

### 2000 PIP 1 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

### **Program Description:** Employee Compensation

The compensation program implementation plans were designed to improve the District's ability to attract and retain high-quality employees.

During the 1990s the District lost their competitive hiring position as a result of state funding deductions and declining enrollment. Unfortunately, this trend continued and while the bump in compensation in 2000-2001 was helpful, the District once again finds its position diminished.

### **Ballot Question Alignment:** Employee Compensation

Election Question Bullet #2 - Attracting and retaining superior teachers and support staff.

### **Explanation and Use of Funds:** Employee Compensation

Employee Compensation	6,610,000
Substitute Teachers Pay	250,000
Beginning Teacher Salary	400,000
Crossing Guard Compensation	100,000
	Substitute Teachers Pay Beginning Teacher Salary

TOTAL \$7,360,000

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$7,360,000 <sub> </sub>	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$7,360,000	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$7,360,000	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



### 2000 PIP 2B CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

Program Description: Class Size Reduction

The class size reduction program implementation plans were designed to reduce class sizes across the District by approximately one pupil per teacher.

In 2012 the D11 Board of Education approved a consolidation of the elementary and high school class size spending plan items into two class size reduction items. PIP #2B is available to reduce class size on a differentiated basis across the District.

#### **Ballot Question Alignment:** Class Size Reduction

Election Question Bullet #1 - Reduce class size.

Staffing allocation will be based on the staffing formulas that are in place at each level (elementary, middle school, and high school) and annually approved by the Board of Education.

### **Explanation and Use of Funds: Class Size Reduction**

In recent years the District has begun to move away from a formulaic-based staffing formula to a more differentiated model that allows the Board of Education and the administration to differentiate class size based on a number of needs including program needs, at-risk population, special needs populations and other concerns that make staffing far more complicated (and meaningful) than a pure formulaic calculation.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$1,300,630	FY 2018-19	27.9	0.0	0.0	27.9
FY 2019-20	\$2,050,630 *	FY 2019-20	27.9	0.0	0.0	27.9
FY 2020-21	\$1,300,630	FY 2020-21	27.9	0.0	0.0	27.9
	* Includes \$750 000 fo	or class size reduction (non	-recurring)			



### 2000 PIP 2C MIDDLE SCHOOL IMPLEMENTATION

Program Description: Middle School Implementation

The class size reduction program implementation plans were designed to reduce class sizes across the District by approximately one pupil per teacher and add sufficient middle school teachers to convert from junior high scheduling and instruction to middle school scheduling and instruction.

**Ballot Question Alignment: Middle School Implementation** 

Election Question Bullet #1 - Reduce class size.

### Explanation and Use of Funds: Middle School Implementation

The middle school concept and implementation plan calls for providing an additional team planning period for middle school teachers, requiring additional teachers to maintain the average class size in accordance with the middle school formula.

PIP2C was created by pulling out the middle school implementation that was mistakenly included in the plan amendment for PIP 2B, approved by the Board of Education in June 2012. PIP 2C was implemented specifically for the middle school staffing formula (one team planning period.)

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$2,621,955	FY 2018-19	56.3	0.0	0.0	56.3
FY 2019-20	\$2,621,955	FY 2019-20	56.3	0.0	0.0	56.3
FY 2020-21	\$2,621,955	FY 2020-21	56.3	0.0	0.0	56.3



## 2000 PIP 5 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES & MATERIALS

### Program Description: Instructional Supplies & Materials

The intent of these funds is that they will go directly to schools to help support the increased costs of supplies, materials, textbooks, software, printing, library furniture and materials, etc. at the building level.

The Achievement, Learning & Leadership (ALL) division determines the appropriate plan for purchases each year as part of its budget development.

### **Ballot Question Alignment:** Instructional Supplies & Materials

Election Question Bullet #4 - Purchase classroom instructional supplies and materials.

### **Explanation and Use of Funds:** Instructional Supplies & Materials

Funds are utilized to support supplies and materials at the school level; they may be used to purchase consumable or supplemental instructional materials for classroom use.

