

**Wake County Public School System
Superintendent's Proposed Budget 2026-27
Board of Education Q&A
May 5, 2026**

1. Could you please tell me what we spend on AP exams?

Historically, North Carolina has covered the cost associated with AP (Advanced Placement), IB (International Baccalaureate) and Cambridge International exam fees for all public-school students through state funding and the NC AP Partnership, an agreement between the state and College Board. This funding has ensured equitable access to advanced coursework and supported teachers with professional development and instructional resources.

Current Legislative Update
NC Senate budget proposal

- Eliminates funding for the NC AP Partnership
- Limits exam fee coverage to only economically disadvantaged students

The House budget proposal maintains full funding.

Until a final budget is adopted, NCDPI must plan according to the Senate proposal, which represents the more restrictive funding scenario.

If the Senate proposal is enacted:

- Students not classified as economically disadvantaged will be responsible for exam fees ranging from \$99 to \$130+ per test.
- Schools may need to collect exam fees during the fall test ordering window.
- Elimination of the NC AP Partnership would mean:
 - Loss of district-specific data, coaching, and school walkthroughs.
 - Loss of customized professional development and AP Summer Institute support for teachers.

North Carolina students do not pay for AP exams for the current 2025-2026 school year, thanks to the North Carolina Advanced Placement Partnership.

The cost of the exam ranges from \$99 to \$130+ per test.

- 42,312 AP exams were taken in WCPSS in 2025.
- The final 2025 number may change slightly pending final reporting from DPI.
- 39,660 exams were taken in 2024
- Elimination of this funding would be a significant loss for our students.

2. Could you please look into the annual cost of our DreamBox subscription and whether there is any data supporting continued use?

Discovery Education provides the following supplemental resources:

Experience engages students with real-world content and multi-modal instruction, supports teachers with intuitive teaching tools, and ensures high-quality instruction with cross-curricular strategies—delivering a unified classroom experience that prepares learners for tomorrow. (K-5 Science only)

DreamBox Math is an engaging and adaptive supplemental math program that integrates curriculum and continuous formative assessment to personalize instruction, develop conceptual understanding, build critical skills, and improve achievement for every student, regardless of where they are in their learning journey.

Historical Costs related to DreamBox:

Year	Discovery Ed Experience	Dreambox Mathematics	Total	Funding Source
21-22	\$524,300	\$1,329,185.84	\$1,853,485.84	Textbook/Title IV
22-23	\$357,000	\$1,288,412.49	\$1,645,412.49	Textbook/Title IV
23-24	\$360,000	\$1,450,913.53	\$1,810,913.53	Textbook/SPED
24-25	\$399,600	\$1,272,822.86	\$1,672,422.86	Textbook/SPED
25-26	\$434,000	\$1,230,935.41	\$1,664,935.41	CIP
26-27	\$1,265,887.00 (Combined)		\$1,265,887.00	

DreamBox Usage Data:

Elementary

Show student log-in usage based upon enrollment at or greater than 90 percent
(Exceptions: Oakview, Rex Road (85-87 percent))

Middle School

15 out 41 middle schools show usage (some schools opted out). 7 out of the 15 middle schools that use Dreambox show usage of greater than 89 percent

Experience Usage Data:

Elementary Schools:

43 elementary schools show student interactions fewer than 1,000

Teacher interactions range from 200- 1,533 (removing outliers)

[Overall Data Usage Report](#)

3. Is there a way to determine the savings if we ended 1:1 chromebooks in K-2 and went to a one class-set per grade for those in elementary schools next year?

All school issued student devices are funded through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and do not have an immediate impact on local funding. The district's Device Working Committee is developing a sustainable device strategy evaluating several models, including evaluating K-2 device ratios, device types, and cost models. Transitioning to a single shared cart per grade level presents several instructional and operational challenges:

- Class sizes vary significantly across schools, with one cart potentially serving 2 classes in some buildings and 6+ in others.
- K-2 assessments require reliable, individual device access within tight testing windows.
- State digital learning standards require consistent, purposeful technology use.
- Shared carts limit the ability of grade-level teams to deliver aligned, simultaneous instruction.

