Rationale

Delaware spends over a billion dollars annually to fund our schools; unfortunately, the funds are not sufficiently allocated to meet the needs of our most vulnerable students – those attending high poverty schools. According to Delaware Department of Education data, 93 schools have 40% or higher rates of students in poverty as measured by students receiving free and reduced lunch or high numbers of students living in concentrations of poverty. Research clearly shows, students in poverty require additional resources and services to achieve the same levels of academic proficiency and other college and career ready skills as students from middle class and affluent households.

Over the past eighteen months, the Delaware Equity Funding Collaborative (DEFC), a diverse group of community advocates, educators and parents have been working together to obtain broad-based census regarding the essential needs of schools with students living in high concentrations of poverty throughout Delaware and determine adequate funding levels to revise our current education funding structure designed to meet these needs and thereby dramatically improve the academic and social-emotional needs of our students. We did not focus on HOW schools should be funded but rather WHAT high poverty schools required to successfully educate our children. The formulas used below are based on the current unit count structure but have also been converted to dollar based values; however, calculations will be revised if a different method is approved.

Determining the Need

With a significant number of schools serving students in poverty, DEFC determined 4-levels of need based on the percentage of students in poverty, see chart below:

| LEVEL 1 - SEVERE | 75% or greater low-SES or 100 or more students in 40% or greater poverty | 31 schools |
| LEVEL 2 - CRITICAL | 40% or greater but less than 75% low-SES or 60 or more students in 40% or greater poverty | 62 schools |
| LEVEL 3 - MODERATE | 25% or greater but less than 40% low-SES or 20 or more students in 40% or greater poverty | 78 schools |
| LEVEL 4 - LOW | 25% or less low-SES or less than 20 students in 40% or greater poverty | 50 schools |

See master workbook tab "School PEF OG" for schools by LEA data
See master workbook tab "School OG by tier" for schools by tier level data
The information below is ongoing yearly funding unless otherwise indicated as one time funding

Extended Learning Opportunities

High poverty schools should operate on an 11-month employee schedule to provide a flexible approach to extended learning opportunities benefiting students and families, i.e. extended day, school year and/or Saturday School and include transportation to eliminate access barriers.

- **Extended Learning and Support Opportunities Tiered Model**

  Tier 1: Additional instruction and support hours will be generated by extending 100% units earned by Low-SES Students to 11 month schedule hour total and other unit at a count based on 50% units earned by Low-SES Students to 12 month schedule hour total. This will require educators from other schools to participate. Other support and curricular costs are included at $5 per added hour.

  Tier 2: Additional instruction and support hours will be generated by extending 75% units earned by Low-SES Students to 11 month schedule hour total and other unit at a count based on 15% units earned by Low-SES Students to 12 month schedule hour total. This may require educators from other schools to participate. Other support and curricular costs are included at $5 per added hour.

  Tier 3: Additional instruction and support hours will be generated by extending 40% units earned by Low-SES Students to 11 month schedule hour total and other unit at a count based on 10% units earned by Low-SES Students to 12 month schedule hour total. Other support and curricular costs are included at $5 per added hour.

  Tier 4: Additional instruction and support hours will be generated by extending 20% units earned by Low-SES Students to 11 month schedule hour total. Other support and curricular costs are included at $5 per added hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1 - SEVERE</th>
<th>Cost State</th>
<th>$10,044,532</th>
<th>Cost match</th>
<th>$3,894,766</th>
<th>31 schools, 191,349 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2 - CRITICAL</td>
<td>Cost State</td>
<td>$9,191,211</td>
<td>Cost match</td>
<td>$3,555,827</td>
<td>62 schools, 178,856 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3 - MODERATE</td>
<td>Cost State</td>
<td>$5,589,350</td>
<td>Cost match</td>
<td>$2,163,691</td>
<td>62 schools, 108,270 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 4 - LOW</td>
<td>Cost State</td>
<td>$553,463</td>
<td>Cost match</td>
<td>$213,476</td>
<td>50 schools, 11,071 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Cost State</td>
<td>$25,379,166</td>
<td>Cost match</td>
<td>$9,827,760</td>
<td>221 schools, 489,545 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Methodology

Background

Delaware is one of a small number of states that has not provided significant ongoing statewide appropriations to meet the needs of students impacted by poverty. Historically over the past 40 years Delaware has attempted limited initiatives and related funding to address some of these student needs. While occasionally some benefits have been seen from such efforts, none have been sustained or expanded statewide. Despite broad agreement that Delaware should meet these needs, and suggestions from stakeholders, no substantive governmental study had been undertaken to define and reach consensus on these needs, nor to determine how and at what level these supports have to be delivered to meet the needs of students impacted by poverty.

