

**To:** ACPS School Board Members  
**From:** Maya Kumazawa, Director of Budget & Planning  
Rosalyn Schmitt, Chief Operating Officer  
**Date:** January 30, 2020  
**Subject:** Responses to Questions Regarding the FY 2020/21 Superintendent's Funding Request



---

The below questions were asked by School Board members before and during the Budget Work Sessions. Staff have provided responses to these questions in this memo.

### **Revenues**

**1. What happened in 19/20 to account for the huge jump in the LCI?**

Local Composite Index (LCI) is a comparative formula that is based upon 3 primary drivers; total value of real estate, total income, and sales tax. The LCI increase in the prior biennium was primarily due to a large influx of income to a very small number of individuals in the community. During the time period that the FY 2019/20 LCI information was captured, far fewer than 100 individuals in the community received approximately \$1 billion in new income. This increase in income represented nearly a 20% increase in the total income of the entire community. Staff's analysis was that this income was episodic due to one-time capital gains and associated sales/public offerings of local companies. The LCI for FY 2020/21 is calculated upon a total local income that is more than \$300M less than the prior biennium, which appears to support staff's previous analysis.

**2. Please expand on what Games of Skill (A-24) means. Is it simply discretionary monies for our use?**

Games of Skill are arcade-like machines usually located in bars, convenience stores and gas stations. Players can earn money based upon their success in playing the games. These machines have become increasingly popular and heretofore have not been subjected to much regulation.

At the state level, they have generated increasing concern because they are likely taking revenue away from the state lottery, which in part funds education. The Governor's proposal would take revenues from these games and divert it to education.

The funds are discretionary monies for our use. We have not received any information from the state, other than: "School divisions are permitted to spend these funds on both recurring and non-recurring expenditures and do not require a local match".

**3. Re the Per Pupil figures on B-9 through 10, how many students are factored in? I struggle to make the figures jibe with those on B-8. Same question for Supplemental Lottery/pupil on B-13. Using \$1,589,412 over 14,000 students, I get \$113.53 vs. the \$314.62 shown**

The state determines the "per pupil allocation (PPA)" for each of the SOQ funded programs. The PPA is set based on a number of factors including SOQ standards, support costs, inflation rates,

average salaries, and estimated benefit costs. For most SOQ programs, a funding formula incorporates the PPA, projected enrollment, and the Local Composite Index (LCI):

$$[\text{PPA} \times \text{ADM} (14,161)] \times [1 - \text{LCI} (0.6449)]$$

For example, for Special Education (page B-10), the PPA is set at \$672. Plugging this into the above formula, the resulting revenue projection for Special Education is: \$3,379,200.

Special Education:

$$[\text{PPA} (\$672) \times \text{Average Daily Membership} (14,161)] \times [1 - \text{LCI} (0.6449)] = \$3,379,200$$

The calculation for Supplemental Lottery is slightly different. The state has set the PPA at \$314.62. For this item, the state projection for ACPS' Average Daily Membership (ADM) of 14,226.55 is used, instead of the ACPS projected ADM of 14,161. (The ACPS projected ADM calculation is page G-4.) The actual funding distribution will be based on the actual March 31 ADM, up to \$1,589,412 (which is based on the state ADM projection).

Supplemental Lottery:

$$[\text{PPA} (\$314.62) \times \text{Average Daily Membership} (14,226.55)] \times [1 - \text{LCI} (0.6449)] = \$1,589,412$$

**4. B-16. What is the impact of the increased funding for IDEA? Is this impact factored into the budget #s?**

Yes. All increased finding under IDEA has been calculated and utilized to address special education staffing in FY 2020/21. The Annual Plan utilizes IDEA funds primarily to pay for special education teachers' salary and benefits.

**5. B-18. Were the Western Operating expenses due to the new ESA addition?**

Yes, \$50,304 in FY 2019/20 represents the Local Government transfer for operating the additional 10,000 square feet added to Western Albemarle High School, as part of the bond referendum. There was a corresponding budgeted expenditure increase of the same amount that reflects the costs associated with operating the additional science facilities (0.5 Maintenance FTE and 0.5 Custodial FTE). For FY 2020/21, these revenues are incorporated into the base transfer amount.

**6. What is the Mobile VIA unit?**

Rent payment from the Virginia Institute of Autism to the Division for use of a mobile unit on the Murray High School campus. This is new in FY 2019/20.

