Critical Dates.

- March 15\(^{th}\) – DAC meeting (UIP Recommendations, input for budget subcommittee on budget recommendations)
- March 17\(^{th}\) – DAC recommendations to the BOE on the district UIP priority performance challenges, root causes, and major improvement strategies
- April 7\(^{th}\) – DAC recommendations to the BOE on budget priorities (BOE final approval of district UIP)
- April 19\(^{th}\) – DAC meeting with SAC chairs and principals (updates and training)
- April 21\(^{st}\) – BOE meeting (DAC not on agenda)
- May 5\(^{th}\) – BOE Budget approval (scheduled)
- May 11\(^{th}\) – Close of the Colorado state legislative session for 2016
- May 17\(^{th}\) – DAC meeting (final meeting scheduled for 2015-16 school year)
UIP Root Causes and Major Improvement Strategies

Jeffco DAC 3/15/16
Unified Improvement Planning Processes

Section III: Data Narrative

- Gather and Organize Data
- Review Performance Summary
- Describe Notable Trends

Section IV: Target Setting

- Prioritize Performance Challenges
- Set Performance Targets
- Identify Interim Measures

Section IV: Action Planning

- Identify Root Causes
- Identify Major Improvement Strategies
- Identify Implementation Benchmarks

Preparing to Plan

Ongoing: Progress Monitoring
The Role of Root Cause Analysis

Priority
Performance Challenges

Root Cause Analysis

Major Improvement Strategies
Root Causes are. . .

• Statements describing the deepest underlying cause, or causes, of performance challenges.

• Causes that if dissolved would result in elimination, or substantial reduction of the performance challenge(s).

• Why we see our current pattern of performance.

• Things we can change and need to change.

• The focus of our major improvement strategies.

• About adult action.
Major Improvement Strategies...

- Respond to and should eliminate the root causes of the performance challenges the district (or school) is attempting to remedy.

- An overall approach intended to result in improvements in performance (associated action steps describe how the major improvement strategy will be implemented).

- Three is a “suggested maximum” number of major improvement strategies.

- They should be research based.
Proposed Root Causes

• Final review (they reflect input from our February meeting and follow-up work by the UIP subcommittee).

• Clarifying questions.

• Motions...
Major Improvement Strategies

• Table discussion
  o Clarifying questions
  o Do they respond to the identified root causes
  o Suggestions for conceptual revisions (not “word smithing”).

• Full group
  o Motion to recommend
  o Amendments
Major Improvement Strategy #1
Addresses root causes in Priority Challenges #1 & 2

Develop and/or enhance systemic practices of rigorous teaching and learning in a variety of delivery methods to ensure all students have access to, opportunity for and expectation of success in rigorous learning outcomes (e.g. early literacy, algebraic thinking and career, college and life goals ready).

-- will focus on clear understanding and implementation of rigorous student learning expectations
--will utilize implementation and accountability structures to track evidence of change in classroom practice

Major Improvement Strategy #2
Addresses root causes in Priority Challenge #3 and supports the success of #1 & 2

Develop and/or enhance the systems and practices for multiple learning pathways (differentiation and choice programming) that support every student on his/her way to a successful completion of a Jeffco education.

-- will focus on improvements to the development, implementation and accountability of current individualized education plans (IEPs, 504s, ALPs, READ Plans, etc.),
--will enhance the role of an “ICAP Plus” as a meaningful goal setting and tracking plan for a student’s chosen learning pathway beginning at the end of 6th grade through senior year that connects with college, career and/or post high school pathways.
--will pilot a progress tracking tool to enhance the responses to the early warning system.

Major Improvement Strategy #3
Addresses root causes in all three Priority Challenges and ensures the success of #1&2

Develop and/or enhance continuous improvement processes to determine what is working and not working in order to make informed choices and decisions.

-- will focus on short cycle improvements in the development, implementation and accountability of current continuous improvement processes (UIPs, evaluation systems, resource allocation structures, etc.),
--will establish a pilot model for short cycle, rigorous analysis for timely identification of successful practices and programs
The percentage of third graders that Met/Exceeded the state performance expectations in CMAS ELA is the lowest of all grade levels; highest percent of Did Not Yet Meet of all grade levels. Additionally, achievement gaps exist for all disaggregated groups except FEP (who performed higher than all subgroups, including ALP).

Rationale

Research shows that proficiency in reading by the end of third grade enables students to shift from learning to read to reading to learn, and to master the more complex subject matter they encounter in the fourth grade and beyond. Most students who fail to reach this critical milestone falter in the later grades and often drop out before earning a high school diploma.

CMAS ELA 3rd grade: Achievement: 44% Met/Exceeded state expectations (only 6% above the state average) 34% Partially Met/Did Not Yet Meet (highest in Did Not Yet Meet of all grades).

CMAS ELA gaps in 3rd: Achievement: Hispanic: 25% gap compared to White (over 20% gaps at all grade levels) ALP: 3rd grade Met/Exceeded lower than in all other grade levels Exited IEP: 8% gap compared to No IEP (IEP below 10% Met/Exceeded) FRL: 33% gap compared to No FRL (over 30% at all grade levels) EL: 24% gap compared to Overall (noted gain: 3rd grade FEP at 90% Met/Exceeded) Gender: males over 10% gap compared to females.

MAP 3rd grade: Achievement: 66th percentile at BoY to 55th percentile at MoY Growth: 5.4 Observed Growth compared to 7.2 Projected Growth 39% of 3rd graders met Projected Growth.

DIBELS 3rd grade: 75% (BoY) to 78% (MoY) met benchmark (K and 1st made 7% and 9% increases, respectively).

Performance Targets

Board Ends:

Ends 1 The percentage of proficient/advanced third grade students in reading on TCAP (CMAS) will increase from 80% (xx) to 85% (xx) by August of 2015 (xx). The percentage of proficient/advanced students in writing on TCAP (CMAS) will increase by August 2014 (xx): ES – 64% (xx), MS – 66% (xx), HS – 59% (xx).

Ends 2 Every student will achieve one year's growth, or more as needed to 'catch up,' in each year of school and be ready for the next level.

Jeffco 2020:

Content Mastery  
CMAS ELA 3rd Overall Baseline to xx  
ELA 3rd Reading Claim Baseline to xx  
ELA 3rd Writing Claim Baseline to xx  
ELA 3rd Vocabulary Subclaim Baseline to xx  
ELA 3rd Written Expression Baseline to xx

Communication  
ELA 3rd Informational Subclaim Baseline to xx  
Conventions Subclaim Baseline to xx

--- Yellow highlights are placeholders for updates to be made and targets to be set.
Root Cause Analysis

Why does this priority performance challenge exist?

