**Education Law §3614 School Funding Allocation Report**

**Part F - Narrative Description**

**Describe the local methodology/approach used to allocate funds to each school in the district during the process of budget development and implementation. If schools are allocated funds—either in part or in full—through a formula, outline the nature/mechanics of the formula and the elements impacting each school’s allocation. In addition, explain any non-formulaic elements impacting each school’s allocation. (Please note that this question asks about the district’s budget process, not about how the district completed the New York State School Funding Transparency Form.)**

Approximately two-thirds of school budgets are allocated via the Fair Student Funding (FSF) formula, a weighted student funding formula. In addition to FSF, schools receive other funding through School Allocation Memoranda (SAMs). DOE allocates funding to schools via SAM to support specific purposes. Schools can then budget for the needed services, such as teachers and supplies. The written description in each SAM provides; the purpose of the funds, background about the funds, source of the funds and how the funds should be used. Schools receive funding via SAMs only for programs they are eligible for, such as Title I. All SAMs are posted on the DOE website.

FSF is based on the following principles:

• School budgeting should help improve student achievement, move the school system towards funding equity, and be transparent and predictable;

• Different students have different educational needs, and funding levels should reflect those needs as best as possible; and

• School budgets should be transparent so that funding decisions are visible for all to see and evaluate.

In keeping with these principles, FSF means that:

• Money follows each student to the public school that he or she attends;

• Schools receive funding for each student based on grade level; and

• Schools also receive additional dollars in accordance with the needs of each student.

The FSF allocation provides dollars to schools as follows:

• Grade weights, based on student grade levels;

• Needs weights, based on student needs including academic performance, special education needs, and English proficiency; and

• Enhanced weights for students in “portfolio” high schools, such as arts high schools or Career and Technical Education high schools.

Two additional resources are provided to schools through the allocation but not included as part of the formula:

• Base (“foundation”) amount – a fixed sum that all schools receive; and

• Collective bargaining-related increases for staff funded with FSF.

Below is a table of the FSF weights and associated per capita.

In particular, the weights are designed to do two things:

• Meet the needs of students who need the greatest support; and

• Reflect objective criteria that can be applied evenly.

FSF Category

Type of Pupil/Need Grade Span Weights FY 2020

Per Capita

Grade Weight General Education and Special Education Pupils

 K-5 1.00 $ 4,109

 6-8 1.08 $ 4,438

 9-12 1.03 $ 4,232

Academic Intervention

 Poverty 0.12 $ 493

 4-5 Well Below 0.40 $ 1,643

 4-5 Below 0.25 $ 1,027

 6-8 Well Below 0.50 $ 2,056

 6-8 Below 0.35 $ 1,438

 9-12 Well Below 0.40 $ 1,643

 9-12 Below 0.25 $ 1,027

 9-12 Heavy Graduation Challenge OTC 0.40 $ 1,643

English Language Learner

 K-5 Freestanding English as a New Language (ENL) 0.40 $ 1,643

 6-12 Freestanding English as a New Language (ENL) 0.50 $ 2,056

 K-5 Bilingual 0.44 $ 1,808

 6-12 Bilingual 0.55 $ 2,260

 K-5 Commanding 0.13 $ 534

 6-12 Commanding 0.12 $ 493

 K-12 Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE) 0.12 $ 493

Special Education Needs Weight

 Single Service <=20% 0.56 $ 2,301

 Multi-Service 21% to 59% 1.25 $ 5,139

 K-8 Self-Contained (SC) >= 60% 1.18 $ 4,852

 9-12 Self Contained (SC) >= 60% 0.58 $ 2,100

 K Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) >= 60% 2.09 $ 8,581

 1-12 Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) >= 60% 1.74 $ 7,150

 K-12 Post IEP Support 0.12 $ 493

Portfolio Schools

 CTE Tier 1 0.26 $ 1,068

 CTE Tier 2 0.17 $ 699

 CTE Tier 3 0.12 $ 493

 CTE Tier 4 0.05 $ 205

 Specialized Academic 0.25 $ 1,027

 Specialized Audition 0.35 $ 1,438

 Transfer - Heavy Graduation Challenge 0.40 $ 1,643

 Transfer - Regular Graduation Challenge 0.21 $ 856

As an example, 11X566, Pelham Gardens Middle School, has a total FY 2020 projected register of 456 students.