**7. What are Recovered Costs: Piedmont Regional Education Program. Why did it decrease?**

Recovered Costs are reimbursements from other governmental entities including Albemarle County, insurance companies, and agencies for costs incurred by the School Division on its behalf. PREP Recovered Costs are payments from the Piedmont Regional Education Program for servicing the Ivy Creek facility, owned and maintained by the School Division. The reduction in FY 2019/20 is due to new arrangements for the use and service of the facility.

## Compensation

- 8. Additional Compensation Increase (A-26, A-28). Are these monies a placeholder to see where we are in April re Teacher and Classified raises and to see if we can make the leap to \$15? May I assume that the first two (T&C) are covered by the \$2.5 MM and the \$15 monies are not built in yet?**

Correct, this is a placeholder amount for now. There are three components to the placeholder: it represents an additional 0.5% increase for teachers (above 2.5%), an additional 0.5% increase for classified employees (above 1.5%), and funds required to raise the minimum pay rate to \$15.00/hour (above \$13.50/hour) for the School Division. The placeholder figure does not include the cost of raising the minimum pay rate for Child Nutrition and EDEP Special Revenue Funds.

- 9. Minimum Pay Rate Increases assumes \$13.50 factored into calculations? The jump to \$15.00 requires ~an additional \$1.6 million? Are we looking to add State/Local funding to make that happen?**

Yes, "Minimum Pay Rate Increase" assumes \$13.50. An additional increase from \$13.50 to \$15.00 as the minimum pay rate would require an additional \$1,650,000. This amount has been factored into the Superintendent's balanced budget request within the "Additional Compensation Increase" on page A-26 and would not require additional State/Local funding above what is currently expected. The placeholder figure does not include the cost of raising the minimum pay rate for Child Nutrition and EDEP Special Revenue Funds from \$13.50 to \$15.00.

- 10. E-30, 62101. Are these the monies we need for the 3% Teacher pay raise?**

No, this amount is made up of approximately \$265,000 for an additional 0.5% increase for Classified employees (bringing them up to a 2.0% total increase) as well as \$1,650,000 for an additional \$1.50 increase to the minimum pay rate (bringing it up to \$15/hr).

The cost of an additional 0.5% increase for Teachers (to bring them up to 3.0% increase total) is approximately \$630,000. This has been incorporated into the Multi-School budget on page D-70. (Please note that there are some output errors that will be corrected on page D-70. The total budget for Multi-School services is \$14,149,759 including an approximately \$6,650,000 increase in salary and benefits.)

**Non-Discretionary/Directed**

**11. SPED Restructure and Current Year Growth (A-26, A-29). Why is the number at \$926,297 if that figure is reduced by \$140,598 from the Increase/Decrease of Medicare Reimbursements/PREP Reimbursements. Why isn't \$785,699 (last paragraph, first sentence) the correct figure, please?**

Beginning with page A-26, all changes described are expenditure changes. While the net impact of the SPED Restructure is \$785,699, the actual expenditure change is \$926,297. This is the figure we show, so that if you add up all of the expenditure changes, you can see the total FY 21 expenditure growth, when compared to the FY 20 Adopted Budget expenditures.

FY 21 School Fund Revenues	FY 21 School Fund Expenditures
-\$359,402 (A-24 Regional Tuition) <u>+\$500,000 (A-25 Medicaid Reimb.)</u> +\$140,598	+\$926,297 (A-29 SPED Restructure)
Net "Cost" to the School Division: \$785,699	

**12. How will the change in the Regional tuition allocation and medicaid reimbursement affect the services PREP students receive? In the new redefining of eligible students, will students who were once eligible no longer be eligible? Ideally the end-user wouldn't notice any change, right?**

The majority of "PREP Students", are actually Albemarle County Students sitting in our classes across the School Division across grade levels.

The commitment ACPS has made throughout this process is that students that have been served through PREP in the past will continue to receive the same services in 2020-2021. This is also true for our families. For example, vision services previously provided through PREP will continue to be provided, but in 2020-2021 through a Special Education Teacher endorsed in Vision Impairments. Likewise, Albemarle County families who have previously received information and support through the Parent Resource Center provided by PREP, will continue to have such services, but ACPS will now run its own Parent Resource Center that will serve our families in a similar way that PREP has operated in the past.