School-level Root Cause:
In many schools, there is a lack of systemic evidence-based instructional practices that promote learning of rigorous literacy skills and competencies to ensure every student can “read to learn” by the end of third grade.

School-level Root Cause:
For many students, the various literacy interventions are not specifically matched to student learning needs and may create additional barriers to learning rather than supporting literacy growth.

System-level Root Cause:
Evidence indicates that professional development in standards/competency-based core instructional strategies and learning supports has had limited impact on the effectiveness of classroom high level literacy practices and matching interventions to student needs.

System-level Root Cause:
Evidence indicates that professional development and resource allocation for literacy instruction has had limited impact on the desired increases in rigorous literacy performance.

Verification – Data Sources

- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- School UIP priority challenges and root causes
- Teacher evaluation results from professional practice rubric

- Intervention resources and assessment tools
- School Improvement Review trends
- Intervention and assessment data

- Professional development course-taking
- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- Teacher evaluation results – relevant indicators

- Professional development course-taking
- Teacher evaluation results – relevant indicators
- Student performance results

Major Improvement Strategy
The percentage of 8th grade Math students that Met/Exceeded the state performance expectations of “on grade level” math is the lowest of all grade levels; highest percent of Did Not Yet Meet “on grade level” math of all grade levels. Additionally, achievement gaps exist for all disaggregated groups except FEP.

**Rationale**

Algebraic thinking is a gateway to more advanced mathematics coursework and to technical proficiency in any field, whether a high school graduate goes directly into the workforce, into some form of post-secondary education, or into the military. Preparing students in algebraic thinking through elementary and middle school is critical to ensure student success in mathematic literacy in high school and beyond.

**CMAS Math 8**: Achievement: 16% Met/Exceeded state expectations**

53% Partially Met/Did Not Yet Meet (highest bottom level of all grades) whereas, 77% Met/Exceeded on Algebra I and 91% Met/Exceeded on Geometry tests

**CMAS Math 8 gaps**: Achievement: Hispanic: 14% gap compared to White (over 20% gaps at most grade levels)

ALP: percent at Met/Exceeded lower than all other grade levels

Exited IEP: 4% gap compared to No IEP (IEP at 3% Met/Exceeded)

FRL: 14% gap compared to No FRL (8% FRL at Met/Exceeded)

EL: 1% gap for FEP compared to Overall (IEP & NEP over 10% gap)

Gender: there are no gaps between males and females

**MAP 8th***: Achievement: 72nd percentile at BoY to 69th percentile at MoY

Growth: 2.1 Observed Growth compared to 3.0 Projected Growth

45% of 8th graders met Projected Growth

* 8th graders in 8th grade math take CMAS Math 8, in Algebra I take CMAS Algebra I, in Geometry take CMAS Geometry

** not comparable to the state average due to variability in test-takers by districts across the state

*** all students in 8th grade take the 8th grade MAP test; adaptive functionality assesses students at their level

**Performance Targets**

**Board Ends:**

Ends 1  Every student will have completed Algebra 1 by the end of 9th grade (unless IEP requirement is different).

The percentage of proficient/advanced fourth grade students in math on TCAP (CMAS) will increase from 77% (xx) to 80% (xx) by August of 2015 (xx)

Ends 2  Every student will achieve one year's growth, or more as needed to ‘catch up,' in each year of school and be ready for the next level.

**Jeffco 2020:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Mastery</th>
<th>Baseline to xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAS Math 8 Overall</td>
<td>Baseline to xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 8 Major Content Subclaim</td>
<td>Baseline to xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 8 Supporting Content Subclaim</td>
<td>Baseline to xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Critical Thinking & Creativity | Baseline to xx |
| Math 8 Reasoning Subclaim | Baseline to xx |
| Math 8 Modeling Subclaim | Baseline to xx |

--- Yellow highlights are placeholders for updates to be made and targets to be set.
Root Cause Analysis

Why does this priority performance challenge exist?

School-level Root Cause:
In many schools, there is a lack of systemic classroom-based instruction, assessment and grading practices throughout the elementary and middle years that focus on higher level math concepts and procedures leading to algebraic thinking.

School-level Root Cause:
In many schools, there is a lack of systemic classroom-based practices that require application and transfer of higher order algebraic thinking to meaningful/relevant real world problems and contexts.

System-level Root Cause:
There is a lack of understanding across the system of the vertical alignment (PK through 12th) and interdependence of math concept development that leads to successful learning in algebraic thinking.

System-level Root Cause:
There is a lack of commitment across the system to ensure consistent differentiated teaching and learning practices matched to student needs so that every student will be successful in learning rigorous math concepts (algebraic thinking).

Verification – Data Sources

- Comparison of CMAS & MAP results to course grades
- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- Teacher evaluation results from professional practice rubric

- Collaborative Curriculum Alignment Process (CCAP) evidence outcomes
- Lesson design and delivery
- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends

- Comparison of CMAS & MAP results to course grades
- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- Teacher perception data (TELL Survey, focus groups)

- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- Teacher and student perception data (TELL survey, Make Your Voice Heard survey, focus groups)

Major Improvement Strategy
2016 PRIORITY PERFORMANCE CHALLENGE #3

Of all Jeffco juniors, 28% met the ACT college readiness benchmarks in all four subjects measured (see below). Of the students who attend Colorado Public Institutions of Higher Education, 26.6% of Jeffco graduates required remediation courses. In addition, over 1,000 students did not graduate in four years. While there are multiple paths to successful completion of a Jeffco education, many students are not leaving with career, college and/or life goal readiness.

**Rationale**

Successful completion of high school is a strong predictor of economic and social mobility. Research shows that students who do not successfully complete their high school education earn less and are more likely to end up in prison, on welfare, or dependent on social services. Most significantly, they are more likely to have children who follow in their footsteps, perpetuating a cycle of intergenerational poverty.

