

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
Enrollment Projections	<p>The documents use very different figures for 2015-16 high school enrollments than appeared in the November enrollment package. This is true of both the projected (7,490 vs 7,285) and actual (7,583 vs 7,135). The projections and actuals do not appear to have been changed for K-5 and Middle Schools. Can we get an explanation?</p> <p>There also appear to be re-estimates of projected 2016-17 students at all three levels since November 30 totaling 451 fewer. Can we get details on what has changed in the last two months to produce these new estimates?</p> <p>Last, I would like information about 4K enrollments and budgets to be consistently provided and considered with other budget materials.</p>	<p>Our primary focus at this point is the FTE commitment associated with the staffing workbooks and the enrollment numbers that drive the workbooks. At the high school level, the staffing workbooks are used only for the four big high schools so we use an enrollment count which <u>excludes the IAE sites</u>.</p> <p>If attempting to use the September 3rd Friday enrollment count as a point of comparison versus the staffing workbook enrollment count, there will be a difference, as you've noted. Again, since the IAE enrollment is <u>included</u> in the 3rd Friday count and <u>excluded</u> in the staffing workbook count used for the four big high schools, the staffing workbook enrollment will be lower.</p> <p>It's just a matter of using a different filter on the enrollment count for a specific purpose. (It is important to also note that the IAE sites are staffed via central office allocations.)</p> <p>You can reconcile to the November board report on 3rd Friday enrollment by looking at the school-by-school data rather than the district-wide totals.</p>
Enrollment Projections	<p>On K-12 school staffing and budget, this is what I see:</p> <p>43 = high estimate of positions to be cut \$5.4 million in personnel and non-personnel savings from k-12 schools 43 FTE @ \$80,000 per FTE = \$3.44 million \$1.96 million in school-based savings yet to be identified (at least in the OWG materials)</p>	<p>At the school level, budget version 2.0 is based on approx. 55 school-level reductions (approx. \$4.5 M): 25 elementary, 12 middle, 18 high school (see slides 26 & 27). Of these, the enrollment-related reductions are between 30-39 FTE.</p> <p>That leaves 10-20 FTE via either targeted or equity based reductions to workbooks. Reduction of non-personnel is to be determined--range near \$500,000 (TBD). That brings the total to approx.. \$5.0 million towards a goal of \$5.4 million. We will have refinements for version 3.0.</p>
Priority Area 1 follow up-- Coherent Instruction	<p>Title 1 Reallocations - Please describe where the Title 1 money is coming from when using it to fund other priorities.</p>	<p>This is a more systematic way to fund this support for intensive schools. We carried over about \$125,000 in Title I from last year. By utilizing Title I carryover, and by combining existing Title I school-based purchases into one reservation amount, we minimize any impact to per-pupil allocation to schools.</p>

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
Priority Area 1 follow up-- Coherent Instruction	Reading Intervention Priority Item - Please describe what this is funding for and provide data to support that it is working.	<p>The reading intervention tool provides students with web-based, computer-adaptive software in schools that receive intensive support. This software is utilized as a supplement to core and/or intervention-based on specific skill deficits in foundational skills. It is supplemental only and is often utilized as independent work and/or within an intervention block. Teachers receive structured professional development as they integrate this one tool within their core instruction.</p> <p>Other non-intensive schools have chosen to purchase Lexia on their own from other funding because they have seen the success in other schools. These schools are: Emerson, Marquette, Randall, Thoreau, Lapham and Shorewood.</p> <p>Please see the attached PowerPoint, Mid-Year Update for Intensive Schools-Web-based Software, that was utilized with intensive schools in a webinar last week. This PowerPoint summarizes our web-based, computer-adaptive software usage and progress to date. It displays the positive results that are being achieved when this is utilized as a supplement to core instruction as recommended. It is important to note that some schools are in their first year of implementation. We will provide a more detailed update to the Board at the Instruction Work Group in May.</p>
Priority Area 1 follow up-- Coherent Instruction	Reading Interventionist - Is each school expected to have a Reading Interventionist? What is the minimum interventionist in each school?	<p>Each elementary school last year was allocated 0.5 interventionist out of local funding. Based on need, many Title I schools increased this intervention allocation to 1.0 or more. Last year, all intensive-need middle schools also received 1.0 interventionist FTE. All other middle schools received 0.5 interventionist out of local funding.</p> <p>However, when the elementary equity budget cuts were made at the school level last year, 11 schools cut between 0.1-0.5 interventionist allocation. Of these 11 schools, 9 Title I schools reinstated these positions or increased them with their Title I funding. Only two schools cut their interventionist</p>