Adjusting K-2 ratios may create future CIP savings but introduces notable instructional trade-offs and no immediate financial impact.

4. If we have ~\$500K we can remove from cuts, how many Literacy Coaching positions would this be?

Adjusting elementary literacy coaches on page 109 of the Superintendent's Proposed Budget by \$500k equals approximately 57.5 months of employment.

5. If we were only to have devices in "specials" classrooms (vs. all classrooms, all children) what would that savings be? (Devices, maintenance, programs upgrades, staff - please share the costs involved).

If the district were to limit student devices to "specials" classrooms only, rather than providing access across all classrooms and for all students, the immediate savings to the local funds would be zero dollars. Student devices are funded entirely through Capital Improvement Program (CIP) dollars, not the local funds. While reducing the total number of devices could result in future CIP cost avoidance tied to long-term replacement cycles, most associated expenses (such as device management systems, required software platforms, cybersecurity, and technology support staffing) are districtwide, fixed, or enrollment based. As a result, restricting access to devices in this manner would yield little to no short-term financial reduction in devices, maintenance, program upgrades, or staffing. Moreover, any potential long-term CIP savings must be carefully weighed against critical instructional and compliance requirements. State-mandated assessments are delivered exclusively through digital platforms, making consistent classroom access essential to ensure students demonstrate content mastery rather than limitations in platform familiarity. From an instructional perspective, devices serve as a primary Tier I tool for differentiation, formative assessment, and real-time feedback, enabling teachers to effectively support diverse learners within the core classroom environment. Additionally, sustained access to technology is foundational to developing the digital literacy and readiness skills students need for post-secondary education and the modern workforce.

6. What is the amount of lottery funds that we receive? What does it get applied to?

Each year, the Fiscal Research Division of the N.C. General Assembly reports how lottery funds were distributed to education programs in every county. This information can be found on the [NC Education Lottery website](#).

The cumulative total from when the lottery began on March 30, 2006, through the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 ending June 30th, 2025, for Wake County is \$951,609,567.

The FY 2025 total is \$64,346,784. That is how much of the money raised by the lottery went to education programs in Wake County last year. Elected officials in the state legislature decide how to best use the money provided to the state by the lottery each year.

School Staff	\$ 40,615,381
School Construction	\$ 11,921,671
College Scholarships	\$ 4,950,840
Prekindergarten	\$ 4,321,945
School Transportation	\$ 2,536,947
Total	\$ 64,346,784

School construction lottery funds for WCPSS are disbursed to Wake County for capital projects or to reduce the county capital debt. The County receives the funds on our behalf. Additionally, the General Assembly can and has appropriated funding in the HB to fund some categorical allotments with lottery funds, but the formula applies to all Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

7. Capital Outlay - What is "connectivity support services?"

6410 Connectivity Support Services (per NCDPI Chart of Accounts).

Costs associated with the one-time funding for the shared education strategy to enhance broadband connectivity and improve the education user experience in public schools.

8. Federal Grant Parent - Involvement \$1.26 million - what is this used for?

Parent Involvement funds are mandatory set aside in Title I funds used to support the costs of activities that encourage and support parent involvement in schools, including activities that train parents to provide better learning opportunities for their children.

Federal Title I

School budgets - \$744.90 (in thousands)

Central budgets - \$342.10 (in thousands)

Federal Title IV

Central support budget: \$182.30 (in thousands)

9. "\$2.5 million payment to other government units" - What does that go to?

8100 Payments to Other Governmental Units (per NCDPI Chart of Accounts).

Include payments to other LEAs or governmental units, which are generally for tuition and transportation for services rendered to pupils residing in the paying LEA. It is also used for indirect cost when used in conjunction with object code 392.

- Local payments to other government units are transfers associated with charter school payments.
- All other expenses are associated with indirect costs charged to federal, enterprise, and other non-restricted programs. The indirect cost charged here is used to balance the district's local operating budget.