**2015 Cohort ACT College Readiness:**
- 66% (College English);
- 44% (College Algebra);
- 44% (College Social Studies);
- 40% (College Biology);
- 28% (all four)

**2015 Cohort Graduation Rate (4 Year):** 82.9% approximately 1,154 students did not graduate in four years

**2015 Cohort Completion Rate (4 Year):** 84.6% approximately 1,039 students did not successfully complete in four years

**2015 Cohort Still Enrolled Rate:** 7.6% approximately 513 students were enrolled for the following school year

**2015 Cohort Dropout Rate:** 1.8% approximately 770 students dropped out without successful completion

**2012 Cohort 7 Year Rates:**
- 87.0% Graduation Rate,
- 90.7% Completion Rate

**2013 Cohort College Remediation:** 26.6% of Jeffco graduates required remediation courses

**Performance Targets**

**Board Ends:**

**Ends 3** The college remediation rate for Jeffco graduates will decrease from 29.8% to 27.8% by Spring 2015.

The Colorado ACT scores in every high school in every subgroup will meet/exceed the college readiness benchmarks of English (18); Mathematics (22); Reading (22); Science (23)

**Jeffco 2020:**

- **Content Mastery**
  - PSAT
  - ACT composite and subtests

- **Civic & Global Engagement, Communication**
  - Capstone Performance

- **Self-Direction & Personal Responsibility**
  - Successful use of ICAP

--- Yellow highlights are placeholders for updates to be made and targets to be set.
School-level Root Cause:
In many schools, core instruction in **academics, and social and emotional skill development** is not meeting the needs of all students in achieving the performance expectations that will prepare them for the student’s next chosen level of learning.

School-level Root Cause:
In many schools, there is a lack of understanding of the most **critical performance expectations** for all students to achieve in order to be prepared for the student’s next chosen level of learning.

System-level Root Cause:
There is a lack of a system-wide commitment to ensure **classroom practices and programming choices** that provide every student with the opportunity to successfully complete a Jeffco education pathway.

System-level Root Cause:
The allocation (and reallocation) of resources and supports to meet students’ **social, emotional, reengagement and advancement needs** are not addressing barriers to learning for all students.

**Verification – Data Sources**
- Make Your Voice Heard survey results
- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- Teacher evaluation results from professional practice rubric
- Make Your Voice Heard survey results
- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- Teacher evaluation results from professional practice rubric
- Make Your Voice Heard survey results
- School Improvement Review (classroom observation) trends
- School UIP annual target progress
- ICAP success rates
- Make Your Voice Heard survey results
- Discipline and Behavioral Assessment results
- Senior Survey results

**Major Improvement Strategy**
CMAS: An Annual Academic Check-Up

CMAS (Colorado Measures of Academic Success) is Colorado’s common measurement of students’ progress at the end of the school year. The CMAS provides an indicator of your performance beyond your school and district community.

What are the Benefits of CMAS?

- Help students, parents, schools, and districts understand whether students have mastered the content they need to know by the end of the school year
- Only common measurement for Colorado students and provides important instructional information to start the next school year
- Schools and the district can use results to improve instruction, develop additional academic support, and provide enrichment for students
- Interactive, more engaging online questions aligned with 21st century teaching and learning

Tests Students Will Take

- **English Language Arts**
  Grades 3 through 9

- **Math**
  Grades 3 through 9

- **Social Studies**
  Grades 4 & 7, once at high school level
  To be done on a sampling basis with schools participating once every three years.

- **Science**
  Grades 5, 8 & 11

Changes for 2016

- Shortened Testing Time
- 1 Testing Window
  (March 29 - April 29)

Results Back by Beginning of Next School Year
What is CMAS?

- CMAS stands for Colorado Measures of Academic Success
- CMAS is the state’s annual check-up to help you understand how on track you are for graduation and ready for college or the job you choose
  - English language arts and mathematics tests are given in grades 3 through 9
  - Science tests are given in grades 5, 8, and 11
  - Social students tests are given once every three years in grades 4, 7, and once at high school

Why do I take CMAS?

- Similar to your annual health check-up with your doctor, the CMAS “academic check-up” provides lots of information, such as:
  - how you are performing on Colorado Academic Standards (standards are what every Colorado student is expected to know and be able to do at each grade level)
  - where there are areas of strength and areas for growth for your learning
  - tracks your academic progress over time
- The CMAS is just one way to track your progress—combined with classroom and school tests, as well as district assessments. The CMAS provides an indicator of your performance beyond your school and district community.
- Results for CMAS tests are used by your teachers and schools to better understand what you need next instructionally
- Overall, CMAS tests for each grade will take less time than last year.
- You will also get your CMAS results at the beginning of the next school year.

How do I learn more about CMAS?

- If you have questions about CMAS, please contact your school.
- There is also information about CMAS on the Jeffco Public Schools website.
Introducing the PSAT and SAT in Colorado
Delivering more opportunities for all students

The PSAT and SAT exams will provide Colorado’s 10th and 11th graders with more useful assessments aligned to the Colorado Academic Standards and better benefits, such as free, high-quality practice tools and scholarship opportunities.

Why the PSAT and SAT?

In 2015 the legislature passed House Bill 1323, requiring the state to competitively bid for a new 10th grade exam that is aligned to the Colorado Academic Standards and an 11th grade college entrance exam. The selection committee chose the PSAT for 10th graders and the SAT for the 11th grade college entrance exam because of their alignment to the high school Colorado Academic Standards and because the College Board’s reports and free test preparation services could be more useful to students. The College Board’s system can connect students with resources and activities designed to help identify next steps for extra support or possible acceleration.

Tenth-graders in Colorado will begin taking the PSAT in the spring of 2016 and will no longer take the CMAS tests in English language arts and math. The CMAS English language arts and math tests have also been discontinued for 11th-graders, who will take the ACT this year. Next year’s 11th-graders, however, will transition to the SAT. The PSAT and SAT will be given each spring for the following five years.

Improving outcomes for all students

The PSAT and SAT focus on concepts and skills that matter most for college and career readiness. They are designed to inform instruction and ultimately help improve student outcomes. The tests can help identify students who are falling behind so teachers can intervene, and they can provide indicators to students’ readiness for AP coursework and to keep them on target for college.

Free personalized SAT study plan

Interested students taking the PSAT will be able to get a personalized SAT study plan based on their test scores. Free resources from Kahn Academy include interactive questions, video instruction sessions, thousands of practice questions, a mobile app for daily practice and the ability to scan and score practice tests.

Scholarship and college opportunities

Every income-eligible student who takes the SAT will directly receive four college application fee waivers, which may be used to apply to 2,000 participating colleges. All students can opt in to a service to receive free information about admission and financial aid opportunities from colleges, universities and scholarship programs.

PSAT and SAT Information

- Colorado 10th graders will begin taking the PSAT in spring 2016.
- PSAT is not an exact replica of the SAT. Rather, it serves as an introduction to the test because the questions and format are similar.
- PSAT is shorter than the three-hour SAT, clocking in at two hours and 45 minutes.
- PSAT includes three tests: reading, writing, language and mathematics.
- Colorado 11th graders will take the ACT this year. Next year’s 11th-graders will begin taking the SAT in spring of 2017.
- The SAT is accepted for admission and placement purposes at all public colleges and universities in Colorado.
- The SAT consists of three scored sections, each on a 200-800 point scale.
- About 2 million students take the SAT every year worldwide.

