



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF

EDUCATION

**UPSFF Working Group
Meeting
September 7, 2016, 3:00-5:00pm**

DRAFT Minutes

Attendees: Shana Young, James Albright, Ryan Aurori, Jenn Comey, Justin Ellis, Allen Francois, Faida Fuller, Irene Holzman, Ed Lazere, Mary Levy, Mikayla Lytton, Julie Meyer, Cathy Reilly, Kim Reuben, Kathy Rowland.

Introductions

- Introductions were made
- Group reviewed summary of previous meeting

Review of Minutes, September 7, 2016

- Draft minutes were distributed to the group for review and comment
- No comments on minutes as drafted

Review of Scope of Committee

- An overview was provided about the role of the committee, and the proposed scope of the discussion in advance of OSSE's January report, including reflection on Adequacy Study and implementation to date, including At-Risk; impact of LEA payment methodology changes; outstanding UPSFF policy questions such as adult/alternative and students with 504 plans; and comparisons to other states and jurisdictions
- An overview was provided of the initial scope that was proposed by the committee in the June UPSFF meeting, including: Analysis of current supplemental funding rates including At-risk (by eligibility type), SPED, and consideration of impact and unintended policy consequences; analysis of impact of "non-instructional" costs and spending in schools (e.g. health, nutrition, social svc); Impact of changing LEA payment methodologies; Facilities funding; and UPSFF rates/allocation by grade
- The group reviewed these topics including which had been covered and which were determined to be too broad in scope for review under the committee's timeline.
- The committee expressed its interest in being able to submit recommendations as part of the process and OSSE report.

Review Data Analysis

- Data was reviewed examining the impact of At-Risk funding, and increase in funding compared to previous Summer School allocation.
 - o It was noted that almost all LEAs saw an increase in funding. In the first transition year, 11 LEAs did not see an increase that totaled 2.5%, and got a one-year supplement to cover the difference. This difference was at least partially related to the demographics which some schools served.
 - o Discussion of the benefit of less paperwork to document summer school for the purposes of funding, since At-Risk is more automated.

- Discussion of the impact of the trend of extended school-day and school-year programming and whether UPSFF funding levels/methodologies should adapt to meet those needs.
 - o Discussion that the current funding levels are based on 180-day school year, and how to measure extended instructional time that could happen with extended hours per day, or more days in the year. Also, that not all year-round school is necessarily more instructional hours.
 - o Discussion of whether funding policy could incentivize year-round school

- Discussion of impact of funding changes to LEA stability, including:
 - o Impact of frequent rate changes on LEA ability to plan
 - o Benefit/risks of frequent smaller changes or less frequent more substantial rate changes.
 - o Desire to see the impact of LEA payment methodologies before other major changes are made

- Discussion of grade-level rate allocations
 - o Other district comparisons are not necessarily similar, but most recent changes to UPSFF were made based on Adequacy Study
 - o Noting that other comp cities fund middle school at a higher rate, discussion of possible reasons

- Discussion of other outstanding UPSFF policy questions, including:
 - o Extended School Year (ESY) funding for special education student summer school, and need to fix rates because Level 4 funding is equal to Level 3 funding, when it should be higher. Likely due to error in transcription at some point. Committee agreed this should be fixed.
 - o Funding for 504 plans – there is no current UPSFF allocation for 504 plans, there was discussion as to if there should be. Broadly there was not support to create UPSFF funding specifically for 504, discussion included:
 - Range of diagnoses that 504 covers
 - Potential for increased burdensome regulation that might come with funding
 - Current autonomy granted to LEAs for 504 policies

- Less funding needed to implement 504 overall; potential lack of cost-benefit

Discussion of Next Meeting

- The committee discussed potential framework for next meeting, including coming up with recommendations. Potential agenda topics included:
 - State of SPED recommendations from Adequacy Study and following legislation
 - At-Risk funding and potential further needs for At-Risk or the base funding if At-Risk does not cover full cost
 - Recommendations for application of a percent increase to funding (overall increase, specific increase, etc.)