address the **primary cost drivers** which put upward pressure on the UPSFF, address **how the rate is increased** in response to those cost pressures, or **some combination of the two**.
- 2. As highlighted in this report, LEA costs have been impacted by increasing **personnel costs**, lower **utilization of facilities**, and the cost of **financing and maintaining facilities**. As a result, the city might consider:
  - a. Understanding the **impact of collective bargaining agreements** ("CBAs") on UPSFF increases
  - b. Understanding the relative impact for LEAS of providing some services **in-house vs. outsourcing**, and how and why LEAs choose their mix of in-house service provision and outsourcing.
  - c. Supporting higher performing school programs, or other initiatives to **address small or under-utilized schools and facilities**
  - d. Supporting efforts to **minimize the cost of capital**, primarily for PCS
- To address the rate itself, the city might further consider utilizing a Cost of Living Adjustment (or "COLA") that may better reflect the current and future needs of all LEAs.

Ultimately, the UPSFF should be structured for the current and future mix of LEAs and students, rather than based on historical experience.







GOVERNMENT OF THE

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

#### Annual Per Pupil Expenditures Sample PCS Average (4 LEAs)



Avg. Charter Personnel Expense Per Pupil

<u>Total</u> Expenses: +3.4% CAGR; +10.4% total <u>Personnel</u> Only: +4.7% CAGR; +14.9% total

Notes:

- 1) Personnel costs include wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes and exclude contracted services.
- 2) Non-personnel expenditures include facilities expenditures. Sample PCS reported an average spend of \$2,604 on Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures in FY19. PCS receive incremental "Facilities" Funding through the UPSFF formula for these types of expenditures.





# Per pupil spending on staff at DCPS and PCS has increased a similar rate, though Charters spent approximately \$1,500 less than DCPS as of FY19





Personnel Category	% Total Personnel Expenses	PCS FY19 % Total Personnel Expenses
Food Service	0%	1%
Substitutes	1%	1%
Facility Operations Support	4%	1%
Classroom Staff-Other	4%	5%
Central Management	<mark>6%</mark>	12%
School Administration	10%	11%
Schoolwide Staff	23%	19%
Classroom Staff- Teachers	52%	50%

-----



Note: Personnel costs include wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes and exclude contracted services.



# DCPS has historically spent an average of 20% more on classroom teachers than sample PCS. Both saw significant increases in FY19 due to a new CBA.



## For both DCPS and PCS, the largest YOY increase in average teacher salary happened between FY18 and FY19, at which point the CBA retroactive payments went into effect.

#### Notes:

- 1. This reflects average teacher pay, which is largely influenced by teacher tenure.
- 2. Source data for DCPS Average Teacher Salary base source is publicly available budget books; source for charters is provided FTE-level data from participating charters.
- 3. Salaries reflect base salary only, excluding stipends, benefits, and bonuses.
- 4. One of four participating PCS LEAs is excluded from Charter Average, due to data availability





## On a per-student basis, the sample PCS spend nearly double that of DCPS on non-personnel items, on average

Instructional Support School Administration	\$8.898
Other school-based costs	\$229
Food Service	\$331
Central Management	\$545
Direct Services to Students Facility Operations Support Rent, Debt Service, Depreciation	\$1,444
\$4,570	\$1,634
\$751 \$567	\$1,630
\$1,017 \$428 \$594	\$2,604
\$1,051 \$144	
DCPS	Sample Charte Average

#### Variance Drivers

- Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation: PCS incur these costs, while DCPS does not. PCS receive incremental "Facilities" Funding on a per-student basis through the UPSFF formula for these types of costs.
- **Contracting vs. Staffing:** Some of the sample charters have chosen to contract out services that DCPS has full time staff for.
  - Direct Services to Students A sample of charters on average have a higher per pupil spend in this non-personnel category, driven in part by contracting out SPED and other instructional services that DCPS provides in-house with its own staff.
  - Facilities Operations Support DCPS has more staff-related costs for functions that some of the sample charters have contracted out, primarily for custodians. When combining Personnel with Non-Personnel costs, the per pupil variance for Facilities Operation Support in total decreases to \$155.
- Economies of Scale: DCPS enrollment is nearly 20x higher than the median enrollment of Charters in this study. Spreading organization-wide costs that are largely not driven by enrollment, over a larger student base results in lower per pupil costs in some areas.

Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation costs drive \$2,500 of the variance between DCPS and PCS non-personnel per pupil spend. PCS receive incremental "Facilities" Funding on a per-student basis through the UPSFF formula for these types of costs.

AFTON

Note: Non-personnel includes contracted services and excludes employee wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes.



## For the <u>sample of four DC Public Charter School LEAs</u>, average per-student expenditure on Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation ranged from \$2,604 to \$3,127 over the past four years





#### While large facilities deals can impact cost trends and per-pupil spend significantly, on average, these facilitiesrelated expenditures have decreased on a per-pupil basis for the sample PCS included.

Note that Charters are not obligated to use facility allotment funds on these specific expenditure categories. Some PCS use these funds for items not included in these categories, such as: operational needs (utilities, maintenance, etc.), non-operating capital expenditures, and to build reserves to meet debt service covenants. The intention for this category is to include facilities costs that PCS must incur that DCPS does not. Depreciation (a non-cash expense) is included in this category, as it is an operating expenditure representing the cost of capitalized assets (mostly facilities) over time.

Also note that some of the sample charters included in this group may have more sophisticated debt instruments and access to a lower cost of capital than less established CMOs.



## Generally, with a few exceptions, school programs with lower per pupil spend serve a lower proportion of At-Risk students and perform better on the PARCC tests



GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

#### FY19 School-Level Expenditure Per Pupil and % Proficient 4+ (MATH) by DCPS Program



#### Notes:

- Figures shown include expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.
- % At-Risk and % Proficiency calculations exclude Adult and Alternative students; proficiency excludes students in grades that are note tested (PK-2).





that are not tested (PK to 2<sup>nd</sup>).

Elementary school programs have mixed results compared to those with no program, though Middle Schools and High Schools with programs spend less per pupil, serve a lower proportion of at-risk students, and have better outcomes



Figures shown include expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.
 Figures included represent a weighted average, regardless of program type. Proficiency rates exclude Adult and Alternative Students and students in grades

42



## Implementation considerations





When reviewing UPSFF options, consideration should be given to both implementation opportunities and challenges, as well as adherence to student funding formula goals

#### Implementation Considerations

Affect the ability to readily implement potential change to UPSFF

An existing **common definition** of student need and population considered for funding

Student outcomes data – availability of timely, accurate data

**Ease (or difficulty) of projection** – ability to project student needs with reasonable accuracy, as the UPSFF funds for projected LEA needs

Level of legislative or policy changes required to implement

#### **Student Funding Goals**

Alignment to key goals of allocating funds via a funding formula

**Simplicity** – the option considered is easily explained to impacted stakeholder groups

**Impact** – the change results in funds going to the students that need it most

**Accountability** – outcomes of funding changes can be measured over time

**Aligned incentives** – the incentives created by the funding option align with goals of the UPSFF

Each option has been assessed given these criteria, which impact both the technical challenges associated with implementation, in addition to each options adherence to student funding formula goals





## Based on implementation considerations and Student Funding Formula Goals, options fall into four categories:

1	2	3	4
Shorter Implementation Timeline	Shorter Implementation Timeline	Longer Implementation Timeline	Longer Implementation Timeline
More Aligned to Student Funding Goals	Less Aligned to Student Funding Goals	More Aligned to Student Funding Goals	Less Aligned to Student Funding Goals
At-Risk: Overage / CFSA	At-Risk: 2+ Factors	At-Risk: Equity Index	At-Risk: Overage Intervention before HS
At-Risk: At-Risk HS Weight	At-Risk: 3+ Factors	ELL: SLIFE	Concentration: CEP Implementation
At-Risk: Increase HS		FLL: New to the Country	Concentration: Minimum Eligibility
Weight			Concentration: Funding Tiers
ELL: Grade Band			Concentration: Sliding Scale
			ELL: Proficiency
			ELL: Grade & Proficiency Combination
Three of the options included in table 1 also received the most expert support through advisory group member votes.		AFTON 45	



#### Supporting Strong Schools. Sustaining the Future.



## 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Study Part II: At-risk Student Need



June 2020 Updated September 4, 2020



## **Table of Contents**

- I. Executive Summary
- II. At-risk Student Need research, analysis and options
- III. At-risk Concentration research, analysis and options
- IV. ELL Weight Structure research, analysis and options
- V. Foundation Level Cost Drivers analysis

## VI. Appendix

- a. UPSFF study process and approach detail
- b. Additional background and research
- c. Additional student outcomes and data analysis



## **UPSFF Scope Questions** *At-Risk Student Weight analysis*

- Should the UPSFF include a funding weight based on <u>higher relative need</u> for certain characteristics?
  - Which characteristics should be considered for additional funding?
  - How much more funding is recommended?
- Should the UPSFF include a funding weight for students with <u>multiple at-</u> <u>risk characteristics</u>, or more than one at-risk characteristic?
  - Which combinations of characteristics should be considered for additional funding?
  - How much more funding is recommended?
- What is the updated "adequate" weight target for the 5-characteristic atrisk weight implemented since FY15, as opposed to the 3-characteristic atrisk weight considered by the 2013 Adequacy Study?

Based on an analysis of student outcomes, advisory group and national review, this study includes multiple options to support students with a demonstrated higher relative need than their peers





This study identifies multiple options to support segments of at-risk students whose performance gaps have increased compared to their at-risk and not at-risk peers from FY15 to FY19

- 1. Like most states, the District funds all at-risk students **at the same level**, though some students have demonstrated greater needs than others. However, unlike most states, the District has **five components to the at-risk weight** Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), homeless, CFSA and high school over-age students. For the purposes of this study, students designated as receiving either TANF or SNAP assistance are classified as "Direct Certification" students.
- Student outcomes data, as well as LEA interviews and advisory group feedback, highlights additional needs for high school over-age students (and possibly CFSA), as well as students with 2 or 3 at-risk factors. These groups lag both at-risk and not-atrisk peers.
- 3. Schools in the District with higher performing at-risk student populations have invested in **technology and data, extended day, extended year, after school activities** and **social-emotional supports** to support at-risk students.
- 4. Additionally, a small number of urban school Districts are beginning to adopt more nuanced strategies to support at-risk students, including the **equity index** used in Chicago and **opportunity index** used in Boston. Though these funding mechanisms offer a potentially more personalized approach to at-risk funding, they may be better suited for implementation on the LEA-level.

Note: High performing schools as identified by Empower K-12, which publishes an annual list of schools that "beat the odds" given their mix of student needs and demographics.



Total students designated as At-Risk have remained relatively flat from FY15 to FY19, and the % of At-Risk Students (for DCPS and Charters combined) fell from 50% in FY15 to 45% in FY19



Count of At-Risk Students : District and Charter

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



% of At-Risk Students: District and Charter

Notes

Actual (not budgeted) UPSFF enrollment – excludes Adult and Alternative Students





# In FY19, nearly 39,000 of DC students (or over 45% of all students) were designated as "at-risk", with the largest numbers in KG, 1<sup>st</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades



58% of 9<sup>th</sup> grade students are designated as at-risk, compared to an average 44% of students in grades PK - 8. High School grades have a higher percentage of at-risk students, driven largely by the additional at-risk factor of over-age, which applies only to students in grades 9-12. 1/3 of all 9<sup>th</sup> graders are designated as over-age.

Actual (not budgeted) UPSFF enrollment - excludes Adult and Alternative Students



Similar to most states, the District currently funds all at-risk students at the same level through the UPSFF. However, unlike most states, the District has four components to the at-risk weight - Homeless, Direct Certification, Foster Care (CFSA) and Over-age students.



Notes

· Actual (not budgeted) UPSFF enrollment - excludes Adult and Alternative Students

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

• Bar chart categories are not mutually exclusive and include students with multiple factors. Students with multiple factors are counted in each relevant factor category.



7



Over the last six years, per pupil funding for at-risk students has increased 19%, primarily due to increases in the foundation level of the UPSFF



Based on an analysis of student outcomes, advisory group and national review, this study includes multiple options to support students with a demonstrated higher relative need than their peers.

Note FY17 FY18 funding amounts reflect the retroactive increases stemming from the 2017 Washington Teachers' Union (WTU) contract agreement.





## At-risk UPSFF options





This study includes several options to provide additional supports to sub-sets of at-risk students that have shown a higher relative need based on student outcomes

Should the UPSFF include a funding weight based Question on higher relative need for certain characteristics? from RFA

#### **Key Decisions and Options to Modify UPSFF**

#### Decision 1: Should the UPSFF weight for at-risk students be updated?

#### Decision 2: If yes, which students should be targeted and what options for changing the formula exist?

- Increase funding for over-age, CFSA or both Α.
- Fund intervention prior to high school to mitigate risk of over-age designation Β.
- Increase funding for students with 2+ at-risk characteristics C.
- D. Increase funding for students with 3+ at-risk characteristics
- Ε. Increase high school base amount (all HS students, not just at-risk)
- Increase to high school at-risk amount (only HS at-risk students) F.

#### Decision 3: Should the change be funded with redistributed or incremental funding?

- A. Redistributed funding: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for by decreasing weights on the "all other" at-risk student category, or through changes to the foundation amount
- Incremental funding: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid Β. for with incremental/new funds available over time





At-Risk Need Option A – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

#### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

## 4,597 students impacted (FY19 actual)

[4,284 over-age; 366 foster (not additive due to overlapping characteristics)]

Students with at-risk factors with a higher relative need receive a higher relative weight and more funding

Opportunities	Challenges
Directs additional funding to <b>students showing the</b> <b>highest achievement gaps</b> Highlights a <b>specific need based on academic</b> <b>outcomes</b> , which could help focus policymakers moving forward	<ul> <li>The achievement gap for all at-risk students has increased over the last five years, regardless of the factor</li> <li>Not clear how the incremental funds would be utilized for these student groups</li> <li>Would require a change in UPSFF funding formula (additional complexity), as well as an ability to accurately project students by at-risk category</li> </ul>



N AFTON



At-Risk Need Option A – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>The system clearly defines and tracks both over-age and CFSA students</li> <li>Only High School students can be designated as "over-age"</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Timely, accurate PARCC score data exists for both over-age and CFSA students</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>At –risk student population currently projected as a whole, but not by factor</li> <li>The projection risk is higher for CFSA due to a much smaller student population</li> <li>The new methodology will require more precision than the current process</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change likely required for creating new funding category/subcategory.</li> <li>This will be a new funding category and will require decisions and documentation on students to include, and projection methodology.</li> </ul>	





At-Risk Need Option A – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>This option aligns with the student data outcomes analysis</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>This option would also require the development of a new weight in the UPSFF, and would then flow to the students similar to other weights</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>As this weight would flow directly to High School over-age and / or CFSA students, LEAs should report on student outcomes associated with how these funds were invested.</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>No disincentives should exist with this weight, however the DME should monitor the number of students identified as over-age. This is the only factor where the school and/or LEA may have discretion over policy or implementation.</li> </ul>	
	AFTO	N



At-Risk Need Option A – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

Scenario: Incremental Funding	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for <u>over-age students only</u> (grades 9-12 only), relative to other at-risk weights,	\$1.2M net increase in annual funding for FY22
No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula	<b>19</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of <b>\$23,255</b>
No change to At-Risk weight for other students	<b>0</b> LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of <b>\$0</b>
No change to Alternative student weight	DCPS: \$782K (or 1.2%) increase in at-risk funds
COUNT OF LEAS BY % GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE	COUNT OF LEAS BY \$ GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE AT-RISK FUNDS ONLY
48	48
9 7 	-     -     -     5     4     5     2     1     2       < (\$40k) (\$30k) (\$20k) (\$10k) \$0



See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



At-Risk Need Option A – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of At-Risk Funds)

Scenario: Redistribution of At-Risk Funds	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for <u>over-age students only</u> (grades 9-12 only), relative to other at-risk weights, beginning in FY22 Corresponding decrease to existing at-risk weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula No change to Alternative student weight	<ul> <li>\$0 net increase in annual funding for FY22</li> <li>16 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; median gain of \$10,506</li> <li>43 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$3,711</li> <li>DCPS: \$97K (or 0.2%) increase in at-risk funds</li> </ul>
COUNT OF LEAS BY % GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE	COUNT OF LEAS BY \$ GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE





AFTON 15



At-Risk Need Option B – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

#### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

**COUNT OF STUDENTS IMPACTED IS NOT YET QUANTIFIABLE**, though approximately 2,100 middle school students (or 14%) are 1+ years over the expected age for the grade they are attending

Targeted funding **prior to high school** to help students before they are designated as HS overage. **Incremental funding** for students "at risk" of becoming over-age in High School.

Opportunities	Challenges
Targets funds to <b>support students and families most at-risk</b> <b>of becoming over-age</b> (or possibly already over-age at earlier grades)	Unclear which students or programs would be most impacted by this funding Unclear how this could be funded. May require multiple
Highlights a <b>specific need based on academic outcomes</b> , with a particular focus on intervention and closing the achievement gap before high school	years to secure funding and implement. This is likely <b>an expensive option</b> , as this is a fully new category of funding
If successful, this could <b>lower the number of over-age</b> students in high school	Would require a <b>change in UPSFF</b> with an additional weight, and ability to forecast and track these students for funding purposes





At-Risk Need Option B – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>The system has not "defined" or identified which students to target in this category, though one option articulated herein focuses on over-age middle school students</li> <li>Defining the specific student population and programs to target likely requires an additional study/analysis</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Timely, accurate PARCC score data LIKELY exists for the students identified in this group (once they are identified)</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>It is currently unclear which students or programs would be targeted with this funding.</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Significant legislative change likely required for creating this new funding category/subcategory.</li> </ul>	



At-Risk Need Option B – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>If this student group is identified effectively, the funding could be targeted to the student group most at-risk of becoming over-age.</li> </ul>
Accountability	• This factor is difficult to immediately assess, as the intervention population has yet to be defined. If the population is a subset of existing over-age middle school students, the DME would need to be clear on why certain students are included in this weight.
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>Similar to the impact factor criteria, if the student group is clearly and effectively identified, the calculation of how funds are distributed should be transparent.</li> </ul>
Incentives	<ul> <li>Depending on how this student population is defined, no potential disincentives should exist, though similar to other weights, the DME should monitor number of students included in this group over time.</li> </ul>
	AFTON



At-Risk Need Option B – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

Scenario: Incremental Funding	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for OVER-AGE STUDENTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL, relative to other at-risk weights,	<b>\$645k</b> net increase in annual funding for FY22
beginning in FY22. THIS SCENARIO ASSUMES 14% OF ALL LEA STUDENTS GRADES 6-8 ARE OVER-AGE	<b>34</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of <b>\$5,842</b>
No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula	<b>0</b> LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds;
No change to At-Risk weight for other students	<u>median loss</u> of <b>\$0</b>
	DCPS: \$337k (or 0.5%) increase in at-risk funds





AFTON 19

See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



At-Risk Need Option B – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of At-Risk Funds)

Scenario: Redistribution of At-Risk Funds	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for OVER-AGE STUDENTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL, relative to other at-risk weights.	<b>\$0</b> net increase in annual funding for FY22
beginning in FY22. THIS SCENARIO ASSUMES 14% OF ALL LEA STUDENTS GRADES 6-8 ARE OVER-AGE	<b>23</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of \$4,126
Corresponding decrease to existing at-risk weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate	<b>36</b> LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of <b>\$1,543</b>
No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula	DCPS: -\$36K (or 0.1%) decrease in at-risk funds









W gr

## **Increase funding for students with 2+ at-risk characteristics**

At-Risk Need Option C – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

#### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

**5,654** students impacted (FY19 actual)

Incremental funding for students with 2 or more at-risk factors

Opportunities	Challenges
Students with multiple at-risk factors perform worse on PARCC tests and therefore demonstrate a greater need than students with one at-risk factor At the school and LEA level, it may be <b>somewhat</b> easier to project multiple factors rather than number of students with EACH specific factor	<ul> <li>Large number of students impacted makes this likely a more expensive initiative (compared to funding over-age)</li> <li>Does not differentiate between the TYPES of factors that students have (i.e an over-age and CFSA student could be considered "more at-risk" than a Direct Certified and Homeless student based on student outcomes)</li> <li>Would require a change in UPSFF with likely an additional weight, and ability to forecast and track these students for funding purposes</li> </ul>





At-Risk Need Option C – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>No definition exists in the current UPSFF, though data exists to create this weight</li> <li>Currently, the system clearly tracks each student by risk factor</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Timely, accurate student-level PARCC score data currently exists for at- risk students</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>LEAs have data on current students with multiple factors, but unclear how this would be projected. Significantly more students with 2 than 3+ factors, which makes his option more readily projectable by LEA.</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change likely required for creating new funding category/subcategory. This is also an entirely new funding category - may require additional agreement on definition and projection methodology.</li> </ul>	





At-Risk Need Option C – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>Student outcomes analysis shows that 2+ factor students, on average, have greater needs than students with a single at-risk factor.</li> </ul>
Accountability	• This weight would allow funds to flow to schools and LEAs with the greatest population of students with high numbers of at-risk factors. However, since this weight would apply to ALL at-risk factors, rather than targeted to over-age, for example, it may be more difficult to measure outcomes directly associated with these funds.
Transparency & Simplicity	• This option would also require a new funding weight. Assuming the number of students can be estimated for funding purposes, the formula would continue to be driven by weight and number of students. This factor could increase complexity of the formula, however, due to the methodology of identifying number of students to include in this factor.
Incentives	<ul> <li>No disincentives should exist, but similar to other weights, the DME should monitor and track the number of students placed in this category over time (as schools and LEAs could have discretion over one of the five factors).</li> </ul>





At-Risk Need Option C – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

Scenario: Incremental Funding	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase	
10% increase to At-Risk weight for <u>students with 2 or</u> more at-risk factors, relative to other at-risk weights,	<b>\$1.6M</b> net increase in annual funding for FY22	
beginning in FY22	57 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds;	
No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula No change to At-Risk weight for other students	median gain of \$5,685	
	<b>0</b> LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of <b>\$0</b>	

DCPS: \$814K (or 1.3%) increase in at-risk funds





See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



At-Risk Need Option C – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of At-Risk Funds)

Scenario: Redistribution of At-Risk Funds	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for <u>students with 2 or</u> <u>more at risk factors</u> , relative to other at-risk weights, beginning in FY22 Corresponding decrease to existing at-risk weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula	<ul> <li>\$0 net increase in annual funding for FY22</li> <li>23 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; median gain of \$4,975</li> <li>36 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$1,997</li> <li>DCPS: -\$87K (or -0.1%) decrease in at-risk funds</li> </ul>



1

\$30K \$40K >\$50k

TO

AFTON

TO

TO


At-Risk Need Option D – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

#### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

**265** students impacted (FY19 actual)

Incremental funding for students with 3 or more at-risk factors

Challenges
This option supports a <b>small number of students</b> (under 300 annually) compared to other options, which will complicate projection methodology
Does not differentiate between the TYPES of factors that students have
Would require a <b>change in UPSFF</b> with likely an additional weight, and ability to forecast and track these students





At-Risk Need Option D – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>While a relatively straight-forward definition can be created to define these students, a new definition would need to be created for this option</li> <li>Currently, the system clearly tracks which students have each at-risk factor, though this is sensitive information</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Timely, accurate student-level PARCC score data currently exists for at- risk students</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>Given the small size of this subgroup of students, there is likely more projection risk associated with this option (as compared to other options)</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change required for creating new funding category/subcategory. This is also an entirely new funding category - may require additional agreement on definition and projection methodology.</li> </ul>	





