

2017-18 Budget Amendments

TJ Mertz
June 2, 2017

Reductions

(If no note stating otherwise, dollar amount given is total budget for item and amendment is to cut that amount)

Principal Leadership Coaching (Online Modules), \$50,000.

Bilingual Transportation, Reduce from \$135,000 to \$100,000.

Estimates of cost increase is \$78,448.50 to \$125,709.30; it seems reasonable to budget at the \$100,000 level.

Middle School Report Card, \$40,000.

Welcoming Schools, \$90,000.

Pathways Professional Development, Reduce from \$200,000 to \$106,000.

This is the amount for the Project Based Professional Development, but amendment does not mandate which components are funded.

Developing Future Teachers, Use the Employee Handbook Co-Curricular pay schedule at 5%. Budget impact is unknown.

Development/Redesign of Secondary Alternative Schools, reduce from \$100,000 to \$50,000.

Reservation for Innovation Opportunities, \$200,000.

Additions

Wright Uniforms: Add \$45,000 to fund the purchase of staff and student uniforms at Wright Middle School.

Class Size:

From reviewing MMSD data, and having discussions with many people, there appear to be multiple overlapping, but semi-distinct concerns about class size in our district (depending on the grade level, the subject, and the characteristics of the school). Most center on maximum numbers of students per class/section. Below are a series of proposed maximums, or hard caps. I expect that the discussions of class size will continue beyond this budget cycle, and hope that at least some of the maximums proposed below can be enacted this year.

“Hard Caps” or Maximums– All proposals are for “Hard Caps,” meaning that if at any time through Third Friday Counts a class/section exceeds that number, a new class/section will be added.

K-5 “High Poverty” Schools (see below for discussion of classifying schools as “High Poverty”):

K-3, Hard Cap of 19.

4-5, Hard Cap of 23.

K-5 Other Schools

K-3, Hard Cap of 23.

4-5, Hard Cap of 25.

6-8 “High Poverty” Schools

6th Grade Core Academic Classes (Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies), Hard Cap of 25.

7-8 Grade Core Academic Classes (Reading, Math, Science Social Studies), Hard Cap of 27.

6-8 Other Schools

6th Grade Core Academic Classes (Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies), Hard Cap of 27.

7-8 Grade Core Academic Classes (Reading, Math, Science Social Studies), Hard Cap of 29.

High Schools

9th Grade Core Academic Classes (Reading/English, Math, Science, Social Studies), Hard Cap of 27.

10-12 Grade Core Academic Classes (Reading/English, Math, Science, Social Studies), Hard Cap of 30.

Defining “High Poverty”

The AGR designation does not reflect current demographics of our K-5 schools, and other than via Title I MMSD has not designated Middle Schools as “High Poverty.” MMSD currently uses both self identification (traditional) and Direct Certification to designate students as “Low Income.” These methods produce very different results (see spreadsheets [here for K-5](#) and [here for 6-8](#)). It is impossible to say if one is a “better” measure than the other. I would suggest using an average of the two to rank our schools, and 35% (rounded up) as the “High Poverty” cut point for K-5. By this method the following schools are designated ‘High Poverty’

K-5 (non-AGR schools marked with *; non-Title I schools marked with #)

Allis Elementary	Lindbergh Elementary
Emerson Elementary	Lowell Elementary
Falk Elementary	Mendota Elementary
Glendale Elementary	Midvale Elementary
Gompers Elementary	Muir Elementary#
Hawthorne Elementary	Nuestro Mundo Elementary
Huegel Elementary#	Orchard Ridge Elementary
Kennedy Elementary*	Sandburg Elementary
Lake View Elementary	Schenk Elementary
Lapham Elementary*#	Stephens Elementary*#
Leopold Elementary	Thoreau Elementary#
Lincoln Elementary*	

6-8 (non-Title I schools marked with #)

Badger Rock Middle	Sennett Middle
Black Hawk Middle	Sherman Middle
Cherokee Middle	Toki Middle#
Jefferson Middle#	Whitehorse Middle#
O’Keeffe Middle	Wright Middle

Neutral

Title I

I am propose using traditional self identification low income counts instead of direct certification to allocate Title I funds, along with the “35% rule,” in order to include more schools. For K-5 schools ([spreadsheet here](#)), at minimum this should add Thoreau, Kennedy, Huegel, and Stephens (with Muir and Lapham possible). For 6-8, Whitehorse would be added, with Jefferson and Toki as possibilities ([6-8 spreadsheet here](#)). As noted above in the class size discussion, the different methods of counting low income students yield different results. It is far from clear that one is “better” or more accurate. What is clear is that the differences in the poverty levels among the schools (by either method of counting) most impacted by a change are not great. With Title I as the most important tool we have to provide resources based on student poverty, it is worth considering including more students and schools in the program by using traditional self identification counts instead of direct certification. Some schools would lose in this change, but the losses could be minimized by adjustments to the current practice of banding schools by poverty ranges and allocating different per pupil amounts for different ranges. The 2017-18 budget also includes a \$250 increase in the Middle School per pupil that could be instead partially or wholly reallocated to all schools. I would like to see staff develop for consideration a proposed reallocation of Title I funds as described here.