Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations Fiscal Responsibility

1. GENERAL INFORMATION				
Date:	December 6, 2021	Time:	12:00 pm – 1:00 pm	
Location:	Microsoft TEAMS			
Chair:	Justin Owen			
Members in Attendance:	Justin Owen Katherine Hudgins Chris Littleton Tom Tunnicliffe Harry Brooks Michael Hendrix Jim Ethier Kate Thompson David Perdue Karen King Tara Bergfield Senator Shane Reeves *Member names in bold indicate	those pres	sent for this meeting.	

2. DIRECTIONS	
Торіс	



Please list specific resources that you would like to see incorporated into the funding formula. (In other words, what resources do you think are most important so that the cost of those resources can be included. It does not mean a district MUST spend money in a certain way, only that they would be funded to do so). Please indicate whether each resource is a:

- **Must Have:** Those resources required as a result of federal and/or state law, for safety, or similar.
- **Should Have:** Those resources that may not be mandatory but are essential to ensure the student or student group receives access to a quality education.
- **Nice to Have:** Those resources that are not mandatory and not essential, but (1) may provide a clear and added benefit to students and (2) have a clear return on the investment related to student achievement and future success.
- Long Shot: All other resource ideas.

For each resource, please assign a cost to the resource, if you have it. Subcommittees may assign those amounts, but please also know that resource values will also be reviewed with additional input submitted by LEAs, national experts, and research.

	Subcommittee Comments
Base	
Weights	 Could consider grade differentials as adjustments in the base Pre-K Rewarding in reference to performance (should put this in outcomes) Concentration of poverty (must have) Rural (should have)- acknowledgement that some places have a higher cost of living – wages have to be higher to compete in higher population areas The ability to generate taxes in rural areas is a concern Gap between rural and urban is closing

Public Feedback Comments



Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

	 Maybe look at rural with high population of economically disadvantaged students Small LEA size – what sort of baseline measures will be created – a standard that will be set -what accommodations need to be put in formula? We currently fund school districts not schools – is there going to be a requirement that districts must distribute funds in the same way or will they autonomy to allocate funds to schools as they see fit? – need to balance this with flexibility for school leaders as well Weights need to be done at school level – populations at every school are different (high population of ELs in one school, high poverty in a school, etc.), not at the district level
Direct Funding	 [Will discuss during January 6 meeting] . <
Outcomes	 [Will discuss during January 6 meeting] . <
Other	 Keep local autonomy – every school district is different (maintenance of effort on the state side as well as on the local side) Ensuring that funding is tied to student and school need – parents the opportunity to know how students and classes are getting the resources they need – different parts of TN have different needs Should not allow this to become a mathematical decision – final number and then work backwards – need to consider what is a valid multiplier – study the weights and do research- understand what a good weighted number is for each of these things Choice is a huge driver for parents – when we talk about dollars (Charter, private, homeschool) – the amount needed to homeschool someone is not the same as in the traditional school setting– if the formula ends up allowing the dollars to follow students – what is happening with the remaining money? Is it retained in the district?- It costs more to educate



 a child with special needs – if a child isn't receiving money because they are homeschooling – where does that money go? We are after a+b=x with x being a number that covers the needs No matter how we wind up we will end up spending more money Keep the eye on the ball – giving flexibility to districts to innovate -keep money tied to student characteristics and needs and staying away from
pet projects
 It's about return on investment. Where are we going to get the biggest bang statewide- strike the balance between being good stewards and return on investment for kids
• What are the principles that need to be met? What are some guardrails that we can provide that deal with the components we are discussing?
 Transparency, school level flexibility, better outcome-based funding A way for funds to follow the student instead of the system – but find a method in the midst of this to ensure how the dollars are spent (this could be a topic for next meeting)
• We currently fund school districts not schools – is there going to be a requirement that districts must distribute funds in the same way or will they autonomy to allocate funds to schools as they see fit- need to balance this with flexibility as well
 Needs to be done at school level – populations at every school are
different (high population of ELs in one school, high poverty in a school,
etc.)Recommendation to look at Florida's approach

Resource Feedback

MUST HAVE
 Weighted Category Class size requirements – may need to have a larger weight for elementary due to smaller class size restrictions ELs – all tiers but also consideration for newcomers/refugee status Students with Disabilities - include dyslexia, gifted & talented Economically Disadvantaged Career and Tech – pieces related to law in Weighted and other pieces in Direct Funding Generally anything mandated by state law, unless state law is changed



SHOULD HAVE

- Fast Growing
- Rural TBD
- •

NICE TO HAVE

- •
- •
- •
- •

LONG SHOT

- •
- •
- •

4. FINAL THOUGHTS