February 2016
PSAT: What You Need to Know

All Colorado tenth graders will take the PSAT in April 2018. PSAT (or Preliminary SAT) is the pre-test for the college entrance exam (SAT) that all eleventh graders in Colorado will take in the spring of 2017.

✔ Getting College & Career Ready

Better aligned to Colorado Academic Standards to help prepare you for graduation

PSAT is similar in design, style, and content to the SAT, the new Colorado college entrance exam

✔ Tools to Help You Prepare

Review items on the PSAT that were missed

Phone app with free SAT practice features

Full SAT practice tests are available online for free

Import PSAT results into Khan Academy for customized support at no cost

Student Search Service allows you to find colleges & universities looking for students like you

✔ More Good News

PSAT gives you practice for the SAT and allows you to determine areas where you need help before taking the SAT

PSAT will be the only state assessment required for tenth graders

All U.S. and Colorado colleges & universities accept the SAT for admission and scholarship consideration, when you take the SAT in eleventh grade
State Testing Communication and Resources: An Annual Academic Check-Up

CMAS (Colorado Measures of Academic Success) is Colorado’s common measurement of students’ progress at the end of the school year. CMAS is the state’s annual check-up to help our staff, students, and families understand how on-track students are for graduation, college or a future career. Similar to an annual health check-up with your doctor, the CMAS “academic check-up” provides a lot of information. Learn more at: http://www.jeffcopublicschools.org/media/cmas-academic-check-up.pdf

The district has provided resources to inform various stakeholders about spring CMAS and PSAT/ACT testing on multiple occasions, including:

Audience: School Leaders
Leadership Memo 2/9/16
Leadership Memo 2/17/16
Leadership Memo 3/8/16

Audience: All Employees
Messenger 2/10/16
Messenger 3/9/16

Audience: Parents/Guardians
Chalk Talk 2/19/16
March issue pending

Audience: School Assessment Coordinators
Weekly Updates

The district published CMAS information on the front page of Jeffco’s public website: http://www.jeffcopublicschools.org/

Also note family resources for CMAS, including a short video, at the following links: http://www.jeffcopublicschools.org/tests/index.html
http://www.jeffcopublicschools.org/tests/cmas_resources.html

Regarding Jeffco’s approach to assessments, the district policy IAA was adopted on November 3, 2015. This policy also includes information about student participation in state assessments: http://www.boarddocs.com/co/jeffco/Board.nsf/Public# (click on the board policies tab in the Boarddocs system and search “IAA”)

When parents/guardians contact their school about state testing refusal, school administration and School Assessment Coordinators have been provided a process to better understand the concerns and record the decision to refuse the assessment.
Glossary - Acronyms

ACA: Affordability Care Act
ALP: Advanced Learning Plan
AED: Amortization Equalization Disbursement
BFO – Budgeting for Outcomes
CAFR: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report
CDE: Colorado Department of Education
CHSAA – Colorado High School Activities Association
COP: Certificates of Participation
CMAS: Colorado Measure of Academic Success
CPI: Consumer Price Index
COLA: Cost Of Living Adjustment
C.R.S.: Colorado Revised Statute
CSEA: Classified School Employees Association
ETAP: Education Technology Access Plan
ELL: English Language Learners
ELPA: English Language Proficiency Act
ERD: Educational Research and Design
ESL: English as a Second Language
ETAP: Educational Technology Assessment Plan
FCI: Facility Condition Index
FMP: Facility Master Plan
FY: Fiscal Year
FTE: Full Time Equivalent
GASB: Governmental Accounting Standards Board
GAAP: Generally Accepted Accounting Principles  
GT – Gifted & Talented  
I²a: Instruction/Intervention Assessment Project  
IBNR: Insurance Claims Incurred But Not Reported  
IDEA: Individuals with Disability Education Act  
IEP: Individualized Education Program  
IT: Information Technology  
JCAA: Jefferson County Administrators’ Association  
JCAPP: Jefferson County Adolescence Parenting Program  
JCEA: Jefferson County Education Association  
JCMH – Jefferson County Mental Health  
MLO: Mill Levy Override  
MOE: Maintenance Of Effort  
NAAC – North Area Athletic Complex  
OCR: Office of Civil Rights  
PERA: Public Employees Retirement Association  
POODS: Placed Out Of District  
PPR: Per-Pupil Revenue  
SBB: Student Based Budgeting  
SPED: Special Education  
SOT: Specific Ownership Tax  
SAC: School Level Accountability Committee  
SPAC: Strategic Planning Advisory Council  
SAED: Supplemental Amortization Equalization Disbursement  
TAN: Tax Anticipation Notes
School Accountability Budget Feedback

SCHOOL LEVEL SPENDING PRIORITIES

Please share your top 5 school budget priorities.

- Additional Classroom Teachers (impact class size or multi-grade classes)
- Additional Main Office Time/Support
- Additional Para/Aide Time/Support
- Elective programming (world languages, technology, additional Art, Music, PE)
- Gifted and Talented supports
- Instructional Resources
- Literacy Interventions
- Math Interventions
- Mental/Behavioral Health supports
- Offering Free Full Day Kindergarten
- Professional Development
- Reducing Student Fees
- Resources for at-Risk student populations
- Resources to support School Climate
- STEM programming
- Technology (student devices, computer labs, classroom tools, software/apps, etc.)

DISTRICT LEVEL SPENDING PRIORITIES

We would also appreciate receiving insight from your SAC related to District Spending Priorities. Please take a minute to complete the following questions after you have discussed the options with your SAC or SAC leadership.

In looking at the following district spending priorities, which ones do you believe should be the top 3 priorities for the 2016-17 school year?

- Employee Compensation
- Facilities/Capital Improvement
- School Based Expenditures
- Student Social, Emotional, Physical Wellness and Safety
- Athletics
- Student Fees Reduction
- Technology
Online Budget Consultation Report
For the period February 1 to March 02, 2016
Prepared by Open North for Jefferson County Schools

288 Visitors
138 Responses
6 minutes Median time to complete
47.9% participation

Responses per day

Web visits per day

Web traffic sources

97.6%
GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. School's Management Structure

- District Managed Neighborhood School: 123
- Charter Managed School: 6
- District Managed Option School: 9

2. School's Grade Configuration

- Elementary (K-6): 87
- Elementary (K-8): 5
- Middle School (6/7-8): 19
- High School (7-12): 5
- High School (9-12): 15
- K-12: 7
Charter Managed Schools

Our school-level accountability committee (SAC)...
What were the tradeoffs/choices you made in order to fund the priorities listed above? Select the top three.

