

## Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

### Higher Education and Post Secondary

#### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	January 5, 2022	<b>Time:</b>	9:00 am - 10:00 am
<b>Location:</b>	Microsoft TEAMS		
<b>Chair:</b>	Youlanda Jones		
<b>Members in Attendance:</b>	List names here		

#### 2. DIRECTIONS

##### Topic

Please list specific supports and services that you would like to see incorporated into the funding formula for each category. (In other words, what supports and services do you think are most important so that the cost of those supports and services can be included. It does not mean a district MUST spend money in a certain way, only that they would be funded to do so).

Please prioritize each item as a:

- **Must Have:** Those supports and services required as a result of federal and/or state law, for safety, or similar.
- **Should Have:** Those supports and services that may not be mandatory but are essential to ensure the student or student group receives access to a quality education.
- **Nice to Have:** Those supports and services that are not mandatory and not essential, but (1) may provide a clear and added benefit to students and (2) have a clear return on the investment related to student achievement and future success.
- **Long Shot:** All other supports and services ideas.

Subcommittee Supports and Services Prioritization

SUBCOMMITTEE FEEDBACK AND REFLECTIONS	
<b>BASE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must Have: ratio for school counselors should be 1-100, remediation challenges addressed prior to post secondary, social workers should be included in base, students at all levels have access to High Quality Material(curriculum), High risk counties should have a reduced ratio of counselors to students(1-100), adequate training for school counselors to ensure that every high school has a highly qualified career counselor, middle school career exploration opportunities for all students, <a href="#">the base should reflect an overall increase in recurring funding in the formula, the base should be high enough to result in an overall increase for all districts and students with greater needs, any recurring per pupil education funding through the formula should put Tennessee at or above the national average for financially supporting education</a></li> <li>Should Have: provide additional exposure and opportunities for EPSO and CTE, <a href="#">the base should be pegged to inflation</a>; technology support for all students to increase learning capacity.</li> <li>Nice to Have: high school student should have the opportunity for work based experiences and to have this count as part of their curriculum,</li> <li>Long Shot: remove limits on number of opportunities for EPSO and CTE exposure, students being able to get TCAT diplomas while still in high school,</li> </ul>
<b>WEIGHT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must Have: <a href="#">Economically disadvantaged, English Learner, a tiered Special Education weight (which includes gifted students per Tennessee policy), Sparsity, Concentrated Poverty, Charter</a>, Concentration of Poverty Students with Disabilities and Gifted Students (to include tiers based on the cost to provide services) English Learners (to include tiers based on English proficiency) Dyslexia, Rural</li> <li>Should Have:</li> <li>Nice to Have:</li> <li>Long Shot</li> </ul>
<b>DIRECT FUNDING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must Have: <a href="#">High dosage tutoring in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, Innovative High School models, career and technical education, consolidated health</a>, Early Postsecondary Opportunity (EPSO) Completion, Earning Industry Certificates or Certifications, Work-based Learning Completion Metric, Reading proficiency (multiple ideas on measurement).</li> <li>Should Have: AP Course Completion and/or Passing, Differentiated compensation support.</li> <li>Nice to Have: <a href="#">Funds to address dyslexia and gifted student identification</a></li> </ul>

**Commented [le1]:** While I agree the lowest feasible ratio should be our aim, the price tag for lowering the current average ratio of 1:450 to 1:250 (research based national recommendation) is estimated at \$64 million annually. With David's concern about there being no mention of increasing education funding, a 1:100 ratio seems more like a nice to have and the 1:250 is a must have.

**Commented [le2]:** The national recommendation for school social workers is also 1:250. We may want to specify a ratio. Currently the TN BEP funds school social workers at a ratio of **1:2000**. School social workers would fulfill the "case manager" role that I keep hearing in the feedback.

**Commented [RD3]:** The more I think about what Claude suggested here, the more I like it. The barriers seems to be financial rather than philosophical, and if there were ever a time to go on record with this 'long shot,' it is now.

**Commented [DM4]:** As a note, a sparsity weight, defined as the number of students per square mile in a district, would account for the needs of rural communities that experience geographic spread and/or isolation and many associated challenges.

**Commented [RD5]:** I think this is crucial, and while I defer to others on when/how interventions should occur to address learning deficiencies, it seems this is critical for college preparation. Students off track in early elementary school face an uphill battle. It is much better for the student for intense interventions to occur while they are young to lower the odds that they ever start to get on a path that leads to academic preparation issues and remediation needs.

**Commented [le6]:** Within the gifted student identification, the state needs to increase efforts/training re. identifying students of color, ED students, and ELL students. These groups are typically underrepresented.

**Commented [le7R6]:** This may be an outcome based measure but training and support for gifted/DEC teachers is a funding concern.

**Commented [RD8R6]:** Agreed, many districts do not have the resources to support gifted students, and any formula should provide for and recognize that need.

## Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long Shot</li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOMES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must Have: <b>Transparency:</b> <u>Improved school and district-level spending information that separate state, local, and federal funding to understand more about how funding reaches students. Reporting that connects spending to student needs and what works – specifically, publicly available information on student demographic data, student achievement data, and data on how schools are investing in key resources such as college and career preparation coursework, high-quality teachers, etc to understand how resources are serving students. These data should be available side-by-side, and comparable across similar schools and districts. Additionally, an annual analysis of spending patterns to understand how the formula is targeting funding towards high-need districts and schools. The state should support and coordinate district capacity to do additional analytical and reporting that better connects spending trends with their impact on student learning.</u> <b>Performance Funding:</b> <u>If including performance funding, the Ready Graduate measure should be used which incorporates many of the indicators on the slide from the previous meeting and is an established state indicator of college and career readiness. The performance funding should incentivize closing achievement gaps, funding should be awarded based on growth over time, and there should be an annual review of the impact of performance funding.</u> <b>Accountability:</b> Student Support Personnel (school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists) shall submit evidence of effective programs through measures such as program management agreements, program audits, and use of time reporting.</li> <li>Should Have:</li> <li>Nice to Have:</li> <li>Long Shot</li> </ul>

**Commented [DM9]:** Just a note on this section - considering outcomes and transparent reporting of expenditures go hand in-hand. Transparent reporting allows us to understand how dollars actually reach districts and schools to support students.

**Commented [RD10R9]:** I concur, transparency is imperative.

**Formatted:** Font: Bold

**Formatted:** Font: Bold

**Commented [DM11]:** As a note, a single, clearer measure may better focus potential performance funding and be more transparent. This measure has also been listed numerous times in public comment that we reviewed.

**Commented [RD12R11]:** David, I agree and if this metric already has resonance with districts, the public, and policymakers, then it makes sense to focus on it rather than trying to develop new metrics.

### Subcommittee Policy Reflections and Feedback

Policy Idea	Subcommittee Feedback
<b>Reporting</b>	<u>Investments should be reported at multiple levels – including the district and school level - so that all stakeholders know what resources students are receiving. The state should also provide training and support to districts to review, assess, and report data on the connection between education investments and improvements in learning. There should be regular review of</u>

## Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

	<a href="#">how the new formula is resulting in more resources for students with higher needs.</a>
<b>Local contribution</b>	<a href="#">1) Move to an absolute fiscal capacity approach so that local communities know exactly what they should support; 2) Move to a single, district-level local capacity calculation</a>
<b>Policy</b>	Content
<b>Policy</b>	Content
<b>Policy</b>	Content