

Agenda Item 4. Board Discussion on Questions Raised from the Enrichment Equity Study Team and Answers to the Questions.

Partial Answers to Enrichment Equity Study Team Questions:

- 1. QUESTION: What are the enrichment program differences between the schools—How is the quality different? How is the amount of time different? How is the staff utilization different?**

Answer: Currently, the sites have been provided specialist time in four or five enrichment areas (Art, Music, Science, Technology, and Physical Education) so that K-3 teachers are provided with 120 minutes of prep time each week, and 4-6 teachers are provided with 180 minutes of prep time every week. Because the sites have different enrollment numbers and different numbers of upper and lower grade sections, some schools have been assigned more enrichment staffing. Once a school has been assigned its number of enrichment teacher positions for the next school year, site principals study the needs of students and review the curricular goals of the site, and review personnel that will be available prior to determining the site's optimal schedule/program.

Some sites (AF, SC) have certificated Physical Education teachers because the site PTA raised funds during the previous school year and donated the funds to the DMSEF so that the site could purchase additional staffing in the next school year. Another site (Heights) restructured its enrichment Science program two years ago by eliminating the Science enrichment teacher position and then hiring a Physical Education teacher. Other sites have used PTA or grant funds to purchase classified Physical Education teachers and/or programs.

Del Mar Hills Academy raised funds during the previous school year and has purchased an additional enrichment position for the current school year, in addition to their 06/07 allocation from the district.

Observation: Torrey Hills School is currently assigned six enrichment teacher positions because of its large size. By having six enrichment positions, the K-6 teachers at Torrey Hills receive 120 or 180 minutes of prep time. If Torrey Hills was assigned four enrichment positions, the enrichment master schedule at Torrey Hills would not meet the prep time requirement that is contained in the DMCTA contract.

Currently the 774 students at Torrey Hills have one music teacher to provide music instruction, while the 559 students at Ashley Falls also have one music teacher. The 392 students at Sycamore Ridge also have one music teacher.

The students at these three schools get different amounts of instructional time in music, which illustrates one of the main ways that enrichment is different at the sites. School size impacts the amount of enrichment time that is provided to students.

Another factor that contributes to different amounts of enrichment time at different sites has been the past practice of allowing sites to raise money and purchase additional enrichment positions that exceed the District enrichment allocation. For example, the Del Mar Hills Academy was allocated 3 enrichment positions for 06/07, but the parent community raised enough money during 05/06 so that it purchased an additional enrichment position for 06/07. This means that the 411 students at Del Mar Hills Academy have one music position assigned to their school, while the 779 students at Torrey Hills also have one music position.

In the past schools have been given some latitude in the selection of the content area for the fifth or sixth specialist at a site. For example, Torrey Hills has been assigned six enrichment positions for the 06/07 school year, and the site decided to use one of the six enrichment positions to provide a unique enrichment program that emphasizes Reader's Theater, Drama, and "Future Problem Solving". While the students at Torrey Hills get less instructional time in music than the students at the Hills Academy, the students at Torrey Hills receive a unique enrichment program (Reader's Theater, Drama, and Future Problem Solving) that students at Hills do not experience.

What is common to all 06/07 site enrichment programs is that the seven sites currently provide students with certificated instruction in Art, Music, and Technology. Six of the seven sites are also providing students with certificated enrichment instruction in Science.

What varies throughout the seven sites is the amount of instructional time in each enrichment content area. Large schools have less instructional time per student in Art, Music, and Technology, while small schools have more instructional time per student, due to the number of students who are served in each school.

Currently, each of the 28 enrichment teachers is assigned to one site that results in students having different amounts of enrichment time because site

enrollments are not the same across the district. This challenge is not new to public schools, and most school districts avoid this inequity by assigning each enrichment teacher to an itinerant schedule that will result in all students receiving the same amount of instructional time. For the past 10+ years, DMUSD enrichment specialists have been assigned ONLY to one site, which means that students at smaller sites receive more instructional time in each enrichment content area than students at large sites.