10. Under local - Board of Education (6910) there is an item for \$606,836. Besides the salaries for the nine districts, what is the rest for?

Fund	Purpose	Program	Object	Level	Cost Center	Account Code Description	Current Year Budget	Current Year Expenditures	Current Year Encumbrances	Payroll Projection	Budget Balance
2	6910	2	182	171	900	Employee Allowances Taxable	\$ 26,502.00	\$ 21,956.52	\$ -	\$ 4,545.00	\$ 0.48
2	6910	2	192	171	900	Additional Responsibility Stipend	\$ 339,441.30	\$ 281,147.92	\$ -	\$ 58,292.68	\$ 0.70
2	6910	2	211	171	900	Employer's Social Security Cost	\$ 27,994.82	\$ 23,187.47	\$ -	\$ 4,807.18	\$ 0.17
2	6910	801	311	171	900	Contracted Services	\$ 103,880.00	\$ 86,750.00	\$ 17,000.00	\$ -	\$ 130.00
2	6910	801	312	171	900	Workshop Expenses	\$ 22,372.00	\$ 3,855.85	\$ 6,167.95	\$ -	\$ 12,348.20
2	6910	801	314	171	900	Marketing Costs	\$ 1,838.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38.00
2	6910	801	332	171	900	Travel Reimbursement	\$ 197.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 197.00
2	6910	801	342	171	900	Postage	\$ 25.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25.00
2	6910	801	344	171	900	Mobile Communication Costs	\$ 4,800.00	\$ 3,722.53	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,077.47
2	6910	801	361	171	900	Membership Dues and Fees	\$ 52,062.00	\$ 40,327.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,735.00
2	6910	801	411	171	900	Supplies and Materials	\$ 5,274.00	\$ 830.70	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,443.30
2	6910	801	418	171	900	Computer Software and Supplies	\$ 15,550.00	\$ 15,456.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 93.25
2	6910	801	459	171	900	Other Food Purchases	\$ 6,900.00	\$ 5,239.42	\$ 894.74	\$ -	\$ 765.84
						Totals	\$ 606,836.12	\$ 484,274.16	\$ 25,062.69	\$ 67,644.86	\$ 29,854.41
						Less Board Member Stipend					
						Travel Allowance:	\$ 393,938.12				
						Board Member Operating Expenses:	\$ 212,898.00				

11. \$5.989 Million under "Leadership" - could you break down what this is for?

This funding category supports the costs of activities performed by the superintendent and such assistants as deputy, associate, assistant superintendents, and other system-wide leadership positions, generally directing and managing all affairs of the LEA. These include all personnel and materials in the chief executive officer's office, assistant, and area superintendent.

Services included in the 6940-purpose code are:

- Office of the Superintendent - Costs of activities performed by the superintendent, related support personnel, and other costs in directing and managing the affairs of the LEA.

- Deputy, Associate, and Assistants - Costs of activities performed by those personnel having system-wide leadership responsibilities, as well as involved in developing/ administering budgets, authorizing expenditures of funds, evaluating the performance of subordinates, developing policies and/or regulations for the district as a whole. These areas include all deputy and associate superintendents (regardless of the functional assignment). Also included are assistant superintendents and other system-wide leadership positions, as well as related support personnel and other costs related to their offices. (When assigned to two or more functional areas, costs are coded here. If costs may be placed properly to one specific purpose/function, then costs should be charged to that area.)

12. \$79.8 Million "payments to other government units" - What is this for?

This amount represents the budgeted funds for charter schools' monthly payments.

13. Please clarify the difference between "unbudgeted funds" (\$1.76 million) and our Fund Balance, and how they are utilized?

Unbudgeted funds are generated from savings in the current year's operating budget.

Fund balance increases or decreases at the end of the fiscal year, occurring when revenues exceed expenditures. Fund balance reserves are not included in the annual operating budget.

