

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 Personnel 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	6%	5%
School Administration	10%	8%
Schoolwide Staff	23%	18%
Classroom Staff-Teachers	52%	41%

AFTON 26

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	12%	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



Factors driving differences in school-level per pupil spend: 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: https://edscape.dc.gov/page/facilities-utilization
- 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 2nd)





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 2nd).



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 2nd); 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 2nd); 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