2. QUESTION: What is enrichment equity?

Answer Enrichment equity may mean “Providing students with equal access to the different enrichment content areas and also providing students with the same amount of instructional time in the different enrichment content areas.”



Physical Education Questions (#3 - #7):

3. QUESTION: Can the 28 District enrichment positions and the current PE positions be funded 100% by the District?

Answer: The 28 current enrichment positions will cost \$2.3 (with Physical Education) million during 06/07. Without the full DMSEF contribution of \$600,000 for the 06/07 year, the DMUSD budget will fall out of balance. When the Board adopted its 06/07 budget in June, the 06/07 General Fund was expected to end the 06/07 school year with a very small surplus of \$410,211. The current board adopted budget for 06/07 for the General Fund is a deficit of \$654,124. If the \$600,000 in DMSEF revenue is eliminated from the 07/08 budget, the budget will fall further out of balance and will require budget cuts. (Increased class size? Less prep time? Less custodial staff? Fewer staff members?) Additionally, with Ocean Air School (School #8) opening to students and staff in August 2007, the Board faces the challenge of shifting some existing enrichment positions from schools that will lose enrollment, and to provide Ocean Air students with Art, Music, Science, and Technology enrichment staffing.

The Board approved DMUSD Strategic Plan (1999-2000) called for the creation of an educational foundation that would raise considerable funds to pay for an expanded enrichment program for DMUSD students. In 1999-2000, the Board approved the creation of the DMSEF so that new programs (certificated Art, Music, Technology) could be funded without cannibalizing existing programs.

4. QUESTION: Can we raise the FTE (full time equivalent) baseline for both enrichment and PE?

Answer If District decided to raise the baseline number of enrichment/PE teachers from its current level of 28, the District would need significant new revenue to pay for the new baseline number, or the District could make significant budget cuts to pay for the new expense.

5. QUESTION: Could the enrichment teachers and PE teachers be funded 100% by an endowment?

Answer Yes and that's one reason many staff, parents, and community members have made generous contributions to the DMSEF since it came into existence. If the DMSEF could write a check to the DMUSD for \$2,000,000 next year, then the District may be able to provide DMUSD students with additional benefits (perhaps lower class size in grades 4-6).

6. QUESTION: Can the PE program be considered an enrichment program?

Answer: Already, Del Mar Heights has re-structured its Science enrichment program to put PE into the Heights enrichment schedule/program. In addition, AF and SC have raised funds and purchased PE positions that are included in the enrichment program at AF and SC. During the current school year, Torrey Hills School filled one of its six enrichment positions with a certificated PE teacher.

PE is the only curriculum area in California where the state has specified the number of instructional minutes per week. The California Education Code requires the DMUSD to provide 200 minutes of PE instruction to all students every 10 school days. The California Education Code does not mandate instructional minutes in any other content area.

Perhaps the DMUSD Board may wish to discuss the possible adoption of a board policy that mandates core instructional time (and minutes) so that students get adequate core instructional time.

7. QUESTION: Could the K-6 Enrichment program be staffed by Art, Music, Science, Technology, and PE teachers?

Answer: Currently the 28 District paid enrichment positions have been allocated to provide Art, Music, Science, and Technology. It is conceivable that at least one or more of the 28 positions could be re-allocated to create

several ITINERANT PE teacher positions that could provide instruction at the seven sites. The introduction of itinerant PE teachers will impact the site master schedules for enrichment and core instruction.

Of course the Board could choose to fund 7 new PE teacher positions, but without new revenue (could come from the DMSEF) or new program reductions, the District 's 07/08 budget would likely be negative. The 2006/2007 DMUSD Goals and Objectives include the formation of a PE Action Team to study how the DMUSD might create a superior PE program for all students. When given the choice of hiring 7 PE teachers or hiring 7 classroom teachers and reduce class size in grades 4 and 5, many DMUSD parents have expressed their preference to lower class size. What is the preference? Lower class size or additional PE teachers?