All other services associated with the Regional Reimbursement / PREP Program were provided by our own staff (i.e. special education case management, instructional assistant, speech, psychological, occupational and physical therapy services). The 2020-2021 budget maintaining staffing levels and services to our children in these regards. The change has resulted in coding these professionals from PREP to our local budget.

There is no expected change in the provision of Assistive Technology services offered through PREP as we have put those services back into the budget.

The only other students served by PREP are outside of our neighborhood schools and are served at the Ivy Creek School. No changes are expected in terms of our arrangement or the restructuring of the Regional Reimbursement rules, etc.

**13. Transportation (A-26, A-31): \$322,279 offset by \$39,512 for a net \$182,767. Why is \$322K figure used?**

Beginning with page A-26, all changes described are expenditure changes. While the net impact of Transportation Operations \$182,767, the actual expenditure change is \$322,279. This is the figure we show, so that if you add up all of the expenditure changes, you can see the FY 21 expenditure growth, when compared to the FY 20 Adopted Budget.

FY 21 School Fund Revenues	FY 21 School Fund Expenditures
+139,512 (A-23 VMF Transfer)	+\$322,279 (A-31 Trans. Op.)
Net "Cost" to the School division: \$182,767	

## Growth

- 14. Bookkeepers (A-27, A-33). 1FTE @ \$193K stands out. The explanation on A- isn't clear to me as to whether that is for one position or is shared among 2+ positions**

This proposal adds 1.0 FTE, at a cost of approximately \$59,000 to serve as an itinerant bookkeeper. In addition, there is \$134,000 budgeted to reclassify existing Office Assistants at the elementary schools from 10-month OA IIIs to 12-mo OA IVs. These reclassification funds will be distributed among the elementary schools, but does not add any additional FTEs.

## Proposals

- 15. FLES & Immersion program-- I guess I don't know the difference in these programs. Can you direct me to some information on it? I have heard teachers complain that one of these programs favors a certain demographic of student, creating inequities, so I just want to make sure we're not contributing to unfairness about who gets to participate.**

**What are student outcomes for the Elementary World Language Program? What are the metrics to judge its success? Is there equity-related data collected regarding the program and participation?**

Here is a slide show presented to the board in January 2016 that gives definitions and rationale. <http://esblogin.k12albemarle.org/attachments/c96f031c-b216-4e34-a2de-679479a47a4a.pdf>. We continue to see an increase in Standards of Learning assessments over the past two years as an overall outcome and in some membership groups. We are looking at the inequity of having an “opt-in” program (what currently happens) in contrast to an ‘opt-out’ program to allow for more participation from families that may not be aware of their options.

- 16. STEP Expansion (A-27, A-39). What is AHS's “wrap-around” program and will Darah be funding it via his own budget?**

0.50 FTE of the total 2.50 FTE for the STEP Program Expansion is dedicated for the AHS “wrap-around” program. The proposal does not require any additional operating budget, other than the 0.50 FTE for the “wrap-around” program.

AHS plans to invest in their STEP program with more concentrated plans and support from staff for students in the program. The proposal requests 0.50 FTE to provide resources and develop plans of intervention in areas of mindfulness, restorative practice, etc. to students in STEP. Albemarle had 22 out of school suspension from August 22 through September 30, 2019. With the implementation of STEP, we envision this number being reduced to 2 or 3 students based on those specific infractions.

**17. What are the outcomes of the STEP program thus far?**

STEP is intended to be an alternative to out of school suspension therefore the most effective way to evaluate its effectiveness is to look at the way it impacts the number of out of school suspensions in schools. We can do this by looking at out of school suspension numbers in schools the year before and immediately after STEP has been implemented. When reviewing that data it becomes abundantly clear that STEP is an incredibly effective tool for reducing out of school suspensions at the middle school level and moderately successful at the high school level.

**Schools Implementing STEP SY 2017-2018**

	Out of School Suspensions		Change
	SY 2016-2017	SY 2017-2018	
<b>Burley Middle School</b>	112	15	↓87%
<b>Jouett Middle School</b>	87	20	↓77%

**Schools Implementing STEP SY 2018-2019**

	Out of School Suspensions		Change
	SY 2017-2018	SY 2018-2019	
<b>Albemarle High School</b>	171	138	↓19%

**Schools Implementing STEP SY 2019-2020**

	Out of School Suspensions (Through Quarter 2)		Change
	SY 2018-2019	SY 2019-2020	
<b>Walton Middle School</b>	26	3	↓85%
<b>Monticello High School</b>	93	71	↓24%

**18. EDEP (A-27, A-41) On A-41, the Total Budget row figures are a bit confusing to me. Are they simply the cumulative \$87,663 transfers to EDEP for five years for budget purposes only and the suspended \$87,500 transfer from EDEP is not reflected at all? May I assume that it is included in EDEP’s operating budget?**

On page A-27, the \$87,663 represents the expenditure change for the School Fund. \$87,663 is the proposed new amount that will be transferred from the School Fund to EDEP.

