

# Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

## Students with Disabilities and Gifted Students Subcommittee

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	January 18, 2022	<b>Time:</b>	1:30 pm - 2:30 pm
<b>Location:</b>	Microsoft TEAMS - <a href="#">Click here to join the meeting</a>		
<b>Chair:</b>	Brad Turner		
<b>Members in Attendance:</b>	<b>Brad Turner</b> <b>Carol Westlake</b> <b>Lori Smith</b> Stephen Smith <b>Sandra Edwards</b> <b>David Martin</b> Lynette Porter <b>Jennifer Aprea</b> <b>LeAnn Simmerman</b> <b>Mandy Fisher</b> <b>Anna Thorsen</b> <b>Wendy Tucker</b> <b>Senator Bill Powers</b> <b>Representative Sam Whitson</b>		
	*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	
<b>BASE</b>	<p>The following are additions to the list submitted after meeting #4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Gifted endorsed educators</li><li>• Gifted endorsed district coordinator</li><li>• Professional development for general and special educators (e.g. effective accommodations to meet student needs, gifted training, identification for multiple exceptionalities, understanding of dyslexia)</li><li>• Additional and increased pay for paraprofessionals/educational assistants Note: The group was divided on the placement as part of the base or weight but agreed this was a priority.</li></ul>
<b>WEIGHT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Additional and increased pay for paraprofessionals/educational assistants Note: The group was divided on the placement as part of the base or weight but agreed this was a priority.</li></ul>

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

<b>DIRECT FUNDING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK – 3rd Grade Band: There is a strong push to lower class sizes in the youngest grades to achieve stronger outcomes. Research demonstrates the value of class sizes under 15 students, as well as high dosage tutoring. This could be most efficiently achieved by funding a paraprofessional or new co-teacher in every K-3 classroom, every two classrooms (to focus on literacy, tutoring and intervention), or to focus support in Title I schools.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Include language to also address the needs of gifted students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOMES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## 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

<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