



Equity Considerations for Budgeting Summary Report

Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Department

May 2023

Overview of the Equity Considerations for Budgeting Process

The 2023-2024 school year is the seventh time that schools and departments have engaged in this Equity Considerations planning process. The Equity Considerations for Budgeting Process is designed to walk school and department leaders through steps for an equity-driven budgeting planning. The steps, some of which are required, are outlined in the table below.

Table 1. Equity Considerations for Budgeting Components

Equity Considerations for Budgeting Components		
Sections	School Process	Department Process
Prioritize Activities / Initiatives	Identification and prioritization of activities that are having, or will have, the biggest impact on increasing student success and achieving equity and how each activity aligns to MPS strategic priorities	<p>This Budget Tie Out season, departments engaged in a <i>priority-based budgeting</i> process where individual programs and services, rather than departments as a whole, were proposed and funded. In their SY24 budget proposals, departments sorted their proposed programs and services into three overarching categories: statutory (as required to comply with statutory or regulatory requirements), essential (as required to operate the district), and strategic (all other programs and services).</p> <p>After presenting on their proposed budgets and receiving their allocations, departments were asked to identify which specific student/staff groups will be most directly impacted by changes (eliminations, reductions, or additions). Funded strategic programs were categorized into specific MPS Strategic Plan areas by departments (and by REA staff when departments did not identify a specific goal/strategy) to understand alignment of SY24 funding to the MPS Strategic Plan.</p>
Budget Alignment and Trade-Offs	Identification of how potentially limited or additional resources will be used to support prioritized activities, what trade-offs have to be made as a result of those investments, and how supplementary funding sources will be used to support prioritized activities	
Equity Considerations	Identification of specific student groups who will be most directly impacted by changes (eliminations, reductions, or additions) to programs, supports, or services, how negative impacts will be mitigated, and how continued or expanded programs and activities will positively impact specific student groups	
Additional Considerations / Additional Information	Identification of other impacts that might result from changes (cuts, reductions, or additions) to positions, programs, support, or services	

Schools

High-Level School Summary

This year 60 schools fully completed their Equity Considerations for Budgeting document. This high-level summary is based on the schools that completed their document.

Engaging Stakeholders

- **All schools** that completed an Equity Considerations in Budgeting document included at least one stakeholder group (families, students, staff, or other community members) in their budget decision-making.
 - Schools used a variety of methods to engage stakeholders. Some of the most common engagement methods were surveys, information sessions, and presentations during meetings of existing groups or committees (e.g. student council for students, Instructional Leadership Team for staff, or Parent-Teacher Associations for families and community members).

District-Directed Funding Shifts

At the District level, schools received funding to support Goal 1 priorities of academic interventions for Tier II and III students in math and literacy, support for Advanced Learner students, and Library/Media staff. As some schools did not report these allocations on their equity considerations documents (as they were district-directed), data in the “additions” portion of this segment comes from the [FY24 Budget Allocations to Schools Overview](#), presented at the Committee of the Whole on March 28, 2023.

- Additions
 - A total of **108 intervention triads**, each consisting of one licensed teacher and two Associate Educators, are to be implemented across **65 schools**. Schools received between 0.5 and 5 triads in their budget allocations for SY23-24.
 - **38 schools** received additional funding to support Advanced Learners, between 0.2 and 1.0FTE for Advanced Learner teachers.
 - **68 schools** received funding for a 0.5FTE Library/Media Specialist.
- Cuts and Reductions
 - In order to prioritize strategic academic goals, schools were asked to excess their building reserve substitute teachers (though some schools bought up these personnel using other funding streams). A total of **8 schools** reported excessing their building reserve teacher in their equity considerations document.

School-Directed Funding Shifts

- Additions
 - 46 schools reported adding at least one position.
- Cuts and Reductions
 - 20 schools reported cutting or reducing at least one position.

Supplemental Funding

- 28 schools reported receiving Achievement and Integration Funding.
- 54 schools reported receiving Compensatory funding.
- 38 schools reported receiving QComp funding.
- 57 schools reported receiving Title funding.

Impacts, Equity Considerations, and Mitigation Plan

- Schools reported that budget changes will have positive and negative impacts on a number of students.

