

DAC/SAC Survey: 2018-2019 Spending Priorities

Following are the preliminary summary results of the DAC/SAC Spending Priorities Survey for the 2019-2020 school year. The survey data was provided to us without school names, which has limited our ability to analyze the data at the detailed level provided in the 2018-2019 report. In the prior year's report we were able to provide priorities by school type (including title 1 schools), on a per pupil basis and geographically by Board of Education Representative District. We request that the survey data be provided to us again with school names attached so that we can more fully summarize the survey findings to the BVSD Board.

Summary Data

53 schools responded the Survey

1. 28 - Elementary Schools (53%)
2. 9 - Middle Schools (17%)
3. 9 - High Schools (17%)
4. 5 - K-8th Schools (9%)
5. 1 - K-12th School (2%)
6. 1 - 6th-12th School (2%)

Who completed the survey on the schools' behalf?

7. 79% - SAC via consensus
8. 13% - Principal alone
9. 8% - PTO via consensus
10. 2% - SAC Chair or DAC Representative completed alone

Prioritization of BVSD Funding Questions

Questions 4 & 6: "Please rate each category as highly, moderately or least critical" and "Please rank the following categories from highest (#1) to lowest priority (#7) for your school"

- In order of priority, "Social-emotional supports (SEL)", "Equity and support for all students" and "Academic Support Staff" emerged as the most "highly critical" funding categories for the BVSD schools.
 1. "SEL" – 89% of school listed as highly critical, 100% as highly or moderately critical and 92% ranked as one of their top 3 priorities.
 2. "Equity and support for all students" – 87% of schools listed as highly critical, 100% as highly or moderately critical and 83% ranked as one of their top 3 priorities.
 3. "Academic Support Staff" – 72% of schools listing it as highly critical, 92% highly or moderately critical and 72% ranked as one of their top 3 priorities.
- Additional areas that were deemed important to the schools with high percentages of highly/moderately critical rankings and consistent rankings as mid-level priorities.
 - o "Classroom innovation" – 79% of schools listed as highly or moderately critical and had a weighted priority ranking of #4
 - o "Building Needs" - 74% of schools listed as highly or moderately critical and had a weighted priority ranking of #5

- “Technology” – 72% of schools listed as highly or moderately critical and had a weighted priority ranking of #6

Clarification on SEL and Equity Funding Questions

Question 8: “Please rank each subcategory as highly, moderately, or least critical.”

- “Increasing School Counselors”, Identification of student SEL needs” and “Improving family supports” were ranked as the most critical subcategories of SEL and Equity Funding.
 1. “Increasing School Counselors” was the highest ranked SEL subcategory with 75% of schools listing it as highly critical and 92% as either highly or moderately critical.
 2. “Identification of student SEL needs” was also highly ranked with 64% of schools listing it as highly critical and 92% as either highly or moderately critical.
 - a. It is worth noting that high schools did not find this category as highly critical as middle, elementary and other schools with only 33% listing it as highly critical.
 - b. Identification of student SEL needs was ranked as moderately critical 67% of the time.
 3. “Improving family supports (community liaison, public assistance, etc. ...)” was third in the ranking with 55% of schools listing it as highly critical and 94% as either highly or moderately critical. Looking at the raw data we found it notable that middle and high schools ranked this category highly critical 67% and 74% of the time, respectively, when compared to elementary schools that ranked it highly critical just 46% of the time.
- Other areas that ranked high were “evidence-based SEL programs and curricula” as well as “monitoring impact of SEL (SWIS, student climate survey, etc.)”; both of which had high combined highly critical/moderately critical percentages at 91% and 85%, respectively.
 - a. When looking at ranking of “evidence-based SEL programs and curricula” middle schools were outliers ranking it highly critical 56% of the time compared to elementary schools at 36% and high schools at 33%.
 - b. In addition, 100% of high schools felt “monitoring impact of SEL (SWIS, student climate survey, etc.)” to be highly critical where only 29% of elementary schools and 33% of middle schools ranked it as highly critical.
- It is worth noting that although “increasing academic advisors” was deemed the least critical subcategory when looking at all schools, this is not that case for the high schools which listed it a highly or moderately critical 77% of the time.

