

# **AN ANALYSIS OF BOARD POLICY #9001 AND CURRENT PRACTICE**

**September 25, 2006**

## **BACKGROUND**

Board Policy #9001 was recommended by Superintendent Cheryl Wilhoyte and adopted by the Board of Education in 1994. The Board Policy did not replace a previous policy. Following the Board's approval, the policy was not implemented.

From 1994-96 there was no standard method of allocating resources to the schools. Prior to the implementation of the Revenue Cap Law there were ample funds to provide staff resources as requested by each school. The effect of the imposition of the Revenue Cap made the need to control resources clear.

The basic allocation structure was established as K-1 = 22:1, 2-3 = 23.5:1 and 4-5 = 25:1 at the elementary schools. Middle and high schools continued to be staffed based on the requests of the schools after reviewing the previous year's allocations. Each year, parents and school staffs actively lobbied the Board of Education for additional resources. The Board of Education and/or administration responded to some requests and not to others. The responses to the requests were not based on any criteria.

In 1996 two things became obvious. First, the Revenue Cap, over time, was going to substantially affect the available resources and second, the lack of a systematic way to assign resources based on student need was not meeting the expressed desire of the Board of Education and the administration to provide resources to schools based on student need.

There are now three strategies for distributing the resources based on student need:

- The administration developed the current Equity Resource Formula (ERF) as a systematic way to provide staff resources funded through the operating budget to schools based on student need (See Attachment A). The formula was reviewed with the Board of Education for comment and change. It was implemented for the 1996-97 school year. The formula, with minor changes, has been implemented consistently since.

- The Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program was first initiated by the State of Wisconsin for the 1996-97 school year. The SAGE program provides funds to lower class sizes in grades K-3. The program was phased in over several years.
- ESEA Title 1 federal funds dedicated to educationally disadvantaged children (as determined by receiving free or reduced lunch) have always been distributed based on the student poverty level in individual schools, and was not affected by the adoption of the ERF.

### **ANALYSIS OF BOARD POLICY #9001 AND CURRENT PRACTICE**

The following narrative analyzes current practice relative to the various sections of Equity Policy #9001. The narrative addresses each paragraph of the policy (in bold type) individually.

#### **Purpose**

**This policy provides guidance for the Board to provide an equitable educational opportunity for each student to obtain the 100% success objectives of Madison Schools 2000 in the most effective and economical manner.**

#### **Current Status:**

*The Board of Education defined the vision for equitable opportunity for students in approving the Strategic Plan. The vision states:*

- *All students have the academic and interpersonal skills to become independent learners capable of making informed decisions in our multicultural world.*
- *Race, class, disability, sexual orientation, gender, or home language of origin other than English do not predict academic achievement.*
- *The learning environment is emotionally and physically safe and orderly, and the contributions of all are valued and respected.*

*The vision's definition of the expectations for success for each child and institution guides everything that we do.*

*Throughout my tenure as both Deputy Superintendent and Superintendent, it has been a general tenet of the administration and*

*Board of Education that an equal educational opportunity for all children requires that resources must be distributed based on the needs of individual children. The equitable distribution of resources as currently practiced includes:*

- *Staff resources distributed to schools based on the aggregate educational needs of the students enrolled in the school (Equity Resource Formula),*
- *Smaller class sizes in the elementary school based on poverty index of the school (SAGE program),*
- *ESEA Title 1 funds distributed based on the number of educationally disadvantaged children in the school.*

### **Goals**

**The policy goals are twofold: (1) that all students will be provided an equitable educational opportunity in a diverse setting and (2) that all students will achieve in accordance with the 100% success objectives**

### **Current Status:**

*The Board of Education adopted three goals relative to student performance for the district in 1998. The goals are:*

- *All students complete 3<sup>rd</sup> grade radiant grade level or beyond.*
- *All students complete Algebra by the end of 9<sup>th</sup> grade and Geometry by the end of 10<sup>th</sup> grade.*
- *The district wide attendance rate is at least 94%.*