For a more detailed summary of the information, see the sections below.

Meaningful Inclusion of Diverse Perspectives

The best way to ensure the budgeting process is equity-driven is by centering marginalized voices. Schools were asked to describe the ways they ensured that they have meaningfully included diverse perspectives in their budget decision-making process.

All schools that completed an Equity Considerations in Budgeting document included at least one stakeholder group in their budget decision. All schools engaged teachers/school staff in their budget process and 98% of schools included family/and or community members. 73% of schools that completed an equity considerations for budgeting document engaged students in their process, though this was commonly in the form of providing input into school priorities rather than input on the budget directly.

Some of the most common engagement methods for schools were surveys, information sessions, and presentations during meetings of existing groups or committees. Schools often used groups such as the Parent-Teacher Organization/Association, Instructional Leadership Team, Site Council, and all-staff meetings to engage staff and/or families.

The tables below describe what percentage of schools and divisions/departments engaged with stakeholder groups.

Table 2. Engaging Diverse Perspectives in the Budget Decision Making Process: Schools (N = 60)

Students	Teachers and School Staff	Families and/or Community Members
44 (73%)	60 (100%)	59 (98%)

Budget Alignment and Trade-Offs

In this section of the Equity Considerations for Budgeting document, schools were asked to identify the trade-offs that they were making if cuts and reductions were being made. There was also an opportunity to identify any additions that were being made.

In addition to decisions made independently by schools, district-directed funding shifts added intervention triads, AVID/Advanced Learner teachers, and Library and Media Specialists to schools. At the district-directed level, a total of **108 intervention triads**, each consisting of one licensed teacher and two Associate Educators, are to be implemented across **65 schools**. Schools received between 0.5 and 5 triads in their budget allocations for SY23-24. **38 schools** received additional funding to support Advanced Learners, between 0.2 and 1.0FTE for Advanced Learner teachers. **68 schools** received funding for a 0.5FTE Library/Media Specialist. In order to prioritize strategic academic goals, schools were asked to excess their building reserve substitute teachers (though some schools bought up these personnel using other funding streams). A total of **8 schools** reported excessing their building reserve teacher in their equity considerations document.

For non district-directed funding shifts, 33% of schools that completed the document reported making at least one cut or reduction. The majority of schools that reported cuts (60%) did so in the area of licensed teacher positions or time. The most common specified reasons schools cited making cuts or reductions was either to prioritize strategic funding for the district additions or to match projected enrollment for SY24. 77% of schools reported an addition. The most common additions were non-licensed student support staff or time (usually Associate Educators) and licensed teachers or time.

The tables below show the composition of school and department cuts, reductions, and additions and the trade-offs made.

Table 3A. School Budget Additions, Cuts, and Reductions Summary (N = 60)

Schools that only made cut(s)/reduction(s)	Schools that only made addition(s)	Schools that made both cut(s)/reduction(s) and addition(s)	Schools that made neither cut(s)/reduction(s) nor addition(s)
8 (13%)	34 (57%)	12 (20%)	6 (10%)

Note: this table does not contain district-directed additions and cuts (intervention triads, library/media specialist, Advanced Learner teachers or building reserve teachers)

Table 3B. School Budget Cuts and Reductions (N = 20)

Licensed teacher positions or time	Licensed student support staff or time	Non-licensed student support staff or time	Teacher support staff or time
12 (60%)	5 (25%)	6 (30%)	4 (20%)

Note: Schools may have reported more than one cut or reduction so the percentages do not add up to 100.

Table 3C. School Budget Additions (N = 46)

Licensed teacher positions or time	Licensed student support staff or time	Non-licensed student support staff or time	Teacher support staff or time	Clerical staff or time
22 (48%)	18 (39%)	20 (63%)	13 (28%)	2 (4%)

Note: Schools may have reported more than one addition so the percentages do not add up to 100.

Table 4. School Trade-Offs for Making Cuts/Reductions (N = 20)

Prioritizing support for MPS Strategic Plan	Projected enrollment	General budget balancing
8 (40%)	6 (30%)	9 (45%)

Note: Schools may have reported more than one cut or reduction OR more than one reason for a cut or reduction so the percentages do not add up to 100.

