

# Meeting Takeaways and Recommendations

## Rural and Small Districts Subcommittee

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	December 9, 2021	<b>Time:</b>	11:30 am CST – 12:30 pm CST
<b>Location:</b>	<a href="#">Microsoft TEAMS</a>		
<b>Chair:</b>	Janet Ayers		
<b>Members in Attendance:</b>	In Attendance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Janet Ayers</b></li><li>• <b>Allen Pratt</b></li><li>• Charlie Hatcher</li><li>• <b>Jerry Boyd</b></li><li>• <b>Mike Garren</b></li><li>• <b>Kristy Brown</b></li><li>• <b>Shawn Kimble</b></li><li>• <b>Norma Gerrell</b></li><li>• <b>Eddie Pruett</b></li><li>• <b>William Curtis</b></li><li>• <b>John Stevens</b></li><li>• <b>Ron Gant</b></li><li>• <b>Lillian Hartgrove</b></li></ul>		

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

### 2. DIRECTIONS

Topic

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

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.
- **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.

For each resource, please assign a cost to the resource, if you have it. Subcommittees may assign those amounts, but please also know that resource values will also be reviewed with additional input submitted by LEAs, national experts, and research.

## Public Feedback Comments

	Subcommittee Comments
Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surprised that leadership is not included – so suggest including principal salaries, asst principals, and those that evaluate teachers. We are required by state law to evaluate, so we need to think about funding at the rate in which law requires.</li> <li>• The actual number of schools should be a critical component of the formula</li> </ul>
Weights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do we have a good example of a state that weights charter enrollment? We would like to see one.</li> <li>• We can't just have a <i>rural</i> weighting...needs to be more specific than that</li> <li>• Possibility of stacking weights (i.e., ED and SWD). If he/she is identified/tested in multiple subgroup categories, then how will that be reflected in the funding received for said student.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Direct Certification is counted, where parents/guardians that fill out the Free/Reduced forms and qualify are NOT factored into the count of Econ Disadv.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Physical capacity of the district to support needs</li> </ul>

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-2</li> </ul>
<b>Direct Funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are many things that are state/federally mandated that definitely should be included.</li> <li>• Fine arts programs (possibly in “nice to have” or “long shot”)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth needs to be considered</li> <li>• Consider ways to incentivize rather than being penalized (like a bonus program). More about meeting or exceeding expectations.</li> <li>• Clarify what does this mean: punitive or incentive</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If what is currently outside of the BEP makes it into the new formula, then we need to make sure that we capture that it’s not “extra.”</li> <li>• Projections are very important – helps us plan ahead of time</li> <li>• The metrics for determining [the definition of] rurality, sparsity, etc. are really important topics to discuss.... and if the qualifying criteria for ED were to change, it would have a significant impact on future district funding.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is the longevity of the definition?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Resource Feedback

### MUST HAVE

- Address sparsity
- Class-size (K-12) – possibly based on concentration of poverty

### SHOULD HAVE

- 
- 
- 

### NICE TO HAVE

# Tennessee Funding Review Engagement

- 
- 
- 

## LONG SHOT

- 
- 
- 

## 4. FINAL THOUGHTS