You are correct that the \$87,500 suspended transfer from EDEP to the School Fund is not reflected here because that is captured on the School Fund revenue side. The \$87,500 transfer that EDEP typically pays to the School Fund was captured as a “local revenue” to the School Fund. The proposal eliminates this transfer, which would decrease School Fund revenues, at a “cost” of \$87,500. The net benefit to EDEP is \$175,163 in FY 2020/21.

The 5-year projection on page A-41 only represents the School Fund expenditure side. The increasing expenditures over 5 years reflect scaling the proposal over time to expand the service to a larger number of economically disadvantaged students.

For FY 2020/21, these are the impacts for the EDEP proposal:

<b>FY 21 School Fund Revenues</b>	<b>FY 21 School Fund Expenditures</b>
-\$87,500 (A-23 EDEP Transfer)	+\$87,663 (A-41 Proposal)
Net “Cost” to the School Division: \$175,163	

<b>FY 21 EDEP Expenditures</b>	<b>FY 21 EDEP Revenues</b>
-\$87,500 Transfer +\$87,500 Proposal \$0 Expenditure Change	+\$87,663 Proposal
Net “Benefit” for EDEP: \$175,163	

**19. EDEP participants-- do we know what % of current participants are on free/reduced lunch now? Can the new lottery system prioritize Albemarle County teachers, as another "perk" of employment to make their lives easier?**

EDEP serves approximately 1,000 students total. Out of that total, there are currently 11 students who receive a 25% reduction in fees and 6 students who receive a 50% reduction in fees. These numbers are consistent with the 2018-2019 students receiving reduced rates (14 at 25% and 5 at 50%). We have 100 students with parents employed by ACPS (including teachers, assistants, custodians, human resources, etc.) and 21 students with parents employed by Local Government. Early/priority registration for Albemarle County staff can be made available; however, it would eliminate 12% of the available space.

**20. Microcredentialing & Certification-- Are the participants in CRT asking for this, or is this something WE think is a good idea? I heard from some teachers who went through the program that it was too much work for too little reward.**

Microcredentialing is a fairly new, but research-based, best practice that allows teachers to delve deeper into specific areas and earn a “mini-certification” in a specific area. In the truest sense of the concept, micro-credentials are earned through self-paced, often online, modules that allow participants to gain greater understanding, implement what they’ve learned, deep reflect on outcomes, and transfer their learning to daily practice in their classrooms.

In ACPS we currently have two types of micro-credentials. One is focused on social-emotional learning that involves three tiers. This has been ongoing at Cale, Agnor-Hurt, Greer and Woodbrook as part of the SEAD initiative. The purpose of Tier I professional learning is to ensure that all staff members have fundamental understandings of Responsive Classroom (RC), Crisis Prevention (CPI), Trauma Informed Teaching, and the three introductory modules of Culturally Responsive Teaching.

At the second tier, teachers may choose to dig deeper into each of these areas through online modules provided by BloomBoard or approved face to face professional learning sessions. Upon completion of the Tier I and Tier II curriculum, they will have completed the ACPS micro-credential program in social-emotional learning. Teachers who successfully complete Tier I and Tier II receive \$1500 divided over a three-year period.

Currently, our other micro-credential program is around Culturally Responsive Teaching. Teachers may earn \$500 for completing the requirements for the micro-credential process in one of the CRT domains.

To date, both of these micro-credentialing programs are teacher choice and give opportunities for learning and compensation. In ACPS our structures for professional learning allow for a wide range of opportunities for teachers to choose from a wide range of topics and learning environments. The micro-credentialing curricula are both rigorous and may take considerable time which is why we offer the compensation.