*These three goals establish the 100% success objectives referenced in the policy.*

*The district demographics have undergone substantial change since the policy was adopted in 1994. For example, in 1994 the district was 21% low income as measured by students receiving free or reduced*

*lunch. Last year, the district was 38% low income based on the same measure.*

*As of the 2005-06 school year there were only two schools in the district whose low income percentage is below the 1994 district average of 21%. Elvehjem Elementary School had 16% low income and Hamilton Middle School had 18% low income in 2006. All other schools currently exceed the district average for 1994.*

*The current demographics of the district mean that all schools, to varying degrees, currently meet the definition in the policy that "Diverse setting is defined as a setting in which students have the opportunity to come in contact with students of other races and socio-economic levels."*

### **Review**

**In accordance with the purpose and goals of this policy, staff will review and prioritize the needs of each individual school in the District (noting schools with student populations which exceed 15% over the district wide average of students receiving [eligible for] free and reduced lunch) and District needs based upon an annual examination of various student success indicators as they relate to achievement, participation, climate, and attitude.**

### **Current Status:**

*The staff statistically reviews every school relative to the educational needs of the individual students in the school. The policy does not require any specific action relative to the schools that are 15% or more above the district low income percentage. The current diversity of the district requires the careful monitoring of all our schools.*

*The administration developed and presented to the Board of Education the Educational Framework which guides all of our student achievement strategies. The Framework defines the three components of education as Engagement, Learning and Relationships. The Framework was defined based on the best current research, much of which was not available in 1994, thus the difference in language.*

The review of the educational needs of each individual school is accomplished through the statistical review that is part of the Equity Resource Formula (ERF). The formula establishes an Educational Needs Index (ENI) for each child based on the presence for that child of the demographic and educational factors that statistically show an effect on student performance (See **Attachment A**).

The elementary factors below are an example of the factors used in the analysis:

**ELEMENTARY DEMOGRAPHIC AND EDUCATIONAL FACTORS INCLUDING WEIGHTS.**

Non ESL/EEN Portion (87% of total supplemental pool)

Free Lunch	80%
Reduced Lunch	5%
Parent Education less than college	5%
Lives with 2 adults	5%
Average More than 1 school change per year	5%

ESL/EEN Portion (13% of total supplemental pool)\*

ESL	25%
CD or autistic	25%
ED	25%
LD	25%

\*The ESL/EEN portion of the formula affects the allocation of regular education staff resources. Both ESL and Special Education (EEN) staff are allocated separately based on formulas unique to those categories.

The ERF statistical analysis assigns each school an Educational Needs Index (ENI) based on the aggregate of the individual student's ENI. The school's ENI establishes their relative need for additional resources.

**Reporting**

**After review and prioritization, the Superintendent will recommend implementation strategies as appropriate and, upon Board approval, the strategies will be initiated. The strategies may include differentiated resource allocation in relationship to staffing, facilities, and program options.**

## Current Status

*There are several implementation strategies utilized by the Superintendent and staff to address the provision of an equitable educational opportunity as defined in the policy.*

### *1. Equity Resource Formulas*

*The regular education staff allocations are assigned to the schools using the distribution method that is part of the ERF.*

*The design of the ERF staff allocation distribution methodology was designed by the principals of each school level, the Assistant Superintendents and the Deputy Superintendent when the formula was created in 1996. Given the expected continued reduction of future resources the formula was designed to distribute the resources available and not create new resources.*

*The formula provides three types of resources, Base (allocations provided based on the enrollment of the school), Supplemental (allocations provided based on the ENI of the school) and Targeted (allocations provided to the school for specific positions i.e. librarians). The high schools chose to have no supplemental resources in the original design of the plan (see **Attachment B**).*

*Student Services Staff are assigned using a similar type of formula based on student need. The special education staff is distributed based on a formula that takes into account both the severity of the disability(s) of the individual students and the number of students on the special education staff member's case load.*

