

## Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

### Chambers of Commerce

#### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	December 6, 2021	<b>Time:</b>	12:00 pm CST – 1:00 pm CST
<b>Location:</b>	<a href="#">Microsoft TEAMS</a>		
<b>Chair:</b>	Jared Bigham		
<b>Members in Attendance:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Jared Bigham</b></li><li>• <b>Lora Barnett</b></li><li>• <b>Ralph Schultz</b></li><li>• <b>Vicki Bunch</b></li><li>• <b>Hope McDow</b></li><li>• <b>Pat Sheehy</b></li><li>• Ted Townsend</li><li>• Brenda McCroskey</li><li>• Bryan Daniels</li><li>• Paul Bailey</li><li>• Clark Boyd</li><li>• Larry Jenson</li></ul>		

*\*Member names in bold indicate those present for this meeting*

#### 2. DIRECTIONS

##### Topic

Please list specific resources that you would like to see incorporated into the funding formula. (In other words, what resources do you think are most important so that the cost of those resources can be included. It does not mean a district MUST spend money in a certain way, only that they would be funded to do so). Please indicate whether each resource is a:

- **Must Have:** Those resources required as a result of federal and/or state law, for safety, or similar.
- **Should Have:** Those resources that may not be mandatory but are essential to ensure the student or student group receives access to a quality education.

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

- **Nice to Have:** Those resources that are not mandatory and not essential, but (1) may provide a clear and added benefit to students and (2) have a clear return on the investment related to student achievement and future success.
- **Long Shot:** All other resource ideas.

## MUST HAVE

- 
- 
- 

## SHOULD HAVE

- 
- 
- 

## NICE TO HAVE

- 
- 
- 

## LONG SHOT

- 
- 
-

## 4. FINAL THOUGHTS

BASE SLIDE: What types/roles are included in “counselors?” Should we disaggregate for our recommendations? Academic, career, ...?

## Initial Notes and Resource Recommendations (uncategorized)

- BASE:
  - Having access to effective career assessment tools at all grade levels (measuring aptitude AND interest). Helpful if it is consistent funding source across the state.
- WEIGHTS:
  - Can “weights” be stacked for students?
  - Surprised that dyslexia and gifted did not surface
  - Bottom two bullets (fast growing and charter enrollment) are surprising. Why differentiate here if the funding follows the student? Why call these out separately? Need clarification...what are we considering *charter enrollment*? Interested to know what reasons stakeholders have given for giving additional weight to Charter students. Is it because some "for profit" charters are more expensive? Is it because of above average numbers of teachers and staff? Would just like to know the rationale behind this feedback.
  - Wouldn't support: charter enrollment at this point
  - Class size is something to learn more about, need to explore how other states are approaching it.
  - What about access to technology – is this a weighting consideration for down the line?
- ADDITIONAL DOLLARS:
  - Not really a financial literacy component yet - is that included in the middle school CTE listed on this slide? If not, this would be a nice addition.
  - Funding for travel for CTE and postsecondary related purposes
- OUTCOMES:
  - Some type of system in place to measure progress towards outcomes.
  - EPSO completion – reward growth for aims toward postsecondary success. Ensuring that we approach it thoughtfully. (Ralph suggested looking at Seattle's experience with this about 20 years ago).