In looking at the following district spending priorities, which ones do you believe should be the top 3 priorities for the 2016-17 school year?
District Managed Schools (includes Neighborhood Schools and Option Schools)

91.67% of the District Managed schools’s SAC engaged in a conversation about school budget priorities. However, only 86.89% of the SACs who engaged in a conversation about school budget priorities recommended priorities to the principal.

83.85% of District-managed schools’ SACs considered their UIP/School Improvement Plan as part of the process to determine their spending priorities. Two schools did not provide an answer: Foothills Elementary and Ralston Elementary.
Reducing student fees and having Additional Main Office Time/Support are the lowest priorities for District-managed schools, selected by only 6.06% and 8.33% respectively.

The top 5 priorities for all District-managed schools combined are

1. Additional Classroom Teachers (74.24%)
2. Technology (59.1%)
3. Instructional Resources (49.24%)
4. Additional Para/Aide Time/Support (42.42%)
5. Mental/Behavioral Health Supports (40.91%)
35 schools selected “Other”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our top 5 are where we decided NOT to cut after decline in enrollment</td>
<td>Moore Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were cut in all areas</td>
<td>Jefferdon Jr./Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time DTL</td>
<td>Stober Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our need for interventions is more around training and not as much for resources</td>
<td>Coronado Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Four Priorities • Focuses on increased student achievement • Provides for multiple pathways – comprehensiv</td>
<td>Dakota Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a fully-funded International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme</td>
<td>Patterson International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to offer Free Full Day, but currently charge tuition.</td>
<td>Sheridan Green Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening AP classes to more students and helping teacher with the skill set of teaching all kids.</td>
<td>Golden High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not in a position to fund additional priorities without cutting programming</td>
<td>Westridge Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Teaming and Honors ALP coordinator</td>
<td>Bell Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Peck Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Curricular</td>
<td>Arvada K8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional LMS time</td>
<td>Campbell Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing AMP/electives</td>
<td>Peiffer ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added many funded aspects during 14 - 15. Maintaining our expanded staff, interventions, tech support and PD.</td>
<td>Bear Creek K - 8 School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Falcon Bluffs Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Teachers</td>
<td>Deane Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Administrators and Instructional Coaching supports, especially for underserved schools (Title I)</td>
<td>Lumberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements (furniture, etc.)</td>
<td>Evergreen High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub time for PD, individual student testing, OELS and Young Ameritowne Planning</td>
<td>Lukas Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Coach</td>
<td>Westgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funds for administrative support/consistent Principal and Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Blue Heron Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More administrators possibly</td>
<td>Dunstan Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Teacher Librarian</td>
<td>Vivian Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional classroom teachers needed due to growth. Instructional resources includes interventions and GT</td>
<td>Meiklejohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was not &quot;additional&quot; classroom teachers; more 'maintenance of' classroom teachers.</td>
<td>Eiber Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time AP</td>
<td>Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional teacher support in planning and instruction</td>
<td>Red Rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting before and after school activities</td>
<td>Foster Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to maximize Advanced Placement offerings</td>
<td>Bear Creek High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTL</td>
<td>Kullerstrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are priorities but they didn't impact our budgeting to an unusual degree.</td>
<td>Wayne Carle Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time DTL</td>
<td>Stott Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about extending Kindergarten day from 9:15 to 8:30 AM (starting with everyone else) as a parent priority</td>
<td>Secrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our SAC doesn't include a parent, we tried! 100% sped-improving services.</td>
<td>Sobesky Academy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The least sacrificed priorities by District-managed schools are

(1) Resources for at-Risk student populations (6.82%)
(2) Gifted and Talented supports (6.06%)
(3) STEM programming (5.3%)

The top 3 trade-offs selected by District-managed schools are

(1) Additional Para/Aide Time/Support (32.58%)
(2) Offering Free Full Day Kindergarten (27.27%)
(3) Additional Classroom Teachers (22.73%)

Followed closely by Technology, selected by 21.97% of District-managed schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math interventions</td>
<td>JefferdonJr./Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in general fund allocations to fund staff in the classroom,</td>
<td>Dakota Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counseling, and assessment coaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were able to fund all our priorities without trade-offs</td>
<td>Mandalay Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We didn't experience any trade-offs because we are able to continue to</td>
<td>Westridge Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund current programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Trade Offs were needed</td>
<td>Carmody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased student population allowed for additional resources, most of</td>
<td>Bell Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our priorities status quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Maple Grove Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not take anything away</td>
<td>Hutchinson Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Intern/Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Hackberry Hill Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional AMP/electives, 4th-6th</td>
<td>Peiffer ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presently, we didn't have to trade anything off SBB was implemented.</td>
<td>Bear Creek K - 8 School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of small school status, we gave up many of these as priority</td>
<td>Parmalee Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spending.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond these 3 priorities we are reducing numerous supports for Title I</td>
<td>Lumberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities upgrades(furniture, copier)</td>
<td>Semper Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>Westgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We didn't really have to sacrifice anything they wanted.</td>
<td>West Jefferson Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in office support was for Assistant</td>
<td>Blue Heron Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal position</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiber Elementary</td>
<td>We are cutting a teacher due to low enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everitt Middle School</td>
<td>Everitt is a school with high mobility/declining enrollment 4 out of 5 years. Difficult to budget priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Elementary School</td>
<td>We tried very hard to create a balance for all things we felt were important and were able to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Creek Canyon K-8</td>
<td>Full time Instructional Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Mountain Elementary School</td>
<td>GMES is able to continue funding all programs currently offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Carle Middle School</td>
<td>None of our budgeting necessarily precluded our ability to provide anything in this list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton Elementary School</td>
<td>Had more of a conversation and did not make decisions on what to fund/not fund. We are meeting in April again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrest</td>
<td>Decided to fund mental health counselor in lieu of increasing DTL to full time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Miller School</td>
<td>For the answer below, we would like more money to be allocated to transportation to ensure safety for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the answer below, we would like more money to be allocated to transportation to ensure safety for students.
87.88% of District-managed schools believe Employee Compensation should be one of the districts’ top 3 spending priorities for the 2016-17 school year, followed by Student Social, Emotional, Physical Wellness and Safety and School Based Expenditures with similar support rates of 57.58% and 54.55% respectively.

Overall, District-managed schools mostly believe that Athletics and Student Fees Reduction should not be in the districts’ spending priorities for the 2016-17 school year (with only 6.06% and 6.82% support respectively).
Elementary Schools

Our school-level accountability committee (SAC)...

