

Thank you for the opportunity to share some thoughts on the funding formula.

First of all – let me say that Nampa is NOT in opposition to a funding formula based on enrollment which creates a base funding amount and then adds additional weights added for “special student populations”. We agree with the charge given the interim committee in House Concurrent Resolution 49.

There are areas where our district has distinct concerns:

1. We are in agreement with 80% of our colleagues who took the IASA survey that salary based apportionment should not be included in the funding formula. The inclusion of SBA creates confusion at the negotiation table and weakens and perhaps unravels the gains we have experienced with the career ladder implementation.
2. We oppose the Wealth adjustment as a lever. It is not aligned with the charge given to the joint task force. In addition, it consumes almost 5% of the total funding – this is money that should be directed to specific student needs. In learning together with our small rural districts in our area, several benefit from the Wealth Adjustment. While we concur that these small rural districts should be winners, they should be winners because they are small, rural districts serving students of need. In addition, the wealth adjustment creates an environment that is not supportive of economic growth in a community.
3. As Chairman Westfall has already stated, we have significant concerns about unintended inequities in the formula which allocate higher per pupil revenues to LEAs who serve fewer students of poverty, fewer students qualifying for special education, and no or few students whose first language is not English. The disparity is significant and does NOT reflect the intended outcome of the new funding formula. The small school lever should be applied toward small, rural schools.
4. Alternative School Funding. Nampa is working hard on finding multiple pathways for all of our students to graduate on time and pursue opportunities after graduation. We have increased our graduation rate by more than 4% this last year and now have a higher graduation rate than the state average. One of the pathways we have used to achieve this significant event is alternative schools. This formula offers little support to continue this option for our students.

We would encourage you to spend some time evaluating whether or not the proposed formula as is actually achieves the goals outlined in the Concurrent Resolution. This is the accountability and assessment piece. Do the numbers demonstrate that we value weights to serve students with the greatest need? In our attempts to understand the current formula, we would have to answer “not yet”. We urge you to slow down, take the time to implement the “right” formula that honors all students and LEAs in Idaho, and not just “a” formula to say that the work is done.

For your reference:

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) serving students in Nampa

District/LEA Identifier	Total New Funding Model WITH CAP	Enrollment	Revenue Per Pupil	FRL	SPED	EL	GT
LEA 1	\$ 1,543,156.82	290	\$ 5,321.23	31%	11%	3%	0%
LEA 2	\$ 6,545,072.59	1117	\$ 5,859.51	42%	5%	3%	0%
LEA 3	\$ 83,297,992.09	14066	\$ 5,921.94	66%	11%	12%	3%
LEA 4	\$ 53,514,972.16	8664	\$ 6,176.71	61%	11%	15%	3%
LEA 5	\$ 2,154,676.85	313	\$ 6,883.95	39%	7%	0%	0%
LEA 6	\$ 2,867,029.60	400	\$ 7,167.57	35%	2%	0%	0%
LEA 7	\$ 3,031,941.67	414	\$ 7,323.53	31%	5%	0%	0%
LEA 8	\$ 979,827.17	106	\$ 9,243.65	54%	25%	0%	0%