*The approach embodied in the ERF aligns the staff resources available to a school based on the defined educational need of each individual child.*

### *2. Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE)*

*The SAGE program provides categorical state funding for the reduction of class sizes in grades K-3 to 15 students to 1 teacher. The funding provides \$2,000 for each child who receives free or reduced lunch. The funding is school specific and is granted under a five year contract.*

*The SAGE program was phased into the district over a period of years. The initial schools, Mendota, Glendale and Midvale, began the implementation in the 1996-97 school year on funding provided by the state. Additional schools were added to the program as the state increased the available funding and federal ESEA Title 2 Class Size Reduction funds were added.*

*When the district reached a point that the majority of our schools were scheduled to be involved in the SAGE program, the use of the supplemental resources available to elementary schools was analyzed. The analysis showed that the majority of the supplemental resources were used to lower class size. The decision was made to reduce the supplemental pool by the amount needed to provide additional operating budget dollars to fund small class sizes in more schools than could be provided under the funding from SAGE and Federal Class Size Reduction funds (ESEA Title2).*

*The initial full implementation of the program established small class sizes in all of the elementary schools except for the seven schools which had the least concentration of poverty (lower than 25%). Over time four of the seven schools exceeded the low income percentage of the schools that were part of the original group of SAGE schools. The SAGE program was added to each of the schools using operating budget funds when this threshold was reached.*

*The methodology used to implement the SAGE program creates three tiers of class sizes based on % of low income students in the school.*

- 1. District Base Allocation – these schools are staffed at the district base allocation (K-1 = 22:1, 2-3 = 23.5:1, 4-5 = 25:1). There is no additional allocation to lower class size.*
- 2. SAGE Literacy Block – these schools are staffed at the district base allocation with additional allocations provided to lower class sizes (K-1 = 15:1, 2-3 = 15:1 for math and reading 23.5:1 rest of the day, 4-5 = 25:1)*
- 3. SAGE Full Day – Schools that are over 50% low income receive the base allocation plus additional allocations to lower their class sizes in grade K-3 to 15:1 for all classes (K-3 = 15:1, 4-5 = 25:1).*

#### *ESEA Title 1*

*The district receives funds from the federal government through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title 1 for educationally*

*disadvantaged children. The amount of funding is based on the % of low income children, as measured by those receiving free or reduced lunch in the district. The law provides strict rules governing the allocation and use of these funds. Schools whose percentage of low income students exceeds the district's average of low income students, including private school student living in the school's attendance zone, are eligible to receive Title 1 funds. A portion of the Title 1 funds are also required to be distributed to private schools.*

*The allocation for Title 1 is a per pupil allotment based on the low income percentage of the school, with higher poverty schools receiving more funding per child than lower poverty schools. Schools that are more than 40% low income may use their funding to support all students in the school. School below 40% poverty must target their funds directly to individual children who are educationally disadvantaged.*

*The complete staffing for each school is approved by the Board of Education as part of the budget process.*

**The Superintendent will present to the Board an annual report which will include each school's educational goals and diversity profile. The report will also contain the progress or lack of progress each school has made toward reaching its goals, and appropriate recommendations for further action designed to achieve the goals. As part of the annual report, if the Superintendent recommends the transfer of students from one school to another for diversity purposes, then the Superintendent's annual report shall provide strategies which reflect how the students subject to transfer will be provided an equal educational opportunity to achieve the District's 100% success objectives.**

*Current Status:*

*The Board of Education adopted three educational goals for the district. These goals apply to all of our schools. The Superintendent presents an annual report to the Board of Education on the progress of the district relative to the three goals. The annual report is disaggregated based on race/ethnicity, gender, and special education and ESL/Bilingual students. The report tracks progress on the three goals over time. The annual report also presents the District's demographic profile both currently and historically.*