8. QUESTION: How many enrichment specialists should be purchased without negatively impacting the core academic program?

Answer : If students spent their entire school day receiving instruction in art, music, science, technology, and PE, then it seems predictable that student achievement in Language Arts (reading, writing, listening, and speaking), Math, History/Social Science, and Science would likely decline. The DMUSD Board and Superintendent expect that all seven sites have a balanced instructional program that promotes academic achievement and enrichment programs. Right now students get several hours of language arts each day, while the same students get about two hours (grades 1-3) or three hours (grades 4-6) of enrichment each week. This allocation of time has produced high achievement in the academic content areas as measured by the mandated California Standards Tests. An excellent program is a balanced program.

9. QUESTION: How much can enrichment funding be cut without impacting programs?

Answer: If the District decided to eliminate 20% of the enrichment teachers at all seven sites, it is obvious that the enrichment program would be impacted, and the District would struggle with its contractual obligation to provide teachers with prep time.

Answer: (However if there was a declining enrollment site that went from 400 pupils down to 300 pupils, the need for regular classroom teachers and

enrichment specialist teachers would also decline by 25%. Depending how the District allocated enrichment staffing, all four of the enrichment areas can still be offered. Having fewer students reduces the need for all staffing, including enrichment staffing. When Sycamore Ridge opened in August 2005, its enrollment was about 300 pupils. One of the three enrichment specialists at SR agreed to provide art instruction 0.50 FTE and science instruction 0.50 FTE. Thus all four enrichment content areas are being provided at a small school.

10. QUESTION: What district funds are available to support the enrichment program?

Answer: Currently, the District has budgeted \$1,600,000 from the 06/07 general fund to pay for 70% of the 06/07 enrichment expense. The total cost of the 06/07 enrichment program is \$2.2 million. If the DMSEF is unable to make a portion of its 06/07 donation to the general fund, it is anticipated that the 06/07 general fund will not be balanced.

If the 2006/2007 budget goes into the “red”, then the Board will have to study its options in order to get the 07/08 budget back into the “black”. The SDCOE provides state fiscal oversight to the DMUSD, and will likely not recommend that the DMUSD lower its reserves to pay for future enrichment. Reserves are usually expended on “one time” expenses that do not have ongoing cost. An example is a new roof for a school that may be necessary. A new roof is a one-time expense, while music teacher and program have on going expenses. Reserves are necessary for unforeseen challenges and problems.

11. QUESTION: How could itinerant teachers travel as itinerant specialists?

Answer: If the Board wanted to provide students at larger schools with additional enrichment time, the Board could assign some of the current non-itinerant specialists to itinerant positions that travel to different schools. This is a common practice in most other school districts. If the Board decided to have itinerant positions, the administration would collaborate with the specialists to design itinerant schedules that meet contractual requirements and are good for students and itinerant teachers.

One consequence of having itinerant specialists is that the master schedule at each site would be impacted and would require cooperation between principals. Designing a successful balanced itinerant enrichment schedule across seven sites would take considerable time and is a change for the

enrichment program. The DMUSD special education program has used itinerant staff (school psychologists, speech pathologists, occupational therapists, and adaptive PE teachers) for many years.

12. QUESTION: What happens if a school doesn't make its DMSEF goal?

Answer: Currently there are NO negative "consequences" for a site that doesn't meet its DMSEF annual goal (\$190 per pupil). Instead there are positive incentives that have helped sites to make the annual goal. The first positive incentive is that a site that makes its DMSEF annual goal can purchase additional enrichment staffing (certified or classified) beyond the normal allocation, like a PE teacher or increase staffing from 3.0 FTE enrichment positions to 4.0 FTE enrichment positions. The second positive incentive is to provide sites that make their annual goal with 100% of the amount over the site goal. (For example, lets assume that a site with 500 students raised \$100,000 through the DMSEF in one school year. The Foundation would recognize that the site had met its annual goal of $500 \times \$190 = \$95,000$, and would provide the site with a \$5000 reward that could be used to purchase items that will enhance or improve the school.) The two incentives have helped schools to meet their annual DMSEF goals without imposing a negative consequence. In addition, the annual goal amount (\$190 per year per student) has been set low enough so that all sites can reach the goal and enjoy the possible benefits.