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
		<p>allocation in consultation with the Chief of Schools and employed a different model of intervention with other staff members who were highly qualified (316/317 reading certification). Kennedy cut 0.1 and Thoreau cut 0.5.</p> <p>Our central office staff is working with Kennedy and Thoreau providing professional development and support for implementation of research-based interventions.</p> <p>We are proposing the same .5 local allocation for 2016-17 for interventionist allocations. At our intensive elementary schools we are proposing that a 1.0 interventionist be the mandatory minimum allocation, with 0.5 from local and 0.5 from Title I funding.</p>
Priority Area 1 follow up-- Coherent Instruction	Intensive support school Release Days - Please describe what this is for and provide support that it is working.	Feedback and information related to release days has been extremely positive. This feedback is detailed in the attachments titled " Mid-Year Update for Intensive Schools Grade Level Planning " and " Middle School Professional Learning Survey to date. "
Priority Area 1 follow up-- Coherent Instruction	Thoreau DLI Busing - Can you remind the Board about the DLI busing at Thoreau? Do we know approximately how many students will take us up on the bus offer yet?	Thoreau was one of the elementary schools that had the highest number of Spanish-speaking ELLs and met trigger numbers for access to bilingual programming as described in the Board-approved ELL Plan. We anticipate that less than 10 students will need transportation to an alternative site for bilingual programming. Some of these students actually may be within walking distance to Leopold already. We are monitoring 4K enrollment and taking this into account as we allocate for Thoreau at the kindergarten level.
Priority Area 2 follow up-- Personalized Pathways	Small Learning Communities (SLCs) - can you explain what these are? Is there any cost associated with SLCs?	Smaller Learning Communities or SLCs are a core component to the personalized pathway model that students elect into. Students will be organized into a smaller learning community in which they would be matched with core content teachers and student services staff. The purpose of smaller learning communities is:

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
		<p>--to increase and strengthen relationships between students and classroom teachers by having a small group of teachers working with the same students;</p> <p>--to provide opportunities for common planning time for teachers within a smaller learning community, allowing opportunities for curriculum planning, student problem-solving, and integration of curriculum;</p> <p>--to increase communication with parents and families.</p> <p>SLCs will be an organizing structure and will not have costs associated with their implementation.</p>
Priority Area 2 follow up-- Personalized Pathways	Academic and Career Planning (ACP) professional development (PD) priority item (\$61,400) - can you provide more information on what this funding is for?	<p>The majority of the \$61,400 will focus on professional development and planning at all of our 18 secondary schools which includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summer Professional Learning in summer 2016 and June 2017 to support the professional learning and curriculum development for grades 7 and 10; ACP curriculum refinement for grades 8 and 9 in June 2016.; and support learning for ACP implementation for grades 6-11 in June 2017. The \$54,000 will cover teacher extended employment, space rental, and supplies. 2. District-wide professional learning communities for ACP/SELS (Social Emotional Learning Standards) integration and implementation to support continuous learning and program improvement for ACP Coordinators and ACP teachers at middle and high schools = \$8,000 for extended employment and subs. 3. School year planning for student-led conferencing and 8th grade passage presentations for implementation in 2017-18 = \$5,000 for extended employment. 4. School-based planning for ACP/SELS teams to meet monthly to monitor implementation = \$2,700 for extended employment. <p>(continued)</p>

