

Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

Rural and Small Districts Subcommittee

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Date:	January 20, 2022	Time:	11:30 am CST – 12:30 pm CST
Location:	Microsoft TEAMS		
Chair:	Chair: Janet Ayers Vice Chair: Shawn Kimble		
Members in Attendance:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Janet Ayers• Allen Pratt• Charlie Hatcher• Jerry Boyd• Mike Garren• Kristy Brown• Shawn Kimble• Norma Gerrell• Eddie Pruett• William Curtis• John Stevens• Ron Gant• Lillian Hartgrove		

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

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
BASE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Considerations for inflationary costs• Emphasize fair and equitable formula – support salaries• BASE = adequate and equitable (enough included?)
WEIGHT	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern that charters for profit will take advantage of these funds.• Can charter receive block grants instead?• Lots of public comments were not in favor for a weight for charters.
DIRECT FUNDING	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include I.T. personnel/specialists

Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

OUTCOMES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure this is incentivizing/ not punitive • Include growth
-----------------	--

QUESTIONS/CONCERNS/CLARIFICATIONS:

- BASE: How does this list translate into an overall increase?
- BASE: This list is broad – is there a more exhaustive list of what all it will include? Will it at least include funding for positions as it currently exists or will it include additional/more?
- WEIGHTS: How is the ‘weight comparability’ determined? Who determines these?
- WEIGHTS: Will students in charters also receive weighted funding for unique learning needs?
- Nowhere should private schools receive funding and not be held to the same level of account. that public schools are held to. Moreover, the use of adopted TN standards.
- Policy: need to address fiscal local capacity – review in tandem with the shift to a new funding formula.
- Request a regular cadence of review of the formula moving forward.

Subcommittee Policy Reflections and Feedback

Policy Idea	Subcommittee Feedback
Policy: Definition of Economically Disadvantaged	Current: Direct Certification Disparity here – take F/R lunch into consideration, particularly where situational poverty is play. Better reflects school/local community.
Policy: Definition of Concentration of Poverty	Current: Attending a Title I School Include: Attending a Title I ‘eligible’ school Are there any ‘targeted assist’ left vs. whole school
Policy: Definition of Sparsity	Current: Students per square mile (federal is 10, but the range is 10-25 students)

Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

Policy: Teacher Salaries	Question: What, if any, requirements should the formula require on investing new education dollars into existing educator salaries moving forward?
Policy: Teacher Salaries	Question: Are there any other policies for teacher salaries that should be included?
Policy: Tutoring	Question: This is required for students who score at "Below" on the 3 rd grade TCAP beginning SY23-24. Should there be funding included in the formula for this legally required support?
Policy: CTE	Question: Please review the CTE content and provide feedback on how TN may choose to address CTE considerations.
Policy: K-2 Weight	Question from the Steering Committee: How might you consider a K-2 weight or additional investment in the earlier grades?
Policy: Outcomes	Question from the Steering Committee: They would like to see outcomes options for middle school. What outcomes does your subcommittee recommend?
Policy: Outcomes	Question from the Steering Committee: They would like to see other outcomes options for elementary school. What outcomes does your subcommittee recommend?
Policy: Accountability	Question from the Steering Committee: What accountability measures should be included in any new formula proposal, or what ideas do you have?
Policy: Reporting	Question: What information should be included in public reporting for school and for district level financials?
Policy: Funding Year	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

Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

	that year and for declining enrollment districts, it may be harder to adjust budgets in real time. Given that challenge, are there mitigation ideas?
Policy: ADM Shifts	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?
Policy: Maintenance of Effort	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).
Policy: Professional Development and Training	Question: Are there any professional development opportunities or additional supports that should be provided?
Policy	Content