

2019 Supplemental Budget Decision Package

Agency: 350 – Supt of Public Instruction

DP code/title: 2-digit RecSum code and short, descriptive title limited to 35 characters. This will appear on DP and RecSum reports. Regionalization For Spokane Charter

Budget period: 2019 Supp

Budget level: ML

Agency RecSum text: Brief description of your proposal. A cogent “elevator pitch” including a concise problem statement, proposed solution and outcomes affected by the proposal. Agencies should strive not to exceed 100 words. Summary text should not repeat references to cost or FTEs, displayed directly below in the fiscal detail.

The legislature passed House Bill 2242 (2017) in response to a court ruling on school finance. House Bill 2242 included a new funding component called a “regionalization” factor. Based on the statute, charter schools are to receive the same regionalization factor as the school district in which they are geographically located. However, due to an oversight, the regionalization factor for the charter schools in Spokane does not reflect the same regionalization factor as Spokane Public Schools. This request intends to correct that oversight.

Fiscal detail: To be completed by budget staff

Operating Expenditures	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Fund 17F-1	\$0	\$162,000	\$196,000	\$177,000
Total Expenditures	\$0	\$162,000	\$196,000	\$177,000
Biennial Totals	\$162,000		\$373,000	
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Obj. N	\$0	\$162,000	\$196,000	\$177,000

Package description

Your detailed package description should elaborate upon the RecSum description provided above. This detailed description should provide the Governor, OFM, the Legislature and the public an understanding of the problem you are addressing.

To thoroughly describe the package and its justification, agencies are strongly encouraged to use:

- High-quality narrative descriptions
- Informative tables
- Charts and graphs
- Logic models
- Timelines
- Flowcharts
- Maps or other graphics

House Bill 2242 (2017) included a new funding component called a “regionalization” factor. The factor ranges from 1.0 to 1.24, and is applied to the apportionment funding for school districts and charter schools. Schedules on the Legislative Evaluation and Accountability Program (LEAP) Committee website define the regionalization factor that applies to each school district and charter school. Based on provisions in RCW 28A.710.280, charter schools are to receive the same regionalization factor as the school district in which they are geographically located. However, due to an oversight, the regionalization factor for the charter schools in Spokane on the current LEAP schedule does not reflect the same regionalization factor as Spokane Public Schools.

What is the problem, opportunity or priority you are addressing with the request?

- Describe in detail the problem you propose to solve.
- What is the relevant history or context in which the DP request is made?
- Why is this the opportune time to address this problem?
- Have you previously proposed this request? If so, when and how was it received in the budgeting process at that time?

This request is aimed at correcting the LEAP schedule for Spokane charter schools to ensure they receive the level of funding that was intended by the legislature when they passed House Bill 2242 (2017).

What is your proposed solution?

- How do you propose to address this problem, opportunity or priority?
- Why is this proposed solution the best option?
- Identify who will be affected by this DP and how.
- How many clients will or will not be served? Served by whom?

OSPI requests the LEAP schedule be amended to reflect the correct regionalization factor for Spokane charter schools. Amending the factor will ensure they receive the funding to which they are entitled under the current statute.

What are you purchasing and how does it solve the problem?

- What will this funding package actually buy?
- What services and/or materials will be provided, when and to whom?
- How will these purchases achieve the desired outputs, efficiencies and outcomes?

Funding this request will ensure that Spokane charter schools receive the funding to which they are entitled under current law.

What alternatives did you explore and why was this option chosen?

- What are the consequences of not funding this proposal?
- Describe the pros/cons of alternatives. Explain why this request is the best option.
- What other options did you explore? For example, did you consider:
 - » Options with lower costs.
 - » Services provided by other agency or unit of government.
 - » Regulatory or statutory changes to streamline agency processes.
 - » Redeployment of existing resources to maximize efficient use of current funding.
 - » Option to maintain the status quo.

If this proposal is not funded, Spokane charter schools will not receive the funding to which they are entitled under current law.