Supplementary and Restricted Funding

In this section of the Equity Considerations for Budgeting document, schools were asked to identify the ways that they plan to use supplementary resources strategically to achieve their school’s vision of achievement and equity, or support the continuation or development of prioritized activities and programs.

Table 5. School Use of Supplementary and Restricted Funds (N = 60)

Achievement and Integration funds	Compensatory funds	Title funds	QComp funds
28 (47%)	54 (90%)	38 (63%)	57 (95%)

Note: A school may plan to use funding from one of these streams but did not report it in their equity considerations document.

Achievement & Integration Funds

Schools using A&I funds report a variety of uses: both to hire/maintain staff positions and for non-staff budget items. A&I funds are being used to support family liaisons, AVID, TOSAs, classroom teachers, student activities and field trips, staff professional development, curriculum and supplies, and other contracted services.

Compensatory Funds

Schools with Compensatory funding reported that they will use it almost exclusively on staffing. Schools reported that they will use the funds to hire, maintain, and/or increase the hours of a vast range of staff positions, including counselors, TOSAs, SSPAs, AEs, SSWs, and Psychologists. A smaller number of schools reported using Compensatory funding for classroom teachers.

Title Funds

The primary use of Title funds is going towards staff. The wide range of positions schools will pay for with Title funding will support school and district priorities such as MTSS, SEL, student mental health support, family engagement, and reducing class sizes. A smaller number of schools plan to use the funds to provide supplies and materials, primarily to support family engagement events.

QComp Funds

As expected, nearly all schools receiving QComp funds (95%) plan to use them to pay for various expenses related to professional development and coaching for staff. These expenses staff to help facilitate professional development and coaching, staff to support MTSS and SEL implementation, external professional development opportunities, and extended time for staff to attend professional development sessions

Impacts, Equity Considerations, and Mitigation Plan

In this section of the Equity Considerations for Budgeting document, schools were asked to identify who is impacted by budget changes and to describe mitigation strategies or plans if a budget change negatively impacts students.

Schools reported budget changes will have both a positive and negative impact on a number of students. After the category “all students” the student groups most likely to be positively impacted by school budget changes were students receiving English Learner services and Special Education students. As fewer departments reported cuts this year, and many of the cuts being due to enrollment projects, almost all the negative impacts of cuts were reported to affect “all students.”

In order to mitigate the negative impacts budgetary changes might have, schools planned to redistribute work responsibilities to other staff (including for the district-mandated building reserve reduction), increase class sizes/caseloads, or use alternative, outside resources to support programming. Additionally, many schools will experience budget changes (e.g. class section reduction, staff reduction) based on lowered levels of enrollment, meaning staff:student ratios remain relatively similar meaning no mitigation plan is necessary. Departments planned to mitigate negative impacts to students and staff by reprioritizing fund allocation away from less necessary programs to more necessary programs and redistributing work responsibilities to existing staff.

Table 6. Groups Impacted By Budget Changes: Schools

	All students	Students of color	Students receiving Special Education services	Students receiving English Learner services
Negative impacts	14	0	1	1
Positive impacts	44	5	6	10

Note: Numbers are not represented as a percentage of schools because impacts were reported as a result of each individual cut, reduction, or addition, rather than by school.

Departments

High-Level Department/Division Summary

Overview of Programs

- A total of **36 departments** completed an equity considerations document for their strategic programs and services, reflecting **143 funded programs and services** for SY24.
 - The Core Academics budget proposal consisted of 16 separate content areas' proposals and was submitted as a single budget presentation/proposal during BTO so these areas were separated into their own tables for ease of reading the next section. 12 of these content areas submitted equity considerations documents and each content area is treated as a separate department.
 - Not all departments had strategic programs – some only had statutory or essential programs (e.g. Board of Education, General Counsel) OR their proposed strategic programs were not funded (e.g. Family Resource Center, Strategic Initiatives). As such, the list of departments in this report is **not** a comprehensive list of departments.
 - Departments interpreted definitions and categorizations of programs and services in a variety of ways so programs/services were categorized by REA staff to the best extent possible when a department did not report what strategic goal/strategy its programming aligned to.