**21. Work-based learning apprenticeship program (in-house)-- how might that overlap with current CTE programs, or what CATEC offers? Do you know what certifications you're specifically looking at offering? Is the Praxis ParaPro one of them? I don't think that's currently offered anywhere in our area.**

Apprenticeship, as one of eleven Work-Based Learning (WBL) options recognized by VDOE, is an established education strategy requiring students to complete on-the-job training and work experience, relevant technical instruction (RTI), mentorship, and a nationally-recognized industry credential. VDOE has approved industry certifications that can be selected depending on students' career interests and courses. School counseling and career specialist teams support students in the exploration of course, WBL apprenticeships, and credentialing options.

Apprenticeship is available to all ACPS students. Currently, WAHS and CATEC are schools with student apprenticeship enrollment/activity; CTE and CATEC courses are the RTI integrated with on-the-job training and work experience component. Apprenticeships can represent a wide variety of industries. As part of expanding work-based learning for students, ACPS seeks to be an active sponsor of apprenticeship opportunities for students with integrated CTE and CATEC coursework (RTI) leading to a designated credential depending on the field. In doing so, the County is making an investment in talent development leading to hiring for positions especially where there may be talent shortages.

An ACPS apprenticeship program will build on-the-job and work experience options aligned with students' interests and in strategic operational areas with talent needs to be mutually beneficial. As a possible example, a teaching apprenticeship could be developed for students with career interests in the education field combining on-the-job and work experience within ACPS, Teachers for Tomorrow CTE course, with Praxis Para Pro as a designated certification for apprenticeship completion. A study of potential sponsorship areas within Albemarle County and student interest is a foundational step for establishing an apprenticeship program.

**22. Field trips-- are there other possible funding sources for this? Under outcomes, what % are meeting grade level benchmarks now? I know there are probably reports somewhere on benchmarks...**

Field trips are funded now by parents (fee charged), school funding (for Free/Reduced identified students if requested), PTO assistance, and donations. Elementary schools provide a pathway for all students to attend all field trips; however, some children do not attend based on the parent's ability to pay or their ability to ask for assistance. Acquiring grade level benchmarks are reported with end of year Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments, reading benchmarks and math benchmarks in elementary schools. This funding would provide some definitive outcomes for each field trip and ways of determining the benefit of the experience.

**23. Check and Connect-- how are the students selected for this? Also, the outputs and outcomes are kind of vague... what % increase in SOL passing rate could we expect?**

Fifth graders are identified for this program based on previous history of passing SOL tests. Identification targets students who have passed some but not all of the previous SOL they have taken (3rd and 4th grade). Mentors/academic coaches set goals with each student and strategies are developed as steps to meet the student's goal. We would expect, and saw last year, 90% increase in students passing at least one more SOL test than they did the year before.

**24. Regarding the Being a Reader unfunded proposal: I see that one of the outputs is that 80 percent of all second and kindergarten students will meet grade-level benchmarks. What is the current (or most recent available) percentage of second and kindergarten students meeting grade-level benchmarks? Has BAR in 1st grade been implemented long enough to see how many are meeting benchmarks? If so, what's the percentage under BAR?**

For first graders, at the end of last year, about 70% of students were meeting “the end of the year benchmark” in PALS (state testing for Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening given K-3). We have not been implementing long enough to look at the end of the year benchmarks and must remember that cohorts and the assessment changes. We will be looking to track the growth of the cohort from kindergarten last year to end of first grade this year. Comments from teachers (in our professional development sessions) are telling us that teachers are seeing improvements in short-term formative assessment.

**25. Being a Reader-- do we know what the K-2 teachers think about this program? What % of K-2 students are meeting grade level benchmarks now?**

We are in the process of collecting that data from 1st grade teachers but are encouraged by both the comments of the teachers, the data that is available from individual teachers and PLCs, and principals' response to the consistency that they are seeing across first grade classrooms.

## Departments

**26. C-6. What is the SB Reserve of \$57,662? I thought that there was a Sup's Contingency Reserve in 18-19 that was, in part, spent on the addition of a SB Attorney.**

The School Board Reserve is budgeted annually for the School Board to have a small amount of funding that it may dedicate to specific programs or projects. These programs or projects may be one-time or recurring in nature.

Separately, the Superintendent's Contingency reserve was established to meet the needs of the Superintendent as he restructured Central Office to better meet the needs of the Division moving forward. Once the superintendent restructured and hired a School Board Attorney, this account was eliminated as the structural changes were already incorporated for future budget cycles.

**27. E-7. What are the specific budget numbers for the School Board?**

There is \$54,795 budgeted for salary and benefits of the School Board members. There is an additional \$148,912 budgeted for School Board operational costs. The largest operational costs are funds for the School Board Reserve, contract services, travel, dues & memberships, and staff development.