At-Risk Need Option D – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	• Student outcomes analysis shows that 3+ factor students, on average, have greater needs than students with less than 3 at-risk factors. This is a much smaller number of students than other at-risk options considered, so the impact may be more limited unless a significantly higher dollar amount is allocated for these students (and LEAs)
Accountability	<ul> <li>This weight would allow funds to flow to schools and LEAs with the greatest population of students with the highest numbers of at-risk factors. However, since this weight would apply to ALL at-risk factors, rather than targeted to over-age, for example, it may be more difficult to measure outcomes directly associated with these funds.</li> </ul>
Transparency & Simplicity	• This option would also require a new funding weight. Assuming the number of students can be estimated for funding purposes, the formula would continue to be driven by weight and number of students. This factor could increase complexity of the formula, however, due to the methodology of identifying number of students to include in this factor.
Incentives	<ul> <li>No disincentives should exist, but similar to other weights, the DME should monitor and track the number of students placed in this category over time (as schools and LEAs could have discretion over one of the four factors)</li> </ul>





At-Risk Need Option D – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

Scenario: Incremental Funding	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for <u>students with 3 or</u> more at-risk factors, relative to other at-risk weights,	\$68k net increase in annual funding for FY22
beginning in FY22	<b>17</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds;
No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula	median gain of \$1,034
No change to At-Risk weight for other students	0 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds;
No change to Alternative student weight	median loss of \$0
No change to Alternative Student weight	DCPS: \$42K (or .07%) increase in at-risk funds





See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



At-Risk Need Option D – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of At-Risk Funds)

10% increase to At-Risk weight for students with 3 or more at risk factors, relative to other at-risk weights, beginning in FY22\$0 net increase in and 11 LEAs experience in median gain of \$830Corresponding decrease to existing at-risk weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate10% increase to exist at risk weight to pay 10% increase to exist at risk weight to pay 10% increase to new weight/rate	ual fund crease in crease ii %) incre	ing foi UPSF 1 UPS	r FY2 =F fur FF fu	2 nds; nds;			
beginning in FY22       11 LEAs experience in         Corresponding decrease to existing at-risk weight to pay       median gain of \$830         for increase to new weight/rate       40	crease in crease in %) incre	n UPSF	FF fur FF fu	nds; Inds;			
for increase to new weight/rate	crease in %) incre	n UPS	FF fu	nds;			
40 LEAs experience deNo change to other areas of the UPSFF formulamedian lossmedian lossof \$171	%) incre						
No change to Alternative student weight DCPS: \$3K (or 0.0	, , ,,	ease ir	n at-ri	isk fu	nds		
COUNT OF LEAS BY % GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE	' \$ GAIN / T-RISK FU	(LOSS) NDS OI	EXPE NLY	RIENC	E RAN	NGE	\$
48	48						
8 11 	) \$0 \$0 TO N.	3 10	) 1 \$10K \$20K	- ( \$20K TO ( \$30K	- \$30K TO \$40K	- \$40K TO	- >\$50k

See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact

AFTON





#### Increase to High School Base Weight

At-Risk Need Option E – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

#### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

**16,750** students impacted (FY19 actual)

Increase HS weight (for all students in grades 9 - 12)

Opportunities	Challenges
Likely the <b>simplest option</b> proposed Student outcomes data reflects <b>overall poor</b> <b>outcomes for high school students</b> , particularly in Math	This would benefit <b>all High Schools</b> , regardless of number of at-risk students served Large number of students impacted <b>could result in a</b> <b>smaller capacity to increase per pupil rates</b>
	AFTON 3

32



#### **Increase to High School Base Weight**

At-Risk Need Option E – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>This option aligns to the current definition of HS students (grades 9-12)</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Timely, accurate PARCC score data exists for HS students, though a lower portion of HS students take PARCC (compared to lower grade levels)</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>Projection would align to current process to estimated number of HS students for UPSFF formula</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>No legislative change likely required for a change to an existing weight</li> </ul>	
	AF	TON



#### Increase to High School Base Weight

At-Risk Need Option E – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>Student level data analysis shows at-risk students falling behind not-at risk peers - this weight would benefit ALL students in High School, not those most in need of additional support</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>Accountability closely aligns to the impact of each option - the more funds flow directly to students that need those funds, the more LEAs should be held accountable for outcomes for those students.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This is the simplest option for at-risk funding. No changes to the structure of the UPSFF would be required.</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>No disincentives should exist with this weight</li> </ul>	
	AFTO	N



## **Increase to High School Base Weight**

At-Risk Need Option E – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

Scenario: Incremental Funding	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to base UPSFF for <u>HS</u> (grades 9-12 only), relative to other at-risk weights, beginning in FY22	<b>\$25.4M</b> net increase in annual funding for FY22
No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula	17 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; median gain of \$559k
No change to At-Risk weight for other students	<b>0</b> LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds;
No change to Alternative student weight	<u>median loss</u> of <b>\$0</b>
	DCPS: \$15.8M (or 1.6%) increase in TOTAL UPSFF
COUNT OF LEAS BY % GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE AT-RISK FUNDS ONLY	COUNT OF LEAS BY \$ GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE AT-RISK FUNDS ONLY
Scenario would result in no change to "at-risk" funding, but would rather increase general HS funding	Scenario would result in no change to "at-risk" funding, but would rather increase general HS funding
<-20% -20% -15% -10% -5% -2.5% 0% / 0% 2.5% 5% 10% 15% >20% TO TO TO TO TO TO NA TO TO TO TO TO -15% -10% -5% -2.5% 0% 2.5% 5% 10% 15% 20%	< (\$40k) (\$30k) (\$20k) (\$10k) \$0 \$0 / \$0 \$10K \$20K \$30K \$40K >\$50k (\$50k) TO TO to TO TO NA TO TO TO TO TO (\$50k) (\$40k) (\$30k) (\$20k) (\$10k) \$10k \$20k \$30k \$40k \$50k





At-Risk Need Option F – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

#### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

## **8,537** students impacted (FY19 actual)

High School at-risk students receive a higher relative weight and more funding than PK-8 at-risk students

Opportunities	Challenges
Adds complexity, but within the current definition of at- risk (four existing characteristics)	Large number of students impacted makes this a more expensive option
Invests in <b>High Schools with demonstrated need</b> (as compared/opposed to Option E)	Does not differentiate between the TYPES or NUMBER of at-risk factors
High Schools show a significant gap in performance overall, particularly in math	Does not address potential needs in earlier grades
Over-age students are included in this category, as 1/3 of 9 <sup>th</sup> graders and 1/4 of all HS students are categorized as "over-age"	
This option concreted the most support of all at risk	

This option generated the most support of all at-risk options by the Advisory Group





At-Risk Need Option F – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>This option aligns to the current definition of at-risk students</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Timely, accurate PARCC score data exists for at-risk high school students</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>Projection should align to current process to estimated number of students for UPSFF formula</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change likely required for creating new funding category/subcategory under at-risk</li> </ul>	
	AF	ΓΟΝ



At-Risk Need Option F – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>Student level data analysis shows that all at-risk HS students have increasing gaps when compared to their non-at-risk peers. This weight would invest more funds to this group of students, but not as targeted as over-age and CFSA.</li> </ul>
Accountability	<ul> <li>As this weight would flow directly to High School at-risk students, LEAs should report on student outcomes associated with how these funds were invested.</li> </ul>
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>Like the remaining options, this weight would require a new weight in the UPSFF.</li> </ul>
Incentives	<ul> <li>No disincentives should exist with this weight</li> </ul>
	AFTON



At-Risk Need Option F – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

Scenario: Incremental Funding	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for <u>HS at-risk (g</u> rades 9-12 only), relative to other at-risk weights, beginning in FY22	\$2.3M net increase in annual funding for FY22
No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula	<b>18</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of <b>\$52,712</b>
No change to At-Risk weight for other students	<b>0</b> LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds;
No change to Alternative student weight	median loss of <b>\$0</b>
	DCPS: \$1.4M (or 2.2%) increase in at-risk funds





AFTON



At-Risk Need Option F – Fiscal (Redistribution of At-Risk Funds)

Scenario: Redistribution of At-Risk Funds	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to At-Risk weight for <u>HS at-risk</u> , relative to other at-risk weights, beginning in FY22	<b>\$0</b> net increase in annual funding for FY22
Corresponding decrease to existing at-risk weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate	<b>16</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of \$32,737
No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula No change to Alternative student weight	43 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$5.853
	DCPS: \$92k (or 0.1%) increase in at-risk funds









#### **At-Risk Equity/Opportunity Index**

At-Risk Need – Long Term Option – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

#### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

#### All students in the system impacted (new formula)

Implement a new, uniform funding formula that incorporates new, additional student-level environmental factors that demonstrate impact on student outcomes. Use the student-level formula to assign Index "scores" to schools and then LEAs, determining relative need and funding levels.

See "At-Risk National Research" for details on Boston Opportunity Index and Chicago Equity Index.

Opportunities	Challenges
Allocate funding based on measures to account for – and proportionately fund – a <b>myriad environmental</b> <b>factors that affect student performance</b> More sophisticated (data-rich) formula would identify and fund students with highest need, based on additional factors that impact student need that are not considered in the current version of UPSFF	Few states or school systems have adopted this type of student funding mechanism This option presents the most "hurdles" or "barriers" for implementation and requires a longer timeline to full implementation





#### **At-Risk Equity/Opportunity Index**

At-Risk Need – Long Term Option – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>No common definition exists for this option</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Since this is a student-level option, rolled up to school-level allocations, the outcomes data should still be available by student and school.</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>Projecting student-level needs to the level of granularity required for this index may be challenging. Likely will require school-level projections based on prior year/s index.</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change required for creating new funding category/subcategory.</li> </ul>	





#### **At-Risk Equity/Opportunity Index**

#### At-Risk Need – Long Term Option – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	• This potential weighting requires a significant amount of data for each student, which is then rolled up by school and LEA. Impact would be directed to LEAs that need the funds most based on each student's at-risk profile. The impact score assumes data will ultimately be available, which is likely several years in the future.
Accountability	<ul> <li>This weight is school-level rather than student-level. Outcomes for a school-level weight would likely also be school, rather than student-level.</li> </ul>
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This factor requires the most data for each student to calculate a school level needs-weight. This is likely the most complex factor to implement.</li> </ul>
Incentives	<ul> <li>Funds will be allocated based on individual student needs, most or all of which are not controllable by the schools or LEAs</li> </ul>





## At-risk outcomes data





## <u>At-risk outcomes data</u>: data shows over-age, CFSA students and those with multiple at-risk factors have the greatest needs when compared their peers

Multi-year performance data show students that are designated as over-age, as well as CFSA, have more significant test score variances from both students not designated at-risk as well as their at-risk student peers

Additionally, students with **multiple at-risk factors** tend to perform more poorly on the PARCC standardized test than those with a single at-risk factor





#### <u>At-risk student data</u> – over-age and CFSA students have the most significant performance gaps compared to other students By Factor Type - All Grades







<u>At-risk student data</u> – looking at High School students only, over-age students underperform other student groups. CFSA students, with significantly fewer students and test takers than other at-risk student groups, also underperform





3 Year Performance (FY15, FY18, FY19)

2 Year Performance (FY18 & FY19)





### <u>At-risk student data</u> – for High School students, over-age underperforms other student groups, though CFSA had a significant drop in FY19

By Factor Type – Grades 9-12 Only



There are significantly fewer CFSA students in high school, which results in less reliable outcomes data for the high school only analysis for this group. Their data is included herein for completion purposes only.

47

AFTON



# <u>At-risk student data</u> – for High School students, over-age consistently underperforms other student groups, though CFSA had a significant drop in FY19

By Factor Type – Grades 9-12 Only





## <u>At-risk student data</u> - proficiency gap has increased over time for each at-risk factor category

By Factor Type – All Grades



Performance

(FY18 & FY19)

Performance

(FY19)

Performance

(FY15, FY18, FY19)

PARCC Math Proficiency 4+ Gaps Compared to Not At-Risk Peers

AFTON



## At-risk student data - proficiency gap has increased over time for each at-risk factor category

By Factor Type – All Grades



PARCC ELA Proficiency 4+ Gaps



#### <u>At-risk student data</u> – students with more at-risk factors tend to have larger proficiency gaps compared to students with fewer or no at-risk factors

By Count of At-Risk Factors - All Grades



• FY19 reported n<10 students with 4 Factors, none of which recorded a test score;

· Enrollment reflects Actual (not budgeted) UPSFF enrollment and excludes Adult and Alternative students



## UPSFF at-risk funding options Advisory Group voting outcomes





#### Based on these considerations for <u>at-risk</u> students, several options are available to modify UPSFF

#### Should the UPSFF include a funding weight based Question from RFA on higher relative need for certain characteristics?

#### **Key Decisions and Options to Modify UPSFF**

#### Decision 1: Should the UPSFF weight for at-risk students be updated?

#### Decision 2: If yes, which students should be targeted and what options for changing the formula exist?

- Increase funding for over-age, CFSA or both Α.
- Fund intervention prior to high school to mitigate risk of over-age designation Β.
- Increase funding for students with 2+ at-risk characteristics C.
- D. Increase funding for students with 3+ at-risk characteristics
- Ε. Increase high school base amount (all HS students, not just at-risk)
- Increase to high school at-risk amount (only HS at-risk students) F.

#### Decision 3: Should the change be funded with redistributed or incremental funding?

- A. Redistributed funding: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for by decreasing weights on the "all other" at-risk student category, or through changes to the foundation amount
- Incremental funding: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid Β. for with incremental/new funds available over time





## The Advisory Group favored incremental funding over redistributed existing at-risk funding, with the understanding redistribution could likely be more readily implemented







## The Advisory Group was neutral to positive for an intervention weight prior to High School



Primary concerns documented for intervention funding were driven by potential implementation challenges and data on which students to support





## The Advisory Group supported 2+ factor over 3+ factors primarily due to the number of students potentially impacted



The Group also highlighted concerns over the LEA's ability to effectively project number of 2+ and 3+ factor students for the UPSFF





GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DMEX







# How are DC schools currently supporting at-risk students?



## High-performing schools/LEAs in DC report supporting at-risk students with the effective use of data, social-emotional supports, and extended time with students

Most common supports identified by leadership teams have included:

- **Use of data, technology and personalization**. Leaders pointed to data-driven instruction, as • well as effective RTI, as crucial to identifying and tracking personalized strategies to support students, often with protected time to analyze and discuss data.
- **Extended day programs**. This includes additional structured academic supports and ٠ extracurricular programs. More engaged time with students at school has been highlighted as a crucial element of success.
- **Extended year programs**. Several teams mentioned the benefits (as well as some of the ٠ challenges) of providing additional days beyond the traditional DCPS calendar. Some sites provide additional days in the summer, while others provided additional days via "Saturday" school."
- **Social and emotional support**. Every school highlighted their investments in social workers, ٠ psychologists and other social-emotional supports for students with the greatest needs.
- **Professional development** Investing in quality professional development for teachers was ٠ highlighted by most school leaders, particularly professional development focused on implementing a specific program or analyzing student data.

Though UPSFF funding cannot dictate how funds are spent, these insights can help inform the range of supports that may be required for students with greatest needs





## At-Risk Needs: What innovative, emerging practices are we seeing around the country?



## **National Research**

How are states funding At-Risk students?

- As highlighted by the <u>Education Commission of the States</u>, at-risk funding is typically binary -- that is, students (and therefore LEAs) either qualify for at-risk funding or they do not.
  - This differs from funding formulas for Special Education and sometimes English Language Learner populations.
  - The most common factors utilized are qualification for the National School Lunch Program, or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
  - The five-factor qualification method for DC students is more unique than most other states, though Michigan uses a <u>10-factor qualification</u> <u>standard</u>




# **National Research**

New methodologies are being explored to support students based on many more environmental factors impacting a child's life

- New measures are emerging that allow states and districts to account for – and proportionately fund – myriad environmental factors that affect student performance and attainment.
- Urban Districts including Boston (<u>Opportunity Index</u>) and Chicago (<u>Equity Index</u>) have undertaken these studies





# National Research - Chicago

What emerging, innovative approaches are we seeing in the field?

# Chicago Public Schools (CPS) Equity Index

CPS is investigating various methods to ensure school funding is directed to students with the highest needs. One such proposal is adopting an Equity Index that looks at the following factors:

- % Owner Occupied Homes (by census block)
- % Single Parent Households (by census block)
- % College Educated adults (by census block)
- Student homelessness
- Special Needs
  - Students with Limited English Proficiency or a Special Education Individual Education Plan
- Exposure to Trauma
  - Defined by student home address proximity within 1/32 of a mile to aggravated battery/assault, homicide, or sexual assault



## **National Research - Chicago**

What emerging, innovative approaches are we seeing in the field?

### **CPS Equity Index (continued)**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- Based on those Equity Index factors for individual students, data was then aggregated back to the attending school level.
- The model showed strong correlation to educational attainment scores. As the Equity Index score shows schools with more students with disadvantageous factors, the lower the aggregate attainment scores for the school







# National Research - Chicago

What emerging, innovative approaches are we seeing in the field?

# **CPS Equity Index (continued)**

- By aligning additional resources to high needs students identified using the Equity Index, CPS would target funding to help address the achievement gap
- Implementation of any proposed funding methodology change would take place in FY22



# **National Research - Boston**

What emerging, innovative approaches are we seeing in the field?

# BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

### What is the Opportunity Index?

The Opportunity Index is a pioneering tool designed and developed by the Boston Public Schools and the Boston Area Research Initiative (BARI) to measure and quantify schools that serve the highest concentrations of students in need. It incorporates a range of data representing factors that are outside of the schools' control but are also predictive of students' academic outcomes. These factors include data related to a student's home neighborhood, such as safety; income and education levels; and physical environment. It also calculates factors specific to individual students and their families, such as the socioeconomic status of the family, and student attendance rates and academic achievement. These multiple measures are used to create an Opportunity Index score for each school that is based upon the concentration of students in greater need compared to to their peers across the district. Opportunity Index scores range from 0.01 to 0.99, with higher numbers indicating a higher average level of student need.



https://www.bostonpublicschools.org/domain/2301



# National Research - Boston

What emerging, innovative approaches are we seeing in the field?

# **BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

### How is the Opportunity Index being applied?

For the 2019-2020 school year (fiscal year 2020), BPS will apply the Opportunity Index to two allocations:

- The Partnership Fund: money provided to schools with the intent of funding schoolbased opportunities provided by external, community-based organizations, known as partners.
- School Support Funds: discretionary funding provided to schools to support academic goals and priorities.





# **National Research - Boston**

What emerging, innovative approaches are we seeing in the field?

# BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS





# **National Research**

Key <u>implementation considerations</u> for implementing Opportunity/Equity Index in the District of Columbia

- Students in urban centers face a host of challenges. Limiting funding resource allocation to only a single set of binary factors may not be enough. A deeper analysis of the multiple factors students encounter and how it correlates to academic achievement is needed.
- **Creating the momentum for equity is critical.** CPS & BPS brought in a diverse set of stakeholders to discuss a way forward with implementation that includes universities, community members, school administrators, teachers, and students.
- A 'Hold-harmless' might be needed. Due to challenges with schools possibly losing funding, the CPS model includes a 'hold-harmless' to keep 'losing' schools at their funding baseline
- Aligning funding to address academic achievement gaps promotes equity. Ensuring schools have the adequate supports to address the needs of students sends a strong message to stakeholders that there is a commitment to equity
- An Opportunity/Equity Index provides additional strategic advantages. CPS and BPS are using the data to provide a deeper level of understanding of an individual school's context and, in addition to providing additional funding increases, are looking at other creative ways to strategize and support schools serving the students with the highest needs





# Evaluation of 2013 at-risk weight vs. current UPSFF at-risk weight and funding





# At-risk formula: comparison to 2013 Adequacy Study

<u>Scope question</u>: What is the updated "adequate" weight target for the 5characteristic at-risk weight implemented since FY15, as opposed to the 3characteristic at-risk weight considered by the 2013 Adequacy Study?

- The Current formula allocates more funding to schools with at-risk students than the 2013 adequacy study recommends
- However, at-risk funding per pupil is lower than the 2013 adequacy study imputes, as more students are eligible under current policy than recommended in 2013 study
- Three factors recommended in the 2013 adequacy study for at-risk funding (CFSA, Homeless, TANF) would have included an estimated 23,861 funded students in 2019. At a 0.37 weight and \$10,658 foundation, this would amount to \$94.1M to LEAs under the at-risk weight based on 2013 study.
- The five factors used to identify at-risk students in 2019 resulted in additional funding for 43,564 students. At a 0.224 weight, LEAs received approximately \$104.0M in at-risk funding in FY19, \$9.9M more than adequacy report study.

#### See next slide for details of calculation

Total funded at-risk enrollment includes actual charter at-risk students and budgeted DCPS at-risk students. Factor-specific enrollment uses actual at-risk enrollment for both charters and DCPS (not budgeted).





# At-risk formula: comparison to 2013 Adequacy Study

	FY19 AT-RISK WEIGHT		
a	FY19 FOUNDATION UPSFF WEIGHT	\$10,658	
Ь	FY19 ALLOCATED AT-RISK UPSFF FUNDS (ACTUAL) CHARTER COMPONENT DCPS COMPONENT	\$104,004,345 \$44,264,635 \$59,739,710	OCFO DCPS FY19 BUDGET BOOK ALLOCATION
c	FY19 AT-RISK STUDENT COUNT CHARTER COMPONENT DCPS COMPONENT	<b>43,564</b> 18,541 25,023	ACTUAL AND BUDGETED AT-RISK ENROLLMENT OCFO - ACTUAL DCPS FY19 BUDGET BOOK COUNT
d = b / c	FY19 AT-RISK FUNDS PER AT-RISK STUDENT CHARTER COMPONENT DCPS COMPONENT	<b>\$2,387</b> \$2,387 \$2,387	
e=d/a	FY19 AT-RISK WEIGHT - ACTUAL	0.2240	]
FY19	AT-RISK WEIGHT CALCULATION (IF EXCLUDING OVERAGE	AND SNAP)	
f	TOTAL FY19 OVERAGE AND SNAP STUDENT COUNT	19,703	SCHOOL-LEVEL DATA FILE
g = c - f	AT-RISK STUDENTS EXCLUDING OVERAGE AND SNAP	23,861	
h = b	FY19 ALLOCATED AT-RISK UPSFF FUNDS (ACTUAL)	\$104,004,345	
l = h/g	FY19 AT-RISK FUNDS PER ADJUSTED AT-RISK STUDENT (EXCLUDING OVERAGE AND SNAP)	\$4,359	
j=i/a	FY19 AT-RISK WEIGHT - IF NO SNAP & OVERAGE	0.409	]
ĸ	ADEQUACY STUDY RECOMMENDED WEIGHT TARGET	0.370	
l=j-k	COMPARISON TO ADEQUACY STUDY RECOMMENDATION	0.039	]



# Over-age students in the District





In each of the past five years, DC has enrolled 5,000 to 4,300 over-age students at Charter LEAs and DCPS. These students are all in grades 9-12.



- FY15 includes 67 over-age students from an "OSSE Managed School" neither DCPS nor Charter.
- Data set excludes 7 schools serving Adult and Alternative students only.
- Pie chart excludes students categorized in grades NA or SPED.





Across DC, one in every three 9<sup>th</sup> graders and one in every four high schoolers (grades 9-12 combined), is designated as "over-age." The percentage has declined from 30% to 26% over the last five years.

Percentage of Students in Grade Designated as "Overage"									
	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19				
Grade 9	37%	36%	34%	33%	33%				
Grade 10	32%	26%	23%	27%	24%				
Grade 11	27%	25%	21%	22%	24%				
Grade 12	22%	19%	19%	19%	18%				
All Grades 9-12	30%	28%	26%	26%	26%				





Compared to a city-wide 14% of students designated as SPED in FY19, 26% of over-age students were SPED. These students were allocated an additional ~\$19M in UPSFF SPED funding for FY19.