• Applying the FSF student need weights (above) to those students and their unique characteristics (ELL, Special Education etc…), the school has an FSF weighted register (based on their register as per the table of weights above) of 739.31.

• At the FSF per capita of $4,109.01, at the school’s funding percentage of 100%, the school has a FY 2020 FSF register allocation of $3,037,830.

• Applying fringe and pension benefits (which are allocated outside of school budgets) brings us to the school’s FY 2020 Weighted Register allocation of $4,862,837.

• Each school receives $225,000 in FSF foundation. This is outside of each school’s weighted register allocation, but a part of their FSF funding. Applying fringe and pension results in a per school value of $360,171.

• Each school receives funding for collective bargaining related increases for staff funded with FSF. 11X566 received $649,047 in FY 2020 to cover collective bargaining related increases for their staff. Funding for collective bargaining increases is outside of each school’s weighted register allocation, but part of their FSF funding. Applying fringe and pension results in $1,038,968 in collective bargaining funding.

• The total amount is computed as the sum of each school’s weighted register allocation, foundation, and funding for collective bargaining. For 11X566, this is the sum of $4,862,837 in weighted register funding, $360,171 in FSF foundation, and $1,038,968 in Collective Bargaining. This totals $6,261,976.

The administration has invested over $355 million annually – not including associated pension costs – in the FSF formula. These investments have increased the average FSF for all schools from 88% to 93% by:

• Creating new weights for English Language Learners and students with interrupted formal education, an increase of $40 million; and

• Raising the floor from 81% to 90% for all schools and to 100% for Renewal schools, an increase of $316 million.

This Administration has invested State aid increases into raising the FSF level. In order to fund all schools at 100 percent of their FSF, the funding mandated by the Campaign for Fiscal Equity (CFE) settlement is necessary. For the 2019-20 school year, the remaining obligation is $1.1 billion.

**If applicable, is there anything unique about certain schools which explain why per pupil spending at these locations may be significantly higher/lower than the district average?**

As a result of investments in the FSF Formula and targeted investments like the Equity & Excellence for All agenda, per pupil spending tends to be higher at schools serving higher-needs populations, including students with:

• concentrations of students in poverty;

• concentrations of students with disabilities;

• concentrations of English Language Learners;

• lower math and ELA proficiency rates; and

• lower graduation rates.

The Equity and Excellence for All agenda is building a pathway to success in college and careers for all students. Our schools are strengthening foundational skills and instruction earlier, with Universal Literacy and Algebra for All. Our schools also offer students more challenging, hands-on, college and career-aligned coursework, as Computer Science for All brings 21st-century computer science instruction to every school, and AP for All works to give all high school students access to at least five Advanced Placement courses. Along the way, our schools are providing students and families additional support through College Access for All, Single Shepherd, and investment in Community Schools. Efforts to create more diverse and inclusive classrooms are central to this pathway.

**If applicable, describe any items which the district feels are anomalous in nature and require additional description beyond the Excel entry.**

Part A – District Level Information

• Since last year, in response to new and forthcoming State reporting requirements, the DOE has made improvements to its reporting methodologies in order to more accurately capture costs in different program categories.

• Fringe/Pension – Part A of the Form requires the DOE to report on fringe and pension costs in such a way that has not been traditionally reported by the City. The State form’s “fringe” category requires DOE to include pensions and other personnel benefits. However, within the City’s budget, pensions are not considered part of DOE’s operating budget. As a result, the State Form automatically produces a fringe rate that is higher than the fringe rate DOE typically reports. Additionally, the DOE noted that the fringe rate was rounded to two decimal places for all calculations in the form and has adjusted the calculations accordingly.

• Funding Source – There are instances where the total budget figures will not match the City’s Financial Management System (FMS) due to constraints of the Form that create automatically calculated amounts and require specific categorizations of funds under the ST-3. For example, the Form requires the DOE to include Impact Aid under State and Local funding, rather than Federal where it is typically budgeted by the City.