Under guidance aligned with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), fund balance is classified to reflect the level of constraint on how those resources can be used. North Carolina local governments and school districts follow these classifications:

- **Non-spendable Fund Balance:** Amounts that cannot be spent because they are not in spendable form (e.g., inventories, prepaid items) or are legally required to remain intact.
- **Restricted Fund Balance:** Resources that can only be used for specific purposes due to external constraints, such as state law, grant requirements, or bond covenants.
- **Assigned Fund Balance:** Intended for specific purposes but without formal board action. This is often designated by management or through the budget process.
- **Unassigned Fund Balance:** The residual classification for the general fund resources that are available for any lawful purpose. Board policy establishes 6 percent of the subsequent year's county appropriation as the district threshold for maintaining a healthy fund balance.

14. How much do we spend on legal fees per year and what category is that paid from in budget? How much of it is for our attorney's fees?

The board attorney's legal fees with Tharrington Smith were \$1.9 million for the 2024-2025 school year.

Tharrington Smith Attorney Invoices 2024-25										
Month	Invoice #	Category O Retainer & Expenses	Category A Admin Svcs	Category B Superintendent	Category C Communications	Category I Academics/SPEC/ SSS	Category S Area Superintendents	Category T Technology	Category X Operations/ Facilities	Monthly Totals
Through July 31	522306	\$,917.75	\$1,845.00	\$20,417.50	\$92.00	\$23,682.00	\$8,226.50	\$0.00	\$7,272.00	\$117,452.75
Through August 31	523784	\$4,874.16	\$41,607.50	\$24,681.00	\$46.00	\$46,053.50	\$5,618.00	\$138.00	\$6,225.00	\$129,243.16
Through September 30	525061	\$6,903.17	\$47,312.00	\$35,225.00	\$115.00	\$42,217.00	\$6,347.50	\$69.00	\$3,032.00	\$141,220.67
Through October 31	526509	\$5,333.13	\$65,341.50	\$23,495.50	\$0.00	\$87,968.00	\$3,424.00	\$713.00	\$4,389.00	\$190,864.13
Through November 30	527903	\$3,767.60	\$57,784.00	\$21,393.00	\$23.00	\$46,085.00	\$6,334.50	\$0.00	\$3,540.50	\$138,927.60
Through December 31	529241	\$3,646.73	\$55,716.00	\$18,396.50	\$0.00	\$51,916.50	\$6,890.00	\$0.00	\$2,570.50	\$139,136.23
Through January 31	530555	\$3,888.63	\$68,126.00	\$28,954.50	\$1,426.00	\$59,007.50	\$12,298.00	\$2,277.00	\$5,776.00	\$181,753.63
Through February 28	531825	\$5,301.77	\$70,963.00	\$35,736.00	\$4,186.00	\$56,382.00	\$8,647.50	\$345.00	\$4,864.50	\$186,425.77
Through March 31	533322	\$6,576.00	\$90,522.00	\$38,924.00	\$230.00	\$52,804.50	\$6,101.00	\$0.00	\$6,625.00	\$201,782.50
Through April 30	534682	\$3,350.09	\$53,127.00	\$34,353.00	\$276.00	\$49,028.00	\$8,614.00	\$0.00	\$7,282.50	\$156,030.59
Through May 31	535931	\$4,183.39	\$79,539.00	\$21,710.00	\$598.00	\$47,864.00	\$17,985.00	\$506.00	\$4,911.50	\$177,296.89
Through June 30	537367	\$3,646.15	\$74,976.50	\$20,942.50	\$184.00	\$76,944.00	\$13,229.00	\$368.00	\$4,015.00	\$194,305.15
TOTAL AMOUNT PAID			757,059.50	324,228.50	7,176.00	639,952.00	103,715.00	4,416.00	60,503.50	1,954,439.07

15. Please provide the total number of positions and the total funds we pay for:

a) How many teachers do we have in total?

WCPSS has 11,090 teachers.

b) How many beginner teachers do we have?