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
		5. ACP supplies (\$150 per middle school, Shabazz and IAE, \$250 per comprehensive high school) = \$3,100 for extended employment.
Priority Area 2 follow up-- Personalized Pathways	Please describe how the additional 3.4 school-based FTE are allocated across the schools more specifically.	A breakdown of the 3.4 FTE built into the Personalized Pathways budget: --1.9 FTE to increase allocation for the implementation of academic and career planning in grade 7 balanced across all middle schools; --1.5 FTE to increase allocation for the implementation of academic and career planning in grade 10 balanced across all high schools.
Priority Area 2 follow up-- Personalized Pathways	Can you provide more of the specific grant terms for the Pathways grant?	In summary, MMSD is currently being considered for funding to support the implementation of Personalized Pathways. This grant will provide both in-kind services for technical support for Pathways development and direct grant funds to support professional learning and Pathways implementation for central office and school staff. We are currently in final conversations with our funder to determine final terms of the grant. As part of the grant, MMSD will become part of a regional cohort of four other districts that are implementing Pathways for the first time. As we learn more, we will share this information with the Board of Education. We are anticipating official notification by February 19, 2016.
Priority Area 2 follow up-- Personalized Pathways	9th Grade Transition - Can you explain what this is and why this is separate from the summer school budget?	In prior summers, MSCR offered a course called HS 101. After working with MSCR last summer, we realized this high-leverage course should be renamed and would be best implemented through our actual 9th grade teachers versus summer school teachers or MSCR staff. The costs associated with this program are to fund extended employment for teachers to work directly with the transitioning students in a more intentional way to build relationships and community amongst the students and the teachers. The \$25,000 is needed to increase the number of teachers at each of our four high schools for two weeks. This cost was not included in the summer school budget for two reasons. First, we were still working out the budget details when the summer school budget needed to be approved. Second, we consider this a priority supplemental cost specifically for our transitioning 8th

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE																								
		grade summer school students and we weren't sure that the Board would want us building the priority item into the budget in January.																								
Priority Area 3 follow up-- Family, Youth and Community Engagement	What is the FYCE/Communication Team strategy to diversity the DLI Program? Please provide that communication plan.	Attached you will find our Communication Plan that is in process for DLI with embedded links to examples of the fliers, ads, guidance to principals, etc. Please let us know if you have questions.																								
Priority Area 3 follow up-- Family, Youth and Community Engagement	Can you confirm that the Community School budget is \$185,000 from Fund 80? Please provide a table summary breakdown of the \$185K	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 70%;">Expense</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Revenue Source</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Budget Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Personnel (two Resource Coordinators, .50 FTE)</td> <td>Fund 80</td> <td>\$90,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract extension for Community School Planner to assist with implementation of schools</td> <td>Fund 80</td> <td>\$35,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Professional Development for targeted staff in selected schools</td> <td>Fund 80</td> <td>\$10,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contracted Services – WCER Evaluation</td> <td>Fund 80</td> <td>\$5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School level budgets (family engagement or other logistical costs, divided between each school)</td> <td>Fund 80</td> <td>\$35,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District: Program Supplies / Advertising/ Printing</td> <td>Fund 80</td> <td>\$10,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$185,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Expense	Revenue Source	Budget Amount	Personnel (two Resource Coordinators, .50 FTE)	Fund 80	\$90,000	Contract extension for Community School Planner to assist with implementation of schools	Fund 80	\$35,000	Professional Development for targeted staff in selected schools	Fund 80	\$10,000	Contracted Services – WCER Evaluation	Fund 80	\$5,000	School level budgets (family engagement or other logistical costs, divided between each school)	Fund 80	\$35,000	District: Program Supplies / Advertising/ Printing	Fund 80	\$10,000			\$185,000
Expense	Revenue Source	Budget Amount																								
Personnel (two Resource Coordinators, .50 FTE)	Fund 80	\$90,000																								
Contract extension for Community School Planner to assist with implementation of schools	Fund 80	\$35,000																								
Professional Development for targeted staff in selected schools	Fund 80	\$10,000																								
Contracted Services – WCER Evaluation	Fund 80	\$5,000																								
School level budgets (family engagement or other logistical costs, divided between each school)	Fund 80	\$35,000																								
District: Program Supplies / Advertising/ Printing	Fund 80	\$10,000																								
		\$185,000																								