13. QUESTION: What are the various roles of the DMSEF, PTA, and DMUSD in relationship to enrichment staffing?

Answer: The DMUSD has provided about 60-70% of the cost of enrichment staffing for the past few years. Last year, the DMSEF donated over \$500,000 that helped to pay about 30% of 05/06 enrichment expenses. For fiscal 06/07, the Enrichment program will cost about \$2.2 million, and the DMSEF has pledged to make a \$600,000 contribution.

During the past three years, the Board has allowed sites that have reached their annual DMSEF goal to purchase additional staffing if the PTA had the resources to purchase the additional position. This has put PTA leaders at some sites (that want to purchase additional staffing) into the challenging role of being fundraisers, and can cause confusion. The historic mission of PTA units has been to support programs, and some PTA members have come to recognize that fundraising should NOT be the primary task of the PTA. One reason that the DMSEF (with unanimous support from the DMUSD school board) came into being was to centralize all fundraising under the leadership of a fundraising expert employed by the DMSEF. What has occurred in the

past four years is that PTAs are still doing a great deal of fundraising so that declining enrollment schools (Hills and Heights) can maintain their historic "high water" level of enrichment positions, while PTAs at other schools are raising funds to secure PE specialists. The status quo in Del Mar is that the PTA is a fundraiser, while the DMSEF is another fundraiser. Having two separate groups raising funds for "enrichment" requires considerable communication and shared goals.

14. (NEW QUESTION): When will the staff provide the Board of Trustees with the proposed 07/08 site enrichment allocations?

Answer: Staff recently received the 2007 Davis Demographic enrollment projection that helps staff to estimate the August 2007 enrollment by attendance area. The opening of Ocean Air School in August 2007 will result in enrollment shifts at Torrey Hills, Sycamore Ridge, Del Mar Heights, Del Mar Hills Academy, Sage Canyon, and CDM. Currently Torrey Hills has 294 students enrolled who live in the Ocean Air attendance area, while Sage Canyon has enrolled 48 students who reside in the Ocean Air attendance area. Del Mar Heights has enrolled 38 students who reside in the Ocean Air attendance area, while Del Mar Hills Academy has 31 students who reside in the Ocean Air attendance area. Sycamore Ridge has 35 students who reside in the Ocean Air attendance area, while CDM has 10 students who reside in Ocean Air attendance area.

With a significant enrollment decline predicted for Torrey Hills, the District will likely transfer one or more enrichment positions from Torrey Hills to Ocean Air School so that the 07/08 Ocean Air students will receive enrichment programs that are similar to the 06/07 enrichment programs at Torrey Hills.

The Board of Trustees will be approving the 07/08 enrollment policies in February/March, and that will impact the number of students at each site for 07/08.

The Board will also have to determine the total number of 07/08 enrichment positions as well as the allocation of the enrichment positions that will serve our students during 07/08. Staff hopes to have a draft of possible 07/08 enrichment allocations by the March meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Financial Questions
Asked by the Board of Trustees on January 17, 2007

15. QUESTION: What district funds can pay for enrichment teachers?

Answer: The Unrestricted General Fund is the appropriate fund to pay for enrichment teacher salaries. It is poor fiscal policy to use one-time reserves to pay for on-going programs like enrichment.

16. QUESTION: Can \$600,000 be found in the 07/08 General Fund-Unrestricted budget to cover 100% of the 07/08 enrichment expense?

Answer:

- Cutting the 07/08 supply budgets at sites and district office by 35% will save \$600,000.
- Cutting classified staff currently funded by the General Fund across the district 20% will save \$600,000.
- Cutting certificated staffing by 4% across the district, one per site, and utilizing combination classrooms throughout the district will save \$600,000.
- Any combination of the above strategies to create a \$600,000 savings.

17. QUESTION: Can we implement energy saving strategies to reduce our utility costs by \$600,000?

Answer: In the 05/06 school year, the Board of Trustees agreed to have all schools (except Sycamore Ridge) retrofitted for energy saving lighting. The retrofit did result in reduced electricity usage. The savings is built into the 06/07 budget.