Funds are calculated on a per pupil basis enrollment.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$1,653,546	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$1,653,546	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$1,653,546	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



# 2000 PIP 6 LITERACY RESOURCE TEACHERS (LRTs) / TEACHING AND LEARNING COACHES (TLCs)

Program Description: Literacy Resource Teachers (LRTs), Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs)

The instructional staffing enhancements program implementation plans were designed to add staffing for certain instructional programs in the District.

PIP #6 funds 27 Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs) in order to complete the literacy implementation.

These positions were formerly Literacy Resource Teachers (LRTs).

Ballot Question Alignment: Literacy Resource Teachers (LRTs), Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs)

Election Question Bullet #5 - Increase teacher training.

Election Question Bullet #6 - Expand student assessment and interventional support.

Explanation and Use of Funds: Literacy Resource Teachers (LRTs), Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs)

All positions are filled with highly-qualified and highly-effective Teaching and Learning Coach (TLC) professionals.

Professional development support to school teams.

TLCs will devote 90 percent of their work day in professional development, coaching, and support activities for teachers in improving teaching and learning.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$2,129,770	FY 2018-19	27.0	0.0	0.0	27.0
FY 2019-20	\$2,129,770	FY 2019-20	27.0	0.0	0.0	27.0
FY 2020-21	\$2,129,770	FY 2020-21	27.0	0.0	0.0	27.0



# 2000 PIP 7B INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT & TECHNOLOGY TRAINING

Program Description: Instructional Staff Development & Technology Training

This program provides training for teachers in standards, literacy, and assessment. Technology training is also provided for both school and administrative staff to include application, integration, and system training. The primary focus is school-based staff.

Ballot Question Alignment: Instructional Staff Development & Technology Training

Election Question Bullet #5 - Increase teacher training.

### Explanation and Use of Funds: Instructional Staff Development & Technology Training

Professional development will be dispersed in a variety of ways. Teachers will receive training in standards, literacy, assessments, research-based interventions, technology and interfacing with available data systems. Funds would also be used in training teachers in the implementation of personalized learning (formerly referred to as 21st-century learning). Technology training will be available for all D11 staff, but will focus on school-based staff. The majority of the funding will be used to either provide substitutes or pay teachers to participate in identified trainings, depending on the nature of the training, as well as purchase the services of consultants when necessary to guide our work.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$372,834	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$372,834	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$372,834	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



# 2000 PIP 9B LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY EDUCATORS (LTEs), SECURITY, & EDSS STAFFING

Program Description: Library Technology Educators (LTEs), Security, EDSS Staffing

From 1996 until 2001, elementary Library Technology Educators (LTEs) and secondary Library Technology Technicians (LTTs) were funded by the five-year mill levy funds. The mill levy passed in November 2000 provided funds to maintain the current level of staffing, or 1 full-time LTE in schools of 300+ students and half-time LTEs in schools under 300 students. The LTE serves as librarian, instructional support specialist and technology support/integration specialist.

The LTT supports the LTE in all areas of responsibility.

Add personnel to the Security Department staff in order to improve safety and security.

Provide staff to support professional development for teachers and school leadership with the aim of increasing data literacy of instructional staff in order to improve instruction in under-performing areas.

### Ballot Question Alignment: Library Technology Educators (LTEs), Security, EDSS Staffing

Election Question Bullet #5 - Increase teacher training.

Election Question Bullet #7 - Increase library support.

Election Question Bullet #8 - Increase school safety and security.

