Everything CSCs Should Know About the Collaborative School Committee (CSC)’s Unified Improvement Plan (UIP), School Budget and School Performance Framework
Welcome!

To introduce yourself, please share

• Your name
• Your school affiliation
• Your role there
• Something measured in your school that you are most proud of
Today’s Agenda

- The Unified Improvement Plan (UIP)
- The School Performance Framework (SPF)
- The school budget
Today’s Objectives

• Gain an understanding of the CSC’s UIP
• Gain support for the development of a CSC that understands their role
• Learn about budgeting roles and indicators that guide decision making
The Unified Improvement Plan (UIP)
Unified Improvement Plan

What is the UIP?

• Helps schools and districts engage in a cycle of continuous improvement and performance management

• The UIP is a shared way to help track, manage and share that performance and improvement
Unified Improvement Plan - Purpose

The main goal of the UIP is to align efforts to ensure all students exit the K–12 education system ready for postsecondary education, and/or to be successful in the workforce, earning a living wage immediately upon graduation.
Unified Improvement Plan - Purpose

To support this goal, the UIP....

• Provides a framework for performance management
• Streamlines the improvement planning components
• Facilitates performance management
• Supports use of performance data
• Meets state and federal accountability requirements
• Makes data available to external stakeholders
• Serves as 2-year strategic plan
### Unified Improvement Plan - Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Alignment</strong></th>
<th>A system to align improvement planning requirements for state and federal accountability into a “single” plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
<td>A common format for schools and for districts to document improvement planning efforts. Schools/districts on accountability clock must demonstrate a coherent plan for dramatic change and adjustments over time. Reviews conducted by CDE and the State Review Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td>A process for including multiple voices, including staff, families and community representatives. Plans are also posted publicly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Practice</strong></td>
<td>A statewide strategy to promote improvement planning based on best-practice, including use of state and local data and engagement in a continuous improvement cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>A mechanism for triggering additional supports through CDE (especially for schools/districts on accountability clock).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unified Improvement Plan – Process
Unified Improvement Plan – Data Basis

The data narrative includes:

• Description of school setting
• Process of data analysis
• Accountability expectations
• Progress and trend analysis
• Priority performance challenges
• Root cause analysis
• Progress monitoring
What is the CSC’s role in the UIP?

The CSC is responsible for providing guidance, evaluation, and recommendations for the UIP to the principal, who creates and adopts the UIP.
Unified Improvement Plan Activity

Review your report to answer the following questions:

1. What did you learn about the school from this report?
2. What are their areas of success?
3. What do they need to improve?
4. What else did the UIP tell you?
The School Performance Framework (SPF)
School Performance Framework (SPF)

- Comprehensive annual review of school performance
- Basis of mandatory school accreditation ratings
- Aligns district goals, state requirements and federal mandates
- Factors into enrollment decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Assignment</th>
<th>Framework Points Earned</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>at or above 59%</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>78.1% (19.5 out of 25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>at or above 47% - below 59%</td>
<td>Academic Growth</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>75.0% (37.5 out of 50 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Improvement</td>
<td>at or above 37% - below 47%</td>
<td>Academic Growth Gaps</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>76.8% (19.2 out of 25 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Participation: Meets 95% Participation Rate

TOTAL: 76.2% (76.2 out of 100 points)

*Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.
SPF Indicators

• Academic Growth
• Academic Status / Proficiency
• College and Career Readiness
• Improvement in College and Career Readiness Over Time
• Student Engagement
• Enrollment
• Parent Satisfaction
SPF Ratings

Distinguished (80%–100%)
Meets expectations (51%–79%)
Accredited on watch (40%–50%)
Accredited on priority watch (34%–39%)
Accredited on probation (0–33%)

The ratings roll up to an overall evaluation of the school/district’s performance, which determines the plan type or accreditation rating:

School Plan Types: Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, Turnaround
School Characteristics Indicator (SCI)

SCI: The indicator of how each school performs relative to similar schools in the district.

Weighted calculation consisting of:

- FRL (40%)
- ELL (20%)
- SpEd (20%)
- Mobility (20%)

Schools are rank-ordered by education level and compared with 10 schools closest to them.
School Performance Framework Activity

*Review your report to answer the following questions:*

1. What did you learn about the school from this report?
2. What are their areas of success?
3. What do they need to improve?
4. What else did the SPF tell you that informed the UIP you reviewed?
The School Budget
School Budget

- Students
- Per Student Base
- School SBB Allocation

Students x Per Student Base = School SBB Allocation
## Student Based Budgeting - History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2008-09</th>
<th>FY2009-10</th>
<th>FY2010-11</th>
<th>FY2011-12</th>
<th>FY2012-13</th>
<th>FY2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pension refinancing increases dollars available via SBB. Supplemental allocations added for:  
• Base Funding  
• Free Lunch  
• Gifted and Talented  
• At-Risk  
• Additional targeted funding for some underperforming schools  
RAM to SBB adjustment eliminated | Small School Factor continues to ratchet down as planned  
Facilitator requirements "loosened" to allow for additional site-level discretion  
Some schools begin budgeting on actual salaries  
Some Federal ARRA funds allocated directly through SBB | Final year for Small School Factor  
Central budget for Guest Teachers (substitutes) allocated directly to schools  
State lifts restrictions on instructional funding – more flexibility for schools | $10 million added to SBB  
• Additional funding for at-risk students  
• Additional base funding  
• Performance allocation added to formula to incentivize SPF performance  
Refinements implemented to streamline SBB formula  
Additional site-level control over Mild Moderate and Nurse/Mental Health Staffing | ELL Weight added $400 per ELL  
Multiple Pathways Centers transition to a weighted student formula | Modified center program supplement to allocate funds based on programs within the school  
Kindergarten students funded at 1.00 for all SBB allocations  
Additional funds related to passage of 2012 MLO rolled out through SBB  
• Tutoring  
• Arts  
• ECE  
• Enrichment / PE  
• Technology |
# School Budget – Timeline for Creation

