



UPSFF Working Group

Oct. 25, 2018



Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions (5 min)
- Timeline Overview (5 min)
- National Landscape Review (25 min)
- Focus Areas: At Risk, English Learners, Special Education (35 min)
 - Adequacy Study Specifications
 - At Risk Characteristics and Overlap
 - School Outcomes: Bold Performance Schools
 - Driving Questions and Discussion
- Public Comment Period (15 min)
- Up Next (11/29) (5 min)



Timeline Overview



Introductory Meeting

UPSFF Review Process, UPSFF Overview, and Focus Area Introduction

Monthly Group Meeting

Adequacy Study Review, Focus Area Selection

Monthly Group Meeting

National Landscape Review Follow Ups from Adequacy Study Review
Focus Area Overview and Deep Dive on At Risk

Monthly Group Meeting

Focus Area Discussion and Deep Dive
Preliminary Recommendations

Review Draft Report

Finalize Focus Area Discussion Review and Comment on Draft Report



Timeline Overview: Working Group Goals

- Responsibilities of UPSFF working group :
 - Provide input and develop recommendations regarding revisions to the UPSFF
- Goals for the working group:
 - Examine the UPSFF and district-wide budgeting in practice (August)
 - Revisit Adequacy Study of education costs in the District (September)
 - Review national landscape, including research in education and education finance (October)
 - Develop recommendations regarding revisions to the UPSFF on the focus area categories: At Risk, ELL, and SPED (October, November and December)
 - Recommend areas of further study following the report's publication (October, November and December)



National Landscape Review

- During the September meeting, working group members asked how other jurisdictions handle funding for at risk, English Learner, and special education students, and how does Washington, DC compare.
- See accompanying presentation by Katie Hagan of the Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University.



Adequacy Study Resource Specifications

- In response to a question raised at the September meeting, what resources did the Adequacy Study include in their specifications for at risk, English language learner, and special education students?
- After the Edunomics Lab presentation, how should we approach the Adequacy Study's resources and specifications?



Adequacy Study Resource Specifications for Special Populations: Staff

- Additional staff to support special needs students: at-risk students, English language learners, and special education students
 - **At-risk students:** additional teachers to lower class sizes for at-risk students in secondary schools; additional pupil support positions, such as counselors, nurses, psychologists, social workers, and family liaisons (roughly 100:1); interventionists (100:1); and district-level services
 - **English language learners:** ELL teachers (15:1 for Levels 1 and 2, 22:1 for Level 3); pupil support positions (100:1); bilingual aides (50:1); bilingual service provider (ELL coordinator) positions; and district-level services
 - **Special education students:** Special education teachers (ranging from 22:1 to 8:1 by level of need); instructional aides for higher need levels; additional pupil support (psychologists and social workers) and therapist support (speech, occupational, and physical therapy); school-level special education coordinators; and district-level services



Adequacy Study Resource Specifications for Special Populations: Programs

- Before- and after-school programs for at-risk students and ELL students (100% of at risk and Level 1 and Level 2 ELL students)
- Summer school for at-risk and ELL students (100% of at-risk students and all Level 1 and Level 2 ELL students); and summer bridge programs for students entering 9th grade



At Risk Characteristics

- In response to a question raised at the September meeting, are there overlaps in the characteristics of at risk students found when looking more in depth at the definition?



At Risk Sub-Categories: Overlap

- FY18 characteristics of students at risk of academic failure:
 - 1% are students in foster care
 - 14% are students who are homeless
 - 44% are students who live in low-income families eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
 - 86% are students who qualify for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
 - 11% are high school students that are one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which the student is enrolled
- Overlap of characteristics
 - Students can be in more than one category simultaneously; only one category is necessary to be considered at risk of academic failure



At Risk Sub-Categories: Overlap

	TANF	SNAP	CFSA	Homeless	Overage	
TANF		47%		18%	47%	19%
SNAP	92%			25%	67%	43%
CFSA	0.4%	0.3%			1%	1%
Homeless	15%	11%				43%
Overage	5%	5%		11%	34%	

Examples: 47% of SNAP eligible are TANF eligible.

92% of TANF eligible are SNAP eligible.

Note: Based on 17-18 enrollment audit data



School Outcomes: Bold Performance Schools

- In response to a question raised at the September meeting, which schools with high at risk student populations perform at higher levels when compared with similar schools?



School Outcomes: Bold Performance Schools



2018 **BOLD** SCHOOLS



SCHOOL (WARD)	AT-RISK	PERCENT PROFICIENT ABOVE EXPECTATIONS
KIPP DC Heights ES (8)	59 %	33.5 %
KIPP DC Promise ES (7)	57 %	33.2 %
Ketcham ES (8)	80 %	22.6 %
KIPP DC Lead ES (6)	42 %	19.6 %
Marie Reed ES (1)	35 %	17.6 %
DC Prep Benning MS (7)	49 %	17.3 %
H.D. Cooke ES (1)	54 %	17.2 %
DC Prep Benning ES (7)	61 %	16.8 %
KIPP DC KEY MS (7)	51 %	16.7 %
Friendship Blow-Pierce MS (5)	73 %	16.5 %
Thurgood Marshall HS (8)	61 %	16.3 %
Truesdell ES (4)	57 %	16.1 %
Friendship Chamberlain MS (6)	60 %	16.1 %
Washington Leadership HS (5)	54 %	15.7 %
Rocketship Rise ES (8)	77 %	15.7 %
KIPP DC Quest (7)	58 %	15.4 %
DC Prep Edgewood MS (5)	36 %	15.2 %
Ingenuity Prep (8)	61 %	14.5 %
KIPP DC Spring ES (5)	49 %	14.3 %
Friendship Tech Prep HS (8)	61 %	12.8 %
Noyes EC (5)	77 %	12.2 %
Barnard ES (4)	48 %	11.7 %
Walker-Jones (6)	82 %	11.1 %
Stanton ES (8)	90 %	11.0 %



School Outcomes: Bold Performance Schools





At Risk Discussion: Driving Questions

- National perspective
 - What was interesting/compelling from the national landscape review?
 - When looking to the report, are there areas we need to further study to provide our recommendations?
- At Risk Concentration and Definition
 - Should at risk concentrations be considered in the UPSFF (school-level, student-level, both)?
 - How do we know if our at risk definition captures the right students?
- At Risk and Outcomes
 - How can the Bold Performance analysis inform the working group's recommendation on at risk?
 - What information is necessary to better understand school outcomes?



Public Comment

- Time for non-members to provide feedback or comments



Up Next

- Next Meeting: November 29, 3:30-5:00
- Draft Agenda:
 - Focus area topics
 - Develop preliminary recommendations