18. QUESTION: Do the After School Programs or the DMUSD National School Lunch Program use any General Fund resources?

Answer: Both programs reimburse the General Fund or pay directly for any resources they use. There is no negative financial effect on the General fund as a result of the district running these programs.

19. QUESTION: What is the largest transfer of funds out of the General Fund—Unrestricted?

Answer: Currently there is a transfer of \$2.2 million budgeted for the Special Education Encroachment. Funding for special education programs is far below the cost of providing legally mandated services for the students. This is a dilemma statewide.

20. QUESTION: What are any known additional costs for 07/08 at this time?

Answer:

- Step and column (06/07 cost): \$408,000
- Additional principal, administrative assistant, office assistant, head custodian, night custodian, health technician and library technician for Ocean Air: \$380,000
- Utility rates are expected to increase
- Salary and benefit increases to be negotiated
- Three expansion teacher positions including one in special ed.: \$270,000

21. QUESTION: How will the new GASB45—Retiree Benefits mandate, impact the 07/08 budget?

Answer: The district is currently participating in an actuarial study to quantify our liability. The district must begin funding the liability in the 08/09 school year. The new mandated GASB45 requirement will have a significant negative fiscal impact on the 08/09 budget.

22. QUESTION: How does the district plan to pay for anticipated new 07/08 expenses?

Answer: Over the last four years property taxes have increased by an average of 11%. The district is hoping the 07/08 increase in property taxes will pay all or a portion of the anticipated increased expenditures.

**Agenda Item 5.c. Board Discussion and Possible Action on
January 17, 2007 Options and New Options.**

January 9, 2007

To: Board Members

Through: Tom Bishop

Subject: Options for Board Policy on Purchasing Enrichment Staffing

Critical Question:

SHOULD THE DISTRICT CONTINUE THE PRACTICE OF ALLOWING SCHOOLS TO PURCHASE ENRICHMENT STAFFING POSITIONS THAT EXCEED THE ENRICHMENT ALLOCATIONS PROVIDED BY THE BOARD?

Background Information:

Three years ago, the Board of Trustees decided that enrichment positions be allocated to sites so that large schools with more students have more enrichment positions than small schools who have fewer students. When the Board adopted this policy, several smaller schools immediately asked if they could raise funds to purchase enrichment positions that would exceed the enrichment allocations that are provided by the Board. The Board responded by authorizing sites to purchase additional enrichment positions. The funding for these additional enrichment positions has been generated mostly by site PTA units. The previous Board item (Report from the Enrichment Equity Study Team) outlines some of benefits and drawbacks that have resulted from the Board decision three years ago. Parents, teachers, and administrators have asked for a more definitive long-term policy on this topic for the future.

District staff have created four possible policy options for Board consideration that may help the Board before it decides the 07/08 enrichment staffing policy. The options are fully explained to help all stakeholders understand the issues that surround each option.

Financial Update:

The 06/07 DMUSD enrichment program will cost about \$2.2 million. The District currently anticipates that the DMSEF will make a \$600,000 donation toward this expense, while local PTAs have contributed about \$100,000. The District general fund will provide the remaining \$1,500,000.

Considerations:

1. Does the Board have an interest in ensuring that all DMUSD students receive the same instructional program?
2. Should some DMUSD students have a “richer” program than other district students, based upon the capability of individual sites to raise funds to purchase additional staffing?
3. Does the Board have an interest in the allocation of instructional time that will keep our schools focused on NCLB and our high priority academic goals as measured by STAR testing results and the Academic Performance Index?

**ENRICHMENT STAFFING POLICY
2007/2008**

Option 1

Maintain all current 06/07 practices within the DMUSD and DMSEF and allow sites to purchase enrichment staffing positions that will exceed the 07/08 enrichment allocation. (Status quo)

Benefits:

- Enhances site vision and program
- Increases enrichment opportunities at some sites
(See complete list of benefits from the Study Team in previous board item)

Drawbacks:

- Creates program inequity across the seven sites
- Encourages competition between DMSEF and PTAs that harms DMSEF
- Causes confusion regarding complex DMSEF formula that includes site incentives
(See complete list of drawbacks from the Study Team in previous board item)

Option 2

Distribute 100% of enrichment resources based exclusively on student enrollment; Board identifies DMSEF as exclusive organization that can raise funds for enrichment staffing; DMSEF raises funds as a “whole district”, not as individual sites. Sites not allowed to purchase additional enrichment staffing because of negative impact on enrichment equity, and negative impact on DMSEF.