Alignment to Strategic Plan

- Departments reported which goal and strategy each of their funded programs aligned to. If applicable, departments could list more than one goal or strategy for each program. Of the 143 reported funded programs:
 - **105** programs aligned to Goal 1: Academics
 - The most common specific strategy for Goal 1: Academics was Strategy 2 (Ensure all curriculum and instructional practices are anti-racist and sustain the cultures, languages, and experiences of our students), with 39 programs funded applying to this area.
 - **50** programs aligned to Goal 2: Student Well-Being
 - The most common specific strategy for Goal 2: Student Well-Being was Strategy 3 (Integrate social and emotional practices into all classrooms and Out of School Time activities), with 14 programs funded applying to this area.
 - **27** programs aligned to Goal 3: Effective Staff
 - Nearly all programs and services aligned to Goal 3: Effective Staff were aligned to a non-specific strategy—23 of 27 goals reported a generic alignment to Goal 3.
 - **57** programs aligned to Goal 4: School and District Climate
 - The most common specific strategy for Goal 4: School and District Climate was Strategy 5 (Support community partnerships to enhance student experiences and learning opportunities), with 21 programs funded applying to this area.

For a more detailed summary of the information, see the section below.

Alignment of Strategic Programs to Strategic Plan

For each program or service proposed in a department's submitted budget, departments identified a specific goal and strategy the program or service aligned to. The summary of each funded program is below.

For a less condensed version of this table, including the full description of each strategy and title of each program/service, please view the appendix.

Table 7A. Non-Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal Areas

Department Name	Goal 1: Academic Achievement	Goal 2: Student Well-Being	Goal 3: Effective Staff	Goal 4: School and District Climate
Accountability (N = 2)	2	2	2	2
Adult Education (N = 2)	2	0	0	2
Career / Tech Ed (N = 4)	4	0	0	2
Communications / Marketing (N = 5)	0	0	1	4
Community Education (N = 3)	3	3	3	3
Early Childhood Education (N = 2)	2	2	0	0
ECE: Teen Parent Services (N = 2)	2	2	2	2
Emergency Management, Safety & Security (N = 1)	0	1	0	0
Equity and School Climate (N = 3)	0	2	0	3
Extended Learning (N = 3)	1	2	1	3
First Stop Program (N = 1)	0	1	0	1
IT Services (N = 5)	2	1	5	2
KBEM (N = 4)	0	0	0	4
Mental Health Supports (N = 3)	0	3	3	0
Multilingual/Magnet	4	4	0	0

Schools (N = 4)				
Office of Black Student Achievement (N = 3)	3	3	3	3
Office of the Ombudsperson (families) (N = 1)	0	0	0	1
Office of the Ombudsperson (staff) (N = 1)	0	0	1	0
Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (N = 20)	11	7	1	13
Senior Academic Officer (N = 1)	1	1	0	0
Social Work (N = 1)	0	1	1	1
Student Retention and Recovery (N = 3)	3	3	0	3
Student Support Services: Counseling (N = 1) <small>Note: there were actually 4 strategic programs but the equity considerations document only reports on 1</small>	1	1	0	0
TOTAL	41	39	23	49

Table 7B. Non-Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 1 Strategies

Department Name	General	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3	Strategy 4	Strategy 5
Accountability (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Adult Education (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Career / Tech Ed (N = 4)	4	0	0	0	0	0
Community Education (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0
Early	2	0	0	0	0	0

Childhood Education (N = 2)						
ECE: Teen Parent Services (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Extended Learning (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
IT (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Multilingual/Magnet Schools (N = 4)	4	0	0	0	0	0
Office of Black Student Achievement (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0
Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (N = 11)	2	5	6	3	3	2
Senior Academic Officer (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Student Retention and Recovery (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0
Student Support Services: Counseling (N = 1) <small>Note: there were actually 4 strategic programs but the equity considerations document only reports on 1</small>	1	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7C. Non-Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 2 Strategies

Department Name	General	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3	Strategy 4	Strategy 5
Accountability	2	0	0	0	0	0

