

# Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

## Education Foundations Subcommittee

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	January 26, 2022	<b>Time:</b>	11:30 am - 12:30 pm
<b>Location:</b>	Microsoft TEAMS - <a href="#">Click here to join the meeting</a>		
<b>Chair:</b>	Dan Challener		
<b>Members in Attendance:</b>	<p> <b>Dan Challener</b>  <b>Chris Letsos</b>  <b>Katie Cour</b>  <b>Amanda Waddell</b>  <b>Lisa Trail</b>  <b>Scott Bacon</b>  Lynn Voelz  <b>Stan Harville</b>  Senator Richard Briggs  <b>Representative David Hawk</b> </p> <p>*Member names in bold indicate those present for this meeting.</p>		

### 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

Policy Idea	Subcommittee Feedback
<b>Policy: Definition of Economically Disadvantaged</b>	Current: Direct Certification
<b>Policy: Definition of Concentration of Poverty</b>	Current: Attending a Title I School

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<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

<p><b>Policy: Funding Year</b></p>	<p>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?</p>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>Content - <b>Adequacy</b>            We recommend a new funding formula that provides and maintains <b>for educators a</b> best-in-region total compensation package (including salaries, benefits, and professional development), to emphasize our <b>commitment to and investment in educators and education.</b>  <b>“Educators” includes all</b> certified personnel (<b>teachers, administrators, counselors, social workers, etc.</b>)</p>
<p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>Content - <b>Adequacy</b>            We recommend that Tennessee make a historic and dramatic recurring investment in K-12 public education that fully supports a new <b>student-based, student weighted</b> funding formula that will transform our schools, strengthen our economy, and provide a great education <b>and pathways to college and career</b> for our children.</p>
<p>Additional Feedback: Outcomes</p>	<p><b>We recommend that the outcomes portion of the formula include</b> the student groups noted in the <i>Unique Learning Needs</i> of the Weights portion of the framework as additional student groups for outcomes. <b>As noted by Matthew Joseph, the expert who spoke to our subcommittee, the weights must be</b></p>

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

	<b>substantial enough to avoid rewarding wealthy districts and disadvantaging less wealthy districts.</b>
Additional Feedback: Direct Funding	In future communications about the framework and the formula, ensure there is clarity on why these are direct funded rather funded through the base; define direct funding for public understanding.