Benefits:

- Provides an equitable enrichment programs across the District
- Reduces fund-raising pressure on PTA units

Drawbacks:

- District may not have adequate resources to support site goals/vision
- Donations to DMSEF may decline

Important Notes

This option eliminates the practice of establishing DMSEF annual site goals and also eliminates incentives for those school communities that reach their annual DMSEF goal. Instead, all DMSEF donations would be placed in one pool and tracked all as a whole district. (The 06/07 DMSEF goal per student is \$190; in previous years, those schools that met the annual goal (\$190 x enrollment) by March 1 were allowed to purchase ADDITIONAL enrichment positions (beyond the District enrichment allocation) if the site had ADDITIONAL funds to pay for the ADDITIONAL position. Thus, a school with 400 students had a DMSEF annual

goal of \$76,000. If this site wanted additional enrichment staffing for the following school year, the DMSEF needed to receive \$76,000 in donations from parents at this site AND the site needed to (simultaneously) raise the money to pay the salary/benefits of the extra teacher. For 07/08, we estimate that the total cost (salary, benefits, retirement, etc) of one full time enrichment teacher will be at least \$65,000. So this hypothetical school of 400 that wants an extra enrichment position will need to raise \$141,000 by March 15.

Dividing \$141,000 in expense by 400 students means that the cost to each student is \$352. It is uncertain how many parents can make a \$352 donation during the next few months, but not every parent at every site is capable of donating \$352 to help purchase additional enrichment teachers. Because some parents can't donate \$352, other parents may contribute an amount that exceeds the \$352 amount.

During the past three years, all sites have reached their annual DMSEF goal, which has been the minimum "benchmark". If a site meets its DMSEF annual goal (benchmark), then the site gets an additional benefit: it gets to keep any DMSEF money raised above the annual goal. During the 05/06 school year, the seven sites exceeded their annual goal by about \$100,000.)

Option 3

District assumes 100% of the expense for enrichment program for 07/08 ONLY; Sites not allowed to purchase enrichment positions beyond District allocation; DMSEF is identified as the exclusive organization that raises funds for enrichment positions; Sites are not allowed to raise funds for additional enrichment staffing. During 07/08, District asks DMSEF to raise \$800,000 for 08/09 enrichment staffing. Then 08/09 enrichment staffing is adjusted, based on funds actually raised by Foundation during 07/08. If the DMSEF raises \$400,000 during 07/08, then District designs 08/09 enrichment to include \$400,000 contribution from DMSEF that will be given to the DMUSD by the DMSEF on June 30, 2008. District estimates that total cost of 08/09 enrichment program may be \$2,400,000. District contributes \$1,600,000 and DMSEF contributes \$800,000; if DMSEF contributed less than \$800,000, enrichment program would have to be adjusted.

Benefits:

- Equitable enrichment staffing across the District
- New incentive program for parents to donate to DMSEF

Drawbacks:

- Less DMUSD fiscal integrity; fewer resources in an uncertain future
- District reserves (already not at suggested level for basic aid school district) dip lower, while District challenges (Shores, GASB-45, collective bargaining) likely increase.

Option 4

District assumes 100% of enrichment expense, based exclusively on student enrollment, for indefinite future; PTAs and individuals not allowed to purchase enrichment staffing.

Benefits:

- Equitable enrichment across the District

Drawbacks:

- Significant reductions in unidentified staff/programs for 07/08
- Will likely impact collective bargaining

(If no reductions made, reserves exhausted in four/five years because expenses will be significantly higher than revenues. Inability to meet new challenges.)

FISCAL IMPACT: Unknown at this time; different options have different fiscal impacts