**28. Please help me understand why there is a \$209,263 cut in Transportation Staffing.**

The largest component of the \$209,110 decrease seen on page A-22 is the transportation restructure that is mentioned on pages A-31 and F-15. Transportation provides services to outside agencies (e.g., ACAC, Boys & Girls Club). The Vehicle Maintenance Special Revenue fund is now being utilized to more accurately track costs for non-ACPS agencies. The Department of Transportation would previously record non-ACPS field trip costs as a negative expenditure for operations. This is now being more accurately tracked as a credit towards drivers' wages related to these field trips; however, this credit seemingly reduces the "Staffing" as the amount spent by ACPS on wages decreases. Additional components of this \$209,110 decrease is a change in the budgeted VRN rate (from 9.4% adopted in 19/20 to 6.52% budgeted for 20/21) as well as other baseline savings due to changes in employee benefit selections and parameter changes. Overall, the Department of Transportation is adding 16 FTEs for the 20/21 request with a total budget increase of \$842,590 or 7.4% (page E-33).

**29. E-19. Given that there is 0 under Other Management, is this because Michelle Castner will oversee ESOL for another year?**

Cyndi Wells' former position is vacant this year, but is planned to be filled in next year. The budget will be updated to reflect the position vacancy.

**30. E-21. Is HR under the Schools or under the County? I understand that it is a shared operation, but I thought it was run by the County. The \$587,967 transfer from the County seems to belie my thinking.**

Human Resources is a shared operation between ACPS and Local Government. We include the full staffing and operational costs within the ACPS budget for which Local Government then transfers funds for their share to the School Division.

**Schools**

**31. Please provide a summary table of per pupil expenditures by school.**

Staff is working on this and will provide this at a later time.

**32. After going through the “school pages”, I note the differences in requests for more/less funding in four categories. Would it be simple enough to create a summary chart?**

Below is a summary chart in the requested categories. The majority of the changes in “Instruction” are due to FTE growth, as described at the January 28th Work Session. Other changes shown in this table are due to position turnover and benefits changes (e.g., health care reallocation, benefit rate changes).

Changes in Building Services (Custodial staff) and Technology (Technology Support Specialists and Learning Technology Integrators) are due changes in financial records to more accurately reflect the locations of staff across schools. In addition, there is a significant lag between the time of budget preparation in the fall and actual staff assignments the following year. The projected FTE allocations for Building Services and Technology for FY 2020/21 are detailed on page G-22.

Please note that as we work through scrubbing the budget, some expenditures may have shifted categories from what is published in the Superintendent’s Funding Request. Total budgets by school have remained the unchanged.