Percentage of Overage Students Designated as SPED									
FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 FY1									
CHARTER	33%	32%	29%	30%	30%				
DCPS	28%	25%	24%	21%	23%				
Grand Total	30%	27%	26%	25%	26%				

A	В	С	D	E = C * D					
FY19 UPSFF PER PUPIL FUNDING SUMMARY BY SPECIAL EDUCATION LEVEL									
LEVEL FUNDING FUNDING RATE OVERAGE ASSUMED SPED WEIGHT RATE COUNT STUDNETS									
Level 1	0.97	\$10,338	296	\$3,060,048					
Level 2	1.20	\$12,790	411	\$5,256,690					
Level 3	1.97	\$20,996	220	\$4,619,120					
Level 4	3.49	\$37,196	165	\$6,137,340					
TOTAL SPED			1,092	\$19,073,198					



• "SPED" = Special Education

- Estimated funding figures above are based on actual student enrollment counts (for which over-age detail is available). DCPS UPSFF funding allocations are based on budgeted enrollment figures.
- Figures on this slide include students assigned to <u>grades 9-12 only</u> excludes students considered "adult or alternative"





Supporting Strong Schools. Sustaining the Future.



# 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Study Part III: At-risk Concentration

June 2020





# **Table of Contents**

- I. Executive Summary
- II. At-risk Student Need research, analysis and options
- III. At-risk Concentration research, analysis and options
- IV. ELL Weight Structure research, analysis and options
- V. Foundation Level Cost Drivers analysis

# VI. Appendix

- a. UPSFF study process and approach detail
- b. Additional background and research
- c. Additional student outcomes and data analysis





# **UPSFF Scope Questions** *At-Risk Concentration*

- Should the UPSFF include a funding weight for school-level at-risk concentration?
  - What should the "tipping point" of concentration be? Should there be multiple tipping points? What is the appropriate level of additional funding for each tier, relative to the current at-risk weight?
  - What is the impact for schools that fall just below the tipping point(s)?
  - Are there unintended consequences to implementing a school-level atrisk concentration weight, specifically any that may exacerbate at-risk concentration?
- What are the benefits and deterrents of various implementation mechanisms for the additional funding (i.e. a Community Eligibility Provision for at-risk students, an additional student-level "at-risk concentration" weight, etc.)?





# National research on the impact of concentration funding is inconclusive, and support for this school-level weight is mixed

- 1. Student outcomes in the District are **closely aligned to concentration levels of schools**, meriting the consideration of an additional weight for highconcentration schools
- 2. However, national research and recent studies have been **inconclusive on the impact of concentration funding** on student outcomes
- 3. Implementation of concentration funding would require adding a **school-level weight to the at-risk component of the UPSFF.** Other school-level weights in the UPSFF, such as for SPED and residential programs, are program (and site) specific and do not change materially year over year. A school-level concentration weight could change each year based on student demographics and needs.
- Though a formal poll was not administered, the advisory group generally expressed concern about adding a school-level weight to the funding formula. However, some members supported a sliding scale methodology if concentration were considered.





Count of

**Schools** 

# Current policy allocates larger at-risk funding per school as the % of at-risk concentration increases



Assumed Total FY19 At-Risk Funding per School by At-Risk Concentration Band

The above chart represents total at-risk funding allocated to schools in each band of concentration, divided by <u>total school</u> <u>count</u> in each band

The UPSFF currently funds at-risk students with a "linear" funding model (or fixed amount per pupil).

At-risk "concentration" funding would invest a higher amount per pupil for students in schools with a higher number, or concentration, of at-risk students (this is otherwise known as "non-linear" funding).





# State definitions of high concentrations of at-risk students varies significantly, as do funding mechanisms

Sixteen states have implemented concentration funding with an **array of** funding structures and eligibility levels

- Eligibility for concentration funding ranges from 5% (in Nebraska) to over 80% (North Carolina)
- Funding mechanisms include:
  - Tiered funding (Arkansas, California) based on concentration levels (i.e. all schools above a certain threshold receive additional per pupil funding)
  - A "sliding scale" methodology (Ohio, Minnesota), where schools receive additional per pupil funding as concentration increases. Utilizing this methodology would result in students in each school receiving a different per pupil funding amount based on the concentration level at their school.
  - Mixed tiered funding and sliding scale (Massachusetts) per pupil funding based on poverty "decile" of the district (12 deciles implementing for FY21). Utilizing this methodology would result in students in schools with similar concentration levels receiving the same funding amount per pupil. In Massachusetts, multiple schools are in each "tier" and receive funding levels based on a range of concentration, rather than each school receiving a different per pupil amount (such as a full sliding scale)





# At-risk concentration UPSFF funding options



7



# Based on national research and benchmarking, multiple options exist for the DME to implement concentration funding

Question from RFA Should the UPSFF include a funding weight for school-level at-risk concentration (i.e. funding students in schools with a higher at-risk concentration more than students in schools with a lower concentration)?

#### Key Decisions and Options to Modify UPSFF

#### Decision 1: Should the UPSFF add additional funding for high-at-risk concentration schools?

#### Decision 2: If yes, which schools should be targeted and what options for changing the formula exist?

- A. <u>Qualification level for at-risk funding</u> establish a minimum at-risk threshold for at-risk funding, allocate all at-risk funding to schools above the minimum threshold.
- B. <u>Tiered funding</u> incremental funding for schools above a certain threshold
- C. <u>Emulate the Community eligibility provision for school food</u> as defined in the RFA, this would treat schools above a certain threshold as having 100% at-risk students
- D. <u>Sliding scale</u> additional per pupil funding as concentration level increases

#### Decision 3: Should the change be funded with *redistributed* or *incremental* funding?

- A. <u>Redistributed funding</u>: reallocate existing funding levels based on concentration levels of schools, through changes to at-risk funding pool or foundation level
- B. <u>Incremental funding</u>: support concentration funding based on availability of new funds





### **Concentration - qualification level for at-risk funding** School Level Concentration Option A – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

Definition: Add a qualifying minimum for **at-risk funding at 20%**. Schools with lower concentration of at-risk students have shown better results on standardized tests than schools with a higher concentration of at-risk students. Schools that do not meet this minimum threshold would not receive at-risk funds, with schools above this threshold receiving these funds on a per pupil basis.

Opportunities	Challenges
Additional funding to higher concentration schools and LEAs	Excludes 43 LEAs currently receiving at-risk funding (with concentration below 20%)
There is a clear, linear relationship between	Adds a new criteria for eligibility for at-risk funding
concentration and student outcomes.	Adds complexity to the funding formula
	This approach adds a school-level criteria that does not yet exist in the UPSFF





# **Concentration - qualification level for at-risk funding**

School Level Concentration Option A – Implementation Considerations



#### DME COVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMUNIEL BOWSER, MAYOR

# **Concentration - qualification level for at-risk funding**

School Level Concentration Option A – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>As compared to other concentration options, this option would likely spread additional dollars to a significantly larger number of schools and LEAs than other options and may not target high needs students as directly as other options.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>Similar to the sliding scale option, this option will impact many more schools and LEAs than funding tiers and CEP options. That being the case, it may be difficult to hold schools and LEAs accountable for the use of these additional funds.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	• All concentration funding elements would add complexity to the UPSFF, as they are all school-level, rather than student-level, factors. Minimum eligibility requirements, if implemented as presented, would not require additional structural changes to the UPSFF as at-risk funding would flow to all LEAs with schools above a pre-set threshold.	
Incentives	<ul> <li>Disincentives could exist just above or below the established tiers for this option</li> </ul>	



11



# Option A (cont.) – 39 schools below 20% concentration generated an estimated \$4.1M in UPSFF At-Risk Funding in FY19

Α	В	С	D	E = D/C	F	G	H = G/F	1	J	K = J/I	L*	М	N = L * M
FY19 CONCENTRATION ANALYSIS						Math			ELA			ASSUME	D \$
At-Risk Concentration Range	Count of Schools	Total Enrollment	At Risk Count	% At Risk	Math 4+ All Student Test Takers	Math 4+ All Student Proficient	Math 4+ % All Student Proficient	ELA 4+ All Student Test Takers	ELA 4+ All Student Proficient	ELA 4+ % All Student Proficient	At Risk Count	At-Risk Per Pupil Funding	FY19 At-Risk Funding
0%-10%	20	10,333	534	5%	5,291	3,497	66%	5,240	3,969	76%	534	\$2,387	\$ 1,274,867
10%-20%	19	7,949	1,168	15%	3,693	1,622	44%	3,905	2,188	56%	1,168	\$2,387	\$ 2,788,474
20%-30%	14	6,760	1,684	25%	3,380	1,219	36%	3,641	2,004	55%	1,684	\$2,387	\$ 4,020,368
30%-40%	20	7,634	2,673	35%	3,469	1,034	30%	3,490	1,210	35%	2,673	\$2,387	\$ 6,381,499
40%-50%	35	12,142	5,538	46%	5,675	1,535	27%	5,640	1,780	32%	5,538	\$2,387	\$13,221,377
50%-60%	40	14,903	8,120	54%	7,622	1,646	22%	7,661	2,046	27%	8,120	\$2,387	\$19,385,623
60%-70%	34	12,661	8,228	65%	4,837	543	11%	4,921	873	18%	8,228	\$2,387	\$19,643,461
70%-80%	26	8,962	6,765	75%	4,148	404	10%	4,174	698	17%	6,765	\$2,387	\$16,150,707
80%-90%	13	4,305	3,605	84%	1,993	264	13%	1,979	269	14%	3,605	\$2,387	\$ 8,606,548
90%-100%	2	650	622	96%	63	-	0%	79	-	0%	622	\$2,387	\$ 1,484,958
Total	223	86,299	38,937		40,171	11,764		40,730	15,037		38,937		\$92,957,882

#### SHOWING % OF STUDENTS TESTING 4+ PROFICIENT

Notes:

- At-risk funds for allocation to LEAs are calculated based on LEA student total counts, not school total counts.
- The estimated at-risk funding shown above assumes FY19 per pupil at-risk funding of \$2,387.39 times the count of UPSFF enrollment at-risk students, by school.
- The above analysis uses actual at-risk student counts for DCPS schools (not budgeted student counts, which are not done by school). DCPS assumes funding associated with budgeted at-risk student counts for the LEA in total.
- Figures above exclude Adult and Alternative students, as they are not eligible for At-Risk funding. Similarly, schools serving 100% Adult and or Alternative students are not included above.



# Option A (cont) - In a scenario where \$4.1M of FY19 UPSFF at-risk funds are redistributed from schools with *under* 20% concentration to those with *over* 20% concentration, schools with *over* 20% concentration receive an increase of \$109 per at-risk student

Α	В	С	D	E = D/C		F		G = E * F		Н		I = G + H
FY19 CONCENTRATION ANALYSIS												
At-Risk Concentration Range	Count of Schools	Total Enroliment	At Risk Count	% At Risk	At- F	Risk Per Pupil unding	A' F	t-Risk Funding before Redistribution	Red 0-	distribution of •20% At-Risk Funds	F F R	Y19 At-Risk unding after edistribution
0%-10%	20	10,333	534	5%	\$	2,387	\$	1,274,867				
10%-20%	19	7,949	1,168	15%	\$	2,387	\$	2,788,474				
20%-30%	14	6,760	1,684	25%	\$	2,387	\$	4,020,368	\$	183,770	\$	4,204,138
30%-40%	20	7,634	2,673	35%	\$	2,387	\$	6,381,499	\$	291,696	\$	6,673,195
40%-50%	35	12,142	5,538	46%	\$	2,387	\$	13,221,377	\$	604,345	\$	13,825,722
50%-60%	40	14,903	8,120	54%	\$	2,387	\$	19,385,623	\$	886,111	\$	20,271,734
60%-70%	34	12,661	8,228	65%	\$	2,387	\$	19,643,461	\$	897,896	\$	20,541,358
70%-80%	26	8,962	6,765	75%	\$	2,387	\$	16,150,707	\$	738,244	\$	16,888,951
80%-90%	13	4,305	3,605	84%	\$	2,387	\$	8,606,548	\$	393,403	\$	8,999,951
90%-100%	2	650	622	96%	\$	2,387	\$	1,484,958	\$	67,877	\$	1,552,835
Total	223	86,299	38,937				\$	92,957,882	\$	4,063,341	\$	92,957,882

#### Notes:

- At-risk funds for allocation to LEAs are calculated based on LEA student total counts, not school total counts.
- The estimated at-risk funding shown above assumes FY19 per pupil at-risk funding of \$2,387.39 times the count of UPSFF enrollment at-risk students, by school.
- The above analysis uses actual at-risk student counts for DCPS schools (not budgeted student counts, which are not done by school). DCPS in reality assumes funding associated with budgeted at-risk student counts for the LEA in total.
- Figures above exclude Adult and Alternative students, as they are not eligible for At-Risk funding. Similarly, schools serving 100% Adult and or Alternative students are not included above.



# Option A (cont.) - This scenario would increase funding at schools with greater than 20% at-risk population by 4.6%



Note: The above chart represents total at-risk funding allocated to schools in each band of concentration, divided by <u>TOTAL enrollment</u> for these schools



14



### **Concentration – tiered funding**

School Level Concentration Option B – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

#### Provide additional funding for schools with higher concentration of at-risk students

<u>Potential tiers</u>: Though national research is inconclusive on definitive levels of concentration other States fund, the federal government defines high poverty as 75%, and some states identify incremental funding "tiers" from 70% to 90%.

<u>Funding levels</u>: Other states show a wide dispersion of how concentration is funded. Examples follow:

- California: Districts that qualify for concentration funding receive an additional 0.5 (50%) weight per at-risk student.
- Connecticut: Districts with less than 75% students from low-income families receive an additional weight of 0.3 per identified student. Districts with 75% or more of their students from low-income families receive and additional weight of 0.35 per identified student.
- New Jersey: In FY2017, Under 20%: 41% additional funding; Over 40%: 46% additional funding; Sliding scale in between 20% and 40%

DC could also consider funding schools (or LEAs) with greater than the District average for at-risk students (45% in FY20), similar to Colorado.

Opportunities	Challenges
This option would provide incremental funding for students at high concentration schools	Creates funding "tiers" or "cliffs" which can pose issues for schools just above and below the tiers
Student outcomes are highly correlated with at-risk concentration levels by school	Adds complexity to the formula; no national standard for setting funding tiers
	No school-level weighting exists in the UPSFF



### **Concentration – tiered funding**

School Level Concentration Option B – Implementation Considerations





## **Concentration – tiered funding**

School Level Concentration Option B – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>Concentration funding would target schools within LEAs based on their concentration of at-risk students. Though funding would increase for all high at-risk schools (regardless of the tier selected), this funding is directed to the whole school, rather than an individual student group.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>As with all concentration funding options, LEAs that receive these incremental funds could document their plan to use these funds, and share goals and objectives, including student outcomes.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>All concentration funding elements would add complexity to the UPSFF, as they are all school-level, rather than student-level, factors.</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>Disincentives could exist just above or below the established tiers for this option</li> </ul>	



17



# Concentration - emulate the "CEP" for school food

School Level Concentration Option C – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

"Community Eligibility Provision" for high concentration schools

<u>Definition</u>: Per the USDA, "The **Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)** is a non-pricing meal service option for schools and school districts in low-income areas. CEP allows the nation's highest poverty schools and districts to serve breakfast and lunch at **no cost to all enrolled students without collecting household applications**. Instead, schools that adopt CEP are reimbursed **using a formula based on the percentage of students categorically eligible for free meals based on their participation in other specific means-tested programs**, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)."

- Schools with a minimum **Identified Student Percentage of 40% or greater** are eligible (students identified without FRL forms, using SNAP and TANF data)
- In FY20, 87 of 116 of DCPS schools are participating in the CEP
- Additionally, 37 other DC LEAs participated in the CEP in FY19

Implementation Considerations:

- Unclear how this would differ from current at-risk allocation methodology, though one option may be to <u>fund</u> <u>higher concentration schools as if ALL students were at-risk</u>
- Most DCPS schools currently qualify for CEP, and over half of PCS LEAs. More schools and LEAs qualifying may limit incremental funds available to support the highest poverty schools and LEAs.

Opportunities	Challenges
This option could provide additional funding to schools with high numbers of at-risk students, with a greater impact for those schools particularly at the lower end (i.e. 70 or 80%) vs.	Some schools (and LEAs) would receive significantly more incremental funding than others, particularly those at the low end (i.e. 70% concentration).
the higher end of concentration	Added complexity to the formula, with significantly increased incentives to add at-risk students when a school is close to the funding threshold



## **Concentration - emulate the "CEP" for school food**

School Level Concentration Option C – Implementation Considerations



19



# Concentration - emulate the "CEP" for school food

School Level Concentration Option C – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>Concentration funding would target schools within LEAs based on their concentration of at-risk students. Though funding would increase for all high concentration at-risk schools (regardless of the tier selected), this funding is directed to the whole school, rather than an individual student group.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>As with all concentration funding options, LEAs that receive these incremental funds could document their plan to use these funds, and share goals and objectives, including student outcomes. Funding tiers and CEP option would likely include fewer schools and LEAs.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>All concentration funding elements would add complexity to the UPSFF, as they are all school-level, rather than student-level, factors. CEP-aligned funding assumes all schools above a certain threshold receive funding as if they are 100% at-risk.</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>Disincentives could exist just above or below the established tiers for this option</li> </ul>	



20



## **Concentration – sliding scale**

School Level Concentration Option D – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

### **Option Overview and Assumptions**

<u>Definition</u>: Create formula to allocate additional per pupil funds to schools with higher concentration of at-risk students on a non-linear basis

Implementation Considerations:

- Significantly increases the complexity of the formula, and moves the formula from "per student" to a combination of student and school calculations
- DME and the city would need to agree upon a specific formula to use (as other states have done for sliding scale)
- Depending on implementation, this could increase funding for high concentration schools, and lower funding for low concentration schools

### **Opportunities**

This funding mechanism would provide additional funding as the concentration level increases for schools, eliminating funding cliffs other concentration options presented

At-risk per pupil funding would increase as concentration increases, which aligns to overall school performance

### Challenges

DME would need to create a funding formula that aligns to current student outcomes, and distributes funding fairly. This funding formula will add a level of complexity to the UPSFF, and it will also be school-based rather than student-based.




## **Concentration – sliding scale**

School Level Concentration Option D – Implementation Considerations





## **Concentration – sliding scale**

### School Level Concentration Option D – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>Concentration funding would target schools within LEAs based on their concentration of at-risk students. Though funding would increase for all high at-risk schools, this funding is directed to the whole school, rather than an individual student group.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	• This option would likely impact all schools, regardless of their level of concentration. It may be difficult to identify the tipping point of where the incremental funding can allow school and LEA leaders to develop and implement new strategies to improve student performance	
Transparency & Simplicity	• All concentration funding elements would add complexity to the UPSFF, as they are all school-level, rather than student-level, factors. A sliding scale would require a formulaic approach to funding schools by concentration level	
Incentives	<ul> <li>There should not be disincentives associated with this option, though it is unclear based on the uncertainty of the formula</li> </ul>	





# At-risk Concentration research, data and analysis





## At-risk concentration: National studies and research

- Multiple studies have shown that, "schools with a high percentage of lowincome students, or schools with a high concentration of poverty, require additional services and resources to support student achievement".
- Summarizing national research and studies cited since 1966, <u>a 2016</u> <u>Maryland funding study</u> evaluated literature and studies on linear vs. nonlinear funding strategies for schools and LEAs with higher concentrations of poverty students
  - After reviewing these studies, and the funding formula for Maryland LEAs, the authors of the Maryland funding study recommended that "Maryland should continue its linear funding formula weight, rather than adjust it in an exponential fashion as the concentration of poverty increases."
- <u>A study published by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights</u> found that that "the concentration of poverty in a school was more influential for student achievement than the individual poverty level of the student, as this was related to peer engagement as a factor in improving educational achievement for students of color."





## Student performance on Math and ELA PARCC tests align with concentration levels of at-risk students

Α	В	С	D	E = D/C	F	G	H = G/F	1	J	K = J/I
FY19	CONCE		ANALYSIS	5		Math			ELA	
At-Risk Concentration Range	Count of Schools	Total Enrollment	At Risk Count	% At Risk	Math 4+ All Student Test Takers	Math 4+ All Student Proficient	Math 4+ % All Student Proficient	ELA 4+ All Student Test Takers	ELA 4+ All Student Proficient	ELA 4+ % All Student Proficient
0%-10%	20	10,333	534	5%	5,291	3,497	66%	5,240	3,969	76%
10%-20%	19	7,949	1,168	15%	3,693	1,622	44%	3,905	2,188	56%
20%-30%	14	6,760	1,684	25%	3,380	1,219	36%	3,641	2,004	55%
30%-40%	20	7,634	2,673	35%	3,469	1,034	30%	3,490	1,210	35%
40%-50%	35	12,142	5,538	46%	5,675	1,535	27%	5,640	1,780	32%
50%-60%	40	14,903	8,120	54%	7,622	1,646	22%	7,661	2,046	27%
60%-70%	34	12,661	8,228	65%	4,837	543	11%	4,921	873	18%
70%-80%	26	8,962	6,765	75%	4,148	404	10%	4,174	698	17%
80%-90%	13	4,305	3,605	84%	1,993	264	13%	1,979	269	14%
90%-100%	2	650	622	96%	63	-	0%	79	-	0%
Total	223	86,299	38,937		40,171	11,764		40,730	15,037	





## Schools with the lowest concentration of at-risk students have the greatest performance on PARCC exams

Α	В	С	D	E = D/C	F	G	H = G/F	1	J	K = J/I
FY19	CONCE	NTRATION A	NALYSIS	5		Math			ELA	
At-Risk Concentration Range	Count of Schools	Total Enrollment	At Risk Count	% At Risk	Math 4+ All Student Test Takers	Math 4+ All Student Proficient	Math 4+ % All Student Proficient	ELA 4+ All Student Test Takers	ELA 4+ All Student Proficient	ELA 4+ % All Student Proficient
0%-10%	20	10,333	534	5%	5,291	3,497	66%	5,240	3,969	76%
10%-20%	19	7,949	1,168	15%	3,693	1,622	44%	3,905	2,188	56%
20%-30%	14	6,760	1,684	25%	3,380	1,219	36%	3,641	2,004	55%
30%-40%	20	7,634	2,673	35%	3,469	1,034	30%	3,490	1,210	35%
40%-50%	35	12,142	5,538	46%	5,675	1,535	27%	5,640	1,780	32%
50%-60%	40	14,903	8,120	54%	7,622	1,646	22%	7,661	2,046	27%
60%-70%	34	12,661	8,228	65%	4,837	543	11%	4,921	873	18%
70%-80%	26	8,962	6,765	75%	4,148	404	10%	4,174	698	17%
80%-90%	13	4,305	3,605	84%	1,993	264	13%	1,979	269	14%
90%-100%	2	650	622	96%	63	-	0%	79	-	0%
Total	223	86,299	38,937		40,171	11,764		40,730	15,037	





## **At-risk concentration: Other State Policies**

Sixteen (16) states provide concentration funding, though the levels at which this funding is provided varies significantly.

Qualification for At-risk Concentration Funding				
State	At-risk Student Population			
Nebraska	Over 5%			
Illinois	Over 15%			
New Jersey	20%			
Kansas	Over 35%			
California	Over 55%			
Arkansas	70%			
Utah	75%			
Connecticut	Over 75%			
North Carolina	80%			

Five other states provide concentration funding on a <u>sliding scale</u>, one provides funding for **schools above the state average** (Colorado), and another provides funding **aligned to the Title I program** (Montana)



## DC student outcomes: ELA PARCC test results are highly correlated to school-level at-risk concentration



At-Risk Concentration vs. <u>All-Student</u> % Proficiency (ELA 4+; five years; 991 school data points)





## DC student outcomes: Additionally, Math PARCC test results are highly correlated to school-level at-risk concentration

At-Risk Concentration vs. <u>All-Student</u> % Proficiency (Math 4+; five years; 992 school data points)







## ELA PARCC FY19 test results are highly correlated to school-level at-risk concentration

At-Risk Concentration vs. <u>All-Student</u> % Proficiency (ELA 4+; 206 Schools)







## Math PARCC FY19 test results are highly correlated to school-level at-risk concentration

At-Risk Concentration vs. <u>All-Student</u> % Proficiency (Math 4+; 206 Schools)







## At-Risk Student ELA PARCC test results are correlated to school-level at-risk concentration









0%

0%

20%

10%

## At-Risk Student Math PARCC test results are correlated to school-level at-risk concentration



At-Risk Concentration vs. <u>At-Risk Student</u> % Proficiency

50%

At-Risk Concentration

60%

70%

80%

90%

40%

30%

AFTON 34

100%



Supporting Strong Schools. Sustaining the Future.



