

UPSFF Working Group Survey Responses

October 2020

At-Risk Student Need Options Evaluation

Survey Question: Please evaluate each of the following options from the At-Risk Student Need chapter of the 2020 UPSFF Study on a scale of "Strongly Disagree with implementing this option" to "Strongly Agree with implementing this option."

| At-Risk Student Need Option | Strongly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Somewhat Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Blank | TOTAL |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|
| Increase funding for overage students | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 12 |
| Increase funding for CFSA students | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| Increase funding for both overage and CFSA students | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| Increase funding for students with 2+ characteristics | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| Increase funding for students with 3+ characteristics | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| Increase high school base weight for all HS students | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 12 |
| Create a higher at-risk weight for high school at-risk students | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 |



At-Risk Student Need Options Ranking

Survey Question: Please rank the following options from the At-Risk Student Need chapter of the 2020 UPSFF Study. While you are not required to rank each option, please only mark one option as your 1st choice, one option as your 2nd choice, etc.*

| At-Risk Student Need Option | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th | 5 th | 6 th | 7 th | Blank | TOTAL |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Increase funding for overage students | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 |
| Increase funding for CFSA students | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| Increase funding for both overage and CFSA students | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 |
| Increase funding for students with 2+ characteristics | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| Increase funding for students with 3+ characteristics | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| Increase high school base weight for all HS students | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 12 |
| Create a higher at-risk weight for high school at-risk students | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 12 |

^{*}Note that one survey respondent chose two first choices: funding for overage students and creating a higher at-risk weight for high school at right students.



At-Risk Student Need Funding Methods Evaluation

Survey Question: If a change to the at-risk weight were to be implemented that had a fiscal impact, should the change be funded with redistributed or incremental funding?

| Funding Method | TOTAL |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Redistributed Funding | 4 |
| Incremental Funding | 8 |
| Blank | 0 |
| TOTAL | 12 |



At-Risk Student Need Funding Methods Evaluation

Survey Question: Please evaluate each of the following options from the At-Risk Student Need chapter of the 2020 UPSFF Study on a scale of "Strongly Disagree with implementing this option" to "Strongly Agree with implementing this option."

| At-Risk Student Need Funding Method | | | | Strongly Disagree | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---|-------|
| Redistributed Funding | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| Incremental Funding | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |



At-Risk Concentration Options Evaluation

Survey Question: Please evaluate each of the following options from the At-Risk Student Need chapter of the 2020 UPSFF Study on a scale of "Strongly Disagree with implementing this option" to "Strongly Agree with implementing this option."

| At-Risk Concentration Option | Strongly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Disagree* | Strongly Disagree | Blank | TOTAL |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------|-------|-------|
| Qualification Level for At-Risk Funding | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 12 |
| Tiered Funding | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 12 |
| Emulate the Community Eligibility Provision | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| Sliding Scale | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 |

^{*}Note that the survey included an option for "Disagree" rather than "Somewhat Disagree" for this question.



At-Risk Concentration Options Ranking

Survey Question: Please rank the following options from the At-Risk Concentration chapter of the 2020 UPSFF Study. While you are not required to rank each option, please only mark one option as your 1st choice, one option as your 2nd choice, etc.

| At-Risk Concentration Option | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th | Blank | TOTAL |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Qualification Level for At-Risk Funding | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Tiered Funding | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 12 |
| Emulate the Community Eligibility Provision | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| Sliding Scale | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12 |



At-Risk Concentration Funding Methods Evaluation

Survey Question: If school-level at-risk concentration funding were to be implemented, and it had a fiscal impact, should the change be funded with redistributed or incremental funding?

| At-Risk Concentration Funding Method | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|-------|
| Redistributed Funding | 5 |
| Incremental Funding | 7 |
| Blank | 0 |
| TOTAL | 12 |



At-Risk Concentration Funding Methods Evaluation

Survey Question: Please evaluate each of the following options from the At-Risk Concentration chapter of the 2020 UPSFF Study on a scale of "Strongly Disagree with implementing this option" to "Strongly Agree with implementing this option."

| At Risk Concentration Funding Method | Strongly Agree | Somewhat Agree | | Strongly Disagree | Blank | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|----------------------|-------|-------|
| Redistributed Funding | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Incremental Funding | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 |