- Engaged in a conversation about school budget priorities and recommended priorities to the principal: 75
- Engaged in a conversation about school budget but did not provide input/recommendations regarding priorities to the principal: 10
- Received information from school leadership about the school budget but did not provide input regarding school budget priorities: 4
- Has not discussed the school's budget or spending process: 1

Did your SAC consider your UIP/School Improvement Plan as part of the process to determine your spending priorities?

- No: 13
- Yes: 75

Please share your top 5 school budget priorities

- Additional Classroom: 68
- Additional Staff: 48
- Executive Program: 44
- Gifted and Talented: 40
- Instructional Residency: 35
- Math Interventions: 28
- Mental Health/Behavioral: 25
- Offering Full-Day Kindergarten: 20
- Professional Development: 18
- Reducing Student to Teacher Ratio: 12
- Resources for EL, RLS: 9
- Resources to Support Student Learning: 9
- STEM programming: 5
- Technology/facilities: 5
What were the tradeoffs/choices you made in order to fund the priorities listed above? Select the top three.

[Bar chart showing various priorities with different percentages.]

In looking at the following district spending priorities, which ones do you believe should be the top 3 priorities for the 2016-17 school year?

[Bar chart showing various priorities with different percentages.]
Middle Schools

Our school-level accountability committee (SAC)...

- Engaged in a conversation about school budget priorities and recommended priorities to the principal: 11
- Engaged in a conversation about school budget but did not provide input regarding priorities to the principal: 5
- Received information from school leadership about the school budget but did not provide input regarding school budget priorities: 2
- Has not discussed the school's budget or spending priorities: 1

Did your SAC consider your UIP/School Improv. Plan as part of the process to determine your spending priorities?
- Yes: 15
- No: 4

Please share your top 5 school budget priorities
What were the tradeoffs/choices you made in order to fund the priorities listed above? Select the top three.

In looking at the following district spending priorities, which ones do you believe should be the top 3 priorities for the 2016-17 school year?
K-12 Schools

Our school-level accountability committee (SAC)...

- Engaged in a conversation about school budget priorities and recommended priorities to the principal: 2
- Engaged in a conversation about school budget but did not provide input/recommendations regarding priorities to the principal: 0
- Received information from school leadership about the school budget but did not provide input regarding school budget priorities: 0
- Has not discussed the school's budget or spending priorities: 1

Did your SAC consider your UIP/School Improve. Plan as part of the process to determine your spending priorities?

- No: 1
- Yes: 2

Please share your top 5 school budget priorities

- Additional Class...
- Additional Male...
- Additional Para...
- Elective programs...
- Gifted and Tal...
- Instructional R...
- Literacy/Arts...
- Math Interven...
- Mental/Behavior...
- Offering Free F...
- Professional D...
- Reducing Stud...
- Resources for...
- Resources to s...
- STEAM program...
- Technology (art...
What were the tradeoffs/choices you made in order to fund the priorities listed above? Select the top three.

In looking at the following district spending priorities, which ones do you believe should be the top 3 priorities for the 2016-17 school year?
High Schools

Our school-level accountability committee (SAC)...

Did your SAC consider your UIP/School Improv. Plan as part of the process to determine your spending priorities?

- Yes: 17
- No: 3

Please share your top 5 school budget priorities

- Additional Classrooms: 13
- Additional Mainstream: 2
- Effective Parent Engagement: 2
- Gifted and Talented: 2
- Instructional Res. for Academic Interventions: 8
- Literacy: 8
- Math Interventions: 8
- Mental/Behavior: 7
- Offering Free Full Day Preschool: 11
- Professional Dev.: 0
- Reducing Staff: 8
- Resources for it: 8
- Resources for a: 3
- Resources for b: 4
- Resources for c: 8
- STEM program: 3
- Technology: 4
What were the tradeoffs/choices you made in order to fund the priorities listed above? Select the top three.

In looking at the following district spending priorities, which ones do you believe should be the top 3 priorities for the 2016-17 school year?
By the Numbers

- $680.5 million Total General Operating Fund Revenues
  - 53% Local Funding
  - 47% State Funding
- 154 Schools
- 168 Campuses
- 780 Square Miles
- Over 86,000 Students
  - 31 percent qualify for free and reduced lunch
- 14,000 Employees
  - 4,700 Teachers
  - 99% Highly Qualified* (According to Federal No Child Left Behind Requirements)

We Want to Hear From You!

Please complete the online interactive budget tool at [www.jeffcopublicschools.org](http://www.jeffcopublicschools.org).

Community input is an essential component of the budget development process. The budget tool provides an opportunity for you to weigh in and let the Board of Education know what you think about budget priorities.

What Does the Budget Buy?

- **General Instruction**
  - Teachers, Class Size Relief, Athletics, ESL, Dual Language, Instructional Coaches, Paraprofessionals, Materials & Supplies, Librarians
- **Special Ed Instruction**
  - Teachers, Intervention Services, Preschool, Challenge Program, Transition Services
- **Instructional Support**
  - Psychologists, Therapists, Social Workers, Counselors, Clinic Aides, Gifted/Talented Program, Guidance/Counseling, Health Services, Grants Management, Career & TechEd, Dept. for Learning & Educational Achievement, Assessment & Research, Educational Technology
- **School Administration**
  - Principals, Assistant Principals, School Secretaries
- **Operations & Maintenance**
  - Campus Supervisors, Custodial Services, Utilities, Field Services, Property Management
- **General Administration**
  - Technology Services, Support Services, Board of Education, Superintendent, School Innovation & Effectiveness Team, Financial Services, Human Resources, Communications, Employee Relations, Legal & Audit Fees
- **Transfers to Other Funds**
  - Capital Reserve Fund, Insurance Reserve Fund, Technology Fund, Campus Activity, Transportation Fund

Source: 2015/2016 Adopted Budget
How Do We Compare?

Nationally, Colorado Ranks 40th in Per Pupil Funding Compared to Other States

Source: Colorado School Finance Project for 2015-2016 per the 2015 U.S. Census

How Does the Negative Factor Impact Jeffco’s Funding from the State?

$657.3M Total Funding before the Negative Factor
Less $79.7M Negative Factor
$577.6M Total Funding after the Negative Factor

$80 million
The amount Jeffco lost in 2015/2016 state funding due to the Negative Factor

$485 million
Jeffco's cumulative loss of funding over 7 years since the inception of the Negative Factor in 2009/2010.

How Could $80 million Impact Our Students?

Site-based Needs
Immediate needs for instructional and health support, e.g., full day kindergarten, clinic aide support, reading interventions, safety, school-based budgets, etc.

Student Fees
Decrease existing fees to parents

Athletics & Activities
Increasing needs for existing programs

Deferred Maintenance
$451 million in outstanding facility maintenance needs that have been deferred due to funding constraints.