• Prekindergarten (Pre-K) Community Based Organizations (CBOs) – In FY 2020, funding for Pre-K CBOs has increased compared to the prior year, as a result of methodological changes as well as the transfer of Early Learn Child Care Block Grant funded programs and DOE’s Federal Head Start grant award.

• Central District Costs – The new reporting categories included in “District Academic Support Costs” have resulted in a significant reallocation of projected costs from “Other Central Services” in the prior year to these new reporting categories in the current year.

• Central District Costs – The other central services category requires that the DOE include instructional costs which are centrally managed on behalf of schools: centrally managed Equity & Excellence for All programs, categorical grants, and retroactive collective bargaining payments to our unionized workforce. The guidance for the Form prevents DOE from accurately reporting some of these expenditures as school allocations despite the fact that they are services provided in schools to students.

Part B – Basic School Level Information

• In the interests of completeness and transparency, the DOE has included some schools that do not have traditional BEDS codes. Placeholder BEDS codes have been used as per previous SED guidance.

• The DOE does not collect information in machine-readable format on teaching experience prior to the DOE. Teacher experience information is based on the number of years of experience teaching at the DOE.

• Some school type/grade categories were added which are unique to New York City (e.g., District 79).

 Part C – Basic School Level Allocations

• Since last year, in response to new and forthcoming State reporting requirements, the DOE has made improvements to its reporting methodologies in order to more accurately capture costs in different program categories.

• Following the State’s directions on how to complete the Form, results in the school funding per pupil amounts are inconsistent with resource allocations made by the DOE. The automatic calculations within the Form distribute a standard central district cost per pupil, using data from Part A. However, funding for many of DOE’s centrally managed programs are not in school budgets but are targeted to schools in high-need districts. For example, the Equity & Excellence for All agenda is targeted to support the highest-need schools and those per pupil resources at those schools are not captured using this methodology.

• In addition, there will be high variability in per pupil funding among schools depending on the type of school and range of services and supports provided. For example, District 75 schools serve students with severe disabilities and therefore results in higher per pupil costs.

Part D – School-Level Spending on Pre-K and Community Schools Programming

• Since last year, in response to new and forthcoming State reporting requirements, the DOE has made improvements to its reporting methodologies in order to more accurately capture costs in different program categories.

• In FY 2020, funding for Pre-K CBOs has increased compared to the prior year, as a result of methodological changes as well as the transfer of Early Learn Child Care Block Grant funded programs and DOE’s Federal Head Start grant award. These costs have been incorporated into the “Projected Pre-K CBO Funding” section of Part D. These programs serve students under three years old. As the enrollment section of Part D does not include space for these students, in accordance with the State’s guidance, we have included the students under three years old in the “3-Year-Old Half-Day” category of Part D. The enrollment figure for the “Pre-Kindergarten Community Based Organizations” row in Part A Section IIC is inclusive of all these students, regardless of age.

• Last year, the DOE suggested modifications to the State Form in order to include Pre-K students with disabilities as part of Part D of the report. The State did not modify their reporting template this year. As a result of the limitations of the State’s template:

o In Part D, Pre-K students with IEPs and their associated costs have been excluded as per the State’s instructions.

o As a result, figures in Part D, including State grant claiming figures, do not match public numbers.

Part E – Locally Implemented Formula

• Last year, the DOE suggested modifications to the State Form in order to accurately capture key elements of the DOE’s locally implemented funding formula. The State did not modify their reporting template this year. As a result of the limitations of the State’s template:

o The formula percentages calculated on Part E, column G are incorrect. The DOE calculates FSF percentages based only on the weighted student funding portion of the FSF allocation.

o The difference calculated in Part E, column F deducts formula funding over 100% from the total. As a result of reverting to the State’s format, the cost to bring all schools to 100% of the formula is understated. The cost to bring all schools to 100% of formula in FY 2020 is $757,286,324.

o The local formula as percent of total funding calculated in final row of Part E includes schools which do not receive formula allocations, such as Citywide Special Education students and Pre-K centers.

• There is high variability in “local formula as percent of total funding” based on the type of educational programming at each school. For example, schools with Pre-K programs will be on the low end as Pre-K funding is not included in the formula. On the high end, schools that do not run a lot of categorical programs funded via SAMs (i.e. Title I, Title IV, Contracts for Excellence) are more dependent on FSF.