Assumptions and calculations

You must clearly display the caseload/workload/service-level changes and cost/savings assumptions and calculations supporting expenditure and revenue changes proposed. Please attach an electronic version (Excel) of detailed fiscal models and/or fiscal backup information.

The intent here is not to repeat the fiscal detail summarized above, but to expand and provide all underlying assumptions and calculations associated with this proposal. All calculations must include impacts to the 2019-21 *and* 2021-23 biennia and must support the fiscal summary detail.

Expansion or alteration of a current program or service

If this proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide detailed historical financial information for the prior two biennia (2015-17 and 2017-19).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Detailed assumptions and calculations

- Provide detailed caseload/workload and cost information associated with adopting this proposal.
- Identify discrete expenditure/revenue calculations. Many DPs contain multiple components to achieve a desired outcome. If this package contains discrete funding proposals, the fiscal models or details must break out the complete costs/savings of each component part.
- Clearly explain all one-time expenditure or revenue components.

The regionalization factors applicable to Spokane Public Schools were applied to the funding for their two charter schools. The following table reflects the factors and the cost assumptions.

District	SY 2018-19	SY 2019–20	SY 2020–21
Regionalization factor	1.06	1.06	1.05
Total school year costs	\$203,000	\$201,000	\$170,000
Fiscal year costs	\$162,400	\$196,375	\$176,975

Workforce assumptions

Include FTE information by job classification, including salary and benefits costs. Work with budget staff to prepare this information.

Not applicable.

Strategic and performance outcomes**Strategic framework**

- How does this package relate and contribute to the Governor's Results Washington goal areas and statewide priorities? [Link to results.wa.gov](https://www.results.wa.gov/)
- How does the package relate to the agency's strategic plan?
- Identify how this proposal affects agency activity funding by amount and fund source.

Not applicable.

Performance outcomes

- Describe and quantify the specific performance outcomes you expect from this funding change.
- What outcomes and results will occur? What undesired results are reduced, eliminated or mitigated?
- Explain how efficiencies are optimized.
- Identify all Lean initiatives and their expected outcomes.
- Include incremental performance metrics.

Not applicable.

Other collateral connections**Intergovernmental**

Describe in detail any impacts to tribal, regional, county or city governments or any political subdivision of the state. Provide anticipated support or opposition. Impacts to other state agencies must be described in detail.

This request will provide additional funding for the charter schools in Spokane.

Stakeholder response

Agencies must identify non-governmental stakeholders impacted by this proposal. Provide anticipated support or opposition.

Not applicable.

Legal or administrative mandates

Describe in detail if this proposal is in response to litigation, an audit finding, executive order or task force recommendations.

This funding request corrects an oversight in a document that is instrumental in the implementation of the current statute.

Changes from current law

Describe in detail any necessary changes to existing statutes, rules or contracts. Where changes in statute are required, cabinet agencies must provide agency request legislation as an attachment to this DP and submit it through BATS.

Not applicable.

State workforce impacts

Describe in detail all impacts to existing collective bargaining agreements, compensation or benefits.

Not applicable.

State facilities impacts

Describe in detail all impacts to facilities and workplace needs (See Chapter 9 - Leases and Maintenance). Describe in detail all impacts to capital budget requests.

Not applicable.

Puget Sound recovery

If this request is related to Puget Sound recovery efforts, see Chapter 12 of the budget instructions for additional instructions. **(Not applicable to OSPI)**

Other supporting materials

Attach or reference any other supporting materials or information that will help analysts, policymakers and the public understand and prioritize your request.

Letter of intent from legislators.

Information technology (IT)

ABS will pose the question below for *each* DP. If the answer is yes, you will be prompted to attach an IT addendum. (See Chapter 10 of the budget instructions for additional requirements.)

Information Technology

Does this DP include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

☒ No

☐ Yes

Please download the **IT-addendum** and follow the directions on the bottom of the addendum to meet requirements for OCIO review. After completing the IT addendum, please upload the document to continue.