## 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Study Part IV: ELL Weight Structure

June 2020





## **Table of Contents**

- I. Executive Summary
- II. At-risk Student Need research, analysis and options
- III. At-risk Concentration research, analysis and options
- IV. ELL Weight Structure research, analysis and options
- V. Foundation Level Cost Drivers analysis

## VI. Appendix

- a. UPSFF study process and approach detail
- b. Additional background and research
- c. Additional student outcomes and data analysis





## UPSFF Scope Questions ELL Weight Structure

# Should the English Language Learner (ELL) weight be tiered, reflecting differing costs by service needs, and

along what line of differentiation (i.e. age, newcomer status, WIDA ACCESS level, etc.)?

What is the **appropriate proportion of additional funding for each recommended tier**, relative to the current ELL funding weight?





# This study identifies multiple options to "tier" funding for ELL students, including at the grade level, by proficiency level and new to the country status

- 1. Similar to most states, the District funds all English Language Learner ("ELL") students at the same level, regardless of demonstrated student need. However, several large, urban school districts and two states fund ELL students based on grade band and proficiency level.
- 2. The **number of ELL students in the District has increased by 50% from FY15 to FY20**, while funding in total dollars has increased by over 70% in that time. The achievement gap has also improved during that time, particularly for **elementary school students in math**.
- 3. This study has identified multiple options to tier funding of students based on **grade band**, while local and national practitioners also support incremental funding for **students with limited or interrupted formal education ("SLIFE").** Additionally, student outcomes data reflect additional needs for students with **low proficiency scores**, though implementing a proficiency-based weight is more common for LEAs than States.
- 4. Implementation will require developing **common definitions for student need**, consistent **data collection** methodologies from all LEAs, as well as coordination with OSSE on any forthcoming changes to ELL exit requirements due to changes in the rigor of the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment exam ("WIDA"\*).





# Students designated as ELL have increased by 50% from FY15 to FY20. This growth has impacted <u>DCPS most significantly</u>, with ELL students representing 15% of the total student population in FY20





2) FY15 excludes 14 ELL students at OSSE Managed Washington Hospitality Foundation





# Annual total UPSFF funding for ELL has increased 71% from FY15 actual to FY20 projected; at the same time total ELL students have increased 50%



#### Notes

• Funding is not adjusted for inflation.

 Funding data uses actual charter funding from OSSE and DCPS budgeted funding from budget books – FY17 and FY18 reflect rate adjustments (per Foundation Level letter) due to retroactive WTU increases.







# While UPSFF ELL funding weights have remained constant since FY15, the per pupil funding rate has increased by 16% as a result of increases to the foundation rate



Historical UPSFF ELL Funding Weights

Historical UPSFF ELL Funding Rates \$ Per Pupil



Note FY17 FY18 funding amounts reflect the retroactive increases stemming from the 2017 Washington Teachers' Union (WTU) contract agreement.





## More than half of ELL students are in grades PK to 3, though the number of students significantly increases in 9<sup>th</sup> grade



Source data – ELL student-level data from DME & OSSE Data Filters: FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.





# Nationally, ELL students represent a larger proportion in grades K-5 when compared to grades 6-12; however, DC's proportion of ELL students increases in High School



 ELL students represent an increasing percentage of total students nationally – <u>from 8.1 percent, or 3.8 million</u> <u>students in fall 2000 to 9.6 percent, or 4.9 million students in fall 2016</u>

The difference in higher grades between DC and National Average is partially driven by policy to place students in age-appropriate grades for High Schools, regardless of proficiency level





# What we have heard and learned through Advisory Group meetings and LEA interviews

- 1. In the District, students placed in upper grades with lower WIDA scores require additional supports and resources than younger students with lower WIDA scores.
- 2. Students receive **differing intensity and type of supports based on their WIDA level.** We heard: "the reality is that these students are actually supported based on their proficiency level". *However, concerns exist over unintended incentives in attaching funding to WIDA level.*
- 3. School leaders have highlighted challenges associated with **supporting students new to the country,** including students with limited or interrupted learning. This challenge is exacerbated for LEAs with a limited number of sites (and resources to support these students).
- 4. School leaders also highlighted that **serving ELLs requires more than ESL teachers**; it requires bilingual administrative staff, interpreters, professional development, and additional parent engagement efforts.





# What we have heard and learned through Advisory Group meetings and LEA interviews (cont.)

- 5. DC has limited data on key groups of ELL students. "WIDA screener" data is an optional data field for LEAs to complete, and no system is in place to collect data on students that have experienced interrupted formal education.
  - This data will be crucial to effectively implement funding based on student needs
  - Lack of a citywide definition for "newcomer" or "students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE)" exacerbates this data problem
  - Only have performance data (WIDA and PARCC) for 1/3 of all ELL students
- 6. The WIDA ACCESS test became more rigorous in FY17, **resulting in an increased number of students remaining designated as ELL.** Multiple states have lowered WIDA score exit requirements to between 4.0 and 4.6. OSSE is researching this issue but does not anticipate a change in FY21.
  - Exit requirements remain at 5.0 for DC students
  - Partially as a result of more rigorous exit requirements, ELL funding has increased by over 70% from FY15 to FY20.





## ELL UPSFF funding options





## This study has identified and quantified several options to "tier" funding for ELL students

Question<br/>from RFAShould the English Language Learner weight be tiered, reflecting<br/>differing costs by service needs, and along what line of differentiation?

### Key Decisions and Options to Modify UPSFF

#### Decision 1: Should the UPSFF weight for ELL students be updated?

#### Decision 2: If yes, which students should be targeted and what options for changing the formula exist?

- A. Grade Level 1 Tiered funding for ES, MS, HS students
- B. Grade Level 2 Tiered funding for PK-8, HS students
- C. Grade Level 3 Tiered funding for PK-5, 6-12 students
- D. Proficiency targeted funding for lowest WIDA test scores
- E. Combination of Grade Levels and Proficiency
- F. Additional funding for students designated as "new to country"
- G. Additional funding for students identified as SLIFE

### Decision 3: Should the change be funded with redistributed or incremental funding

- A. <u>Redistributed funding</u>: new UPSFF ELL categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for by decreasing weights on currently existing ELL student categories, or through changes to the foundation amount
- B. <u>Incremental funding</u>: new UPSFF student need categories with higher relative funding weights, paid for with incremental/new funds available over time





## **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for ES, MS, HS students** *ELL Option A – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges*

## **Option Overview and Assumptions**

2,863 students impacted (FY19 actual MS and HS ELL students)

Create a grade-based ELL weight with differentiated funding levels for students in Elementary Grades (PK-5), Middle School Grades (6-8), and High School Grades (9-12)

Assumptions: highest rate for students in MS (highest gap), second highest rate for students in HS, lowest relative rate for students in PK-5

Opportunities	Challenges
Allows for more targeted funding based on student outcomes by grade band	Increases complexity of the formula May not address additional needs of students new to
Relatively simple to communicate and calculate	the country, or other ELL students with high needs
	Few states allocate funds by grade level





## Grade Levels - Tiered funding for ES, MS, HS students

ELL Option A – Implementation Considerations





## Grade Levels - Tiered funding for ES, MS, HS students

ELL Option A – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>This weight would increase funding for students in grade bands likely requiring additional funding. Though students with higher WIDA scores will also benefit from these funds, total ELL performance tends to decline after 5th grade.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>Effective, measurable outcomes are more likely since this weight is focused on a specific student group.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This option would require an additional weight in the UPSFF, though these students are already counting in the existing UPSFF.</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>Disincentives should not exist for this factor</li> </ul>	





## **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for ES, MS, HS students** *ELL Option A – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)*

#### Scenario: Incremental Funding

20% increase to ELL weight for EL MS students, 10% increase for EL HS weight, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula

No change to At-Risk weight for other students

### Fiscal Impact Summary: Incremental Funding

**\$2.8M** net increase in annual funding for FY22

**31** LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of **\$5,627** 

0 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$0

DCPS: \$2.1M (or 4%) increase in ELL funds









## **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for ES, MS, HS students** *ELL Option A – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of ELL Funds)*

### Scenario: Redistribution of ELL Funds

20% increase to ELL weight for EL MS students, 10% increase for EL HS weight, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

Corresponding decrease to existing ELL weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate

No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula

### **Fiscal Impact Summary: Redistribution**

**\$0M** net increase in annual funding for FY22

23 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of \$4,386

**35** LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of **\$7,445** 

DCPS: \$71K (or 0.1%) increase in ELL funds





18

See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



## **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-8, HS students** *ELL Option B – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges*

## **Option Overview and Assumptions**

1,781 students impacted (FY19 actual)

[increased rate for students in grades 9-12]

Create a grade-based ELL weight with differentiated funding levels for students in K-8 and High School (9-12)

Opportunities	Challenges
Align resources based on current practices and demonstrated student performance	May not align to differentiated structured supports for Elementary and Middle school students
Adheres to practices by several urban school Districts Less complex than option A. (two grade bands vs. three)	While the achievement gap has improved in DC for ELL students in Elementary Schools, it has not for students in Middle schools
	Increases complexity of funding formula (two grade weights vs. current single weight)
	Few states allocate funds by grade level



19



## **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-8, HS students**

ELL Option B – Implementation Considerations





## **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-8, HS students**

ELL Option B – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>This weight would increase funding for students in grade bands likely requiring additional funding. Though students with higher WIDA scores will also benefit from these funds, total ELL performance tends to decline after 5th grade.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>Effective, measurable outcomes are more likely since this weight is focused on a specific student group.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This option would require an additional weight in the UPSFF, though these students are already counting in the existing UPSFF.</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>Disincentives should not exist for this factor</li> </ul>	



21



## Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-8, HS students

ELL Option B – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

Scenario: Incremental Funding	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase
10% increase to ELL weight for <u>EL HS students</u> , relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22	<b>\$1.3M</b> net increase in annual funding for FY22
No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula	<b>16</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; median gain of \$4,220
No change to ELL weight for other students	0 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$0 DCPS: \$1.0M (or 1.9%) increase in ELL funds
COUNT OF LEAS BY % GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE	COUNT OF LEAS BY \$ GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE ELL FUNDS ONLY
51	51
-         -	10           -         -         1         -         1         4           < (\$40k) (\$30k) (\$20k) (\$10k) \$0

22



## **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-8, HS students** *ELL Option B – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of ELL Funds)*

### Scenario: Redistribution of ELL Funds

10% increase to ELL weight for <u>EL HS students</u>, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

Corresponding decrease to existing ELL weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate

No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula

### Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase

**\$0** net increase in annual funding for FY22

14 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of \$5,181

44 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of \$2,840

DCPS: \$105K (or 0.2%) increase in ELL funds



See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact


# **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-5, 6-12 students** *ELL Option C – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges*

## **Option Overview and Assumptions**

2,863 students impacted (FY19 actual MS and HS ELL students)

[increased rate for students in grades 6-12]

Create a grade-based ELL weight with differentiated funding levels for students in PK-5 and 6-12

Opportunities	Challenges
Align resources based on current practices and demonstrated student performance	May not fully address the differentiated needs of ELL students in High School vs. Middle school
Adheres to practices by several urban school Districts Less complex than option A. (two grade bands vs. three)	Increases complexity of funding formula (two grade weights vs. current single weight) Few states allocate funds by grade level
Aligns to performance data (lower performance in MS/HS than ES)	





# Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-5, 6-12 students

ELL Option C – Implementation Considerations







# Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-5, 6-12 students

ELL Option C – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	• This weight would increase funding for students in grade bands likely requiring additional funding. Though students with higher WIDA scores will also benefit from these funds, total ELL performance tends to decline after 5th grade.	
Accountability	<ul> <li>Effective, measurable outcomes are more likely since this weight is focused on a specific student group.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This option would require an additional weight in the UPSFF, though these students are already counting in the existing UPSFF.</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>Disincentives should not exist for this factor</li> </ul>	





## Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-5, 6-12 students ELL Option C – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

#### Scenario: Incremental Funding

10% increase to ELL weight for EL MS and HS students, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula

No change to ELL weight for other students

#### **Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase**

**\$2.1M** net increase in annual funding for FY22

**31** LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; median gain of \$3,939

**0** LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$0

DCPS: \$1.6M (or 3%) increase in ELL funds



AFTON

TO

5

\$40K >\$50k

то



#### **Grade Levels - Tiered funding for PK-5, 6-12 students** *ELL Option C – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of ELL Funds)*

#### **Scenario: Redistribution of ELL Funds**

10% increase to ELL weight for <u>EL MS and HS students</u>, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

Corresponding decrease to existing ELL weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate

No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula

#### **Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase**

**\$0** net increase in annual funding for FY22

23 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; median gain of \$2,464

**35** LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of \$5,476

DCPS: \$88K (or 0.2%) increase in ELL funds





AFTON

See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



# **Proficiency - increase funding for lowest WIDA scores** *ELL Option D – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges*

## **Option Overview and Assumptions**

**2,356** students impacted [FY19 EL students with PY WIDA below 3.0]

[ currently 1/3 of ELL students do not have a recorded WIDA score ]

Increase funding weight based on student proficiency levels as assessed utilizing the WIDA exam.

Opportunities	Challenges
Align resources based on demonstrated student	Increases complexity of funding formula
performance (and needs), as identified by proficiency testing	Current data collection issues
Adheres to practices by several urban school	May create unintended incentives
Districts	Few states have differentiated weights by proficiency
	1/3 of ELL students do not have a recorded WIDA score





# **Proficiency - increase funding for lowest WIDA scores**

ELL Option D – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>Currently, the UPSFF does not differentiate amongst levels of ELL proficiency</li> <li>About 1/3 of ELL students in the system do not have prior year WIDA scores, primarily because Pre-k students do not take WIDA</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Only 1/3 of ELL students in FY19 had BOTH valid WIDA and PARCC scores</li> <li>About 1/3 of ELL students in the system do not have prior year WIDA scores (driven by students in grades PK-1 and "newcomers")</li> <li>There is potential to include WIDA screener data for students in younger grades and students new to the country, though that data is not universally available today, particularly from PCS.</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>Projecting student proficiency levels relies on past student performance alone, and while this data exists, it is unclear how reliable of an indicator past WIDA will be for projecting future proficiency, especially by LEA</li> <li>WIDA is administered in the Spring – data may not be available for next year's budget cycle</li> <li>Not all ELL students record prior year WIDA scores, requiring assumptions on tiering for students with no results</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change required for creating new funding category. This change would likely require further study on identification, intervention measures and funding amounts/weights for these students.</li> </ul>	



30



# **Proficiency - increase funding for lowest WIDA scores** *ELL Option D – Student Funding Formula Goals*

Impact	<ul> <li>This weight would increase funding for students with lower proficiency on the WIDA exam. The funds would be targeted to LEAs with the lowest performers on the exam from the prior year.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>Similar to the grade band option, this weight would invest funds to support students with lower proficiency scores.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This option would require a structural change to the UPSFF, and would be the only factor driven strictly by proficiency (vs. hours/support requirements for SPED levels)</li> <li>1/3 of ELL students do not have prior year WIDA test results, primarily because Pre-k students do not take WIDA</li> </ul>	
Incentives	<ul> <li>This factor could create a disincentive to promote students out of ELL (as schools/LEAs would be "rewarded" for keeping students at a lower proficiency level)</li> </ul>	



31



# **Proficiency - increase funding for lowest WIDA scores** *ELL Option D – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)*

#### **Scenario: Incremental Funding**

10% increase to ELL weight for <u>EL students with PY WIDA</u> <u>scores below 3.0</u>, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula

No change to ELL weight for other students

#### **Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase**

**\$1.7M** net increase in annual funding for FY22

42 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; median gain of \$3,658

0 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$0

DCPS: \$1.3M (or 2.5%) increase in ELL funds







See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



## **Proficiency - increase funding for lowest WIDA scores** *ELL Option D – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of ELL Funds)*

#### Scenario: Redistribution of ELL Funds

10% increase to ELL weight for <u>EL students with PY WIDA</u> <u>scores below 3.0</u>, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

Corresponding decrease to existing ELL weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate

No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula

#### Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase

**\$0** net increase in annual funding for FY22

9 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of \$1,503

49 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of \$2,094

DCPS: \$114K (or 0.2%) increase in ELL funds







# **Combination of Grade Levels and Proficiency** *ELL Option E – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges*

# **Option Overview and Assumptions**

2,356 students impacted (FY19: 1,199 grades 3-5 / 1,055 grades 6-12 / 102 alternative)

Create a grade-based ELL weight with differentiated funding levels for students in PK-5 and 6-12. Within each grade-band weight, increase funding weight based on student proficiency levels, as assessed utilizing the WIDA exam.

Opportunities	Challenges
Addresses demonstrated student performance gaps for BOTH students designated as ELL in higher grade levels AND students with lower proficiency levels Align resources based on demonstrated student	Increases complexity of funding formula Current data collection issues May create unintended incentives
performance (and needs)	Few states have differentiated weights by proficiency Currently 1/3 of ELL students do not have a recorded WIDA score





# **Combination of Grade Levels and Proficiency**

ELL Option E – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>Currently, the system does not differentiate between levels of ELL proficiency for <u>all</u> students designated as ELL</li> <li>About 1/3 of ELL students in the system do not have prior year WIDA scores, primarily because Pre-k students do not take WIDA</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Only 1/3 of ELL students in FY19 had BOTH valid WIDA and PARCC scores</li> <li>About 1/3 of ELL students in the system do not have prior year WIDA scores (driven by students in grades PK-1 and "newcomers")</li> <li>There is potential to include WIDA screener data for students in younger grades and students new to the country, but does not yet exist</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>Projecting student proficiency levels relies on past student performance alone, and while this data exists, it is unclear how reliable of an indicator past WIDA will be for projecting future proficiency, especially by LEA</li> <li>WIDA is administered in the Spring – data may not be available for next year's budget cycle</li> <li>Not all ELL students record prior year WIDA scores, requiring assumptions on tiering for students with no results</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change required for creating new funding category. This change would likely require further study on identification, intervention measures and funding amounts/weights for these students.</li> </ul>	



35



# **Combination of Grade Levels and Proficiency**

ELL Option E – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>This weight would increase funding for students with lower proficiency on the WIDA exam. The funds would be targeted to LEAs with the lowest performers on the exam from the prior year.</li> <li>Additionally, this weight would increase funding for EL students in higher grade bands, which have been identified as having higher needs.</li> </ul>
Accountability	<ul> <li>Similar to the grade band option, this weight would invest funds directly to students with lower proficiency scores, which means outcomes for these funds should be readily available over time.</li> </ul>
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This option would require a structural change to the UPSFF, and would be the only factor driven strictly by proficiency (vs. hours/support requirements for SPED levels)</li> </ul>
Incentives	<ul> <li>This factor could create a disincentive to promote students out of ELL (as schools/LEAs would be "rewarded" for keeping students at a lower proficiency level)</li> </ul>





# Increase funding for students designated as "new to the country" or "recently arrived EL"

ELL Option F – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges

# **Option Overview and Assumptions**

**947** students impacted (FY19 estimated)

Add weight for students currently identified as "new to the system" or "recently arrived"

Opportunities	Challenges
Data is readily available and collected by OSSE These students have been identified as requiring additional support by DC school leaders and advisory group members	Limited performance data available on these students – most do not have PARCC and WIDA scores. Some students may be new to the US, but have had some type of formal education previously Increases complexity of funding formula Unclear if other states have new to system weights



37



# Increase funding for students designated as "new to the country" or "recently arrived EL"

ELL Option F – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>OSSE currently tracks students that are flagged as "new to the country", though it is unclear if the definition is consistent across LEAs</li> </ul>	
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Students that are new to the country have limited testing data available</li> </ul>	
Projection	<ul> <li>The projection risk is higher for this designation due to the potential unpredictability from year to year, and the relatively small number of students</li> </ul>	
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change likely required for creating new funding category/subcategory</li> </ul>	
	AF	τον



# Increase funding for students designated as "new to the country" ELL Option F – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>This weight would provide funds to students that are currently designated as new to the country. However, this student flag is currently inconsistently completed in ELL systems across the city.</li> </ul>	
Accountability	<ul> <li>Effective outcomes should be available for this student group if this option were pursued.</li> </ul>	
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This option would require a new weight in the UPSFF, but would be rather straightforward to implement (# students x weight x foundation)</li> </ul>	
Incentives	• This would likely be a time-limited weight (i.e. LEAs receive funding for the first xx years of students attending school in the U.S.), so no disincentives should exist. However, the current definition of new to country is not as clear as SLIFE.	





# Increase funding for students designated as "new to the country"

ELL Option F – Fiscal Impact (Incremental Funds)

#### Scenario: Incremental Funding

10% increase to ELL weight for <u>students new to the</u> <u>country</u> relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula

No change to At-Risk weight for other students

#### Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase

\$694K net increase in annual funding for FY22

**10** LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of \$1,970

0 LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; median loss of \$0

DCPS: \$666K (or 1.3%) increase in ELL funds



See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



# Increase funding for students designated as "new to the country"

ELL Option F – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of ELL Funds)







AFTON

See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



# **Increase funding for students designated as "SLIFE"** *ELL Option G – Overview, Opportunities, Challenges*

# **Option Overview and Assumptions**

154 students impacted (FY20 actual as of January, DCPS only)

Add weight for students designated with "limited or interrupted formal education" or SLIFE. In several urban school Districts, this is considered a separate weight for a limited number of students.