Question 13: Equity – Please rank each subcategory as highly, moderately or least critical.

- The highest ranked equity subcategories were:
 1. “Access to highly skilled teachers and educators” (94% highly critical, 100% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
 2. “Access to differentiated interventions across topics” (85% highly critical, 198% highly critical/moderately critical combined)

3. "Access to high-level, evidenced-based curricula" (72% highly critical, 94% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
- Given the disproportionate number of schools per school category (High, Middle, Elementary, K-8), it is worth looking at some of the outliers.
 - a. Among middle and high schools, "Access to educational technology at school and home" was deemed critical. (78% highly critical, 89% highly critical/moderately critical combined at both types of schools)
 - b. At both elementary schools and K-8 schools, "Access to full day kindergarten" was deemed to be highly critical (91% highly critical, 97% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
 - c. At elementary schools "Identification of learning needs (SPED, dyslexia, TAG, etc.)" was deemed critical (79% highly critical, 89% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
 - d. At K-8 schools "Access to elective and co-curricular activities" was reported to be highly critical (80% highly critical, 100% highly critical/moderately critical combined)

Clarification on Innovation and Technology Funding Questions

Question 15: Innovation – Please rate each subcategory as highly, moderately or least critical:

- All available answers were reported to be highly to moderately critical in the following order
 1. "Project/problem-based learning" (68% highly critical, 96% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
 2. "Interdisciplinary learning" (60% highly critical, 92% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
 3. "Adaptive teaching tools" (47% highly critical, 87% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
 4. "Flexible seating and/or classroom design" (28% highly critical, 75% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
- "Interdisciplinary learning", while important to middle and elementary schools was not as critical to high schools with only 33% reporting as "highly critical"
- "Adaptive teaching and learning tools" saw middle schools as the outlier with only 11% of the middle schools reporting as "highly critical".

Question 17: Technology - Please rate each subcategory as highly, moderately or least critical:

- "Technical support staff (to maintain infrastructure/devices)" was reported as the most highly critical item listed (53% highly critical, 89% highly critical/moderately critical combined)
- Access to software or subscriptions was also reported to be critical (45% highly critical, 89% highly critical/moderately critical combined)

- “Updated A/V equipment” and “More Chromebooks” were, on average, deemed to be moderately critical with lower “highly critical” percentages but a combined highly/moderately critical percentages of 75% and 66%, respectively.

Open Ended Response Questions

Question 19: Interpretation of qualitative responses to Dare to Dream question--“If funding was unlimited, what would you want for your school?”

- Coding of open-ended responses to the “Dare to Dream” question on the Budget Survey revealed trends which underscore the quantitative items above. Respondents overwhelmingly emphasized requests for more personnel, particularly in the areas of reducing class sizes, increasing academic support through more interventionists and paraeducators, and increasing social emotional support through counselors and more programs, particularly in high schools. Full-day kindergarten was a strong theme for elementary schools. Non-personnel requests included facility upgrades, particularly in reconfiguring current space to meet needs, transportation for extracurricular activities, and experiential education opportunities.
- See table below

Percentages indicate number of mentions of code divided by number of schools in category. Some codes are over 100% (for example, counselors/SEL at the high school level) because the codes were mentioned multiple times by individual schools.