WCPSS has 1,674 beginner teachers.

c) How many Behavioral Specialist Teachers?

WCPSS has 49 Behavior Support teachers to support students in grades 6-12 who have behavior intervention plans and intense behavioral needs.

52 EBS teachers teach students with intense behavioral needs in grades K-5.

d) How many of our teachers are Dually Certified?

4,944 of our teachers are certified in more than one teaching license area.

e) How many coordinating teachers? What is their role?

WCPSS has 123 coordinating teachers.

The role varies by department. For example, in Academics, coordinating teachers serve primarily on the district's elementary and secondary regional teams, and academic enhancement teams provide school-based instructional support to teachers and leaders. Coordinating teachers support the development, implementation, and coordination of district and school-based curriculum and instructional initiatives. Their primary focus lies in supporting Professional Learning Communities, professional development and content specific guidance according to school identified needs aligning with school improvement plans and monitoring data sources. Coordinating teachers demonstrate instructional strategies and resources through co-teaching, modeling, and observations while offering feedback to staff.

In Human Resources, the Teacher Support Program Coordinating Teachers ensure district compliance with NCDPI State Board Policy TCED-016 while overseeing the identification, induction, and ongoing development of beginning teachers. They coordinate mentoring, required documentation, professional learning, and licensure support while implementing differentiated systems of support to promote teacher growth.

In Special Education Services, for the upcoming school year, special education coordinating teachers will monitor the implementation of specially designed instruction and compliance for all teachers in their buildings to build capacity for special education teachers. They will coach school staff to increase teacher capacity and student achievement. They will also work with the school administration to build capacity for support for classroom monitoring and PLCs.

To support early learning outcomes in our 192 preschool classrooms, the Office of Early Learning utilizes specialized coordinating teachers who drive curriculum implementation through professional development, coaching, and developmentally appropriate instruction. These roles are strategically divided to ensure every facet of the preschool experience from Title I curriculum consultation to Title III support for Dual Language Learners. Coordinating teachers provide support with the complexities of special education and Tier III behavioral interventions, ensuring compliance and the use of research-based social-emotional strategies. Additionally, these staff members are knowledgeable about the standards of licensed classrooms while managing the screening process for preschool programs through the Universal Application. By bridging the gap between administrative requirements and hands-on classroom coaching, these coordinating teachers foster a cohesive educational environment. Ultimately, this collaborative structure ensures that students, regardless of their specific needs, receive high-quality, data-driven instruction during their most foundational years.

f) If any of the above are using county funds, please clarify what and how much are needed from local funds.

Currently, there are 27 coordinating teachers fully or partially funded out of Fund 2 (Local Current Expense Fund) with salaries totaling \$1.6 million annually.

16. How many Teacher Coaches or Leadership Coaches do we have? Is this provided by state funds, or county and how much?

WCPSS has 351 employees who are in a teacher coach position. Many of these employees are not full time in these positions and hold other assignments. For example, an employee could be 50 percent literacy coach and 50 percent intervention teacher.

Of the total \$18.9 million spent on teacher coach salaries, \$4.3 million is locally funded.

We have five employees in leadership coach positions. Of the \$589,000, \$108,000 is locally funded.

17. What is the role of Literacy Coach?

The purpose of literacy coaches is to support educators in implementing evidence-based literacy instruction. Literacy coaches collaborate with teachers, administrators, and support staff to enhance literacy outcomes through differentiated instruction, data-driven decision-making, and inclusive practices. By providing professional development, modeling effective strategies, and facilitating interventions, literacy coaches empower educators to create accessible and engaging learning environments. Literacy coaches maintain the goal of ensuring that all students, regardless of ability, develop the literacy skills necessary for academic success and lifelong learning.

a) What is the amount we spend on that role cumulatively?

2025-26 Total Literacy Coach Allotment: 648 Months of employment

2026-27 Total Literacy Coach Allotment: 400 Months of employment

b) Can you clarify if we are removing Literacy Coaches entirely or cutting down the number of positions?