### Explanation and Use of Funds: Library Technology Educators (LTEs), Security, EDSS Staffing

These funds will be used to improve school safety and security efforts. The funds are used to pay for an assessment facilitator who, in collaboration with the executive director of Educational Data Support Services, provides professional development to instructional staff on how to use student assessment data to guide and inform instructional practices.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$2,530,322	FY 2018-19	15.0	41.0	2.0	58.0
FY 2019-20	\$2,530,322	FY 2019-20	15.0	41.0	2.0	58.0
FY 2020-21	\$2,530,322	FY 2020-21	15.0	41.0	2.0	58.0



### 2000 PIP 11B TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT

Program Description: Technology Support

The technology program implementation plans were designed to continue the funding of the 1996 technology mill levy by funding training (PIP#7B), library technology educators and technicians (PIP#9B), the Information Technology division (PIP#11B), various software upgrades (PIP#17) and funding for assessment alignment (PIP#20).

This funding provides the operational backbone of the District's information technology system including all technology programs, networks and hardware.

Ballot Question Alignment: Technology Support

Election Question Bullet #10 - Support technology integration in the classroom.

### **Explanation and Use of Funds:** Technology Support

Plan amendments 11B (Technology Support) and IT (Software Upgrades) maximize productivity while minimizing resources in system reliability and 99 percent uptime for PeopleSoft, email, and Q by applying all available patches and upgrades when tested and appropriate.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$3,525,412	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$3,525,412	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$3,525,412	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



# 2000 PIP 12 ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL), SPECIAL EDUCATION (SPED) AND GIFTED AND TALENTED (GT)

Program Description: English Language Learners (ELL), Special Education (SPED) and Gifted and Talented (GT)

Funds supplement services for children who are English language learners (ELL), have disabilities (Special Education), and have gifts and talents (Gifted/Talented) which require specialized instructional support services. Funds will be used to employ additional teachers, psychologists, paraprofessionals, and clerical staff.

Ballot Question Alignment: English Language Learners (ELL), Special Education (SPED) and Gifted and Talented (GT)

Election Question Bullet #6 - Expand student assessment and intervention support.

Explanation and Use of Funds: English Language Learners (ELL), Special Education (SPED) and Gifted and Talented (GT)

Initial staffing plans are shown below:

Year	Gifted/Talented	Special Education	ESL
2001/02	1.5 FTE	9.0 FTE	0.0 FTE
2002/03	2.0 FTE	2.0 FTE	3.0 FTE
2003/04	1.0 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$933,700	FY 2018-19	21.5	0.0	0.0	21.5
FY 2019-20	\$933,700	FY 2019-20	21.5	0.0	0.0	21.5
FY 2020-21	\$933,700	FY 2020-21	21.5	0.0	0.0	21.5



## 2000 PIP 14 FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN (Suspended 7/1/19)

Program Description: Full-Day Kindergarten – Suspended 7/1/19

Researched-based interventions will be put into place to address the needs of students who are partially proficient or unsatisfactory in achieving the standards. The funds are allocated based on student achievement and vary by site. To be approved for funding, the interventions must be data-driven, based on identified needs included in the unified school improvement plan and research-based.

This funding provides the necessary recurring funds for the transition from half-day kindergarten classes to full-day kindergarten classes. The majority of these funds are used for the hire of additional teachers to convert each kindergarten classroom from a .5 FTE to a 1.0 FTE.

Remaining funds support the professional development of these teachers.

#### Ballot Question Alignment: Full-Day Kindergarten

Election Question Bullet #3 - Focus on academic core subjects like math, reading, writing and science.

### Explanation and Use of Funds: Full-Day Kindergarten

17 FTE teacher salaries and benefits \$2,200,000
Intervention staff development \$200,550

\$2,400,550

The expenditures for staff could be extended day, extended year, or in-school interventions.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$2,400,550	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$0	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$0	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



# 2000 PIP 20 ALIGN DISTRICT ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL TESTING AND ASSESSMENTS

### Program Description: Align District Achievement Level Testing and Assessments

District Achievement Level Testing (DALT) assessments allow teachers and parents to see how students are performing. These assessments need to be able to also predict performance on the state assessment. Terra Nova replaced DALT, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) replaced Terra Nova and Galileo K12 replaced MAP. Since the implementation of this PIP, state law required districts to measure kindergarten students' readiness. The funds from this PIP now also support the assessment of kindergarten readiness with the TS Gold system.