*Each school establishes individual goals, objectives and strategies related to their School Improvement Plan to facilitate the achievement of the district's three goals. The individual School Improvement Plans have not been routinely provided to the Board of Education except by request. There is no barrier to providing the reports to the Board of Education if you so desire.*

*The district also provides reports, both current and historical, on the achievement of each school relative to performance on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Test and previously the Wisconsin Third Grade Reading Assessment (since discontinued). The reports have not been routinely provided to the Board of Education individually but are available on the district's website and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction WINNS website. There is no barrier to providing the test results in hard copy to the Board of Education if you so desire.*

*The district provides reports, available on the district's website and on the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction WINNS website, showing the diversity of each school based on both race/ethnicity and poverty for each year and historically. There is no barrier to providing the reports to the Board of Education in hard copy if you so desire.*

*Although the policy provides the option for the Superintendent to recommend transfers of students to achieve diversity in the district, I have not chosen to exercise that option. The Board of Education and the administration reviews the diversity of each school population as a part of the yearly long range planning process.*

### **Definitions**

- 1. Equity is defined as providing each student with an equal educational opportunity to achieve the District's 100% success objectives.**
- 2. Differentiated Resource Allocation is defined as the resources utilized to provide for the educational needs of students to ensure students receive an equal opportunity to achieve the District's 100% success objectives.**
- 3. Diverse setting is defined as a setting in which students have the opportunity to come in contact with students of other races and socio-economic levels.**
- 4. 100% success objectives is defined as students who graduate, students who complete their individual academic program, students who enroll in a post-secondary**

**educational program, or students who are self-sufficient in other endeavors.**

Current Status:

*The definitions of equity are self explanatory. The language used to describe various aspects of equity have changed over time and with new knowledge gained by ongoing research, but the fundamental underlying principles are the same.*

**Application and Review**

**This policy applies to situations that affect students within one school, or between or among several schools, and will be reviewed every three years.**

Current Status:

*To my knowledge this is the first review of the policy.*

**ATTACHMENT A**

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENI WEIGHTS**

**Non ESL/EEN Portion (87% of total supplemental pool)**

ENI1 = Free lunch	80%
Reduced lunch	5%
Parent Education Less Than College	5%
Lives with Less than 2 Adults	5%
Average More Than 1 School Change Per Year	5%
	<hr/>
	100%

**ESL/EEN Portion (13% of total supplemental pool)**

ENI2 = ESL	25%
CD or Autistic	25%
ED	25%
LD	25%
	<hr/>
	100%

**MIDDLE SCHOOL ENI WEIGHTS**

**Non ESL/EEN Portion (87% of total supplemental pool)**

ENI1 = Free or Reduced Lunch	35%
Parent Education Less Than College	45%
Lives with Less than 2 Adults	20%
	<hr/>
	100%

**ESL/EEN Portion (13% of total supplemental pool)**

ENI2 = ESL	25%
CD or Autistic	25%
ED	25%
LD	25%
	<hr/>
	100%

**HIGH SCHOOL ENI WEIGHTS**

**Non ESL/EEN Portion (100% of total supplemental pool)**

ENI = Free or Reduced Lunch	25%
Parent Education Less Than College	20%
Lives with Less than 2 Adults	15%
Average More Than 1 School Change Per Year	30%
Years Enrolled in District Less Than 8	10%
	<hr/>
	100%

The High Schools do not include ESL/EEN criteria in their supplemental allocation formula calculations.

5 Dec 9/25/06

**ATTACHMENT B**

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:  
EQUITY RESOURCE FORMULA**

**Why do we need an Equity Resource Formula (ERF)?**

The primary reason for having a formula-driven process for distributing staffing allocations is to ensure that all schools are treated fairly. Various attendance area study committees originally raised the issue in 1995, groups comprised of parents, teachers and principals. What they discovered was that in the past some school communities were better able to articulate their positions regarding resource needs. This often came at the expense of other communities that weren't as well organized. The formula takes a look at the factors that drive achievement, based on student data, and applies those factors consistently across all schools.