Opportunities	Challenges
Identify ELL students with the greatest potential needs from their LEAs and schools Provide targeted funding for students with the greatest ELL needs Practice is supported in urban school districts, particularly those with potential influx of immigrant populations	Data is not formally collected across LEAs No state weight for SLIFE (only school districts) Could be considered an LEA funding option, rather than State Currently a small number of students





# Increase funding for students designated as "SLIFE"

ELL Option G – Implementation Considerations

Common Definition	<ul> <li>No common definition exists across the system</li> <li>Currently, the DCPS tracks SLIFE students but Charters do not</li> </ul>		
Outcomes Data	<ul> <li>Prior year PARCC and WIDA exam results do not exist for SLIFE and/or new to the country students</li> <li>Outcomes data would be available over time</li> </ul>		
Projection	<ul> <li>The projection risk is higher for SLIFE due to a small student population</li> </ul>		
UPSFF Legislative Requirements	<ul> <li>Legislative change likely required for creating new funding category/subcategory; no common definition exists</li> </ul>		



44



# Increase funding for students designated as "SLIFE"

ELL Option G – Student Funding Formula Goals

Impact	<ul> <li>This option would fund students with limited or interrupted education, which is a criteria only currently documented by DCPS. It is also a small number of students, so the funding level would likely need to be relatively large to make an impact.</li> </ul>
Accountability	<ul> <li>If implemented, this would be a highly focused weight focused on a small student group. Outcomes should be readily measurable.</li> </ul>
Transparency & Simplicity	<ul> <li>This option would require a new weight in the UPSFF, but would be rather straightforward to implement (# students x weight x foundation)</li> </ul>
Incentives	<ul> <li>This would likely be a time-limited weight (i.e. LEAs receive funding for the first xx years of students attending school in the U.S.), so no disincentives should exist.</li> </ul>
	AFTON



## **Increase funding for students designated as "SLIFE"** *ELL Option G – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of ELL Funds)*

#### **Scenario: Incremental Funding**

10% increase to ELL weight for <u>EL SLIFE students</u>, relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22

No corresponding decrease to other areas of the formula

No change to At-Risk weight for other students

#### Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase

**\$118k** net increase in annual funding for FY22

27 LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of \$1,125

**0** LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of **\$0** 

DCPS: \$87K (or 0.2%) increase in ELL funds





AFTON

See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



# Increase funding for students designated as "SLIFE"

ELL Option G – Fiscal Impact (Redistribution of ELL Funds)

Scenario: Redistribution of ELL Funds	Fiscal Impact Summary: 10% Increase	
10% increase to ELL weight for <u>EL SLIFE students</u> , relative to other ELL weights, beginning in FY22	<b>\$0</b> net increase in annual funding for FY22	
Corresponding decrease to existing ELL weight to pay for increase to new weight/rate	<b>15</b> LEAs experience increase in UPSFF funds; <u>median gain</u> of <b>\$187</b>	
No change to other areas of the UPSFF formula	<b>43</b> LEAs experience decrease in UPSFF funds; <u>median loss</u> of <b>\$89</b>	
	DCPS: \$2K (or 0%) increase in ELL funds	
COUNT OF LEAS BY % GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE	COUNT OF LEAS BY \$ GAIN / (LOSS) EXPERIENCE RANGE	

ELL FUNDS ONLY 70 43 15 9 -2.5% <-20% -20% -15% -10% -5% 0% / 0% 2.5% 5% 10% 15% >20% то то то то NA то то то то то то -15% -10% -5% -2.5% 0% 5% 20% 2.5% 10% 15%





46

See notes on process and methodology for details on calculation of fiscal impact



# ELL student outcomes data and analysis



# Student outcomes data from the last three years shows marked improvement for elementary school ELL students, though increasing gaps for middle and high school students

- 1. As measured by PARCC, ELL student outcomes have **improved markedly over** the last three years, primarily driven by elementary school students at WIDA level 3 and above.
- 2. The **proficiency gap in math has decreased by 5.2 percentage points** since FY17, driven by <u>elementary school students scoring 3 or greater on the WIDA exam</u>
- 3. The achievement gap for all students with lower WIDA scores (below 3.0) and their non-ELL peers has increased from FY17 to FY19 at each grade level band: ES, MS, and HS
- 4. Additionally, proficiency levels and gaps **increased for Middle and High school ELL students** as compared to Elementary school students.
- 5. Though students new to the country have been identified as requiring significant additional supports through LEA interview and Advisory Group meetings, limited performance data is currently available for this group of students for PCS
  - As of January 2020, DCPS had 154 students identified as SLIFE in the ELLevate system
  - Though this group of students is relatively small, they require significant supports, including altered scheduling, materials and curriculum





# Proficiency gains for DC ELL students have been driven by students scoring 3 or higher in the WIDA exam. Gains are particularly significant in grades 3-5.



#### Notes:

- ELL students counted: FY15 FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.
- Including Valid PARCC scores only; excludes ELL students with NO WIDA scores reported.
- PARCC scores used for valid scores reported from students in UPSFF grade levels 3-12 only

# ELL students with 3+ WIDA scores in grades 3-5 have both shown improved proficiency as well as materially closed the achievement gap with non-ELL students from FY17 to FY19...



#### Notes:

- ELL students counted: FY15 FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.
- Including Valid PARCC scores only; excludes ELL students with NO WIDA scores reported.
- PARCC scores used for valid scores reported from students in UPSFF grade levels 3-5 only



# ...while ELL students in grades 6-12 have shown mixed results when compared to elementary school, with an increased achievement gap from FY17 to FY19



#### Notes:

- ELL students counted: FY15 FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.
- Including Valid PARCC scores only; excludes ELL students with NO WIDA scores reported.
- PARCC scores used for valid scores reported from students in UPSFF grade levels 6-8 only



# Further, proficiency levels are highest in grades 3-5 for all students, with highest achievement gaps for math in grades 6-8...



## MATH FY19 ONLY

FY19 ONLY - MATH				
	Proficient 4+			
Grade	Not or No	E11	Deviation	
Level	Longer ELL	ELL	from Not ELL	
Gr3	42.9%	35.9%	-7.0%	
Gr4	40.4%	25.6%	-14.8%	
Gr5	34.0%	20.3%	-13.7%	
Gr6	24.7%	7.4%	-17.3%	
Gr7	28.6%	8.6%	-19.9%	
Gr8	26.2%	6.5%	-19.7%	
Gr9	20.2%	5.2%	-14.9%	
Gr10	13.7%	3.5%	-10.2%	
Gr11	3.3%	10.0%	6.7%	
Gr12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

#### Largest drop-off in proficiency for ELLs is between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade (between ES and MS)

#### Notes:

- ELL students counted: FY15 FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.
- Including Valid PARCC scores only
- PARCC scores used for valid scores reported from students in UPSFF grade levels 3-12 only
- There are significantly fewer test takers (and data points) for grades 11 and 12





# ...and ELA gaps in FY19 are highest in grades 6-10, though proficiency levels are mixed for all grades



Notes:

- ELL students counted: FY15 FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.
- Including Valid PARCC scores only
- PARCC scores used for valid scores reported from students in UPSFF grade levels 3-12 only
- There are significantly fewer test takers (and data points) for grades 11 and 12



# ELL national research and benchmarking





# National research supports tiered funding, though unclear whether this should be executed at the State or LEA-level

- 1. National experts, as well as published reports and research, **support targeted funding for targeted groups of ELL students**
- 2. However, most <u>states</u> fund ELL students at the same level, without differentiated funding based on need. North Dakota and Hawaii fund based on proficiency levels, Massachusetts funds ELL students based on grade bands, while several large, urban school districts fund by proficiency level and grade band.
- 3. This report identifies multiple options to tier ELL funding, including **grade levels**, **SLIFE** students and **proficiency levels**.

DCPS enrolls 54% of all DC students and enrolls over 70% of ELL students (which has increased each of the last five years)





# **National Research**

# What does research say about best practices in funding ELL students?

The Migration Policy Institute in its August 2016 briefing, "<u>Funding an Equitable</u> <u>Education for English Learners in the United States</u>", recommends three areas policymakers should consider in funding mechanism:

- 1. Develop funding categories for subpopulations of ELs, such as students with limited or interrupted formal education or different grade levels
- 2. Fund students for as long as they qualify, rather than instituting caps, given that schools must continue to provide services for students who need them (and that accountability measures provide incentive to improve student performance)
- 3. Set aside emergency funds to support unexpected inflows of immigrants and refugees to address the emergent needs of schools and districts who face large, unforeseen costs.

The Advisory Group has primarily focused on subpopulation funding, though other items may need to be considered when implementing any changes to ELL funding





# **National Research**

What does research say about best practices in funding ELL students?

- States are less likely to have tiers of ELL funding or as many tiers as compared to Districts. For example, Cleveland and NYC both have 6 tiers based on ELL grade level and English proficiency level
- Schools with the same demographics can spend dollars the same way and get different outcomes; caution against moves to restrict ELL funding to ELL-only services, and suggest looking at outcomes
- There is no empirical "right" ELL weight -- look instead at ELL performance in *relationship to performance of other groups* as a way to choose a weight (and examine the outcomes of at-risk ELLs versus non-at-risk ELLs, or HS ELLs verses ES ELLs, etc.)





# **State tiered funding recap:**

North Dakota tiers funding based on proficiency level

# Students qualify for EL services if the ONE of the domain Screener scores is below the following:

- 5.0 Overall Composite Proficiency Level OR
- 3.5 Proficiency Level on any of the four domains: Listening, Speaking, Reading, or Writing
- 1st semester Kindergarten and 2nd semester Pre-K students who only take the Listening and Speaking domains would qualify for EL services if either Listening or Speaking is below a 3.5 Proficiency Level.

#### The State has three different funding levels or tiers:

- ELL 1 first of six categories of proficiency (Least Proficient): 0.40 multiplied by the # of FTE students enrolled
- ELL 2 second of six categories of proficiency: 0.28 multiplied by the # of FTE students enrolled
- ELL 3 third of six categories of proficiency: 0.07 multiplied by the number of FTE students enrolled and have not been in the third of six categories of proficiency for more than 3 years

English Language Proficiency Level	Recommended LIEP Service Time	
Newcomer	4-6 units of English language instruction educational services	
Level 1 – Entering	3-4 units of English language instruction educational services	
Level 2 – Beginning	2-3 units of English language instruction educational services	
Level 3 – Developing	1-2 units of English language instruction educational services	
Level 4 – Expanding	1 unit of English language instruction educational services	
Level 5 – Bridging and Level 6 – Reaching	up to 1 unit of English language instruction educational services	





# State tiered funding recap (cont.):

Hawaii also tiers funding based on English proficiency, not by grade

- Weights for ELL students are composed of 3 categories and students are placed into these categories using the WIDA Screener and W-APT. ACCESS for ELLs is the assessment instrument used to measure and report annual English language growth. See the "ELL Identification Flow Chart" link for more details.
  - Non-English Proficient (NEP) : 0.389 (FY20 Per Pupil \$1,736.09)
    - Students have limited or no proficiency in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing English.
  - Limited English Proficiency (LEP): 0.194 (FY20 Per Pupil \$868.04)
    - Students are functionally proficient in understanding and speaking English but limited in reading and writing skills.
  - Fully English Proficient (FEP) : 0.065 (FY20 Per Pupil \$289.35)
    - Students are proficient in the four basic language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) but may be experiencing academic difficulties in the content areas.
- As of September 2019, a state "committee on weights" recommending increasing the weights in 2020-2021 to:
  - NEP: .5867 (+51%)
  - LEP: .2933 (+51%)
  - FEP: .0978 (+50%)




#### State tiered funding recap (cont.):

<u>Massachusetts</u> tiers funding by grade band, but a recent commission has recommended moving towards a unified weight for all grades.

Per the FY20 funding guide, Massachusetts English learner (EL) status depends on a student's home language and English language proficiency. The formula established three funding levels:

- 1. English language learners (ELs) (grades PK-5) \$2,275.85 per pupil
- 2. English language learners (ELs) (grades 6–8) \$2,380.50 per pupil [highest level]
- 3. English language learners (ELs) (grades 9–13) \$1,858.15 per pupil

The implied weights based on junior/middle foundation of \$7,755.82, are 0.29 for PK-5, 0.31 for grades 6-8 and 0.24 for grades 9-13. As a result, the highest weight and rate supports students in the middle school grades, which has a weight **over 22% higher than High School students**.

A report by the Foundation Budget review commission recommended to "Increase the increment for all grade levels, including high school, to the current effective middle school increment...This would increase the range of ELL-only weightings and expand available funds for staff-intensive high school age interventions." *This would also effectively eliminate grade band differentiated weighting for the state*.





#### **Urban district tiered funding recap:**

<u>Boston</u> allocates funding based on proficiency levels and grade bands (ES, MS, HS), with an additional weight for SLIFE students

Boston Public Schoo	ols - SY202	20 (FY19)	)				
Foundation:	\$ 4,291						
English Language Le	earners						
Category	Grades	Weight	Rate	Enrollment	F	Y19 Amount	Notes
ELD Levels 1-3	K0 - 5	0.24	\$ 1,030	6,756	\$	6,957,599	
ELD Levels 1-3	6 - 8	0.51	\$ 2,188	1,389	\$	3,039,701	2.1x greater than K-5 weight
ELD Levels 1-3	9-12	0.61	\$ 2,618	2,401	\$	6,284,642	20% greater than 6-8 weight
ELD Levels 4-5	all grades	0.02	<b>\$</b> 86	7,536	<u>\$</u>	646,740	
Total ELL				18,082	\$	16,928,682	

Students with Limite	d or Interi	rupted Fo	ormal Ed	ucation (S	LIFI	E)	
Category	Grades	Weight	Rate	Enrollment	FY	19 Amount	Notes
SLIFE	4 - 5	0.50	\$ 2,146	172	\$	369,026	2.1x greater than K-5 ELL weight
SLIFE	6 - 8	0.84	\$ 3,604	129	\$	464,973	65% greater than 6-8 ELL weight
<u>SLIFE</u>	9 - 12	0.94	\$ 4,034	124	\$	500,159	54% greater than 9-12 ELL weight
Total SLIFE				425	\$	1,334,158	

ELD: BPS has 5 English Language Development levels





#### Urban district tiered funding recap (cont.):

<u>New York City</u> allocates funding based on grade bands (K-5 and 6-12) and programs, also with an incremental weight for SIFE

New York City DOE				
Foundation:	\$4,109			•
English Language Learners/Multilingual Learn	ers			
Category	Grades	Weight	Amount	Notes
Freestanding English as a New Language (ENL)	K-5	0.40	\$ 1,644	
Freestanding English as a New Language (ENL)	6 - 12	0.50	\$ 2,055	25% greater than K-5
Bilingual	K-5	0.44	\$ 1,808	
Bilingual	6 - 12	0.55	\$ 2,260	25% greater than K-5
Commanding	K-5	0.13	\$ 534	
Commanding	6 - 12	0.12	\$ 493	7.6% LOWER thank K-5 weight
K - 12 Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE)	K - 12	0.12	\$ 493	Incremental weight if student meets this catego

There are three program options for ELLs: Dual Language (DL), Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE), and freestanding English as a New Language (ENL, formerly known as ESL). Each of the three program types offers students a course of instruction that enables them to stay on track to meet promotion and graduation requirements, including courses that are aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards, as well as the New Language Arts Progressions. In DL and TBE programs, students also take courses aligned to the Home Language Arts Progressions.





#### Urban district tiered funding recap (cont.):

<u>Cleveland</u> allocates funding based on proficiency levels and grade bands (K-8 and HS), with higher weights to HS students

Cleveland Municipal School District - SY2019						
Foundation:	\$	4,887				
English Language Learners						
Category	<u>Grad</u>	<u>es</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Amo</u>	<u>unt</u>	<u>Notes</u>
LAU A	K-8		0.49	\$	2,399	
LAU B	K-8		0.41		2,000	
LAU C	K-8		0.33		1,600	
LAU A	HS		0.49		2,399	Same as K-8 weight
LAU B	HS		0.46		2,240	12% higher than K-8 Weight
LAU C	HS		0.41		2,000	25% higher than K-8 Weight

Notes on proficiency levels

LAU A = "Pre-functional level limited English proficiency"

LAU B = "Beginning level limited English proficiency"

LAU C = "Intermediate and advanced level limited English proficiency"

LAU D = "Exited from EL support services"

LAU E = "English proficient"





### UPSFF ELL funding options Advisory Group Voting Outcomes





# The Advisory Group favored tiering funding for PK5 and 6-12 students







# Advisory Group feedback on tiered funding: Less overall support for WIDA/proficiency-based funding, however....





# ... voting and discussion surfaced a wide dispersion of considerations for utilizing WIDA/proficiency...







## ...leading to support for both grade band (alone) weighting, as well as proficiency AND grade band weighting



Primary concerns documented for WIDA/Proficiency-based weighting were driven by implementation & data challenges, along with consideration for creating misaligned incentives for students and schools





# Advisory Group feedback on tiered funding: More support for SLIFE weight than current "New to Country" designation







# Advisory Group feedback on tiered funding: Support implementation based on availability of new funds





70



### Impact of "WIDA 2.0"





## WIDA 2.0: ACCESS test revised to require higher raw score to achieve each WIDA proficiency level

- All DC ELL students are required to take the WIDA test. For those students that have WIDA ACCESS scores, only students with a composite score of 5.0 or above are automatically exited from ELL status.
- However, in 2016-17 (for tests administered spring 2017) WIDA revised ACCESS so that English-learners must demonstrate more sophisticated language skills to achieve the same proficiency-level scores (1-6). The test became more rigorous, resulting in many more students with ELL status around the country. This has become known as "WIDA 2.0"
- Some states adjusted their exit scores as a result of this increased rigor, while others saw a significant decrease in exit rates.
  - Clark County, NV exit rates dropped to 8% in 2016-17 from 16% in 2015-16
  - Albuquerque, NM saw a drop from **16%** to **1%** of ELs meeting proficiency bar
- OSSE has not communicated process or timing associated with any potential changes to WIDA exit requirements. Depending on the outcome of this process, a significant number of students may exit ELL if the exit score is lowered.





## WIDA 2.0: Many states lowered WIDA ACCESS score bar due to test changes

Many states **lowered the composite score required** for reclassification (or consideration for reclassification) and eliminated individual domain requirements

State	Previous	Updated
Colorado	5.0 composite	4.0 composite
Maine	6.0 composite (only state with this bar)	5.0 composite
Massachusetts	5.0 composite; 4.0 for reading + writing	4.2 overall; 3.9 reading + writing
Wyoming	5.0. composite; 4.0 in all domains	4.6 composite
Virginia	5.0 composite; 5.0 for reading + writing	4.4 composite

#### OSSE has not (yet) altered the current benchmark of 5.0, though

they are researching the options in future years. No specific timetable has been communicated as of the publishing of this report.





# Impact of WIDA 2.0 on DC: Annual total UPSFF funding for ELL has increased 71% from FY15 actual to FY20 projected. At the same time total ELL students have increased 50%.



#### Notes

• Funding is not adjusted for inflation.

 Funding data uses actual charter funding from "Alonso files" and DCPS budgeted funding from budget books – FY17 and FY18 reflect rate adjustments (per Foundation Level letter) due to retroactive WTU increases.







# **Impact of WIDA 2.0 on DC**: Since the increase in rigor for WIDA 2.0, there has been an increase in the proportion of ELL students in the system, starting in FY18

% ELL Students UPSFF Enrollment



Enrollment data (ELL total and UPSFF total) pulled from Enrollment Audit Reports at: https://osse.dc.gov/page/data-and-reports-0





# Impact of WIDA 2.0 on DC: Assuming historical growth in proportion of ELL students, there may have been about ~1,500 to 2,000 fewer students designated as ELL in each FY18 to FY20



% ELL Students UPSFF Enrollment - Actual and Alternative

#### Historical ELL Students UPSFF Enrollment



Alternative scenario assumed % ELL assumes the proportion of ELL students would grow at a rate of 0.7% annually – the average of actual YOY increases in FY14-FY17.



Impact of WIDA 2.0 on DC (alternative 1): As a result of the increased WIDA exam rigor and not adjusting the required WIDA score to test out of ELL, there are more ELL students in the system, resulting in \$7.6M to \$11.1M additional UPSFF ELL spend (under these assumptions)

		FY2018	FY2019	FY2020
a	Actual: % ELL	11.09%	11.24%	11.72%
b	Actual: ELL Student Count	10,127	10,430	11,231
c	Alternative Scenario: % ELL	9.43%	9.50%	<mark>9.57%</mark>
d	Alternative Scenario: ELL Student Count	8,615	8,817	9,166
e = a - c	Variance: Actual % ELL to Scenario % ELL	1.66%	1.74%	2.15%
f = b - d	Variance: Actual ELL Count to Scenario ELL Count	1,512	1,613	2,065
g	Actual UPSFF Per-ELL Student Rate	\$5,026	\$5,222	\$5,380
h=b*g	Actual: Total UPSFF ELL Spend	\$50,898,302	\$54,465,460	\$60,425,026
<u>i=d*g</u>	Alternative Scenario: Total UPSFF ELL Spend	<u>\$43,298,990</u>	<u>\$46,042,374</u>	<u>\$49,314,913</u>
j=h-i	Variance: Total UPSFF ELL Spend	\$7,599,312	\$8,423,086	\$11,110,113

Note this assumes actual ELL student count from the audited enrollment files for UPSFF ell, per audited enrollment files – NOT budgeted ELL enrollment in DCPS budget books, which is ~600 and ~850 fewer students in FY18 and FY19 respectively.

FY20 reflects budgeted UPSFF ELL enrollment



Impact of WIDA 2.0 on DC (alternative 2): If OSSE decreased the required WIDA composite score to 4.4 or 4.5 (similar to other states), from the current requirement of 5.0, FY19 UPSFF for ELL would have decreased by \$3.6M or \$4.5M

Quantifying a	ssumed FY19 ELL spend on students with WIDA scores 4.4 - 4.9
845	Count of FY19 EL students with WIDA scores 4.4 - 4.9
\$5,222	per pupil UPSFF for ELL student
\$4,412,590	total FY19 ELL funds for students scoring 4.4 - 4.9
Quantifying a	ssumed FY19 ELL spend on students with WIDA scores 4.5 - 4.9
Quantifying a 680	ssumed FY19 ELL spend on students with WIDA scores 4.5 - 4.9 Count of FY19 EL students with WIDA scores 4.5 - 4.9
Quantifying a 680 \$5,222	ssumed FY19 ELL spend on students with WIDA scores 4.5 - 4.9 Count of FY19 EL students with WIDA scores 4.5 - 4.9 per pupil UPSFF for ELL student





Supporting Strong Schools. Sustaining the Future.



### 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Study Part V: Foundation Level Cost Drivers

June 2020





### **Table of Contents**

- I. Executive Summary
- II. At-risk Student Need research, analysis and options
- III. At-risk Concentration research, analysis and options
- IV. ELL Weight Structure research, analysis and options
- V. Foundation Level Cost Drivers analysis

### VI. Appendix

- a. UPSFF study process and approach detail
- b. Additional background and research
- c. Additional student outcomes and data analysis





### Purpose, approach and limitations to the foundation level cost drivers analysis

As stated in the DME's Request for Applications, the purpose "of this section of the study will be to <u>collect and analyze actual LEA cost information to identify the primary cost</u> <u>drivers addressed by the UPSFF foundation level</u>." To address this goal, it is helpful to clearly define what the foundation is (and isn't), the difference between the foundation level and total per pupil funding, and the methodology used to answer these questions in this report.

#### What is the foundation?

The "foundation level" is the *base* per pupil amount that LEAs receive for each student enrolled in their school system. The foundation is supplemented with additional "weights" (addressed elsewhere in this report) for students with demonstrated needs for additional supports, such as at-risk, ELL or students with an IEP. As such, the foundation level does not reflect total spending per pupil, but the minimum amount each LEA receives for each student enrolled. LEAs receive additional funding for students with different needs, and charter LEAs receive a facilities supplement to offset the annualized cost of purchasing and retrofitting their facilities.





## Purpose, approach and limitations to the foundation level cost drivers analysis (cont.)

#### What is the difference between foundation and total per pupil funding?

As referenced, foundation reflects the base funding allocated to LEAs for each student enrolled. For example, a fifth grader with no additional identified needs would have been funded \$10,658 in FY19 (the final year included in this study), while a fifth-grade student qualifying for ELL supports would receive an additional \$5,222 including the 0.49 ELL weight, for a total of \$15,880. Therefore, the foundation affects both the **base amount, as well as the total supplemental funding each student receives**.

Additionally, though the UPSFF constitutes a majority of funding for all LEAs included in this analysis, the expenditures reviewing herein reflect *total, "all-in" spending* which is supported by UPSFF, federal, philanthropic and other funding. When "total spending" is referenced in this report, it **represents total spending by the LEA per pupil, inclusive of all funding sources**.

What is the methodology used in this report? What are the limitations? To understand the "primary cost drivers" for both DCPS and Charter LEAs, Afton requested and received detailed financial data from DCPS, and from four PCS that "opted-in" to being included in this analysis (the DME invited any LEA to participate). As such, this analysis is comprehensive in nature with DCPS data, and directional in nature with respect to Charter expenditure data.





