



Collaborative School Committee

— Jan.22 —

BUDGET

Agenda

- Enrollment Next Year
- Staffing for Next Year 26-27
 - 2 options

Enrollment 26-27

	6th	7th	8th	Total
Enrollment Data				
<i>Current Enrollment 25-26 (1/22)</i>	111	95	102	308
<i>District Projection 26-27 (Funding)</i>	108	105	94	307
<i>Our 26-27 Caps (Planned)</i>	110	114	98	322 (15 over projection)
<i>Round 1 Choice Numbers</i>	1st Choice: 100 2nd Choice: 22 (Likely Waitlist)	1st Choice: 8 2nd Choice: 2 (Likely Waitlist)	1st Choice: 2 2nd Choice: 2 (Maybe Waitlist)	

Why Are Caps Different in 6th and 7th Grade?

Currently we have 4 MI (Ms. Shannon's students) students as rising 7th graders and 6 MI students as rising 8th graders. This counts towards enrollment but impacts class sizes differently. Our current 6th grade class is about as big of class sizes as we want with 4 sections. Capping 6th grade at 110 helps us maintain class sizes at a similar level.

Staffing for Next Year

- **Reserves (savings) are strong but we face two fiscal cliffs (a plunge in funds) before reaching sustainability**
 - **Balanced Budget**
 - **Ideally our budget for a given year needs to be fully funded without the use of reserves. Currently we have used reserves to balance the budget each of the last few years**
 - **Last \$110k of tiered support funding**
 - **Tiered supports funding” in Denver Public Schools refers to a way the district allocates extra money and resources to schools based on their level of need so that schools with greater challenges receive more support to improve student outcomes.**
 - **The funding diminishes year to year; next year is our last year of this \$**

Continued...

- Enrollment is improving but still unclear if it's sustainable
- Systems are generally strong and improving
- Two years of Green status makes us a top choice in SW Denver
- If reserves decrease significantly, we lose the ability to argue/anticipate higher enrollment than district projections
 - For example, if we are confident that enrollment will be 10 students higher than the district thinks, reserves allow us to not reduce a position in January and when the students arrive in August we get the money back
- We want to ensure we're not overstaffed; this would result in Fall RIBs (reduction in building)

Option A: Reduce 0.5 ELA

- **Next year we are overstaffed in Language Arts by 0.5 FTE based on our current teaching staff**
- **Right now we have 4 full time Language Arts positions since our STL has shifted to full time**
- **Next year we need 3.5 Language Arts positions (1 at each grade + STL)**
 - **STL are 0.5 coaching and 0.5 teaching**
 - **STL allows us to maintain literacy intervention supports and coaching**
 - **STLs are partially district funded and a required position**

Benefits:

- **Maintains around \$57k additional reserves**
- **Allows these reserves to be saved or spent in the fall once actual enrollment and needs are clear**
- **Allows us to deal more flexibly with future funding cliffs (over budget 26-27 and final year of tiered support funding loss)**
- **Aligns with our need for sustainability**
-

Drawbacks

- **Losing a teaching position in the building / RIB will occur**

Option B: Spend More Reserves


- **Cover the cost of a 0.5 teaching position by spending an additional amount of reserves.**
 - **Based on the average teacher cost (salary, benefits, etc) this would amount to \$57k**

Benefits:

- **Keeping a teacher who could support LA or coverage in the building**

Drawbacks

- **It might be a nice to have but it's not a must have**
- **Less flexibility in Fall 26 or a year from now in preparing for 27-28**
- **If enrollment isn't where we expect, this position could be a Fall RIB (person would lose their job mid year)**
- **Likely not sustainable position for 27-28.**



Question & Answer

CSC Suggestion

- What suggestion, A or B is best for BVMS long term?