

Joint Senate and House Education Committee

February 7, 2019

Rob Winslow, IASA and Harold Ott, IRSA

## **I Intro**

Thank you for this opportunity to respond to the January 31<sup>st</sup> draft on the new funding formula. Our associations have been following the development of the funding formula very closely. We have an active group that includes the following: Idaho School Superintendent Association Board, Finance Committee from ISSA, and Idaho Association of School Administrators Legislative Committee that includes superintendents and school administrators from all regions of the state representing large and small districts.

Our original position was to have salary-based apportionment outside the new funding formula. This draft has it flow through the formula. With that in mind, our working group has begun an analysis of the draft. As this new model has evolved it has become increasingly complex. Consequently, it will require a significant amount of time for our working group to determine the impact at the local level.

## **II Our initial concerns are as follows:**

1. There are several problematic issues with inconsistent data. Data is being presented with 2018-2019 in comparison to 2017-2018. Accurate up to date information is needed.

2. Requiring the Career Ladder to be implemented as local salary schedules. (P. 4, line 47)

a. Current local districts salary schedules have only required the starting minimum salary

b. This draft mandates 3 cells in the residency rung and 5 cells in the professional rung with stipulated dollar amounts as a requirement for every charter and school district. (P. 14, line 24-29)

c. The Career Ladder was an allocation model and not a salary schedule.

d. The Career Ladder included in this draft appears to mandate compensation without direct revenue.

3. The "hold positive" provision is an improvement over the "hold harmless." However, members are concerned with the consequences after the 3 years implementation. It would be helpful to see the model projected out 3-5 years with additional revenue to determine impact. (P. 11, lines 21-30)

4. Lack of provision for funding alternative schools. Funding at-risk students is a possible solution. (P. 4, lines 12-20)

5. Distribution of weighted foundation moneys must be allocated to the school the student attends. This would preclude expenditure of funds for district wide needs. We suggest adding the words "or district" after the word school. (P. 11, line 11)

6. Schedule of payments in the draft will cause significant cash flow problems in every charter and school district. Payment schedule ought to reflect, as accurately as possible, enrollment at the time payments are given. We suggest the June payment be reduced from 12 and a half percent to 2 percent and the December payment be increased by 10 and a half percent (P. 11, lines 36-43 and P. 12, lines 1-39)

7. Even though IDLA is not included in this draft, however it is a vital part of meeting the educational needs of students. Consequently, our members believe IDLA needs to be funded in a manner similar to what it is now. It is not a stand-alone service and should be included in the general education support budget.

8. Some concern was expressed regarding the teacher evaluation review requirement as still necessary. (P. 14, lines 30-47 and P. 15, lines 1-2 and lines 9-12)

9. Enrollment needs to be defined, particularly in case of fractional enrollment. (P. 8, lines 37-47 and P. 9, lines 1-9)

10. The school district market value weight explanation is confusing. It appears that school districts would be dramatically affected by having an all or none application of this weight. This weight ought to reflect the wealth of student population of a district more accurately than it reflects the market value in which a district resides. (P.10, lines 41-43 and P. 11, lines 1-13)

### **III Conclusion**

Our association looks forward to a continued dialogue on the components of the new funding formula.