

# Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

## *Rural and Small Districts Subcommittee*

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	January 27, 2022	<b>Time:</b>	11:30 am CST – 12:30 pm CST
<b>Location:</b>	<a href="#">Microsoft TEAMS</a>		
<b>Chair:</b>	Chair: Janet Ayers Vice Chair: Shawn Kimble		
<b>Members in Attendance:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Janet Ayers</b></li><li>• <b>Allen Pratt</b></li><li>• Charlie Hatcher</li><li>• <b>Jerry Boyd</b></li><li>• <b>Mike Garren</b></li><li>• <b>Kristy Brown</b></li><li>• <b>Shawn Kimble</b></li><li>• <b>Norma Gerrell</b></li><li>• <b>Eddie Pruett</b></li><li>• <b>William Curtis</b></li><li>• John Stevens</li><li>• Ron Gant</li><li>• <b>Lillian Hartgrove</b></li></ul>		

*\*Member names in bold indicate those present for this meeting.*

### 2. DIRECTIONS

#### Topic

Please consider policy questions outlined in this document. Subcommittees may provide more policy ideas or considerations as well.

## Subcommittee Policy Reflections and Feedback

### OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS/CONCERNS:

- THERE SHOULD BE CONSIDERATION OF RECONVENING OF SUBCOMMITTEES AS THE WORK CONTINUES.
- POLICY SHOULD INCLUDE A FORMAL REVIEW OF FORMULA ON A REGULAR BASIS (NOT WAITING SO LONG).

Policy Idea	Subcommittee Feedback
<b>Policy: Definition of Economically Disadvantaged</b>	Current: Direct Certification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disparity here – take F/R lunch into consideration, particularly where situational poverty is play. Better reflects school/local community.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy: Definition of Concentration of Poverty</b>	Current: Attending a Title I School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include: Attending a Title I '<u>eligible</u>' school (or over 40% vs. attending).</li> <li>• Are there any 'targeted assist' left vs. whole school?</li> </ul>
<b>Policy: Definition of Sparsity</b>	Current: Students per square mile (federal is 10, but the range is 10-25 students) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students per sq mile better represents rather than total number of students</li> </ul>
<b>Policy: Teacher Salaries</b>	Question: What, if any, requirements should the formula require on investing new education dollars into existing educator salaries moving forward? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in teacher salaries (mitigate challenges regarding recruitment and retention efforts). Base salary increase.</li> <li>• Consider additional supplements for teaching in districts that are in rural areas. *Not local capacity to implement – comes from state level via funding formula.</li> <li>• In response to the challenge of NOT being able to based on the current BEP.</li> </ul>

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<p><b>Policy: Teacher Salaries</b></p>	<p>Question: Are there any other policies for teacher salaries that should be included?</p>
<p><b>Policy: Tutoring</b></p>	<p>Question: This is required for students who score at “Below” on the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade TCAP beginning SY23-24. Should there be funding included in the formula for this legally required support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>YES!!!</b></li> <li>• Above grade 3 as well</li> <li>• HS NEED</li> <li>• School-day tutoring and before/after school when appropriate</li> <li>• Include transportation funding</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: CTE</b></p>	<p>Question: Please review the CTE content and provide feedback on how TN may choose to address CTE considerations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>WEIGHTS <u>and</u> DIRECT FUNDING:</b> Upstart and growth in CTE programming based on local needs/industry/agriculture/etc. to support sustainability efforts and foster innovation.</li> <li>• <b>OUTCOMES:</b> reward those districts that are doing the work/seeing success, not to those who have programs but failing to innovate and push the needle.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: K-2 Weight</b></p>	<p>Question from the Steering Committee: How might you consider a K-2 weight or additional investment in the earlier grades?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Funding to cover:</b> curriculum, intervention needs/staffing in ELA and math, smaller class sized to impact individualized student support, ...</li> <li>• Emphasize the importance of small class sizes in K-2!</li> <li>• Funding to hire/retain educational assistants in K-2 (1.25)</li> <li>• Investment in early education = return in higher grades</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: Outcomes</b></p>	<p>Question from the Steering Committee: They would like to see outcomes options for <b>middle school</b>. What outcomes does your subcommittee recommend?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>outcome/assessment – transitioning to high school. Explore equivalent.</b></li> </ul>

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<p><b>Policy: Outcomes</b></p>	<p>Question from the Steering Committee: They would like to see other outcomes options for <b>elementary school</b>. What outcomes does your subcommittee recommend?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy outcome</li> <li>• Formative assessment/benchmarks (vs. summative)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: Accountability</b></p>	<p>Question from the Steering Committee: What accountability measures should be included in any new formula proposal, or what ideas do you have?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasize BOTH ach and growth!</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: Reporting</b></p>	<p>Question: What information should be included in public reporting for school and for district level financials?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue state report card – maintain what we already have.</li> <li>• Consider links on district websites to emphasize transparency.</li> <li>• More robust training at the state level for finance directors – come prepared for the job.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: Funding Year</b></p>	<p>Question: Should funding reflect the <b>current year or the prior year</b> (as it does now)? For fast-growing districts, it may be beneficial to receive the funds in real time to meet the costs of that year and for declining enrollment districts, it may be harder to adjust budgets in real time. Given that challenge, are there mitigation ideas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: ADM Shifts</b></p>	<p>Question: Student enrollment may fluctuate down in a given year (up or down). Should there be any consideration for hold harmless or fixed costs, or should the funding be specific and reflective of the actual enrollment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q: how will ADM shift with new funding formula?</li> <li>• <b>Hold harmless really needs to be a provision</b></li> <li>• Be aware of contractual obligation that must be filled. How will the new formula impact?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy: Maintenance of Effort</b></p>	<p>Question: How should we consider Maintenance of Effort at the local level? (It provides consistent funding but may deter local investment because of the requirement to continue).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOE needs to be mandatory!</li> </ul>

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<p><b>Policy: Professional Development and Training</b></p>	<p>Question: Are there any professional development opportunities or additional supports that should be provided?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All legislated/mandated PD must be funded!</li> </ul>
<p><b>Definition of Rural:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distance – miles - from urban/suburban (locale number)</li> <li>• District and school considerations</li> <li>• School enrollment</li> <li>• District enrollment</li> <li>• Size of the town</li> <li>• Geographic size of district</li> <li>• Geographic challenges (mtn / rivers vs. miles)</li> <li>• impact of local fiscal capacity – tax base / amount of debt</li> <li>• Tied to county designation (rural, distressed, etc...)</li> </ul> <p>Further research numbers attached to the above. Specific to TN.</p> <p>Delineation between the different levels of rural and sparsity.</p> <p>Tierd</p> <p>All rural factors may not be included, but should be taken into consideration when determining rural qualifications.</p>
<p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>Content</p>
<p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>Content</p>
<p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>Content</p>
<p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>Content</p>