### What are the actual cost drivers experienced by LEAs operating in the District of Columbia?

- **1. Total spending**. In FY19, all LEAs included in this study spent \$22.4K per pupil.
  - DCPS spent on average \$21.1K per pupil, while the sample PCS LEAs spent \$23.9K per pupil, or a difference of \$2.8K in FY19. This differential is primarily due to charter spending on facility financing costs which DCPS does not incur.
  - Charter schools received an additional allotment of approximately \$3.1K per pupil to offset this cost
- Growth in spending. Per pupil spending has increased from \$19.9K to \$22.4K from FY16 to FY19, or a compounded annual growth rate ("CAGR") of 4.1% per year.
  - Per pupil spend at DCPS and sample charter networks increased at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 4.6% and 3.4% per year, respectively, from FY16 to FY19
  - These increases in spending were primarily driven by increased personnel costs
  - 91% of DCPS employees are a part of a collective bargaining agreement, with nearly 60% of FTEs represented by the Washington Teachers Union (WTU)





### What are the actual cost drivers experienced by LEAs operating in the District of Columbia?

- **3. Personnel vs. Non-Personnel spending.** When looking at all LEAs included in the study, and excluding facility rent, debt service and depreciation primarily impacting PCS spending, the LEAs included in this study spent 75% on personnel and 25% on non-personnel.
  - In FY19, DCPS spent nearly 80% on personnel, while PCS spent approximately 70% over the same time period
  - About half of personnel spend has been on Classroom Teacher FTE for both DCPS and PCS
  - The PCS included in this study were more likely to contract out some services that DCPS performed with in-house staff (including some special education services)
- **4.** Average teacher salary. For the LEAs included in this study, the average teacher salary grew from \$70.0K to \$80.2K from FY16 to FY19, or a compound annual growth rate of 4.7%.
  - DCPS spends approximately 20% more on average teacher salaries than the sample charter networks (base salary only)
  - Both PCS and DCPS experienced a large increase in average teacher salaries in FY19, with an increase of 11.7% and 11.5%, respectively
  - The outcomes of teacher contract negotiations at DCPS, which included a "retroactive" compensation component, materially impact increased personnel costs





#### How do cost drivers differ for various school models (i.e. duallanguage schools, schools with CTE programs, and dualenrollment schools)?

To answer this question, Afton analyzed and compared spending, student need, student outcomes, enrollment and capacity utilization at **whole school programs at DCPS** compared to schools with no programs.

DCPS allocated incremental FTEs for four program types: **Career and Technical Education ("CTE"), International Baccalaureate ("IB"), Global Studies and Schoolwide Enrichment Model ("SEM")**. The remaining differences in per pupil spending at DCPS is primarily driven by enrollment and student need.

In comparing school-level per-pupil spend, factors such as school size, student need, and facility utilization rates have a direct impact on reported per pupil spend. Regardless of program offered, smaller schools, schools serving a higher needs population, and schools with a lower facility utilization rates tend to spend more, on a per pupil basis.

Generally, with a few exceptions, school programs with **lower per pupil spend** serve a lower proportion of at-risk students and perform better on PARCC tests.



# How should the UPSFF take these costs into account (i.e. changes to the foundation level, changes to weights, or both)?

- 1. In order to address cost pressures experienced by LEAs, the city can either address the **primary cost drivers** which put upward pressure on the UPSFF, address **how the rate is increased** in response to those cost pressures, or **some combination of the two**.
- 2. As highlighted in this report, LEA costs have been impacted by increasing **personnel costs**, lower **utilization of facilities**, and the cost of **financing and maintaining facilities**. As a result, the city might consider:
  - a. Understanding the **impact of collective bargaining agreements** ("CBAs") on UPSFF increases
  - b. Understanding the relative impact for LEAS of providing some services **in-house vs. outsourcing**, and how and why LEAs choose their mix of in-house service provision and outsourcing.
  - c. Supporting higher performing school programs, or other initiatives to **address small or under-utilized schools and facilities**
  - d. Supporting efforts to minimize the cost of capital, primarily for PCS
- 3. To address the rate itself, the city might further consider utilizing a **Cost of Living Adjustment (or "COLA")** that may better reflect the current and future needs of all LEAs.

Ultimately, the UPSFF should be structured for the current and future mix of LEAs and students, rather than based on historical experience.





### Methodology





### **Overview of methodology**

#### Process

- DME reached out to all PCS LEAs to solicit participation; positive response to participate included in first round
- Collected FY16 FY19 actual expenditure data in common format from participating sites
- Iterated with sites to code individual expenditure lines into uniform, high-level expenditure categories
- Created a database to roll up costs for each LEA, by year, for all expense categories
- Created a DCPS school-level expenditure and academic performance database, grouping schools by grades served and program type offered
- Prepared analyses based on the outcomes of both databases

#### Limitations

- Data included from DCPS and *four charter LEAs*, which were 'self-selected' (see above) only those affirmatively
  responding to communications and providing sufficient data were included.
- Worked with LEA self-reported data in organization-specific categories what one organization considers a "central management" expense may be a "schoolwide expense" at another organization.
- Leveraged existing expense analysis structure, worked with LEAs to allocate historical costs to these categories
- This report mostly uses average figures for this cohort of example PCS LEAs. These participating charter LEAs
  may not be fully representative of all charter LEAs in the city.
- For the DCPS school type (program type) analysis, school-level expenditures are reported on a whole-school basis, grouped by schools offering specific programs. FY19 preliminary expenditure data was used. These expenditures include all school-level expenditures reported by DCPS, even those not associated directly with the unique program offered.
- Site-based expenditure reporting required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was not yet available for this analysis.





### **Overview of methodology (cont'd)**

Afton iterated with sites to code individual expenditure lines into uniform, high-level expenditure categories. The expenditure categories used and definitions match those used in the <u>2013 DC Education Adequacy Study</u> and other common practice studies before it. The categories were as follows:

- Personnel (Salaries, Benefits, Stipends, Bonuses)
  - Classroom Staff-Teachers: Teachers
  - <u>Classroom Staff-Other</u>: Aides
  - <u>Substitutes</u>
  - <u>Schoolwide Staff</u>: Coaches, librarian, program coordinator, counselors, social workers, and psychologists, etc.
  - <u>School Administration</u>: Principal, Assistant Principal, Administrative Aide, Business Manager, Clerks, etc.
  - <u>Facility Operations Support</u>: Maintenance, custodial, security staff (if FTE)
  - <u>Central Management</u>: Non-school-level Central Administration, Instructional Support, Business, Non-Instructional Services, etc.

#### Non-Personnel

- <u>Instructional Support</u>: Professional development and school improvement efforts
- <u>Direct Services to Students</u>: Texts, Instructional Technology, Sports/Athletics, Student Services
- Food Service
- <u>Nonpersonal services/programs</u>: Field trips, school-level non-classroom supplies and materials
- <u>Other school-based costs</u>: Technology, miscellaneous
- <u>Facility Operations Support</u>: Non-personnel facilities costs contracted maintenance, custodial, security; utilities (excludes rent and debt service)
- <u>Facility Occupancy</u>: Rent Payments, Debt Service (Principal and Interest Payments)
- <u>Central Management</u>: Non-personnel expenditures for Central Administration, Instructional Support, Business, and Non-Instructional Services



11



### **Enrollment trends** DCPS and Public Charter Schools





# The proportion of charter school students in DC has increased from 14% in FY02 to 47% in FY19, though the year over year changes have decreased materially in the last three years



#### Sources: FY02-12 DCPS & PCS ; FY13-19 PCS ; FY13-19 DCPS

DME budgeted FY20 UPSFF enrollment at 46% PCS and 54% DPCS





### Historical Expenditure Trends and Analysis DCPS and Sample Public Charter Schools





#### This analysis focuses on DCPS and four sample Public Charter School Networks (PCS). While DCPS enrollment over this time period has been relatively stable, the sample PCS enrollment has grown by 8%.



DCPS FY20 actual enrollment increase over prior year, while not included in this analysis, represented the largest annual growth DCPS has seen in more than 50 years, with audited actual enrollment surpassing 50,000 for the first time since 2006. While every DC CMO was given the opportunity to participate, four LEAs worked with Afton and provided a complete data set. The participating PCS included represent a wide range of LEA size and growth stage. 3 of the 4 LEAs are multi-site operators, and one is a single site operation.





#### <u>DCPS and PCS</u> included in this study have experienced a 4.1% Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) increase in per pupil expenditures over the last four years



Note: Per pupil expenditures are calculated using self-reported historical expenditure data for LEAs and dividing by UPSFF enrollment. Each year is calculated by applying the following methodology: Total Per Pupil Expenditures = [(proportion of DCPS enrollment to total DC enrollment) \* (DCPS per pupil expenditures)] + [(proportion of total PCS enrollment to total DC enrollment) \* (SAMPLE NON-WEIGHTED AVERAGE of participating PCS per pupil expenditures)].





#### <u>Personnel</u> drives the majority of expenditures at DC schools, composing an estimated 75% of expenditures in FY19, when excluding Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures



#### Personnel expenditures include employee wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes.

Notes:

- 1. Personnel expenditures include employee wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes. Contracted services (excluding substitutes) are included in non-personnel.
- 2. Figures exclude Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures. In FY19, DCPS reported \$144 per pupil and PCS, on average, reported \$2,604 per pupil for these types of facilities expenditures.



3. Calculation assumes the average expenditures of participating sample PCS LEAs represent the average for PCS in DC.


#### Average teacher salary has increased at varying rates annually over the past four years, with a CAGR of 4.7%



### For both DCPS and PCS, the largest YOY increase in average teacher salary happened between FY18 and FY19, at which point the CBA retroactive payments went into effect.

Notes:

- 1. Source data for DCPS Average Teacher Salary base source is publicly available budget books; source for charters is provided FTE-level data from participating charters.
- 2. Salaries reflect base salary only, excluding stipends, benefits, and bonuses.
- 3. Average calculation assigns proportional weight to DCPS average salary and PCS average salary using UPSFF enrollment proportion to total DC enrollment. Calculation assumes teacher salaries provided by 3 of the sample PCS LEAs represent the average for PCS in DC.





# The foundation component of the UPSFF increased at a CAGR of 3.9% over the last four years





### <u>DCPS</u> has experienced a total increase of 14.4% in per pupil expenditures over the past four years, or a CAGR of 4.6%, driven primarily by personnel expenditures







### For a <u>sample of four DC Public Charter School LEAs</u>, average per pupil expenditures have increased 10.4% (CAGR of 3.4%), also driven primarily by personnel expenditures, which have increased at a CAGR of 4.7%



Avg. Charter Personnel Expense Per Pupil

Sample Charter LEAs included represent a wide range of LEA size and growth stage. Per pupil expenditure figures for PCS in this report are straight (unweighted) averages of the sample CMOs.





## Historical Expenditure Analysis Personnel Expenditures





# <u>Personnel</u> drives the majority of expenditures at DCPS and PCS, composing 78% and 63% of total expenditures in FY19, respectively



Sample PCS reported an average spend of \$2,604 on Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures in FY19. PCS receive incremental "Facilities" Funding through the UPSFF formula for these types of expenditures.

Note: Personnel expenditures include wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes. Contracted services (excluding substitutes) are included in non-personnel.





When excluding Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures, <u>Personnel</u> represents 79% and 70% of total expenditures for DCPS and sample PCS, respectively in FY19



#### Personnel expenditures include employee wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes.

#### Notes:

- Personnel expenditures include employee wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes. Contracted services (excluding substitutes) are included in non-personnel.
- Figures exclude Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures. In FY19, DCPS reported \$144 per pupil and PCS, on average, reported \$2,604 per pupil for these types of facilities expenditures.



# On a per-student basis, personnel expenditures have increased at similar rates for both DCPS and the sample PCS LEAs (CAGR of 4.6% and 4.7% respectively)





Spend on Classroom Teachers represents about half of total personnel spend for both DCPS and the average PCS LEA.





# For <u>DCPS</u>, Classroom Teachers are the largest single expense category, representing 52% of Personnel Expenditures and 41% of Total Expenditures in FY19



Personnel Category	FY19 % Total <u>Personnel</u> Expenses	FY19 % <u>Total</u> Expenses
Food Service	0%	0%
Substitutes	1%	1%
Facility Operations Support	4%	3%
Classroom Staff-Other	4%	3%
Central Management	<b>6%</b>	<b>5%</b>
School Administration	10%	8%
Schoolwide Staff	23%	18%
Classroom Staff-Teachers	52%	41%

Note: Personnel expenditures include wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends and bonuses and exclude contracted services.



EV10 % Total

EV10



### For <u>sample PCS</u>, Classroom Teachers is the largest single expense category, representing 50% of Personnel Expenditures and 32% of Total Expenditures in FY19



Personnel Category	Personnel Expenses	% <u>Total</u> Expenses
Food Service	1%	1%
Substitutes	1%	1%
Facility Operations Support	1%	1%
Classroom Staff-Other	5%	3%
Central Management	<b>12%</b>	7%
School Administration	11%	7%
Schoolwide Staff	19%	12%
Classroom Staff-Teachers	50%	32%

Note: Personnel expenditures include wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends and bonuses and exclude contracted services.





# On a per student basis, over the past four years DCPS has spent an average of 14% more on total personnel expenditures than the sample PCS average



Note: Personnel expenditures include wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes and exclude contracted services.

AFTON



# On a per student basis, over the past four years DCPS has spent an average of 13% more on <u>classroom teachers</u> than the average PCS, with larger variances in more recent years







### When looking at <u>average teacher salary</u> (base salary only), DCPS has historically spent an average of 20% more on classroom teachers than the average PCS



#### DCPS spends ~1.2 times PCS for each classroom teacher on base salary alone. This reflects average teacher pay, which is largely influenced by teacher tenure.

Notes: Source data for DCPS Average Teacher Salary base source is publicly available budget books; source for charters is provided FTE-level data from participating charters. One of four participating PCS LEAs is excluded from Charter Average, due to data availability





### Average teacher salary has increased at varying rates annually over the past four years, with a CAGR of 5.1% for DCPS and 4.5% for PCS over the past four years



between FY18 and FY19, at which point the CBA retroactive payments went into effect.

Notes:

1. Source data for DCPS Average Teacher Salary base source is publicly available budget books; source for charters is provided FTE-level data from participating charters.



- 2. Salaries reflect base salary only, excluding stipends, benefits, and bonuses.
- 3. One of four participating PCS LEAs is excluded from Charter Average, due to data availability



DCPS wages and benefits are defined in contractual obligations from four different employee union contracts, covering 91% of FTE in FY19, and most recent union contract agreements show salary increase requirements of 2% to 4% annually.



#### DCPS has contractual obligations per union contracts while nearly all PCS do not.

Notes:

WTU Salary Obligation increases apply to each individual STEP on the salary scale. Actual experience of employees advancing a STEP each
year experience a larger increase than those listed in the table above, as base salary increases with each STEP.



32

· Additionally, DCPS provides 3% salary increases to Non-Union Contract staff



## Historical Expenditure Analysis Non-personnel expenditures





# <u>Non-personnel</u> items represented about 22% and 37% of total expenditures in FY19, at DCPS and sample PCS, respectively



Sample PCS reported an average spend of \$2,604 on Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures in FY19. PCS receive incremental "Facilities" Funding through the UPSFF formula for these types of expenditures.

Note: Personnel expenditures include wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes. Contracted services (excluding substitutes) are included in non-personnel.





When excluding Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures, <u>Non-Personnel</u> represents 21% and 30% of total expenditures for DCPS and sample PCS, respectively in FY19



#### Notes:

- Personnel expenditures include employee wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes. Contracted services (excluding substitutes) are included in non-personnel.
- Figures exclude Facility Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation expenditures. In FY19, DCPS reported \$144 per pupil and PCS, on average, reported \$2,604 per pupil for these types of facilities expenditures.





# On a per-student basis, while non-personnel expenditures have increased for DCPS over the past four years, they have remained flat on average for sample PCS









### For <u>DCPS</u>, non-personnel expenditures made up 22% of total expenditures in FY19. Facility Operations Support, Food Service, and School Administration were the top three non-personnel expenditure categories



Non-Personnel Expenditure Category	FY19 % Total Costs
Rent, Debt Service, Depreciation	1%
Central Management	2%
Other school-based costs	3%
Direct Services to Students	3%
School Administration	4%
Food Service	5%
Facility Operations Support	5%
Total Non-Personnel	22%





### For <u>sample PCS</u>, non-personnel expenditures made up 37% of total expenditures in FY19. Rent, Debt Service and Depreciation; Direct Services to Students; and Facilities Operations Support were the top three non-personnel expenditure categories

#### Sample PCS Annual Non-Personnel Expenditures – Per Student



Non-Personnel Expenditure Category	FY19 % Total Costs
Instructional Support	1%
School Administration	1%
Other school-based costs	2%
Food Service	2%
Central Management	6%
Facility Operations Support	7%
Direct Services to Students	7%
Rent, Debt Service, Depreciation	11%
Total Non-Personnel	37%



# On a per-student basis, the sample PCS spend nearly double that of DCPS on non-personnel items, on average

#### FY19 Non-Personnel Expenditures – Per Student



#### Variance Drivers

- **Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation:** PCS incur these costs, while DCPS does not. PCS receive incremental "Facilities" Funding on a per-student basis through the UPSFF formula for these types of costs.
- **Contracting vs. Staffing:** Some of the sample charters have chosen to contract out services that DCPS has full time staff for.
  - <u>Direct Services to Students</u> A sample of charters on average have a higher per pupil spend in this non-personnel category, driven in part by contracting out SPED and other instructional services that DCPS provides in-house with its own staff.
  - <u>Facilities Operations Support</u> DCPS has more staff-related costs for functions that some of the sample charters have contracted out, primarily for custodians. When combining Personnel with Non-Personnel expenditures, the per pupil variance for Facilities Operation Support in total decreases to \$155.
- **Economies of Scale:** DCPS enrollment is nearly 20x higher than the median enrollment of Charters in this study. Spreading organization-wide costs that are largely not driven by enrollment, over a larger student base results in lower per pupil costs in some areas.

Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation costs drive \$2,500 of the variance between DCPS and PCS non-personnel per pupil spend. PCS receive incremental "Facilities" Funding on a per-student basis through the UPSFF formula for these types of costs.



Note: Non-personnel includes contracted services and excludes employee wages (salary), employee benefits, stipends, bonuses, and substitutes.



#### For the <u>sample of four DC Public Charter School LEAs</u>, average per-student expenditure on Rent, Debt Service, and Depreciation ranged from \$2,604 to \$3,127 over the past four years





#### While large facilities deals can impact cost trends and per-pupil spend significantly, on average, these facilitiesrelated expenditures have decreased on a per-pupil basis for the sample PCS included.

Note that Charters are <u>not</u> obligated to use facility allotment funds on these specific expenditure categories. Some PCS use these funds for items not included in these categories, such as: operational needs (utilities, maintenance, etc.), non-operating capital expenditures, and to build reserves to meet debt service covenants. The intention for this category is to include facilities costs that PCS must incur that DCPS does not. Depreciation (a non-cash expense) is included in this category, as it is an operating expenditure representing the cost of capitalized assets (mostly facilities) over time.

Also note that some of the sample charters included in this group may have more sophisticated debt instruments and access to a lower cost of capital than less established CMOs.





### **DCPS School Model Analysis**



## How do cost drivers differ for various school models (i.e. dual-language schools, schools with CTE programs, and dual-enrollment schools)?

- This report includes an analysis of 9 whole-school program offerings at DCPS
- In comparing school-level per-pupil spend, factors such as school size, student need, and facility utilization rates have a direct impact on reported per pupil spend. Regardless of program offered, <u>smaller schools, schools serving a higher proportion of</u> <u>enrollment with student needs, and schools with a lower facility utilization rates</u> <u>tend to spend more</u>, on a per pupil basis.
- On average, schools providing the following programs spend the *least* per student (most efficient): Selective high schools, International Baccalaureate (IB), Opportunity Academy, Montessori, and Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM)
- Elementary school programs have mixed results compared to those with no program. Middle Schools and High Schools with programs spend less per pupil, serve a lower proportion of at-risk students, and report better outcomes compared to their no-program and comprehensive high school peers.
- Generally, with a few exceptions, school programs with lower per pupil spend serve a lower proportion of at-risk students and perform better on PARCC tests
  - For example, compared to schools with other programs and schools with no programs, IB schools and Selective High Schools serve the lowest proportion of at-risk students and therefore generate fewer UPSFF dollars from the District. Per pupil spend at these schools is also among the lowest, comparatively, and at the same time, these students perform the best on the PARCC tests.
- DCPS allocates incremental FTE to schools for four specific programs: CTE, IB, Global Studies, and SEM



## Factors driving differences in school-level per pupil spend: Smaller schools, as measured by student enrollment, typically spend more on a per pupil basis



### While other factors influence school-level per pupil spend, there is a direct negative correlation between per pupil spend and school size.

 Figures shown include FY19 preliminary expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.



• Excludes alternative schools, River Terrace EC, Washington Metropolitan HS, and Youth Services Center



<u>Factors driving differences in school-level per pupil spend</u>: Schools serving students with higher student needs, as measured by the percentage of students designated as at-risk, typically spend more on a per pupil basis



### While other factors influence school-level per pupil spend, there is a direct positive correlation between per pupil spend and percentage of students designated as at-risk.

 Figures shown include FY19 preliminary expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.



• Excludes alternative schools, River Terrace EC, Washington Metropolitan HS, and Youth Services Center



<u>Factors driving differences in school-level per pupil spend</u>: Schools with lower enrollment as a percentage of total programmatic capacity (or facility utilization) typically spend more on a per pupil basis



### While other factors influence school-level per pupil spend, there is a direct negative correlation between per pupil spend and facility utilization rate.

- Figures shown include FY19 preliminary expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.
- Source: <u>https://edscape.dc.gov/page/facilities-utilization</u>
- Excludes schools with no facility utilization rate available for FY18 or FY19. For schools co-located with another school, total enrollment/total programmatic capacity is used. Capacity considered includes both permanent and portable space.





## This section includes an analysis of 9 whole-school (or school-wide) program offerings at DCPS



- Primary school program mapping source: FY21 School Feeder Booklet
- Counting "whole-school" or "school-wide" programs only. High Schools are categorized into just one program category, depending on primary program, or "Comprehensive HS".
- Using FY19 school data, excludes the following schools: School-Within-School @ Goding; Inspiring Youth Program; CHOICE Academy @ Emery; Fillmore Arts Center





# Schools providing the following programs enroll the most students: Dual Language, Selective High Schools, International Baccalaureate (IB), Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM)



- Primary school program mapping source: <u>FY21 School Feeder Booklet</u>
- Counting "whole-school" or "school-wide" programs only. High Schools are categorized into just one program category, depending on primary program, or "Comprehensive HS".
- Using FY19 school data, excludes the following schools: School-Within-School @ Goding; Inspiring Youth Program; CHOICE Academy @ Emery; Fillmore Arts Center





#### Schools providing the following programs enroll the most students, on average, per school: Selective HS, IB, Dual Language, and Opportunity Academy





- Primary school program mapping source: <u>FY21 School Feeder Booklet</u>
- Counting "whole-school" or "school-wide" programs only. High Schools are categorized into just one program category, depending on primary program, or "Comprehensive HS".
- Using FY19 school data, excludes the following schools: School-Within-School @ Goding; Inspiring Youth Program; CHOICE Academy @ Emery; Fillmore Arts Center





#### Schools providing the following programs spend the least, on a per-student basis: Selective HS, IB, Opportunity Academy, and Montessori



- Figures shown include FY19 preliminary expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.
- This calculation does not use "weighted" pupils increased spending on Level 3 SPED students, for example, can skew the spending for a school
- Counting "whole-school" or "school-wide" programs only. High Schools are categorized into just one program category, depending on primary program, or "Comprehensive HS".





## Generally, with a few exceptions, school programs with lower per pupil spend serve a lower proportion of At-Risk students



- Figures shown include expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.
- Counting "whole-school" or "school-wide" programs only. High Schools are categorized into just one program category, depending on primary program, or "Comprehensive HS".