### Ballot Question Alignment: Align District Achievement Level Testing and Assessments

Election Question Bullet #10 - Support technology integration in the classroom.

### Explanation and Use of Funds: Align District Achievement Level Testing and Assessments

These funds are used to purchase an assessment system that a) provides teachers with actionable, instructional information for determining what their students know and are able to do as well as informs whether there are needs for remediation or extension to best serve students' academic needs; b) provide a system with reporting features that can be used to let parents know how their student is performing compared to other students; c) provide leadership with summary reports on student achievement.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$200,000	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$200,000	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$200,000	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



### 2000 PIP 21A & 21B CHARTER SCHOOL FUNDING

**Program Description:** Charter School Funding

Senate Bill 93-183 dealing with charter schools was passed by the Colorado State Legislature in 1993. House Bill 13-1375 subsequently amended the allocation of MLO resources to require the allocation based on either the Board-approved plan or on a pro-rata share based on enrollment. A charter school in Colorado is a public school operated by a group of parents, teachers and/or community members as a semi-autonomous school of choice within a school district, operating under a contract or "charter" between the members of the charter school community and the local board of education.

Under Colorado law, a charter school is not a separate legal entity independent of the school district, but rather is a public school defined uniquely by a charter and partially autonomous while remaining within the school district. The approved charter application and accompanying agreements are the charter, which serve as a contract between the charter school and local board of education.

The District currently has six charter schools in its boundaries that are authorized by the District and they all receive MLO funds.

#### **Ballot Question Alignment:** Charter School Funding

Charter schools are allowed to utilize funding to fulfill any area/PIP of the 2000 MLO and that spending is annually monitored using the Charter School MLO Accountability form.

#### **Explanation and Use of Funds:** Charter School Funding

Each charter school receives MLO funds based on its funded pupil count as a factor of the total fund pupil count for all charters. For example, if the total funded pupil count for all charter schools is 2,000 and a school has 300 as its funded pupil count, then it receives 15 percent of the \$712,051 or \$107,258 for the school year. This amount is distributed in an equal payment each month.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$1,494,554 <sub> </sub>	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$1,494,554	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$1,287,051	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Except When an imployee consistently perfect MLO Program Implementation Plan (PIP)

### 2000 PIP 23 PERFORMANCE REVIEW

**Program Description:** Performance Review

The District commissioned (through a citizen task force) the review of a comprehensive written performance plan review that studies the academic and financial goals and objectives for performance measures and allows the administration, board of education,

academia and the public to identify the actions the District is taking to achieve these agreed upon goals and objectives. Subsequent to the initial performance review, this PIP has been used to conduct a performance review of the MLO program every 2-3 years.

The MLO reviews were performed as follows:

Year	Vendor
2000-2001	KPMG Consulting
2003-2004	Quantum Performance Group (QPG)
2006-2007	Quantum Performance Group (QPG)
2008-2009	Quantum performance Group (QPG)
2011-2012	Delta Solutions
2013-2014	Delta Solutions
2015-2016	Public Consulting Group – Education (PCG)
2018-2019	Public Consulting Group - Education (PCG)

### Ballot Question Alignment: Performance Review & Citizen's Oversight Committee

Election Question Bullet #11 - Establish a citizens' oversight committee to develop an independent comprehensive performance plan.

exceeding normal expectations for the

Satisf actory

When an duties in

Unsat When ar

their job

#### **Explanation and Use of Funds: Performance Review**

This line item receives \$100,000 annually. The funding is used for the MLO review, which shall be conducted no less than every three years. In "off" years, the funds will be transferred to PIP #24, Contingency Reserve or to other PIPs as approved by the MLO's citizens' oversight committee and the Board of Education.

Budget	Amount	Year	Teacher FTE	ESP FTE	Exec/Pro FTE	Total
FY 2018-19	\$100,000	FY 2018-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2019-20	\$0	FY 2019-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FY 2020-21	\$0	FY 2020-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0