Literacy coaches are not being removed entirely. Historically, each elementary school currently receives an allotment for literacy coach. Beginning in 2026-27, schools receiving Level III and Level IV support will maintain their current 2025-26 allotment for literacy coach.

Level III:

- Schools with overall grade level proficiency between 50.0 percent and 64.9 percent who did not meet, met, or exceeded growth and schools with overall grade level proficiency of 49.9 percent or lower who exceeded growth and schools with overall grade level proficiency between 65.0 percent to 79.9 percent who did not meet growth, based on two-year combined proficiency and growth index averages.

Level IV:

- Any low-performing school and schools with overall grade level proficiency of 49.9 percent or lower who met or did not meet growth.

18. Do we have a full list of costs for Professional Development / Program costs? How much is provided for teachers and how much for administrators?

The following breakdown of professional development costs is based on January 31, 2026, which is the 2025-26 base budget in the Superintendent's Proposed Budget document. The amounts shown below include employer matching benefit costs.

Object Code Name	Instructional Costs	Non-Instructional Costs	Total
Substitute Teacher Staff Development Absence	\$ 2,087,551	\$ -	\$ 2,087,551
Instructional Assistant Substitute Pay Staff Development Absence	\$ 250,373	\$ -	\$ 250,373
Staff Development Participant Pay	\$ 599,453	\$ 1,591,554	\$ 2,191,007
Staff Development Instructor	\$ 210,786	\$ 10,374	\$ 221,160
Workshop Expenses/Allowable Travel	\$ 6,667,101	\$ 1,899,268	\$ 8,566,369
Total	\$ 9,815,264	\$ 3,501,196	\$ 13,316,460

19. Our Restart schools seem to be growing in numbers. It was mentioned that the eligibility changed, can you please clarify what has changed and has it affected our budget? Are all Restart funds paid out from state funding? If any costs are not from state, what source does it come from?

We have not added any new Restart schools in the past three years. There have been no changes in the NCDPI eligibility process. In 2024-25, we modified the district's process for submitting applications with a Phase I process step before submitting an official application.

This process has assisted with moving schools out of low performing status, without needing to officially apply for Restart. The linked document provides additional details about the process and support provided. Restart funding comes from lapsed salaries/over-under.

The only applications that have been submitted during the past three years have been for schools that reapplied based on their continued authorization information. This did not add to the numbers of Restart schools in WCPSS, it just continued their Restart status.

20. Can you remind me exactly what the details you used for calculating the Masters Pay budget reduction, based on Dr. Ng's suggestion? Was it that qualifying teachers would receive their bonus pay in Year 3, after Year 3, or something else? If the amount provided in the chart is the savings that would be realized by not paying the bonus until after Year 3, could you please provide me with the savings estimated by not paying the bonus until after Year 2 and until after Year 1 for comparison?

The \$2.355 million was a savings to the current year's budget proposal if we were to delay master's pay for new hires for the coming school year. If we delayed master's pay for more than a year, additional budget increase requests would also be delayed.

The \$2.355 million dollars is an estimate based on the projected increase in the number of additional employees expected to receive local master's pay. The projection is based on a year-to-year increase of 269 teachers paid on the local master's pay salary schedule.

We currently pay just over \$15 million per year for local master's pay. If we were to continue local master's pay, we would likely need to continue annual funding requests of \$2.355 million or more in future years. The following table represents an estimate of delayed funding requests per year. It is important to note; this is a delay in funding requests and not a reduction in funding.

Year	Current proposed increases in master's degree pay for new hires	Proposal to pay master's degree pay to new hires after 3 years teaching in WCPSS – new hires in 26-27 would earn increase in 29-30
2026-27	\$2.355 million	
2027-28	\$2.355 million	
2028-29	\$2.355 million	
2029-30	\$2.355 million	\$2.355 million
Increase over 4 years	\$9.420 million	\$2.355 million

21. Is it possible to cut magnet funds back without cutting them entirely, for those that are off grants?

Yes, it is possible to cut magnet funds back without cutting them entirely for those schools that are off grants. However, it is important to distinguish between "extras" and the core cost that make magnets function as magnets.