While the current administration has dedicated at another attempt to increased appropriation for this need, up until 2019 these are still targeted to a limited number of schools and are designed to meet only a subset of these students’ needs and the path to sustainability and expansion to a statewide system is unclear. In 2019 the governor has proposed a limited statewide "down payment" in these needs.

Structure

Given the history a decision was made to attempt to determine the requirement to meet the needs of students impacted by poverty through a non-governmental stakeholder process. This concept was in part supported by recent completion of Delaware's first Special Education Strategic Plan which was completed by stakeholders in a non-governmental process and adopted by Delaware. To facilitate the process 3 major statewide organizations (DSEA, ACLU and Delaware PTA) agreed to lead the collaboration. A wide range of stakeholders were invited to participate. From initial proposals, collaborative group decided on a 4 step plan.
• To determine the key needs of students impacted by poverty and elements to address those needs
• To determine at what level each of those elements need to be delivered to allow students impacted by poverty to meet their potential, with an initial approach of using tiers to differentiate between the impact of different concentrations and levels of poverty
• To fiscally score these requirements to determine an estimate of the cost to meet the needs of students impacted by poverty
• To publish and distribute an initial reports for review and comment by a broader group of stakeholders and governmental authorities for the propose informing, building consensus and improving the report.

Elements

Though ongoing discussions in the collaborative group meetings consensus was reached on key elements needed (see appendix ? Key Elements). Throughout the process this list is considered a living document. The intent was not to identify every element, but rather to identify key essential elements based on participant firsthand experience, widely accepted best practices and elements used in schools and districts which demonstrated significant improvements (closing the gap by >25% in 5 years) across the US for students impacted by poverty. It is worth noting that no state or even large district has been able to attain and sustain this limited goal let alone the stronger goal of closing the gap by 50% in 5 years.

Level Setting

Initially each key element and the nature of the needs of students living in poverty and what was needed to meet those needs were discussed discretely.

From this list, elements that were most effectively delivered though the school system were aggregated into groups based on common elements and to facilitate funding flexibility for local conditions and based on fiscal scoring characteristics. There groups included both funding which was ongoing and one time funding. From this specific level of additional support, enhancements were derived and included enhanced staffing, both in count and hours, funding levels for non staff supports, professional development, building wide environment improvements and additional sqft of space as well as school building reconfiguration.
This phase also included development and adjustment of tier levels. This included qualifying triggers of both percent Low-SES and count of students living in communities with high concentrations of poverty (>40%).

Fiscal scoring

Once each of the groups of key elements was level set and the funding tier system was specified, a fiscal model was developed and updated that represented that consensus. This was accomplished by utilizing a variety of algorithms to both capture the level setting and tier curve based on the higher needs of student living in progressively higher concentrations of poverty. Each area was calculated at the school/program level based on historic data and was then aggregated statewide.

Output included both unit based and total dollar based outputs.

The model was developed as a dynamic model, to allow for input changes and near real time output.

Broader stakeholder input and consensus

At the completion of this initial report this area in still under design but will likely includes:

- Public meetings including parents, educators and community members
- Stakeholder group meetings and other communication
- Meetings and other communications with decision makers including the DOE, legislator’s state administration, LEA administration and school building leaders.

Validation at the school building level

Iterative process

Each step has included an iterative process where consensus and data runs in returned to the group for evaluation and adjustment. This will continue during the final phase with the group reconvening to integrate impute and finalize the report.
Data sources

DOE/Controller Generals Office average on educator cost including modified staff unit add on costs

Delaware September 30 unit count

School profile data, including student count and Percent Low-SES

Kids count poverty data.

Levels of Poverty from an n>15 report run of student poverty count per census tract (n> 15 constraint causes approximation errors)

Exclusions (or by later project phases)

Funding source analysis

Project phase in analysis (model was designed to facilitate this work)

Funding delivery methodology

Statistical certainty analysis (presumed to be significantly better than an order of magnitude analysis)

Summary

The methodology is intended to provide not only the listing of the key elements required to meet the needs of students impacted by poverty in our schools, but also to estimate at what level of additional supports are needed and the total cost for such supports.