• % At-Risk calculation excludes Adult and Alternative Students



## Generally, with a few exceptions, school programs with lower per pupil spend perform better on the PARCC Math and ELA tests

FY19 School-Level Expenditure Per Pupil and % Proficient 4+ (PARCC) by DCPS Program





#### Figures shown include expenditures coded to schools only and <u>exclude central and schoolwide expenditures</u>, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.

- Counting "whole-school" or "school-wide" programs only. High Schools are categorized into just one program category, depending on primary program, or "Comprehensive HS".
- Proficiency calculation excludes Adult and Alternative Students, and students in grades that are not tested (PK to 2<sup>nd</sup>)





Elementary school programs have mixed results compared to those with no program, though Middle Schools and High Schools with programs spend less per pupil, serve a lower proportion of at-risk students, and have better outcomes



Figures shown include expenditures coded to schools only and exclude central and schoolwide expenditures, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools.

Figures included represent a weighted average, regardless of program type. Proficiency rates exclude Adult and Alternative Students and students in grades that are not tested (PK to 2<sup>nd</sup>).



When differentiating by grades served, performance and per pupil spend vary by program. Elementary school programs have mixed results compared to those with no program, though Middle Schools with programs tend to spend less per pupil and have better outcomes. Selective High Schools outperform and underspend, compared to Comprehensive HS.





• Figures shown include expenditures coded to schools only and exclude central and schoolwide expenditures, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools

Test scores exclude Adult and Alternative students and students in grades that are not tested (PK to 2<sup>nd</sup>); Alternative schools are also excluded from this analysis


Proportion of at-risk students served varies by program. Middle school programs tend to serve a lower proportion of at-risk students, compared to schools with no programs. Selective High Schools serve a low proportion of at-risk students.





Figures shown include expenditures coded to schools only and exclude central and schoolwide expenditures, which DCPS does not assign directly to schools

Test scores exclude Adult and Alternative students and students in grades that are not tested (PK to 2<sup>nd</sup>); Alternative schools are also excluded from this analysis



# **Career and Technical Education (CTE)** programs served 3,098 students across 17 schools in FY19

- "Students enrolled in CTE programs complete a three or four-year course sequence (in addition to their core high school classes) that includes preparation for industry-recognized certification exams and participation in work-based learning experiences, including internships, job shadowing, and industry field trips." (<u>https://dcps.dc.gov/cte</u>)
- Nearly all high schools have a CTE program, but this program is not considered a "whole-school" model. Excluding two high schools (Phelps & McKinley), CTE programs served an average of 21% of the student population at the schools in which the program was offered.
- Only two DCPS high schools Phelps Architecture, Construction and Engineering and McKinley Technology High School – enrolled over 60% of their student population in a CTE program. Due to their application processes, both of these schools are categorized as "Selective HS". Compared to comprehensive high schools:
  - Phelps HS performed similarly on PARCC assessments (8% 4+ Proficient in Math, compared to 9% for comprehensive HS); served a similar proportion of At-Risk students (51%, compared to 55% for comprehensive HS); and reported a similar school-level total per pupil spend (5% greater than the comprehensive HS per pupil spend)
  - McKinley Tech HS outperformed on PARCC assessments (28% 4+ Proficient in Math, compared to 9% for comprehensive HS); served a lower proportion of At-Risk students (32%, compared to 55% for comprehensive HS); and reported a lower school-level total per pupil spend (20% below the comprehensive HS per pupil spend)

#### CTE programs require additional staff and participating students generate incremental federal revenues for the District.

- Per DCPS School Budget Guide and Comprehensive Staffing Models, schools with CTE need at least one qualified CTE teacher... "These positions are locally funded and are required to ensure sustainability of the programming." (FY21 DCPS School Budget Guide p73)
- The high school staffing allocation process takes into account the CTE courses at high schools and allocates staff for those courses specifically.
- DCPS receives incremental federal Perkins Grant Funding for students in this program. "Perkins grant funds are managed and controlled at central office level. Schools work with CTE Director to request resources for their programs" (FY21 DCPS School Budget Guide p73)

Sources/Further Information:

FY19 DCPS School Budget Guide (link <u>here</u>); FY21 DCPS School Budget Guide (link <u>here</u>)







## **Dual Enrollment programs existed at every high school and served 239 students across all DCPS high schools FY19**

- Dual Enrollment offers students the opportunity to take a class at a local college in addition to their normal high school classes. The program allows for students to earn partial college credit before being fully enrolled at a university and can lower the overall cost of college for students, after graduating from DCPS schools, should they decide to pursue college.
- All high schools offer Dual Enrollment, and the opportunity is extended to all students, but it is up to the University partners to determine how many students they admit.
- There was not a whole-school Dual Enrollment school in FY19. A total of 239 students in all DCPS high schools, or less than 3% of HS students, participated in the program in FY19.
- DCPS schools in FY19 did not require additional resources or incur explicit additional expenditures for the Dual Enrollment program.
  - Per DCPS School Budget Guide and Comprehensive Staffing Models, DCPS and its schools incur no incremental costs for students in these programs.
  - Tuition and registration fees are fully covered by the universities and colleges. Special course fees (e.g. art course materials fee) are covered by the student. Textbook support varies annually.
  - A given HS likely experiences little to no change in normal course offerings and class size as so few students participate in Dual Enrollment and as most Dual Enrollment classes are offered after 3pm during the fall and spring semesters.
- However, since FY19, **participation in Dual Enrollment has increased**. Additionally, Bard HS Early College and Coolidge Early College have become whole-school Dual Enrollment schools. As data becomes available on resource allocation and expenditures associated with whole-school dual enrollment models, Afton recommends including this as a category in the school-type expenditure analysis.



• Figures exclude OSSE dual enrollment participants.





Three additional DCPS school models - International Baccalaureate (IB), Global Studies, and Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM) schools - receive incremental resources in the form of a program coordinator

- Per DCPS School Budget Guide and Comprehensive Staffing Models, schools with the following programs are allocated the following incremental positions:
  - IB: IB Coordinator
  - Global Studies: Global Studies Coordinator
  - SEM: SEM Coordinator
- Additionally, these schools have "additional staffing requirements" spelled out in the allocation requirements of the school budget guide. Schools do not receive incremental resources for these staffing requirements, rather principals must plan coverage for the full range of program courses within their regular teacher allocation.



Sources/Further Information:

- FY19 DCPS School Budget Guide (link here)
- FY19 Comprehensive Staffing Models



#### Supporting Strong Schools. Sustaining the Future.



#### 2020 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Study Part VI: Appendix



June 2020 Updated September 4, 2020



### **Table of Contents**

- I. Executive Summary
- II. At-risk Student Need research, analysis and options
- III. At-risk Concentration research, analysis and options
- IV. ELL Weight Structure research, analysis and options
- V. Foundation Level Cost Drivers analysis

### VI. Appendix

- a. UPSFF study process and approach detail
- b. Additional background and research
- c. Additional student outcomes and data analysis





# **Process and Approach:** experts, advisory group, interviews, data & analysis





# Process and Approach: National benchmarking and team of experts

Afton Partners, a financial firm focused on K-12 education finance, led the 2020 UPSFF study with a team of national experts. Below is a summary of the background and roles and responsibilities of each team member:

- 1. Afton Partners performed project management roles, developed student and school-level outcomes analysis, built a long-term UPSFF forecast model and facilitated all Advisory Group meetings.
- 2. Georgetown Edunomics Lab is a nationally-renowned K-12 finance and funding organization with decades of experience with the study of (and supporting implementation of) best practices associated with national, state and local funding of K12 schools. Edunomics, led by Marguerite Roza, provided national funding policy guidance and feedback on UPSFF funding options, recommended options for consideration, and attended all Advisory Group and LEA interviews with the Afton team.





# Process and Approach: National benchmarking and team of experts (cont.)

- **3. Michael Griffith** is an expert on state and local funding practices, including funding formulas for high needs students. Michael provided national benchmarking data and analysis for all at-risk and ELL funding components of the 2020 UPSFF study.
- 4. Gerald Liu is a former Financial professional from Chicago public schools and currently Director of Policy and Operations at Kids First Chicago. Gerald helped build and implement the <u>Equity Index</u> in Chicago, which is a metric using socioeconomic factors gathered from either student level data or publicly assessable data (e.g.- Chicago Data Portal, Chicago Police Crime Statistics, Census tracts/blocks) to measure how those factors correlate with educational outcomes. He has helped inform the student data analysis process, while also providing guidance on the potential opportunity for more nuanced at-risk funding in the District.
- 5. Ensemble Learning is a firm whose mission is to support closing the gap between English learners and English-speaking students. The Ensemble team, led by Elise Darwish, provided guidance on best practices on support ELL students.





#### **Process and Approach: Advisory Group**

As part of proposal, Afton recommended creating an Advisory Group of local experts and practitioners to stress-test and provide feedback on options to modify the UPSFF for the 2020 study. To implement this approach:

- The DME identified practitioners and leaders from DCPS, Public Charter Schools, the Public Charter School Board and the Office of Superintendent of Education (OSSE)
- The Advisory Group met seven times from November 2019 through January 2020. Each meeting's agenda and facilitation materials were shared with the group two days prior to the meeting. Each meeting was held at OSSE.
- The agenda for each meeting focused on the goals and objectives of the study, a review of learnings from the last meeting, a review of key data and analysis, and discussion items and key questions. The advisory group also participated in several "snap polls" to gauge interest and/or risks associated with proposed options.





The Advisory Group's charge has been to provide guidance and feedback on proposed changes or updates to the UPSFF while maintaining a methodology aligned to goals established during the first meeting

<u>Charge</u>: The UPSFF Advisory Group will provide **counsel, guidance and feedback** to the DME on **proposed changes or updates to the UPSFF**.

<u>Scope</u>: The Advisory Group members will participate by giving **feedback on proposals and recommendations based on their relevant expertise and experience**. The Advisory Group may do this by considering proposal options from the lens of various stakeholders, surfacing risks and opportunities, reviewing and pressure-testing relevant analyses, vetting and challenging potential policy options considered, and performing other activities as appropriate to their advisory role. Final recommendations will be put forward by Afton for consideration by the DME.

#### Objectives:

- · Address needs as identified by student outcomes analyses
- Develop **multiple funding options**, including those that are breakeven (distribute the existing pie) or require various levels of incremental funding (add to the pie)
- Keep it simple and align to current communication protocols, processes





#### **Advisory Group team members**

Name	Affiliation
Dane Anderson	KIPP DC
Ryan Aurori	OSSE
Vanessa Carlo-Miranda	E.L. Haynes
Ken Cherry	Friendship
Jennifer Comey	EOM
Justin Ellis	KIPP DC
Allen Francois	DCPS
Elba Garcia	DCPS
Sharon Gaskins	DCPS
Allen Kramer	E.L. Haynes
Alonso Montalvo	PCSB
Jennifer Norton	OSSE
Nnamadim Ozoemena	PCSB
Paris Saunders	OSSE
Jessica Swanson	DCPS
Shana Wang	DCPS





#### Process and approach: The Advisory Group primarily focused on policy and options related to the at-risk and ELL components of the UPSFF study

#### 2020 UPSFF Study

Advisory Group meeting anticipated topic areas As of January 30, 2019

		At-risk			ELL			<b></b> Foundation		
		Policy	Data	Recs	Policy	Data	Recs	Policy	Data	Recs
Meeting #1	November 7, 2019									
Meeting #2	November 21, 2019									
Meeting #3	December 12, 2019									
Meeting #4	December 19, 2019									
Meeting #5	January 9, 2020									
Meeting #6	January 16, 2020									
Meeting #7	January 30, 2020									



#### **Process and Approach: LEA interviews**

<u>Summary</u>: Afton worked with the DME to identify schools and LEAs to perform structured interviews on supports provided to their highest needs students. LEAs and schools were identified by a combination of outreach by the DME in October 2019 to request and ask for participation in the study, as well as reviewing the list of Bold Performance Schools, published annually by Empower K12.

State School ID	School Name	Average PPAE	Yrs Bold
1121	KIPP DC - Promise	35.2%	4
3071	KIPP DC - Heights	29.2%	4
196	DC Prep - Edgewood MS	20.8%	4
190	KIPP DC - LEAD	20.2%	4
257	Ketcham ES	20.1%	4
1110	DC Prep - Benning ES	18.8%	4
130	DC Prep - Edgewood ES	16.2%	2
214	KIPP DC - Spring	15.2%	3
286	Rocketship - Rise	14.8%	2
200	Ingenuity Prep	14.5%	3
1016	Rocketship - Legacy	14.5%	1
237	KIPP DC - Quest	14.0%	3
218	DC Prep - Benning MS	13.8%	4
362	Friendship - Blow-Pierce MS	13.6%	3
189	KIPP DC - KEY	13.2%	4
191	Thurgood Marshall	11.2%	3
363	Friendship - Chamberlain ES	11.1%	2
284	Marie Reed ES	10.5%	1
227	HD Cooke ES	10.5%	2
205	Barnard ES	10.1%	2

#### **Bold Performance Schools – multiple years**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

#### Process

Each interviewee was provided background on the UPSFF study, and key questions that would be addressed prior to the meeting. Additionally, for each school and LEA participating, Afton worked with staff to collect data to estimate costs of supports provided, as well as data to assist in the development of the historical foundation analysis.

These interviews informed both the options considered in this report, as well as supports believed to be most successful at these LEAs





#### **Process and Approach: LEA and OSSE interviews (cont.)**

The Afton team facilitated 10 meetings with over 25 LEA leadership and staff during the course of this work, including:

- Barnard Elementary School (DCPS) principal and leadership team
- Former H.D. Cooke Elementary School principal + current Instructional Superintendent for Cluster I
- DCPS Welcome Center DCPS Language Acquisition Division Executive Director and Welcome Center staff
- DCPS Office of Resource Strategy
- **DC International School –** Executive Director and leadership team
- EL Haynes Public Charter School Chief Operating Officer and Director of Budget and Finance
- Friendship Public Charter School Chief of Staff, Middle and High School Principals, CFO
- **IDEA Public Charter School** Financial Director
- **KIPP DC** Chief Operating Officer, Director of Finance
- OSSE English Language Acquisition Standards and Instruction Team English Learner Program Manager
   AFTON



#### **Process and Approach: Student Outcomes Data**

- **Summary of Outcomes Data:** The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) test is administered annually to students in grades 3-8 and high school for both Math and English language arts/literacy (ELA). Afton worked with student-level PARCC test results data for each of the past five years (FY15 – FY19), provided by the DME and OSSE.
  - Relevant student datapoints included the following: unique student identifier (USI), date of birth, grade level, ELL status, At-Risk indicator (binary), school, LEA, whether or not the student was included in the enrollment audit population, and other demographic data.
  - Relevant testing datapoints included the following, for both Math and ELA performance: whether or not the reported score was considered "valid", overall PARCC scale score, and PARCC performance level (1-5).
- Summary of At-Risk Analysis Approach: Afton primarily worked with school-level data that included ٠ PARCC test results reported by grade level, by school, by each "possible at-risk factor combination" for three years (FY15, FY18 and FY19). For privacy reasons, OSSE and DME converted student-level with at-risk factor detail into school-level data for Afton. Given the four at-risk factors (homeless, direct certification, CFSA, and over-age) there are sixteen possible combinations of factors a given student can be in a given year, including not at-risk. With this level of detail, Afton was able to track and analyze the PARCC performance levels for groups of students in each of the possible at-risk factor combinations. Rather than focusing on overall PARCC scale scores. Afton focused on the group proficiency rate, which is calculated as total count of students reporting PARCC performance level of 4+ divided by total count of valid PARCC test results, for a given group of students, in a given year (or for multiple years).
- Summary of ELL Analysis Approach: Afton primarily worked with student-level data including general student demographic information, ELL status, and WIDA/ACCESS test results for each of the past five years (FY15 – FY19). ACCESS for ELLs (ACCESS) is the collective name for WIDA's suite of summative English language proficiency assessments. Using unique student identifiers, Afton was able analyze the PARCC performance levels for groups of students based on age, grade level, and WIDA test results. Similar to the At-Risk approach, rather than focusing on overall PARCC scale scores, Afton focused on the group proficiency rate, which is calculated as total count of students reporting PARCC performance level of 4+ divided by total count of valid PARCC test results, for a given group of students, in a given year (or for multiple years).
  - Relevant student datapoints included the following: unique student identifier (USI), current year ELL status, current year ELL monitored status, "new to the US" status, native language, date of birth, grade level, school, LEA, whether or not the student was included in the enrollment audit population, WIDA/ACCESS Most Recent Assessment Score, WIDA/ACCESS Most Recent Assessment Year





#### **Process and Approach: UPSFF forecast model**

Afton worked with the DME team to develop a five-year financial forecast model to estimate the financial impact of each option considered. The purpose of the model is to quantify, at the LEA level, the financial impact of changing UPSFF assumptions: weights, rates, new funding categories for new student types, enrollment trends, etc.

The outcomes of this projection model are included for each option articulated in this report, and the model been transitioned to the DME for future analysis

The fiscal impact as quantified in this report refers to the assumed impact in FY22 alone (one year) and is measured by comparing LEA-level funding under the proposed scenario as compared to the LEA-level funding under a steady-state, base case scenario.

Major assumptions for the base case forecast include:

- 1. Enrollment
  - a. FY21 projected UPSFF enrollment by LEA (as of January 2020) is used as base year data for the enrollment forecast
  - b. DCPS: For simplicity, the model assumes a 1.5% annual increase in enrollment starting in FY22 applied uniformly to each funding category and grade level (based on discussions with DCPS)
  - c. PCS: For simplicity, the model assumes no new charter LEAs open after FY21; only select charters are projected to grow, and the annual growth rate applied to these charters is set equal to each charter's approved projected charter enrollment ceiling through FY25 (data provided by DC Public Charter School Board).
  - d. The model forecasts granular student demographic data in order to quantify the impact of proposed funding options. Afton used FY19 actual demographics, grade level, and performance data to understand proportions to total for each LEA (example % of an LEA's at-risk population that is "over-age" vs. "homeless". These FY19 proportions to total are assumed to hold constant and are applied to projected total enrollment, total at-risk count, and total EL counts for each projected year.
- 2. Funding weights and rates
  - a. Funding Categories remain the same as funding categories in the FY20 UPSFF formula
  - b. Funding Weights remain the same as funding categories in the FY20 UPSFF formula
  - c. Annual funding increases on the foundation amount are set to the historical average increase of 2.27%, starting off of the known FY20 base amount of \$10,980



#### **Process, Approach, and Limitations: Foundation Level Cost Drivers Analysis**

#### **Process**

- DME reached out to all PCS LEAs to solicit participation; positive response to participate included in first round
- Collected FY16 FY19 actual expenditure data in common format from participating sites
- Iterated with sites to code individual expenditure lines into uniform, high-level expenditure categories
- Created a database to roll up costs for each LEA, by year, for all expense categories
- Created a DCPS school-level expenditure and academic performance database, grouping schools by grades served and program type offered
- Prepared analyses based on the outcomes of both databases

#### Limitations

- Data included from DCPS and *four charter LEAs*, which were 'self-selected' (see above) only those affirmatively responding to communications and providing sufficient data were included.
- Worked with LEA self-reported data in organization-specific categories what one organization considers a "central management" expense may be a "schoolwide expense" at another organization.
- Leveraged existing expense analysis structure, worked with LEAs to allocate historical costs to these categories
- This report mostly uses average figures for this cohort of example PCS LEAs. These participating charter LEAs may not be "representative" of all charter LEAs in the city.
- For the DCPS school type (program type) analysis, school-level expenditures are reported on a whole-school \_ basis, grouped by schools offering specific programs. FY19 preliminary expenditure data was used. These expenditures include all school-level expenditures reported by DCPS, even those not associated directly with the unique program offered.
- Site-based expenditure reporting required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was not yet available for this analysis.





#### **Process, Approach, and Limitations: Foundation Level Cost Drivers** Analysis (cont'd)

Afton iterated with sites to code individual expenditure lines into uniform, high-level expenditure categories. The expenditure categories used and definitions match those used in the 2013 DC Education Adequacy Study and other common practice studies before it. The categories were as follows.

- Personnel (Salaries, Benefits, Stipends, Bonuses) .
  - **Classroom Staff-Teachers: Teachers**
  - Classroom Staff-Other: Aides
  - Substitutes \_
  - Schoolwide Staff: Coaches, librarian, program coordinator, counselors, social workers, and psychologists, etc.
  - School Administration: Principal, Assistant Principal, Administrative Aide, Business Manager, Clerks, etc. \_
  - Facility Operations Support: Maintenance, custodial, security staff (if FTE)
  - Central Management: Non-school-level Central Administration, Instructional Support, Business, Non-Instructional Services, etc.
- Non-Personnel
  - Instructional Support: Professional development and school improvement efforts
  - Direct Services to Students: Texts, Instructional Technology, Sports/Athletics, Student Services
  - **Food Service**
  - Nonpersonal services/programs: Field trips, school-level non-classroom supplies and materials
  - Other school-based costs: Technology, miscellaneous
  - Facility Operations Support: Non-personnel facilities costs contracted maintenance, custodial, security; utilities (excludes rent and debt service)
  - Facility Occupancy: Rent Payments, Debt Service (Principal and Interest Payments)
  - Central Management: Non-personnel costs for Central Administration, Instructional Support, Business, and Non-Instructional Services





## Additional national research





### National Research How do states define "At Risk"?

- The term "at-risk" is often used by states to describe students who have a higher probability of academic failure<sup>1</sup> While not all students from low-income families are in danger of academic failure, there is a correlation between family income and student achievement. Because of the relationship between income and student success, the majority of states use income measures in their school funding formula as a way of directing additional funding to atrisk student populations.
  - Note that this is state funding, which is separate from federal Title funding
- **42 states plus DC currently have poverty-based funding**<sup>2</sup> (provided in various ways, including formula, categorical, or competitive grants)
- 47 states plus DC currently have some form of At Risk funding <sup>2,3</sup>
  - Several states with At Risk funding utilize academic progress as the qualifier
  - The only states without any additional funding for at-risk students are: Alaska, Idaho, and South Dakota.
- The majority of states use **eligibility for the federal lunch program** as their at-risk identifier<sup>2</sup>.
  - 24 states only use eligibility for the federal lunch program as their at-risk identifier.
  - Seven states use eligibility for the federal lunch program **along with other identifiers for their at-risk program**.
  - DC does not use federal lunch program, but rather uses a five-factor qualifier, wherein a student
    meeting any of the five factors is deemed "At Risk" and receives At Risk funding in the UPSFF

3. Education Commission of the States



<sup>1.</sup> Sean Reardon, *The Widening Academic Achievement Gap Between the Rich and the Poor: New Evidence and Possible Explanations* (Stanford University, 2011)

<sup>2.</sup> EdBuild (<u>http://funded.edbuild.org/national#poverty</u>)

#### **National Research** *What levels of At-Risk students exist across states?*

Breakdown:

Percent of students in high-poverty schools: United States vs. Nearby Areas, All, All public schools, 2016



https://nationalequityatlas.org/indicators/School\_poverty/Ranking%3A35586/United\_States/nearby/Year%28s%29%3A2016/R ace~ethnicity%3AAII/School\_type%3AAII\_public\_schools



#### **National Research** What levels of At-Risk students exist across major cities?

Percent of students in high-poverty schools: United States vs. Washington, DC, All, All public schools, 2016



https://nationalequityatlas.org/indicators/School\_poverty/Ranking:35586/United\_States/nearby/Year(s):2016/Race~ethnicity:AI I/School type:All public schools/



### How are states funding At Risk students?

- There are limitations on what can be learned about costs from other states or locales.
  - Spending levels for student types may be driven by the fine print in state rules and local politics, differences in concentrations of students, labor contracts, school size, and more<sup>1</sup>
- States have unique At-Risk funding structures, as evidenced in The Education Commission of the States' paper "*The Importance of At-Risk Funding*"
- The Education Commission of the States shows that At-Risk Funding is typically binary -- that is, students (and therefore LEAs) either qualify for At Risk funding or they do not.
  - This differs from funding formulas for Special Education and sometimes English Language Learner populations.
- Sixteen states are providing concentration funding. However, the levels at which they provide this funding vary drastically – from tiers beginning at 5% concentration to funding beginning at over 90% concentration.
  - States utilize concentration funding for specific needs unique to their local context.
- 1. M. Roza. Funding Student Types: How states can mine their own data to guide finance policy on high needs students, Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University, November 2017



# What does research say about best practices in funding At Risk students?

- There is no clear answer to the question: What's the right amount to spend per pupil type?
  - One challenge is that the question about the "right" figure assumes that we know the best way to deliver services for each student type and that we can convert those to a fixed-dollar figure.
  - Another challenge is that "at risk" is defined differently across states and districts. Some districts use attendance gaps, courses failed, prior year performance, etc. to measure "at risk" (fewer states use measures of "at-risk" in formulas)
- States should mine their own financial data to uncover patterns and surface potential funding answers. Ask a series of questions:
  - How much is our state allocating right now per pupil type?
  - How much are districts spending today per pupil type?
  - What outcomes are produced from the current spending patterns?
  - What systems are needed to help drive spending and outcomes going forward?
- However, do not consider data to be a panacea
  - School effects matter
  - There is an assumption that more funding = better outcomes, but the link between spending and outcomes is limited, <u>though ongoing research points to a higher correlation</u>.
  - Use data to *inform answers to questions, but not as answers in and of themselves*





What emerging, innovative approaches are we seeing in the field?