2020-21 Requests vs. Adopted											
School	2019-20 Projection (Budget)	2020-21 Projection (Budget)	Budget to Budget % Growth	INSTRUCTION		ADMIN/ATTEND & HEALTH		BUILDING SERVICES		TECHNOLOGY	
				\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
AGNOR HURT	430	440	2.3%	209,180	4.8%	3,636	6.3%	(4,033)	-1.9%	17,060	27.0%
BAKER BUTLER	636	675	6.1%	387,111	6.9%	3,448	6.6%	(9,045)	-4.6%	38,128	59.1%
BROADUS WOOD	254	267	5.1%	94,802	3.4%	1,160	2.1%	(13,581)	-9.1%	2,562	5.0%
BROWNSVILLE	833	873	4.8%	442,944	7.0%	3,664	6.3%	7,024	3.4%	71,174	95.9%
CALE	630	715	13.5%	554,320	8.5%	22,413	55.5%	(2,198)	-0.9%	35,026	58.8%
CROZET	352	340	-3.4%	22,628	0.7%	7,495	13.2%	(4,659)	-3.2%	(1,764)	-2.1%
GREER	531	462	-13.0%	(403,736)	-7.7%	822	1.8%	2,840	1.4%	(8,423)	-8.6%
HOLLYMEAD	415	412	-0.7%	95,012	2.5%	4,131	4.5%	(22,798)	-10.1%	(15,965)	-30.0%
MERIWETHER LEWIS	406	397	-2.2%	27,031	0.8%	(2,455)	-4.8%	15,234	10.8%	(11,593)	-15.8%
V. L. MURRAY	250	252	0.8%	159,242	6.8%	3,814	7.8%	(177)	-0.1%	25,972	59.7%
RED HILL	177	185	4.5%	67,055	3.1%	7,832	12.5%	(8,139)	-8.0%	(16,617)	-26.7%
SCOTTSVILLE	222	213	-4.1%	(58,563)	-2.8%	(2,589)	-4.3%	(8,001)	-6.8%	(10,571)	-18.2%
STONE ROBINSON	410	482	17.6%	463,507	11.5%	1,893	4.1%	11,415	7.3%	8,855	14.8%
STONY POINT	220	230	4.5%	126,239	5.8%	7,079	13.4%	861	0.5%	(14,959)	-23.5%
WOODBROOK	507	523	3.2%	111,633	2.3%	(2,278)	-4.4%	554	0.3%	14,640	24.6%
BURLEY	575	653	13.6%	608,742	12.0%	(2,303)	-3.8%	(11,798)	-5.4%	61,341	159.9%
HENLEY	927	970	4.6%	288,640	4.1%	(2,306)	-4.5%	(1,409)	-0.5%	48,206	40.3%
JOUETT	664	717	8.0%	211,665	3.7%	6,185	14.1%	(11,491)	-4.9%	(90,425)	-53.0%
SUTHERLAND	602	606	0.7%	194,122	3.9%	(13,580)	-25.2%	(90,079)	-30.6%	(119,499)	-100.0%
WALTON	333	335	0.6%	104,913	2.7%	257	0.5%	(10,483)	-5.3%	(430)	-0.4%
ALBEMARLE	1863	1928	3.5%	174,070	1.0%	318	0.5%	(11,946)	-1.7%	(53,695)	-16.5%
MONTICELLO	1159	1189	2.6%	191,636	1.8%	3,419	5.8%	(16,725)	-3.3%	3,999	2.4%
WESTERN ALBEMARLE	1187	1198	0.9%	(87,743)	-0.8%	(576)	-0.9%	(30,061)	-6.1%	10,656	7.5%
CHARTER SCHOOL	50	69	38.0%	20,778	4.4%	0	N/A	58,597	N/A	1,743	11.5%
MURRAY HS	100	105	5.0%	(24,399)	-1.4%	4,988	10.8%	10,403	15.2%	(25,015)	-54.9%

## **FY 20 Adopted Proposals**

### **33. Has there been any discernible outcome to the Substitute Program Improvements allotted for in the FY19-20 budget? Are we on track to reduce unfilled vacancies by 10 percent YOY by June?**

The substitute initiative involved several different parts.

- Incentivizing retired teachers through increased sub pay rate and licensure. Current state - 26 retired teachers are currently active subs.
- Hiring 1 FTE permanent floating sub - Current state - 1 FTE has been hired and is shared between AHS, Jouett and Greer.
- Central Office staff substituting one day. Current state - approximately  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the licensed central office staff have completed this requirement at this point.
- Pay for Performance attendance incentive for those with 35+ years of experience. Current state - 42 teachers are eligible for this incentive. In the first semester 28 teachers in this pilot group earned the full incentive; 6 teachers earned partial payment, and 8 did not meet the requirements for the financial incentive.

Substitute fill rates continue to be a concern across the Division. We have recently initiated an additional pay incentive for teachers and teaching assistants to receive compensation when they cover a class. With this addition, we anticipate a reduction of unfilled vacancies by June.

While these incentives have helped, we are currently researching other practices to help address this need.

### **34. Can you give an example of how you've used the EAB membership? How have they been helpful?**

EAB is an on-demand research firm that we have partnered with in order to support our cycle of continuous improvement. They can do “quick” turn-around research requests and they can also do longer research requests that make take 8-12 weeks to finalize.

We want our strategies in the classroom and in operations to be research-driven and we want our decision-making to be informed by recent research on best practices. Before our partnership, this work was done by staff or sometimes, not at all. Recently, our Long-Range Planning Committee put in a request with 8 questions around transportation, logistics, and best practices in school-planning or estimating student populations. We have received those answers and the LRPAC will use that to inform their work.

Another benefit is that every school division that partners with EAB contributes to the on-demand research, so when we request some research about what other schools are doing when they have substitute shortages, they can call and ask the schools that partner with them as well as gather the research that is available online.

Every program evaluation since this partnership includes research from EAB and every charter that is established for major projects includes the research paper as a component for the project team. Some of this research is around Gifted Services and Talent Development, AVID, and alternative school programs to name a few.