**How does the formula work?**

The formula contains three types of allocations: Base, Supplemental, and Targeted. Base allocations are set to maintain a standard level of services to all children, and generally represent classroom teachers. Targeted allocations are those resources that continue to be mandated by the District at pre-determined amounts, and includes art, music, physical education, talented and gifted teachers as well as librarians and other special programs (like Title 1 and Reading Recovery). Supplemental allocations, based on the idea that some children face greater educational challenges, allow resources to follow children with greater needs regardless of where they attend school in the district.

Taken together, the base and supplemental allocations at each school are designed to be flexible, so that each individual school addresses the unique needs of its students. Schools are encouraged to be innovative in how they use their base and supplemental allocations to meet their goals.

**What factors are used to distribute allocations across schools?**

Total student enrollment is used to distribute the base allocation, using a student-to-teacher ratio for each grade level. For Kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade the ratio is 22:1, at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grades the ratio is 23.5:1, and at 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades the ratio is 25:1. A new feature begun last year is the K-5 Base allocation "round up," in which the sum of the original grade level Base allocations are rounded up to the nearest whole allocation (e.g., 17.6 is rounded to 18.0). Supplemental allocations are made based on several factors, all of which represent achievement needs of children. Finally, factors affecting targeted allocations come in large part from the policy decisions of the administration and Board of Education.

*Spec 9/25/06*

**What specific factors are used to make sure "resources follow needs" with the Supplemental allocations?**

The factors selected for the supplemental portion of the formula were arrived at by analyzing the achievement data of MMSD children against such things as poverty, attendance rates, mobility rates, exceptional educational need (EEN) status, and minority status. Ultimately, poverty (as measured by whether or not children qualify for free- or reduced-price lunches) was selected as the most critical factor in determining the supplemental portion of the total allocation.

Feedback from principals and other administrators indicated that while poverty was unquestionably the most significant variable contributing to student achievement, other factors should be included as well. The formula as it currently stands, includes the following factors in addition to income status: parent education, number of adults living with the child, student mobility, children categorized as EEN, and limited English proficiency.

**What types of allocations are "targeted" by the administration and/or Board of Education?**

Examples of targeted allocations include: Reading Recovery program services allocated to achieve the greatest gains in literacy districtwide; the BOE has determined that a full time librarian should be allocated to each elementary school; and, federal rules also determine where Title I resources can be allocated.

**So how do all of the allocation types – Targeted, Base, and Supplemental – compare in terms of each part's share of the whole pool of allocations available to elementary schools?**

As it stands now, at the elementary level the breakdown of allocations across these three categories is approximately: Targeted - 28%, Base - 64%, and Supplemental - 8%.

The attached chart shows the detail of the whole "pie" of elementary allocations for the upcoming 1999-2000 school year. It also breaks out the proportion of "Supplemental" allocations associated with each of the need factors.

**Were any other changes made to the formula this year?**

The only change to the ERF this was the "round up" calculation for the Base allocation referred to earlier. That is, after grade level allocations were calculated using the designated student to staff ratios, the total Base was rounded up to the nearest whole allocation. For example, if a school was calculated to obtain 17.6 Base allocations, their total was raised to 18.0.

### **How does the ERF affect my school?**

Each school will be evaluated using an objective, across-the-board process. The recommended formula will allow the Board of Education to continue to establish policy, let administrators manage, and afford school communities the opportunity to determine the path that best accomplishes overall goals within their schools. Schools are encouraged to use the Base and Supplemental pools in ways that are innovative in achieving the goals their school community has established. In sum, the ERF is designed to let the Board identify the “ends” and schools the “means” to achieve them.

### **What if I have additional questions about the proposed formula?**

The building principal is the first person to turn to with questions about the allocation formula. If questions remain, it may be necessary to ask the area Assistant Superintendent to become involved. You and the principal can decide this.