Technology
Increasing needs to support assessment

Competitive Compensation
Highly skilled and trained employees make a difference in our students' lives. 1% for 14,000 employees = $5.2 million

Security
Increasing staffing and threat assessments

JEFFCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
1829 Denver West Drive, #27
Golden, CO 80401
303.972.6600
www.jeffcopublicschools.org

Our mission is to provide a quality education that prepares all children for a successful future.
finance and budget

OVERVIEW

DAC Finance & Budget Subcommittee
January 12, 2016
Agenda

- Timeline, Objectives and Process
- Student Based Budgeting and Budgeting for Outcomes
- Community Engagement Plan
- 2015/2016 Statewide Funding and Enrollment Impact
- 2016/2017 Statewide Funding and Jeffco Funding
- Board of Education Training – 1/9/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Governor’s Proposed Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Kick off School (Student Based Budgeting) and Department (Budgeting for Outcomes) Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January/February</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Build Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>March Forecast; Fine Tuning of Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Budget Adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Budget will:

✓ Effectively allocate monetary resources to enhance student achievement.

✓ Clearly communicate the financial state of the district to the public.

✓ Comply with all state, federal and local statutes and regulations as well as internal organizational controls.

✓ Identify all budgetary changes from year to year.

✓ Set appropriations to ensure positive reserve balances in all funds.
The Process will continue to:

✓ Meet specified deadlines while producing a comprehensive and accurate budget.

✓ Provide opportunities for community and staff input to support Board budget direction.

✓ Identify budget assumptions used for the development process.

✓ Use forecasting to anticipate future needs and resources.

✓ Review all program and department budgets.
Two-part Process

1. For Schools
   - Entering second year of Student Based Budgeting (SBB)

2. For Departments
   - Implementing a new process Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO)

These processes work in unison to better align the district’s budget with its strategic plan and long term financial plan.
STUDENT BASED budgeting

Process for Schools
Holding all else constant, a school district that allocated 50 percent of its FY2011 budget to weighted student formula, where money follows the student, is nearly 10 times more likely to close achievement gaps than a district that only allocated 20 percent of its FY2011 budget to weighted student formula.

“Furthermore, the flexibility provided to schools and teachers offers them the opportunity to devise innovative solutions that might not be possible in a top-down budget coming from the district office. In student-based budgeting, school-level priorities drive budgeting and not the other way around.”

2013 Weighted Student Formula Yearbook

- See more at: http://reason.org/news/show/student-based-budgeting-helps-princ#sthash.vlDC85oq.dpuf
Defined expectations – School Autonomy within Established Guidelines

To provide the opportunity for principals, with input from all stakeholders, to make:

► site-specific
► student-based

decisions on the deployment of resources to obtain the greatest student achievement outcomes.
Budgeting for Schools: Central to Local...

From a Central Perspective
- Number of resources dictated to schools and small discretionary dollar amounts for FFE and Supplies
- Decisions for staffing apply to all—no local flexibility

To a School Perspective
- Desire to meet local needs and wants
- Ability to adjust with changing student populations
- Adapt and innovate timely
Background

Implemented for majority of schools for the 2015/2016 school year. This model:

- Allocated **resources to schools** based on their student counts and factors such as at-risk.
- Directed funds to schools in support of **school-based decision-making**.
- Provided **equity** as funds were allocated in a uniform and consistent process based on the population each individual school serves.
- Provided **flexibility for site-based decisions** for staffing and spending within limited parameters known as defined autonomy.
First Year Accomplishments

- Implementation involved over 130 sites
- Training and support were instrumental in the successful roll out of SBB
- Results and feedback were positive

A recent survey of principals showed that over 70 percent view SBB as an improvement from the prior central allocation model.
Enhancement is needed for the nVision reports as compared/aligned to the Hyperion budgeting tool.

Funds are needed to support reduced lunch qualifying students.

More flexibility in staffing (Instructional Coaches, Class Sizes, Support Staff)

Better predictability of declining enrollment/impact of Choice Enrollment

Desire for more help for small schools with high-impact student population
Second Year Goals

- Continue with process
- Fine tune factors – shifting of revenue (free and reduced, small schools, high impact)
- Gather enrollment data
- Include benefits in planning process
budgeting for OUTCOMES

Process for Departments
After research and careful consideration, the Budget staff believes using BFO, a modified priority based budgeting approach, for departments will yield greater results than any of the other models.

- Better aligns our processes with the Board’s ends, strategic planning goals and long term financial plan.

- Creates a departmental process that supports SBB.

- Promotes efficiencies and presents a focus on the district’s already established goals.

- Enables the district to continually evaluate the success of achieving defined goals.
BFO Objectives

The key objective of BFO is to understand our community’s values and create a budget to reflect those values.

Other objectives of BFO:

- Budgeting priorities change with changes in the strategic plan.
- Focuses on programs that directly contribute to the success of the strategic plan.
- Takes in to consideration future needs of the district.
Research on Budgeting Methods

The district researched various budgeting strategies, including:

- Zero-Based Budgeting
  Budget starts from zero. Each department submits decision packages on levels of service.

  - Hundreds of decision packages require significant time commitment from all levels of management.
  - Managers are reluctant to suggest packages below current spending.
  - Managers are focused on decisions packages and do not look at how to change services.
  - Ranking of intangible outputs can be difficult.
  - Current budget staff resources are inadequate to fully implement this process.
Other districts have been cited as purportedly using the zero based budgeting model.

After digging deeper, the majority of these sources were actually using a modified or hybrid approach to ZBB or still using incremental budgeting.

The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) found only 2 out of 413 governments using a textbook version of ZBB.
Phased Implementation

Staff plans is implementing the Budgeting for Outcomes process using a phased approach:

1. Clearly identify priorities of the district based on community values.

2. Identify key departments to take place in the first wave of implementation.

3. Team with Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) for implementation assistance that it offers to districts.