## 2014–2015 Budget Development Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early January</td>
<td>Final Projections of student count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-January</td>
<td>Budget Development pre-meeting with HR Partner and Financial Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early February</td>
<td>Budget Development/School Staffing one-on-one meeting with Principals, Financial Partners and Human Resources School Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early March</td>
<td>Final School Budget, Title II Plans, and other completed forms due to Budget Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early September</td>
<td>Fall Adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSC’s Role in School Budget

- Use allocation to “purchase” staff and other expenses at a school
- Focus is on positions, not people
- Ensure alignment between budget and the UIP
- School leaders retain large amount of autonomy in use of school funds
## 2013-2014 Summary of Allocations-General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Use of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBB Base Allocation</td>
<td>$3,924</td>
<td>per pupil - K-12 (K=1.0)</td>
<td>Primarily discretionary: See “Mill Levy” section for matching funds requirements and guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Funding for Schools with Center Programs    | $7480        | per program per K-12 | - Discretionary  
- Help support the needs of the center-based program students |
| Guest Teacher Allocation (Substitutes)      | $52          | per pupil - ECE-12 (@1.00) | School budgets for guest teachers for absences related to illness, personal leave, etc. |
| Free / Reduced Lunch Students               | $461, $496   | per FRL student - K-12 (@ 1.00)  
- Elementary & K-8 Schools  
- Secondary Schools | - Discretionary  
- Serve the needs of FRL students. Examples include:  
- Intervention teachers/paras/programs  
- Enrichment opportunities  
- Social/emotional support  
- Professional development |
## 2013-2014 Summary of Allocations-General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING PROGRAM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
<th>USE OF FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Interventions</td>
<td>$35,000 - $250,000</td>
<td>Accredited on Probation Accredited on Priority Watch &amp; Consolidated Schools SPF Red/Orange schools &amp; consolidated</td>
<td>Staffing and support tools to drive student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Incentive</td>
<td>$35, $65, $100, $105, $110, $115</td>
<td>per K-12 (K=1.0)pupil Maintain Green Maintain Blue Growth to Orange Growth to Yellow Growth to Green Growth to Blue</td>
<td>Discretionary Implement programs that will continue to drive student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT Allocation</td>
<td>.25 FTE + $120</td>
<td>per identified GT student K-8</td>
<td>Choose one of 3 options for the 0.25 FTE As part of the school's specific GT plan funds must be used for GT students and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Based upon the number of projected Spanish speaking ELA students</td>
<td>Refer to “English Language Acquisition” section for a detailed list of guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Based ELL Funding</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>CELA Levels 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Refer to “English Language Acquisition” section for a detailed list of guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Activities Subsidy</td>
<td>$39.79</td>
<td>HS (9-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Para</td>
<td>$15.66</td>
<td>K-5 (K@1.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013-2014 Summary of Allocations-Mill Levy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING PROGRAM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
<th>USE OF FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 Mill Levy – Student Literacy</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>per K-12 @1.0</td>
<td>To boost academic achievement in literacy, math &amp; science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development (Facilitator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator, teacher, intervention teacher, reading/writing para, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development and supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Mill Levy – Technology Resources</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>per ECE-12 (@1.00)</td>
<td>For the purchase of technology equipment, software, repair, training or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technology support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Mill Levy – Library Resources</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>per ECE-12 (@1.00)</td>
<td>For the central purchase of library books for all schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Mill Levy – Elementary Arts</td>
<td>0.5 – 2.00 FTEs + $7</td>
<td>per K-8 @1.0</td>
<td>Must match the FTE allocation from General Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies and materials must be used directly for related instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Mill Levy – Textbooks</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>per K-12 @1.0</td>
<td>For the purchase of classroom textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Mill Levy - Technology Resources</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>Per ECE – 12 (ECE .5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Mill Levy - Secondary Arts</td>
<td>$160 pp./min .50 FTE + $7</td>
<td>Per 6 - 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Mill Levy – PE/Engagement</td>
<td>$60 pp/min .50 FTE + $5</td>
<td>Per ECE – 12 (ECE @.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Mill Levy - Tutoring</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low Intensity</td>
<td>Allocation based on SPF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013-2014 Summary of Allocations-ECE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING PROGRAM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
<th>USE OF FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>.50 FTE /Half Day 3 hrs. Para /Half Day 4 hrs. Para (Head Start)/ Half Day $48.25/pupil – Half Day $96.50/pupil – Full Day</td>
<td>Supply allocation based upon capacity ECE student population</td>
<td>Funding will provide for teacher FTEs, paraprofessional support and classroom supplies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013-2014 Summary of Allocations-State and Federal Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING PROGRAM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
<th>USE OF FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>$365/$415</td>
<td>per Free/Reduced Lunch Student K-12</td>
<td>To provide supplementary programs to support the needs of the lowest performing student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I Parental Involvement</td>
<td>$7.96</td>
<td>per Free/Reduced Lunch Student K-12</td>
<td>Funds must be used for parent involvement activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II Student Literacy Development (Facilitator)</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>per K-12 (K=1.0)</td>
<td>Staff development: cannot be used for the direct instruction of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPA - Native Language Tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 hrs. per day for every 15 ESL students speaking the same language</td>
<td>Tutors to support ESL student in their non-Spanish native language while they are learning English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Trainings

• Membership, elections and meetings of the CSC
• The policies, purpose and scope of the CSC
What is your most important takeaway from today?
Thank you for attending
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