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
Priority Area 3 follow up-- Family, Youth and Community Engagement	Please describe the purpose of the child care funding in Parent Academy priority item. What groups would be able to use it?	<p>This year we have been providing the Superintendent’s Parent Advisory Group with interpreters and child care in order to engage with as many diverse families as possible. This has been successful in attracting and maintaining an engaged diverse group of parents and is a practice we would like to continue. In addition, we have provided similar support to the African American Parent Leadership Council this year. However, we have had a hard time covering the cost of these logistics consistently or for any of our other advisory groups.</p> <p>Currently, MSCR provides child care for 90-minute meetings, costing approximately \$75 per meeting. Interpreters have been provided by OMGE and we are charged for their time between \$20-\$40 per hour. As we are working to support Parent Academy and parent input sessions out into schools, we would like to provide logistical support for parents who participate in the Parent School Partnership Program (formerly MALDEF) to train parents as advocates.</p> <p>Please note that child care isn't the only cost associated with the Parent Academy line item in the priority investments.</p>
Priority Area 3 follow up-- Family, Youth and Community Engagement	Please provide the timeline for Community Schools	Please see the Community Schools Update to the Board for the February Instruction Work Group meeting.
Priority Area 4 follow up-- Thriving Workforce	Hiring Timeline: Can you provide a summary of the other districts and when they provide the offer?	<p>We reached out to surrounding districts’ HR departments and asked them to complete a few questions about hiring. Attached are the answers to those hiring timing questions. Possibly the most telling and honest response was from Verona, "We try and fill positions before the MMSD process starts."</p> <p>supporting spreadsheet</p>

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
Priority Area 5 follow up-- Accountability and School Support Systems	Lease Costs: Can you break down the \$100K to each specific lease project? What is the current cost of the MATC West location versus the expected future cost? Can we ensure that the space at Lapham wouldn't go unused?	<p>Here are the key points on leasing space for alternative programs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MMSD's lease at MATC West (former Famous Footwear Building) will expire at the end of this school year. The owner is changing direction and we are not able to renew the lease. This requires us to find a new location for <u>Work and Learn West and RISE</u>. The existing lease price is approximately \$64,000 per year. This should be adequate for funding a new lease, but there may be one-time build-out costs for MMSD as we move into a new site. 2. MMSD's leased site for <u>NEON East</u> (near Truax) is not a long-term solution for several reasons. Therefore, we are looking for a new site to lease. The current lease amount is carried in the budget, which should suffice for the new lease, but there may also be one-time build-out costs for MMSD as we move into a new site. 3. At Lapham Elementary, <u>Work and Learn East and AERO</u> are located on the 3rd floor. We were tasked with exploring new site options. A new lease would be expected to be roughly similar to item 1 above (\$64,000), but there may also be one-time build-out costs for MMSD if we move into a new site. <p>The \$100,000 line item in the priority actions is intended as a placeholder for item 3 (Lapham) and for price fluctuations for items 1 & 2.</p>
AVID staffing/enrollments	As we consider the Memorial AVID staffing, can we get information on AVID staffing (FTE, by category--teacher, coordinator, LTE), enrollments and class sizes for each high school?	<p>In the attached you will see that Memorial serves 143 students where La Follette serves 245 students.</p>
Staffing, DLI and Thoreau	Given the plan to bus Thoreau students to DLI programs, what assumptions are being used for the impact on enrollments and staffing at Thoreau?	<p>See the response above. We are assuming that less than 10 students will use the busing option which would not significantly affect Thoreau's enrollment or staffing.</p>