4. Join with the Alliance for Excellence in School Budgeting to gain access to tools and networking opportunities surrounding Best Practices in School Budgeting program.
Budgeting for Outcomes

- Manageable with existing staff and resources
- Aligns with Student Based Budgeting
- Aligns with Our Processes
- With Board Ends, Strategic Planning Goals, and Long Term Financial Plan

Manageable with existing staff and resources
community engagement plan
Community Engagement Plan

Identifying Needs and Priorities

1. Online Surveys – SAC and Community
2. Department Process
3. SAC/DAC
4. District Leadership
5. All input informs BOE decision-making

Board Community Forums

Public Hearings
2015/2016
statewide funding and enrollment impact
2015/2016 enrollment
2015 Student Count

- Membership
- Enrollment
- FTE
- Funded Count
2015 Student Count

SBB is funded using this
2015 Student Count

- Membership
- Enrollment
- FTE
- Funded Count

SBB is funded using this

District is funded by the State using this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16*</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District-Managed Schools</td>
<td>75,738</td>
<td>74,947</td>
<td>(791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools</td>
<td>7,656</td>
<td>8,565</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total District Enrollment</td>
<td>83,394</td>
<td>83,512</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2015/2016 Funding Base – ES $3,580, MS $3,710, HS $3,380
# 2015 Student Funded Count – District Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded Count*</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District-Managed Schools</td>
<td>74,383</td>
<td>73,859</td>
<td>(524)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools</td>
<td>6,747</td>
<td>7,563</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total District Funded Count</td>
<td>81,130</td>
<td>81,422</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2015/2016 Per Pupil Funding - $7,109
District Funding
Decrease of 520 Funded Count = $4M Reduction in District funding for current year.
District Funding
Decrease of 520 Funded Count = $4M Reduction in District funding for current year.

School Based Budgets
SBB funding base for ES, MS and HS will be adjusted for changes in enrollment count.

Support for schools to manage changes.
2016/2017 statewide funding
Governor’s Budget Request for 2016/2017 released in November.

Funding amounts will change throughout the legislative session.

Final funding is typically available in late spring.
Proposed Increased Statewide Funding for K-12 Education of $163M

1. Inflation:
   1.8% (PY 2.8%)

2. Growth in Students:
   10,063 (PY 10,844)

3. Negative Factor:
   Increased $50M (PY decreased $25M)
2016/2017
Jeffco funding
2016/2017 Jeffco Funding Update

$9M

Revenue

$100 Per Pupil
2016/2017 Jeffco Funding Update

Governor’s Request
$9.1M

Estimated growth in funding attributed to charter enrollment.
2016/2017 Jeffco Funding Update

Governor’s Request $9.1M

Total General Fund Increase $7.4M

Less Pass Through to Charters $(1.7M)

Estimated growth in funding attributed to charter enrollment.
2016/2017 Assumptions

Proposed General Fund Increase $7.4M
2016/2017 Assumptions

- Proposed General Fund Increase: $7.4M
- Less Health Care Reform (mandated): $4M
- Less PERA (mandated): $3.2M
- Total General Fund Remaining: $.2M
budget

RESOURCES
Background information available:

1. www.jeffcopublicschools.org

2. Board of Education / Go to BoardDocs
   January 9, 2016 Retreat – Finance and Budget Overview

3. Finance & Budget
   Financial Publications
Jeffco Vision, Ends and Strategic Work

Introduction

Jeffco Public Schools has a long tradition of quality education. This tradition provides the foundation for which to carry out strategic work from preschool through high school in order to ensure a fully prepared high school graduate. The Jeffco 2020 Vision (developed by a representative taskforce) defines the characteristics of a successful graduate for 2020 and beyond.

The Board Ends and the 2015-2017 Strategic Plan set priorities for the district in order to provide all students from Pre-K through 12th grade the educational experiences necessary to make progress toward the Jeffco 2020 Vision.

Current Board Ends (Ends update in process)

Every student will be taught by an effective teacher in a school led by an effective principal so that they are prepared for continuous learning and the world of work in the changing environment of the 21st century. Therefore,

Ends 1   Every student will master the Colorado Content Standards at grade level.
(Targets: Algebra I, 3rd grade reading, 4th grade math, writing at levels)

Ends 2   Every student will achieve at least one year’s growth, or more as needed to catch up, in every year of school and be ready for the next level.
(Targets: Free/Reduced Lunch, Students with Disabilities, English Learners, Advanced Learners)

Ends 3   Every student will graduate career and workforce and/or post-secondary ready.
(Targets: College remediation rates, ACT college readiness benchmarks)

Ends 4   Every student will learn in a caring, safe, and engaging school environment that maximizes parental involvement and encourages community support.

Ends 5   Every student will become a responsible citizen.

2015-2017 Strategic Plan

The strategic plan lays out the actions that will be taken to make progress toward the Jeffco 2020 Vision.

Strategy One: Empower to Educate, Inspire to Learn
   Includes actions for Social, Emotional and Physical Wellness; Family and Community Engagement

Strategy Two: Connect to College, Career and Life Aspirations
   Includes actions for Student Learning Expectations; High Quality Instruction for Engaged Learning; Balanced Assessment Practices; Multiple Learning Pathways

Strategy Three: Leadership Development for all Stakeholders
   Includes actions for Professional Learning and Growth; Leadership Development and Collaboration; Continuous Improvement

We Want to Hear From You! Please complete the online interactive budget tool at www.jeffcopublicschools.org
In order for students to pursue their life goals, by 2020 all Jeffco graduates will be able to successfully apply the following competencies:

- Content Mastery
- Civic & Global Engagement
- Communication
- Critical Thinking & Creativity
- Self-Direction & Personal Responsibility

Whole Child Development
Apply content knowledge and conceptual understandings.

Transfer content knowledge and conceptual understandings.

Demonstrate a year or more of growth.

Academic Confidence

Content Mastery

Critical Thinking & Creativity

Growth Mindset

Creative Solution Finding

Risk-taking and Imaginative Thinking

Higher Order Questioning & Inquiry

Problem Identification and Problem Solving

Self-Direction & Personal Responsibility

Health & Wellness

Reflective Thinking

Self-advocacy

Goal Setting & Monitoring

Perseverance & Resiliency

Self-regulation & Personal Accountability

Self-Direction & Personal Responsibility

Civic & Global Engagement

Leadership

Cultural Proficiency

Advocacy for Others

Civic Responsibility & Citizenship

Communication

Situational Awareness

Collaboration & Teamwork

Conflict Management

Communicate with Clarity & Purpose

Interpersonal Skills

Self-advocacy

Goal Setting & Monitoring

Perseverance & Resiliency

Self-regulation & Personal Accountability

Critical Thinking & Creativity

Growth Mindset

Creative Solution Finding

Risk-taking and Imaginative Thinking

Higher Order Questioning & Inquiry

Problem Identification and Problem Solving

Self-Direction & Personal Responsibility

Health & Wellness

Reflective Thinking

Self-advocacy

Goal Setting & Monitoring

Perseverance & Resiliency

Self-regulation & Personal Accountability

Self-Direction & Personal Responsibility

Civic & Global Engagement

Leadership

Cultural Proficiency

Advocacy for Others

Civic Responsibility & Citizenship

Communication

Situational Awareness

Collaboration & Teamwork

Conflict Management

Communicate with Clarity & Purpose

Interpersonal Skills