<u>CODE</u>	<u>ELEM.</u> <u>(28)</u>	<u>MID.</u> <u>(9)</u>	<u>HIGH</u> <u>(9)</u>	<u>K-8</u> <u>(5)</u>	<u>other (2:</u> <u>K-12,</u> <u>mid/high</u> <u>)</u>
counselors/SEL	57%	56%	111%	40%	0%
full-day K/full-day preK	32%	0%	0%	60%	0%
smaller class size/more teachers	61%	78%	33%	80%	50%
intervention /literacy /math/ELD/paras	171%	33%	133%	100%	0%
intervention, SPED, MTSS, tier II	64%	22%	44%	80%	0%
literacy, reading	50%	11%	44%	0%	0%
math, numeracy	4%	0%	11%	0%	0%
ELD, EL	7%	0%	11%	0%	0%
paras, tutor	46%	0%	22%	20%	0%
admin, APs	18%	11%	22%	20%	0%
all other non-teaching staff	68%	22%	78%	40%	50%
ALL STAFF (includes counselors/SEL, K/preK)	389%	189%	356%	320%	100%
facilities of any kind	64%	11%	122%	80%	0%
transportation	7%	11%	22%	0%	50%
experiential/outings/critical thinking	14%	22%	67%	60%	50%
collaboration and planning	4%	33%	22%	0%	0%

Question 20: Interpretation of qualitative responses to board recommendations question—“What ultimate recommendations do you have for the Board of Education regarding district spending priorities?”

- Coding of open-ended responses to the “Board Recommendations” question of the Budget Survey also underscore the quantitative items above. Many of the same themes, such as full-day kindergarten, smaller class sizes, more teachers (including interventionists), and more counselors and social emotional support emerged. While equity is a theme embedded in many of the “Dare to Dream” responses above (for example, full-day kindergarten, more interventionists, smaller class sizes), it was more explicitly called out in this question, particularly at the high school level. Two other codes which should not be ignored: a significant proportion of schools at all levels (44, 43, 33% elem/mid/high, respectively) indicated in some way that they want autonomy in determining their spending and staffing priorities and a somewhat smaller but still significant proportion of schools (18, 11, 11%, elem/mid/high, respectively) indicated that the BVSD education center is over-staffed.
- see table below

Percentages indicate number of mentions of code divided by number of schools in category.

CODE	ELEM. (28)	MID. (9)	HIGH (9)	K-8 (5)	other (2: K-12, mid/high)
equity	46%	44%	78%	20%	0%
SEL, counseling	32%	44%	22%	100%	0%
Full-day K	29%	11%	22%	20%	0%
smaller class size	11%	22%	11%	0%	0%
more teachers/staff	11%	22%	11%	0%	0%
intervention					
n	43%	0%	33%	20%	0%
literacy, reading	21%	0%	0%	20%	0%
ELD	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%
paras	4%	11%	11%	0%	0%
transportation	4%	0%	11%	0%	0%
other staff	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%
admin, AP	4%	11%	0%	0%	0%
Ed Center	18%	11%	11%	0%	0%
how to fund	43%	44%	33%	0%	50%

Changes to make to the survey

Questions in which schools indicate importance of categories are of diminishing use; many or most categories are ranked “highly important” by most schools. Questions in which schools rank priorities relative to each other give better differentiation of responses.

Questions are not well-differentiated for level. For example, high schools do not have kindergartens, but they have school resource officers (and elementary schools have kindergartens but tend not to have security staff). Differentiating questions by level of school and/or giving schools the ability to answer “not applicable” would be helpful. In addition, it might be useful to have questions for reporting Title 1 status or geographical location (school board district) so that DAC can include these analyses without sacrificing anonymity of responses.

While most responses to the open-ended questions were codable, it is likely that respondents were not anticipating that this is how they would be analyzed. There were distinct outliers; in particular, the “other” category had very little data because the responses were vanishingly brief, while a few responses were rambling and hard to code. Questions which had more limitations/parameters and more instructions might yield better information. (Eg, “Responses will be analyzed and coded for common themes across schools.” “Please limit your responses to no more than 150 words.” Open-ended questions around specific themes, such as staffing, facilities, equity, with a ranking-type question about the order of priorities for these themes.) In particular, we should solicit feedback from SACs about the Budget Survey itself. (“Please give us your feedback for improving this survey.”)