- New measures are emerging that allow states and districts to account for – and proportionately fund – myriad environmental factors that affect student performance and attainment.
- Districts including Boston (Opportunity Index) and Chicago (Equity Index) have undertaken these studies
- In addition to socioeconomic status, more nuanced factors may be included in funding formulas
  - Examples: exposure to trauma, percentage of owner-occupied homes, percentage of college educated adults, and percentage of single parent households
- Methodologies look at not only how each factor affects attainment but also their effect when metrics are compounded
  - Completed through robust correlation analyses





# What considerations should we keep in mind regarding tiering ELL students?

Metrics currently collected and available for use in classifying tiers include:

Metric	Definition	Output Values
Assessment and Reporting Grade	Grade of the student	P3, P4, KG, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, AE, Missing
ACCESS Scale Score	Composite overall scale score	100-950
Proficiency Level (WIDA)	Composite overall proficiency level	1.0-6.0 Addtl values for alternative assessments
New to US	An indication of whether the student newly enrolled in a school in the United States within the previous 12 months	Yes/No/Unknown
Native Language	The Native Language of the Student	Language Code (ex: SPA)
Monitored Indicator	An indication of whether the student was identified to be monitored for English Learner services in each of the last 5 school years	Yes/No
English Language Learner Status	An indication of whether the student was identified as an English Learner in each of the last 5 school years	Yes/No





# Additional At-risk and ELL data and analysis





## At-risk factor combination analyses 3-year, 2-year and 1-year





in terms of percent proficient by group; counting categories with 30 or more scores over 3 years analyzed

A	В	С	D	Ε	F	G	н	I
		3 YEARS - F	Y15, FY18, FY1	9 Combined				
a.				Math			ELA	
Combination Name	# At Risk Factors	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At-Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At-Risk P4+
1 Not At-Risk	0	132,227	60,605	38%	0%	62,121	45%	0%
2 Homeless	1	3,758	1,287	20%	-18%	1,276	23%	-21%
3 Direct Certification	1	91,064	42,843	15%	-23%	43,261	18%	-27%
4 Homeless/Direct Certification	2	9,107	3,219	14%	-24%	3,222	16%	-29%
5 Foster	1	494	219	11%	-27%	216	13%	-32%
6 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification	3	94	38	8%	-30%	38	16%	-29%
7 Foster/Direct Certification	2	231	79	8%	-30%	82	12%	-33%
8 Homeless/Overage	2	333	108	7%	-30%	103	16%	-29%
9 Overage	1	6,966	2,309	5%	-33%	2,448	15%	-30%
10 Direct Certification/Overage	2	5,856	1,884	2%	-36%	1,949	6%	-38%
11 Homeless/Direct Certification/Overage	3	463	120	2%	-36%	112	8%	-37%
12 Foster/Direct Certification/Overage	3	-						
13 Foster/Homeless	2							
14 Foster/Overage	2							
15 Foster/Homeless/Overage	3							
16 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification/Overage	. 4							
Total Students		250,821	112,771	27%	-11%	114,888	32%	-13%

• Performance data for students in groups rows 12-16 not shown, given low count of test scores recorded (n<30).

• Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA





A	В	С	D	Ε	F	G	н	1
		2 YEARS - FY	18 & FY19 CON	ABINED				
				Math			ELA	+
Combination Name	# At Risk Factors	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+
1 Not At-Risk	0	92,635	43,379	40%	0%	44,398	48%	0%
2 Homeless	1	3,181	1,119	20%	-20%	1,106	24%	-24%
3 Direct Certification	1	59,414	28,988	16%	-24%	29,206	20%	-27%
4 Homeless/Direct Certification	2	6,985	2,529	14%	-26%	2,520	18%	-30%
5 Foster	1	264	123	11%	-29%	122	13%	-35%
6 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification	3	88	36	8%	-32%	36	17%	-31%
7 Foster/Direct Certification	2	165	59	8%	-32%	60	12%	-36%
8 Homeless/Overage	2	281	98	6%	-34%	92	14%	-34%
9 Overage	1	4,476	1,649	5%	-35%	1,696	15%	-33%
10 Direct Certification/Overage	2	3,535	1,247	2%	-38%	1,253	6%	-41%
11 Homeless/Direct Certification/Overage	3	344	94	1%	-39%	85	8%	-40%
12 Foster/Direct Certification/Overage	3							
13 Foster/Homeless	2							
14 Foster/Overage	2							
15 Foster/Homeless/Overage	3							
16 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification/Overage	4							
Total Students		171,526	79,369	29%	-11%	80,622	35%	-13%

• Performance data for students in groups rows 12-16 not shown, given low count of test scores recorded (n<30).

• Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA





# When reviewing <u>one year of data</u> (FY19), the 16 combinations of at-risk factors, performance ranges from 21 ppts to 50 ppts lower than students not designated at-risk

A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1
		9	L YEAR - FY19					
				Math	]		ELA	(
Combination Name	# At Risk Factors	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At-Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At-Risk P4+
1 Not At-Risk	0	47,362	22,337	40%	0%	22,814	50%	0%
2 Homeless	1	1,666	583	20%	-21%	574	24%	-26%
3 Direct Certification	1	29,356	14,426	17%	-24%	14,516	22%	-28%
4 Homeless/Direct Certification	2	3,318	1,238	14%	-26%	1,236	18%	-31%
5 Foster	1	102	46	11%	-29%	45	16%	-34%
6 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification	3	72	29	10%	-30%	29	21%	-29%
7 Foster/Direct Certification	2	96	37	5%	-35%	38	13%	-36%
8 Homeless/Overage	2	149	41	2%	-38%	36	6%	-44%
9 Overage	1	2,159	754	7%	-34%	760	16%	-33%
10 Direct Certification/Overage	2	1,764	617	2%	-38%	621	7%	-42%
11 Homeless/Direct Certification/Overage	3	159	36	0%	-40%	33	9%	-40%
12 Foster/Direct Certification/Overage	3	20	n<10	0%	-40%	<mark>n&lt;10</mark>	0%	-50%
13 Foster/Homeless	2							
14 Foster/Overage	2							
15 Foster/Homeless/Overage	3							
16 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification/Overage	4							
Total Students		86,299	40,171	29%	-11%	40,730	37%	-13%

• Performance data for students in groups rows 13-16 not shown, given low count of test scores recorded (n<20).

• Note there are less than 10 data points (test scores) for the widest gap of 50 ppts (line 12). Category used here for consistency with previous analysis.



• Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.



## Multi-factor analysis 3-year, 2-year and 1-year





# When looking at 3 years of data, the more factors a student is identified with the more poorly that student tends to perform

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	
	В	y Count of	At-Risk Fact	tors FY15, FY18,	FY19 Com	bined		
2			Math			ELA	1	
# At Risk Factors	At Risk Audited Factors Enrollment		Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	
0	132,227	60,605	38%	0%	62,121	45%	0%	
1	102,282	46,658	14%	-23%	47,201	18%	-27%	
2	15,700	5,337	10%	-28%	5,404	12%	-32%	
3	607	171	3%	-35%	162	9%	-35%	
4	n<10							

Notes:

- Though a correlation exists with number of factors and performance, there are significantly fewer data points beyond 2 factors, and n<10 test results for students with all four factors.
- Above analysis reflects combined 4+ proficiency in FY15, FY18 and FY19.
- Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.





# Data from the past 2 years show similar results, the more factors a student is identified with the more poorly that student tends to perform

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
		By Count	of At-Risk Fa	actors FY18 & FY	19 Combi	ned	
			Math			ELA	
# At Risk Factors	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+
0	92,635	43,379	40%	0%	44,398	48%	0%
1	67,335	31,879	16%	-24%	32,130	20%	-28%
2	11,080	3,970	10%	-30%	3,963	14%	-34%
3	472	141	3%	-37%	131	10%	-38%
4	n<10						

Notes:

- Though a correlation exists with number of factors and performance, there are significantly fewer data points beyond 2 factors, and n<10 test results for students with all four factors.
- Above analysis reflects combined 4+ proficiency in FY18 and FY19.
- Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.





#### A one year (FY19) analysis shows similar results, the more factors a student is identified with the more poorly that student tends to perform

A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
		isk Factors FY19	Only				
			Math			ELA	
# At Risk Factors	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+ Risk P4+		PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+
0	47,362	22,337	40%	0%	22,814	50%	0%
1	33,283	<mark>15,809</mark>	16%	-24%	15,895	22%	-28%
2	5,389	1,952	10%	-30%	1,952	14%	-35%
3	262	73	4%	-36%	69	13%	-36%
4	n<10						

Notes:

- Though a correlation exists with number of factors and performance, there are significantly fewer data points beyond 2 factors, and n<10 test results for students with all four factors.
- Above analysis reflects combined 4+ proficiency in FY19.
- Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.




## **Performance trends by at-risk factor** FY15 – FY19





At-Risk by Factor (Single Factor or Combined) FY15, FY18, FY19											
		Math									
At-Risk Factor		m Not At-Ri	sk P4+								
	FY15		FY18	FY19	FY15		FY18	FY19			
Not At-Risk	31.6%		3 <mark>9.</mark> 8%	40.3%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%			
Homeless	<mark>12.9%</mark>		15.7%	15.2%	-18.7%		-24.1%	-25.1%			
Direct Certification	11.0%		15.3%	15.8%	-20.7%		-24.5%	-24.5%			
CFSA	8.5%		9.4%	8.6%	-23.2%		-30.4%	-31.7%			
Overage	2.8%		3.6%	4.3%	-28.9%		-36.2%	-36.0%			

At-Ris	At-Risk by Factor (Single Factor or Combined) FY15, FY18, FY19											
				EL	A							
At-Risk Factor		Profic	ient 4+		Ppt Devia	ation fro	m Not At-Ri	isk P4+				
	FY15		FY18	FY19	FY15		FY18	FY19				
Not At-Risk	37.1%		45.9%	49.5%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%				
Homeless	10.9%		19.3%	19.3%	-26.2%		-26.6%	-30.2%				
Direct Certification	11.2%		18.3%	21.1%	-25.9%		-27.6%	-28.5%				
CFSA	10.8%		9. <mark>5</mark> %	13.6%	-26.4%		-36.4%	-36.0%				
Overage	10.8%		10.7%	12.0%	-26.4%		-35.2%	-37.5%				

Ppt deviation from not at-risk increases from FY15 to FY19 for each at-risk category

Notes:

- These categories are not mutually exclusive, as any student marked as combination of factors falls in each category.
- Showing Math Proficiency Levels at 4+
- Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA





A <u>trend analyses</u> on performance by count of factors ALSO shows that while student proficiency levels have improved over the past five years, the gap between at-risk and not-at-risk students has widened.

At-Risk by Count of Factors FY15, FY18, FY19									
				Ma	th				
Number of Factors		Profici	ent 4+		Ppt Devia	ation from	m Not At-Ri	sk P4+	
1	FY15		FY18	FY19	FY15		FY18	FY19	
0	<mark>31.6%</mark>		39.8%	40.3%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	
1	<mark>11.0%</mark>		15.5%	16.2%	-20.7%		-24.3%	-24.0%	
2	7.6%		10.6%	9.9%	-24.0%		-29.2%	-30.4%	
3	3.3%		1.5%	4.1%	-28.3%		-38.3%	-36.2%	
4	NA		NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	

At-Risk by Count of Factors FY15, FY18, FY19										
	ELA									
Number of Factors		Profici	ent 4+		Ppt Devia	ation fro	m <mark>Not At-R</mark> i	isk P4+		
	FY15		FY18	FY19	FY15	•••	FY18	FY19		
0	37.1%		45.9%	49.5%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%		
1	11.8%		18.8%	21.7%	-25.3%		-27.1%	-27.8%		
2	7.9%		13.8%	14.2%	-29.2%		-32.1%	-35.3%		
3	6.5%		6.5%	13.0%	-30.7%		-39.5%	-36.5%		
4	NA		NA	NA	NA		NA	NA		

Ppt deviation from not at-risk increases from FY15 to FY19 for each at-risk category

(though 3-factor has improved from FY18 to FY19)

Notes:

Showing Math Proficiency Levels at 4+

• Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.





## Individual factor analysis 3-year, 2-year and 1-year





# When reviewing 3 years of data, any combination including over-age has the most significant impact on outcomes, followed by CFSA

A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н
	At-Risk by Factor (Sing	e Factor o	r Combined	) FY15, FY18, FY1	9 Combin	ed	
			Math			ELA	
At Risk Factor	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+
1 Not At-Risk	132,227	60,605	<mark>38%</mark>	0%	62, <mark>12</mark> 1	45%	0%
2 Homeless	13,849	4,802	15%	-23%	4,781	18%	-27%
3 Direct Certification	106,853	48,193	14%	-24%	48,673	17%	-28%
4 CFSA	1,047	396	9%	-29%	396	11%	-33%
5 Overage	13,774	<mark>4,4</mark> 54	4%	-34%	4,645	11%	-34%

#### Notes:

- These categories are **not mutually exclusive**, as any student marked as combination of factors falls in each category.
- Direct Certification and Homeless to perform relatively similarly, while also having the most test scores to evaluate
- Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.





A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
	At-Risk by Factor (Sir	ngle Factor	or Combine	ed) FY18 & FY19	Combine	d	
			Math			ELA	
At Risk Factor	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+
1 Not At-Risk	92,635	43,379	40%	0%	44,398	48%	0%
2 Homeless	10,960	3,904	15%	-25%	3,867	19%	-28%
<b>3</b> Direct Certification	70,560	32,962	16%	-24%	33,168	20%	-28%
4 CFSA	675	266	9%	-31%	266	12%	-36%
5 Overage	8,732	3,110	4%	-36%	3,148	11%	-36%

#### <u>Notes</u>

- These categories are **not mutually exclusive**, as any student marked as combination of factors falls in each category.
- Direct Certification and Homeless to perform relatively similarly, while also having the most test scores to evaluate
- Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.





## These takeaways are consistent when reviewing 1 year of data from FY19

Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
	At-Risk by F	actor (Sing	le Factor or	Combined) FY1	9		
			Math			ELA	
At Risk Factor	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+
1 Not At-Risk	47,362	22,337	40%	0%	22,814	<mark>50%</mark>	0%
2 Homeless	5,421	1,946	15%	-25%	1,927	19%	-30%
3 Direct Certification	<mark>34,78</mark> 8	16,389	16%	-24%	16,478	21%	-28%
4 CFSA	366	139	9%	-32%	140	14%	-36%
5 Overage	4,284	1,458	4%	-36%	1,461	12%	-38%

#### Notes:

- These categories are **not mutually exclusive**, as any student marked as combination of factors falls in each category.
- Direct Certification and Homeless to perform relatively similarly, while also having the most test scores to evaluate
- Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.

However, the at-risk category of over-age only applies to High School Students. The following analyses only use High School test scores.





## **High School-only analysis**







% At-Risk Student by Grade FY19 - School Level Data

Actual (not budgeted) UPSFF enrollment - excludes Adult and Alternative Students

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



#### When reviewing the 16 combinations of at-risk factors for <u>HIGH</u> <u>SCHOOL STUDENTS ONLY</u> for FY15, FY18, and FY19, performance ranges from 9 ppts to 44 ppts lower than students not designated at-risk

in terms of percent proficient by group; counting categories with 10 or more scores over 3 years

A	В	С	D	Ε	F	G	Н	1
At	-Risk by Fac	tor (Single Fact	or or Combi	ned) FY15, F	Y18, FY19 Com	pined		
4				Math		ELA		
Combination Name	# At Risk Factors	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At-Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At-Risk P4+
1 Not At-Risk	1	23,208	8,711	21%	0%	10,402	44%	0%
2 Homeless	1	366	146	12%	-9%	156	21%	-24%
3 Direct Certification	1	12,416	5,273	8%	-14%	5,671	20%	-24%
4 Homeless/Overage	2	333	108	7%	-14%	103	16%	-29%
5 Foster	1	77	27	7%	-14%	26	15%	-29%
6 Homeless/Direct Certification	2	580	245	7%	-14%	255	20%	-24%
7 Overage	1	6,951	2,300	5%	-16%	2,439	15%	-30%
8 Direct Certification/Overage	2	5,856	1,884	2%	-19%	1,949	6%	-38%
9 Homeless/Direct Certification/Overage	3	462	120	2%	-19%	112	8%	-36%
10 Foster/Overage	2	101	20	0%	-21%	21	5%	-39%
11 Foster/Direct Certification/Overage	3	33	10	0%	-21%	n<10	0%	-44%
12 Foster/Direct Certification	2							
13 Foster/Homeless	2							
14 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification	3							
15 Foster/Homeless/Overage	3							
16 Foster/Homeless/Direct Certification/Ove	e <mark>4</mark>							
Total Students		50,454	18,866	13%	-8%	21,165	30%	-14%

• Performance data for students in groups rows 12-16 not shown, given low count of test scores recorded (n<10).

• Excludes students in Adult and Alternative programs.





A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
	At-Risk by Factor	Single Fact	or or Combin	ned) FY15, FY18	, FY19 Com	oined	
			Math	an an		ELA	
At Risk Factor	Audited Enrollment	PARCC Math Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+	PARCC ELA Count	Proficient 4+	Ppt Deviation from Not At- Risk P4+
Not At-Risk	23,208	8,711	21%	0%	10,402	44%	0%
Homeless	1,790	633	7%	-14%	640	17%	-27%
Direct Certification	19,383	7,545	6%	-15%	8,009	17%	-28%
CFSA	282	79	3%	-19%	78	8%	-37%
Overage	13, <mark>7</mark> 58	4,445	4%	-18%	4,636	11%	-33%

Notes:

- These categories are **not mutually exclusive**, as any student marked as combination of factors falls in each category.
- Showing Math Proficiency Levels at 4+





## Over-age students in the District







- FY15 includes 67 over-age students from an "OSSE Managed School" neither DCPS nor Charter.
- Data set excludes 7 schools serving Adult and Alternative students only.
- Pie chart excludes students categorized in grades NA or SPED.





Percentage of Students in Grade Designated as "Overage"										
	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19					
Grade 9	37%	36%	34%	33%	33%					
Grade 10	32%	26%	23%	27%	24%					
Grade 11	27%	25%	21%	22%	24%					
Grade 12	22%	19%	19%	19%	18%					
All Grades 9-12	30%	28%	26%	26%	26%					





Percentage of Overage Students Designated as SPED										
	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19					
CHARTER	33%	32%	29%	30%	30%					
DCPS	28%	25%	24%	21%	23%					
Grand Total	30%	27%	26%	25%	26%					

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A	В	C D		E = C * D						
	FY19 UPSF	F PER PUPIL	FUNDING SU	MMARY						
BY SPECIAL EDUCATION LEVEL										
	EUNDING	EUNDING	OVERAGE	ASSUMED SPED						
LEVEL	WEIGHT	DATE	STUDENT	FUNDS FOR OVERAGE						
	WEIGHT	NATE	COUNT	STUDNETS						
Level 1	0.97	\$10,338	296	\$3,060,048						
Level 2	1.20	\$12,790	411	\$5,256,690						
Level 3	1.97	\$20,996	220	\$4,619,120						
Level 4	3.49	\$37,196	165	\$6,137,340						
TOTAL SPED			1,092	\$19,073,198						



- "SPED" = Special Education
- Estimated funding figures above are based on actual student enrollment counts (for which over-age detail is available). DCPS UPSFF funding allocations are based on budgeted enrollment figures.
- Figures on this slide include students assigned to <u>grades 9-12 only</u> excludes students considered "adult or alternative"





### Additional ELL student data





## Of these 10,503 ELL students in FY19, 6,760 (or 64%) have a recorded valid WIDA score

	Count of Valid WIDA Scores	Min WIDA Score	Max WIDA Score	Average WIDA Score	Median WIDA Score
PK3 and PK 4	-	-	-	-	-
KG-5	4,122	1.0	5.0	3.35	3.5
6-8	969	1.0	5.1	3.32	3.5
9-12	1,556	1.2	4.9	2.99	3.0
Other	113	1.4	4.9	2.12	1.9
All Students	6,760	1.0	5.1	3.24	3.4





#### Notes:

• DATA UNIVERSE: FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.

• Excluding Alternative WIDA test results from analysis: scores of A1, A2, A3, P1, P2



#### Of the 10,503 ELL students in FY19, 947 (or 9%) were "New to the Country" and have no recorded valid WIDA score



Percent of FY19 EL Students that are "New to the Country" by Grade Band



Notes:

• DATA UNIVERSE: FY19 students flagged as "Yes" for English Learner Status and "Yes" for Enrollment Audit Population.

Excluding Alternative WIDA test results from analysis: scores of A1, A2, A3, P1, P2





## 2020 UPSFF





### **Current UPSFF Funding – FY20**

Total LIPSEE Funds	V	Veights	Rates	TOTAL DC \$1 807 367 258	
Foundation Amount		1.00	\$10,980	φ1,007,307,200	% Total \$
General Education					65.7%
PK3		1.34	\$14,713	\$86,425,337	4.8%
PK4-Kindergarten		1.30	\$14,274	\$212,183,010	11.7%
Grades 1-5		1.00	\$10,980	\$374,132,520	20.7%
Grades 6-8		1.08	\$11,858	\$190,683,072	10.6%
Grades 9-12		1.22	\$13,396	\$236,847,604	13.1%
Alternative		1.44	\$15,811	\$40,634,784	2.2%
Special Education Schools		1.17	\$12,847	\$4,945,941	0.3%
Adult		0.89	\$9,772	\$41,932,510	2.3%
Special Education					13.9%
Level 1		0.97	\$10,651	\$51,932,326	2.9%
Level 2		1.20	\$13,176	\$51,294,168	2.8%
Level 3		1.97	\$21,631	\$33,916,781	1.9%
Level 4		3.49	\$38,320	\$113,734,354	6.3%
Special Education Compliance					1.5%
Special Ed Compliance		0.10	\$1,087	\$14,462,801	0.8%
Attorney's Fees Supplement		0.09	\$977	\$13,001,912	0.7%
English Language Learners (ELL)					3.3%
ELL		0.49	\$5,380	\$60,425,026	3.3%
At-Risk Students					6.0%
At-Risk		0.23	\$2,471	\$107,691,566	6.0%
Other Weights (incl charter facilities allowance)					9.6%
				\$173,123,548	

Funding for all students depends upon the foundation level and weights for each student group