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
DLI Plan budget update	<p>Two items from this budget are on the priorities list.</p> <p>https://multilingual.madison.k12.wi.us/files/esl/ell-plan-budget-implications.pdf</p> <p>Can we get an update on the rest, including anticipated 2015-16 expenditures, and what is included in the budget assumptions we have been working with.</p>	<p>The only priority items as part of Coherent Instruction were approved as part of the ELL Plan. The priority item includes a 1.0 DLI Planner to support program expansion and the cost for one route (if necessary) to transport students from Thoreau who request access to a bilingual program. The initial ELL budget proposed 3 FTE. The new proposal is only 1 FTE (DLI Planner). OMGE will repurpose from within to support needs related to Community Building for Global Awareness and Hmong ELL Planning. Any material needs will be supported from our Curriculum and Instruction CLRM budget.</p>
BEP Funding	<p>Referencing documents from the Retreat Agenda.</p> <p>The BEP one-pager a reduction of \$356,000; the BUDGET DEVELOPMENT 2016-17 - DRAFT SLT PRIORITY ACTIONS REQUIRING NEW FUNDING (spreadsheet) shows no reduction.</p> <p>Which is correct ?</p>	<p>The Priority Spreadsheet is meant to track any of the 15/16 investments and any new investments for this year. Last year we spent \$2.3M on BEP and this year we don't recommend increasing that dollar amount. That is all the spreadsheet is meant to convey. We don't have any of the efficiencies in the spreadsheet.</p> <p>The BEP one pager states the following:</p> <p>"...Based on feedback and limited spending to date of the school-based PD resources, a \$281,000 reduction to the BEP budget is recommended. An additional \$75,000 savings comes from restructuring the BEP Institute. Final reduction of BEP PD Budget = \$356,000."</p> <p>The \$356,000 in reductions is included in the \$800,000 in non-personnel efficiencies.</p>
Priority Actions	<p>I would like the initial list of \$4.3M "Priority Actions" and a status update on those not brought forth (were they funded via another process? were they abandoned? were they put on hold?).</p>	<p>Please see the document labeled Priority Spreadsheet. You will find the list in the column labeled "Initial Request Next Year"; the total on the bottom is \$4.3. If there is a \$0 in the column labeled "Final Request," then it was not funded. Every item on this list was important to the team; however, we ultimately removed any item because we either received grant money for it (Pathways), it was work that hadn't been started yet, or it was work that as a team we couldn't justify losing a staff position over at this time. The conversations that got us from the \$4.3M to the final \$2M were long, well-debated items amongst our leadership team and were not taken lightly.</p>

2016-17 Budget Q&A Tracker as of 2.12.16

CATEGORY	QUESTION/REQUEST	RESPONSE
Priority Actions	<p>The Baird reports we have received in the past have included past, current, projected for the coming year, and an additional year (last February it included 2016-17). Please provide for 2017-18.</p> <p>Is there a Baird (or other) forecast that goes to 2017-18 (or beyond) that we could review before we are asked to consider the "Priority Actions," after all one of the "Guiding Principles" is "Maintain a multi-year perspective to support momentum and effective support to schools while ensuring financial sustainability?"</p> <p>What is the most recent forecast from Baird that the district has received?</p>	<p>The reason why a forecast model for more than one year doesn't help us much at this point is because of the difficulty in forecasting the two-year state budget for 17/18 and on. Even if we were to put a model out there, it would be very unreliable.</p> <p>The Tech Plan assumes that we will be able to find \$625,000 in our priority budget to invest in school based technology each year until 2021, after which we will start to dip down and even out. Every year we will continue to work hard to learn from the previous year and find efficiencies in the Plan while ensuring we are providing our teachers and our students with what they need to be successful.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>Attached are the documents you requested. Baird Forecast cover letter and model</p>
School Allocation of Psychologists	How many psychologists are at each high school, specifically West	<p>Here is the breakdown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 2.0 East ● 2.0 La Follette ● 2.0 Memorial ● At West, 2.0 allocation, but filled with 1.4 psych, plus an additional .6 Social Worker (we tried to fill the full Psych job and we couldn't find anyone with the proper certifications so we supplemented with a Social Worker) ● 1.0 at IAE ● .4 at Shabazz
Student-to-staff ratios	Student-to-staff ratios on "high spending" Wisconsin districts as a comparison group	Attached are data tables collected by Cross & Joftus. We will present the Compensation Study results to the Board in May as scheduled.