

# Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

## Urban District

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	January 20, 2022	<b>Time:</b>	2:00 pm - 3:00 pm
<b>Location:</b>	Microsoft TEAMS		
<b>Chair:</b>	Cato Johnson		
<b>Members in Attendance:</b>	<b>Cato Johnson</b> <b>Terrence Patterson</b> <b>Cardell Orrin</b> <b>David Jordan</b> <b>Tyler Boldin</b> <b>Ted Cornelius</b> Ryan Hughes <b>Chris Henson</b> Dr. Joris Ray <b>Candy Johnson</b> Angela Whitelaw Senator Raumesh Akbari Rep. Eddie Mannis Darrell Cobbins <i>*Member names in bold indicate those present for this meeting.</i>		

### 2. DIRECTIONS

Topic

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

Please list finalize any recommendations you have. Continue to name the level of prioritization for each. Please also consider the draft initial framework in your discussions. Subcommittees may choose to edit their document from last meeting in lieu of this document.

Next, please consider policy questions outlined in this document. Subcommittees may provide more policy ideas or considerations as well. This meeting and next meeting will include this work.

## Subcommittee Supports and Services Prioritization

	SUBCOMMITTEE FEEDBACK AND REFLECTIONS
<b>BASE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation and deferred maintenance for facilities (funding in current formula is not adequate)</li><li>• This group needs requests a list of what is already included in the base (funded inside or outside of BEP)</li><li>• Teacher positions – districts always hire more than is in the formula – a different way of looking at this</li></ul>
<b>WEIGHT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Students who have experienced trauma or have high ACES score</li><li>• Urban districts- cost of doing business is higher (not sure if this should be in weights or direct funding)</li><li>• ELL should have heavy weight</li></ul> <p>Question Would charter schools that don't have to pay rent receive the funds for rent?</p>

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<b>DIRECT FUNDING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of living in urban areas (cost of doing business is greater in Urban district (must pay higher salaries, higher cost of doing business, higher cost of living)</li> <li>• Literacy – opportunities to support literacy (literacy grants)</li> <li>• Transitional components (additional supports for those going to be retained in 3<sup>rd</sup> / Middle school algebra math support / 9<sup>th</sup> grade transition support</li> <li>• Professional Development for teachers</li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOMES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentivize districts who partner with community partners that benefit students (not sure which section to include – direct funding or outcomes)</li> <li>• Academic growth (all grade bands)</li> <li>• ACT (some way to incentivize students for multiple attempts on the ACT - other than score of 21)</li> <li>• Mental Health Measures (ACES, student surveys)</li> </ul>

## Subcommittee Policy Reflections and Feedback

Policy Idea	Subcommittee Feedback
<b>Policy: Definition of Economically Disadvantaged</b>	Current: Direct Certification Need to make this broader that direct certification – capturing all ED students that may not be captured in this way

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<b>Policy: Definition of Concentration of Poverty</b>	Current: Attending a Title I School
<b>Policy: Definition of Sparsity</b>	Current: Students per square mile (federal is 10, but the range is 10-25 students)
<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?
<b>Policy: Teacher Salaries</b>	Question: Are there any other policies for teacher salaries that should be included?
<b>Policy: Tutoring</b>	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?
<b>Policy: CTE</b>	Question: Please review the CTE content and provide feedback on how TN may choose to address CTE considerations.
<b>Policy: K-2 Weight</b>	Question from the Steering Committee: How might you consider a K-2 weight or additional investment in the earlier grades?
<b>Policy: Outcomes</b>	Question from the Steering Committee: They would like to see outcomes options for middle school. What outcomes does your subcommittee recommend?
<b>Policy: Outcomes</b>	Question from the Steering Committee: They would like to see other outcomes options for elementary school. What outcomes does your subcommittee recommend?
<b>Policy: Accountability</b>	Question from the Steering Committee: What accountability measures should be included in any new formula proposal, or what ideas do you have?
<b>Policy: Reporting</b>	Question: What information should be included in public reporting for school and for district level financials?

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<b>Policy: Funding Year</b>	Question: Should funding reflect the current year or the prior year (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?
<b>Policy: ADM Shifts</b>	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?
<b>Policy: Maintenance of Effort</b>	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).
<b>Policy: Professional Development and Training</b>	Question: Are there any professional development opportunities or additional supports that should be provided?
<b>Policy</b>	Content
<b>Policy</b>	Content
<b>Policy</b>	Content
<b>Policy</b>	Content
<b>Policy</b>	Content