We are in the process of critically analyzing our magnet programs to assess opportunities for improvement, sustainability, and where appropriate, potential sunseting of programs. This analysis is focused on:

- Which investments are most closely tied to student outcomes and diversity goals.
- Where federal commitments align with or differ from local funding structures.
- How any proposed changes would impact access, particularly for lower-income and geographically distant students.

This approach will allow us to make informed, strategic decisions that balance fiscal responsibility while protecting access and program quality.

22. Could you please provide additional information about:

a) Expenses associated with out-of-state travel by central office staff

- Communications, Translations or Community Services: Has no out-of-state travel.
- Finance Office: NAFEPA Conference, Washington DC (March 2026) - \$2,654
- Human Resources: \$4,300
- Technology Services: Has no out-of-state travel for the current fiscal year.
- Transportation: Has no out-of-state expenses.
- Maintenance & Operations: Has no out-of-state expenses.
- Facilities, Design and Construction: \$2,506
- Child Nutrition: Has no out-of-state expenses.
- School Choice Planning and Assignment: Has no out-of-state expenses.
- Academic Enhancement (Title I, Advanced Learning Services, ESL):
 - **NAFEPA** for K-12 AE Senior Director, Title I Director, Title I Fiscal Senior Administrator, ESL Director, ESL Senior Administrator
 - Conference Purpose: Conference where federal education program administrators, schools and district leaders, state education agencies, and other professionals share expertise, explore federal program policies and fiscal outlook, and learn about evidence-based practices for program effectiveness and continuous improvement
 - Title I: \$6,221 for Title I Director and Fiscal Senior Administrator
 - ESL: \$12,305 for Senior Director, ESL Director, ESL Senior Administrator, and Budget Analyst Team Lead
 - **National Family Engagement Summit**
 - Conference Purpose: To gain strategies and best practices to leverage family engagement to address chronic absenteeism, teacher preparation, teacher retention, culturally responsive practices, student achievement, early literacy, mental health issues and immigrant families.
 - Title I: \$9,522 for six members of family and community engagement committee
- Region 1 and 2 Elementary & Secondary Achievement and School Support: Has no out-state travel
- K-12 Arts: NAMM-Program Director's Conference (award recipients) \$5,770
- Athletics: National ADA Conference (Award Recipients) \$2,378
- CTE (Non-CTSO Travel)
 - Youth Business Summit: \$5,513
 - ACTE Vision Conference: \$6,280
 - National Policy Seminar: \$1,193
 - Total: \$12,987
- Special Education: No out-of-state expenses
- Student Support Services (Office of Early Learning, Alternative Education, Student Due Process, Health Services, Behavioral Health, CASS):
 - Southeastern Behavioral Health Conference - \$4,271 (pending mileage reimbursements)
 - National Association of School Nurses- \$3,397 (scheduled for June)
 - Total Approximate Out-of-State Travel Cost: \$7,668

b) Expenses associated with Board of Education travel out of state and professional development

The budget to support the Board out-of-state travel and professional development are combined. The total out-of-state travel and professional development costs are combined – totaling \$3,856 (YTD).

02.6910.801.312.0171.0900.000			
Accounting Date	Transaction Reference	Transaction Description	Actual Amount
		Beginning Balance:	\$ -
23-Sep-25			
	INV-REG/0171/091225	NCCBSBM	\$ 100.00
	INV-REG/0171/091225/A	NCCBSBM	\$ 100.00
26-Sep-25			
	INV-REG/0171/091625	NCCBSBM	\$ 100.00
13-Oct-25			
	INV-INV-05158-F9F8X7	NC SCHOOL BOARDS ACTION CENTER	\$ 199.00
4-Nov-25			
	INV-PCARD-4673670-04-NOV-25	WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	\$ 241.70
20-Nov-25			
	INV-744	WAKE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP	\$ 150.00
2-Dec-25			
	INV-PCARD-4681594-02-DEC-25	WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	\$ 522.12
	INV-PCARD-4681594-02-DEC-25	WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	\$ 568.23
2-Dec-25			
	INV-USE TAX/02DEC2518:07/F02/7.25	WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	\$ 24.80
24-Mar-26			
	INV-212310	GREATER RALEIGH CHAMBER OF	\$ 1,850.00
			\$3,855.85 Total YTD