(N = 2)						
Community Education (N = 3)	1	0	0	2	0	0
ECE: Teen Parent Services (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Management, Safety & Security (N = 1)	0	0	0	0	1	0
Equity and School Climate (N = 2)	1	0	1	0	0	0
Extended Learning (N = 2)	1	0	0	1	0	0
First Stop Program (N = 1)	0	1	1	0	0	1
IT (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health Services (N = 3)	0	3	0	0	0	0
Multilingual/ Magnet Schools (N = 4)	4	0	0	0	0	0
Office of Black Student Achievement (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0
Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (N = 7)	1	2	3	4	0	1
Senior Academic Officer (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0

Social Work (N = 1)	1	1	1	0	0	0
Student Retention and Recovery (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0
Student Support Services: Counseling (N = 1) <small>Note: there were actually 4 strategic programs but the equity considerations document only reports on 1</small>	1	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7D. Non-Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 3 Strategies

Department Name	General	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3	Strategy 4	Strategy 5
Accountability (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Communications / Marketing (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Community Education (N = 3)	2	0	0	1	0	0
Early Childhood Education (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
ECE: Teen Parent Services (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Extended Learning (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
IT (N = 5)	5	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health Services (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0

Office of Black Student Achievement (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0
Office of the Ombudsperson (staff) (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (N = 1)	0	0	0	1	0	0
Social Work (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7E. Non-Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 4 Strategies

Department Name	General	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3	Strategy 4	Strategy 5
Accountability (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Adult Education (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Career / Tech Ed (N = 2)	0	0	0	0	0	2
Communications / Marketing (N = 4)	4	0	0	0	0	0
ECE: Teen Parent Services (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Extended Learning (N = 1)	1	0	0	2	1	0
First Stop Program (N = 1)	0	1	0	0	0	1
IT (N = 2)	2	0	0	0	0	0

KBEM (N = 4)	0	0	0	0	0	4
Office of Black Student Achievement (N = 3)	2	0	1	0	0	0
Office of the Ombudsperson (families) (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (N = 13)	1	4	2	6	3	6
Social Work (N = 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Student Retention and Recovery (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0

Table 8A. Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal Areas

Content Area	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Arts (N = 7)	7	3	3	3
AVID (N = 3)	3	0	0	0
College Credit Programming (N = 12)	12	0	0	0
Ethnic Studies (N = 1)	1	0	0	1
Health and Physical Education (N = 7)	5	5	0	0
Literacy (N = 7)	7	0	1	0
Mathematics (N = 6)	6	0	0	0
Middle Years Programming (N = 10)	9	0	0	1
Primary Years	5	0	0	0

Programming (N = 5)				
Science (N = 3)	3	0	0	0
STEM (N = 2)	2	0	0	0
World Languages (N = 4)	4	0	0	0

Table 8B. Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 1 Strategies

Content Area	General	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3	Strategy 4	Strategy 5
Arts (N = 7)	0	3	4	7	3	2
AVID (N = 3)	3	0	0	0	0	0
College Credit Programming (N = 12)	0	0	1	12	0	0
Ethnic Studies (N = 1)	0	0	1	0	0	0
Health and Physical Education (N = 5)	0	4	2	0	0	0
Literacy (N = 7)	1	6	0	0	0	0
Mathematics (N = 6)	0	6	0	0	0	0
Middle Years Programming (N = 10)	0	5	5	4	3	0
Primary Years Programming (N = 5)	0	2	3	3	2	0
Science (N = 3)	0	1	0	3	1	3
STEM (N = 2)	0	0	0	2	0	2
World Languages (N = 4)	0	4	3	1	0	0

Table 8C. Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 2 Strategies

Content Area	General	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Goal 5
Arts (N = 3)	0	0	0	3	0	0
Health and Physical Education (N = 5)	0	0	0	1	0	5

Table XD. Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 3 Strategies

Content Area	General	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Goal 5
Arts (N = 3)	0	2	0	2	0	
Literacy (N =1)	1	0	0	0	0	0

Table XE. Core Academics Strategic Programs Alignment to Strategic Plan / Goal 4 Strategies

Content Area	General	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Goal 5
Arts (N = 3)	0	1	0	0	1	3
Ethnic Studies (N = 1)	0	0	1	0	0	0

Appendix

In the appendix section you'll find the equity considerations for budgeting documents for all schools and departments.

[School Documents](#)

[Department Documents](#)