



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF

EDUCATION

UPSFF Working Group

Meeting Notes

Aug. 20, 2020, 3-5 p.m.

- Introductions and roll call
- Walkthrough of the 2020 UPSFF Study - At-Risk Student Need section
 - Reviewed the definition and components for at-risk student qualification, trend analysis of at-risk student counts from FY15-FY19, detail of at-risk students by at-risk component, detail of at-risk students by grade, and performance data (PARCC scores) for each at-risk category. Notes that higher percentage of at-risk students are in high school than at other grade levels.
 - Clarification that alternative students are not considered at-risk student for funding purposes. Alternative student characteristics are not included in this at-risk analysis, even though there are alternative students that would also be considered at-risk students.
 - Clarification that the study analyzes data from before the COVID-19 health emergency. The number of at-risk students may be higher and the proficiency gap between at-risk and non-at-risk students may be greater now. Any cost estimates for implementing the options would need to be updated.
 - Request from the working group to share the definition/requirements to become an alternative school.
 - Discussion related to the at-risk weight recommendation in the Adequacy Study. The Adequacy Study recommended a higher weight, but a more limited at-risk definition. The city implemented a broader definition for at-risk and lower weight, however the total amount of at-risk funding to LEAs is higher.
 - Discussion about what schools are doing with at-risk funding to improve outcomes and how the at-risk funding is going specifically to at-risk students. Review of some of the qualitative response from LEAs.
 - Review and discussion of options to change at-risk funding that are listed on Slide 10 and the matrix the study used to analyze each option.
 - Overall consensus that funding should be incremental instead of redistributed. However, it is difficult to look at these options in a vacuum without considering other changes to the UPSFF that the working group may recommend.
 - Generally, the working group favors broad options that aren't targeted to only a few students.
 - Request to review the financial transparency legislation
- Public comment period
 - No public comments.