c) Expenses associated with Board of Education meals

02.6910.801.459.0171.0900.000			
Accounting Date	Transaction Reference	Transaction Description	Actual Amount
		Beginning Balance:	\$ -
29-Jul-25			
	INV-7467300	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 10.44
	INV-7467300	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 10.95
	INV-7467300	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 455.82
4-Aug-25			
	INV-7469450	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 2.31
	INV-7469450	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 48.62
18-Aug-25	JE20083	CNS CATERING BOE RETREAT INV 5553446	\$ 483.09
24-Sep-25	JE20172	CNS CATERING - BOE INV 5553479	\$ 138.03
29-Sep-25	JE20183	CNS CATERING BOE - INV 5553495	\$ 133.97
29-Sep-25	JE20183	CNS CATERING BOE - INV 5553477	\$ 138.03
10-Nov-25	JE20281	CNS CATERING BOE INV 5553537	\$ 138.03
10-Nov-25	JE20281	CNS CATERING BOE INV 5553543	\$ 138.03
14-Nov-25			
	INV-7488800	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 10.90
	INV-7488800	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 10.95
	INV-7488800	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 392.82
8-Jan-26	JE20390	CNS CATERING BOE MTGS - INV 5553617	\$ 138.03
8-Jan-26	JE20390	CNS CATERING BOE MTGS - INV 5553619	\$ 138.03
9-Jan-26			
	INV-A25619452908	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 73.85
27-Jan-26	JE20437	CNS CATERING BOE NOV 25 INV 5553742	\$ 127.50
27-Jan-26	JE20437	CNS CATERING BOE NOV 25 INV 5553743	\$ 110.42
11-Feb-26	PO-282296	WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	\$ -
18-Feb-26			
	INV-REIMB/021726	Allen, Ms. Melissa R	\$ 71.41
	INV-REIMB/021326	Taylor, Doctor Robert P	\$ 238.12
20-Feb-26	JE20477	CNS CATERING BOE INV 5553749	\$ 138.03
23-Feb-26	JE20480	CNS CATERING BOE INV 5553745, 5553744	\$ 357.23
23-Feb-26	JE20480	CNS CATERING BOE INV 5553745, 5553744	\$ 110.42
11-Mar-26	JE20525	CNS CATERING BOE INV 5553748	\$ 460.08
6-Apr-26			
	INV-PCARD-4727943-06-APR-26	WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	\$ 605.26
20-Apr-26			
	INV-7513435	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 1.09
	INV-7507365	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 6.47
	INV-7507365	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 10.95
	INV-7513435	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 83.53
	INV-7507365	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 291.57
28-Apr-26			
	INV-7524733	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 24.00
29-Apr-26			
	INV-A25619461131	CAPITOL COFFEE SYSTEMS	\$ 141.44
			\$ 5,239.42 Total YTD

d) Expenses associated with Board of Education IT Equipment and Support

Mobile communications costs for Verizon Wireless services YTD are \$3,723

23. Aside from having second thoughts on taking more people out of school buildings compared to a very small supplement increase, I have a question about the mechanics.

One school that would lose an AP has one AP on a terminating contract. Would that AP still be moved to an open AP position within the district regardless of the terminating contract? It's certainly a person that the principal would bring make if they were not losing a position.

If a school were losing an assistant principal position and they had one assistant principal on a terminating contract, that employee would be the assistant principal to not return to the school. While HR would support the assistant principal on a terminating contract by contacting schools with open positions on their behalf. They would not be guaranteed a position in the district.