

Budget Sharing Decisions:

Category	Yes/No	Central Funding Estimate	Owner & Requirements or Justification
Custodians	Yes	Actual salaries	<p>Owner: David S.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would have certain requirements. Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Maintenance of the building – still needs to be done to protect the asset.</li> <li>○ Hiring, background checks</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Need to consider adhering to the labor agreement. This agreement defines ability to outsource. If can't outsource, Innovation school would have to apply for waiver of the collective bargaining unit – with 60% of the custodians agreeing they want to go down this path.</li> <li>• Supplies example: would get a per-pupil based on whatever the district cost is, even if volume-leveraged</li> <li>• Some potential, increased costs to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ District would need to monitor standards being met.</li> <li>○ Would district keep dollars for area superintendents to continue to monitor?</li> <li>○ Other areas like HR – oversight of the hiring/ background?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recommend doing on a pilot basis if a school wants to do this</li> </ul>
Central PSN (Recommend naming this Central MAST/ Best etc.)	No	\$3,635,037 \$58/student	<p>Owner: John</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liability risk - not able to delegate the liability out to the school</li> <li>• Health &amp; safety risk</li> <li>• Charters do not take on Central MAST/ Best, Prevention and Intervention, Speech and Lang</li> </ul>
Speech & Language	No	\$5,492,999 \$87/student	<p>Owner: John</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as central PSN</li> </ul>
Prevention & Intervention	No	\$343,205 \$5/student	<p>Owner: John</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is central support for suspension &amp; expulsion</li> <li>• This removes central support for placement of kids in other schools</li> <li>• Moral hazard</li> </ul>
Athletics	HS – Yes  MS – Possible. See notes	\$1,967,359  \$350,000	<p>Owner: Karen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern around safety and equipment purchases.</li> <li>• Not sure if CHSSA fees embedded; if yes, need to pull this out</li> <li>• Need to define what services this money buys:</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Karen and her time</li> <li>○ Possible training/support for coaches</li> <li>○ This includes transportation, grounds, maintenance</li> <li>● School would need to be able to explain decisions (if lowers athletics programs) to parents, community</li> <li>● Note on MS Athletics – this is the General fund supplement only, not the fundraised amount. Question: Have we committed to the fundraisers that the district will match a certain amount?</li> </ul>
Instructional Support, Data partners, and elementary para’s	Instructional Sups and Data Partners NO Elementary Para’s - YES	\$506,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Cannot waive instructional superintendents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We have requirements for standards, assessments, unit scope/sequence - and is supervisor for principal so still require instructional superintendent; data partners part of required support</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Para – elementary schools only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To support schools with larger class sizes. There is an equity question. This is driven by the bargaining agreement. They would need to waive this article to get the money.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Concurrent Enrollment	Yes – But see justification	\$690,000 \$42/student	<p>Owner: Antwan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Money follows the kids involved in concurrent enrollment.</li> <li>● This is not per pupil money, allocated based on participation. Not all schools offer college courses, therefore each year schools are asked to project number of college courses offered at their schools. Funds are distributed equally, among participating schools, for tuition cost. Funds are also used to support students who take full college loads, this can be up to \$3,500 a year per student.</li> </ul>
College Readiness	Yes	\$550,000 \$34/student	<p>Owner: Antwan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Used to support AP, IB, PD around preparing kids for college</li> <li>● Central Software agreement, reduced cost for school. If waived services, schools would have to pay much more for Naviance.</li> </ul>
9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Academy	Yes	\$350,000 \$21/student	<p>Owner: Antwan</p>
AVID	No	\$450,000 \$16/student	<p>Owner: Antwan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mill levy dedicated funding</li> <li>● If school doesn’t have AVID today then they shouldn’t get AVID money</li> <li>● District gets a reduced rate for AVID membership based on schools participating district wide. Autonomous schools would pay more for individual memberships, and not receive district wide AVID PD opportunities</li> </ul>

Credit Recovery	No	\$450,000 \$28/student	Owner: Antwan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This money is allocated to schools, but managed centrally.</li> <li>This is not per pupil; it is only for kids needing credit recovery and adjusts during the year depending on how schools are spending. District needs to retain ability to reallocate money across schools if funds aren't being used for this.</li> <li>These funds ARE all administered to schools, but not based on per pupil. They are allocated based on need (students who need to recover classes). This fund needs to be centrally administered because as schools do not allocate funds we send them to schools who demonstrate need.</li> </ul>
Principal Staff Development	Yes	\$112,400 \$2/student	Owner: Pat (Fund 10/BR2184) Funds have been used in the past at the discretion of the CAO. Funds were transferred to Elementary Education in March. Funds have been used to pay for principal travel to New York (HS principals) and California (ES principals). Funds are used selectively to support principal development based on need.
Humanities Curriculum <i>Items 1-8 below</i>	Further Discussion	\$1,541,905 \$24/student	Owner: Susana/Elizabeth <b>See breakout below:</b>
1.PCK Intensives	Further Discussion Mill Levy	\$500,000	TDB by Debbie Moving to Debbie Hearty's budget; all schools have the opportunity to opt-in to this school-based professional development project. Schools that don't opt-in don't receive the resources.
2.Indian Education	No	\$11,534	Funding is allocated specifically to provide services to Native American Students and covers transportation to center programs and central office supplies
3.Salary Expenses for Curriculum Coordinator, Director, and Office support	No Title II	\$231,572	Humanities staff creates curriculum documents, Teacher Portal, Standards alignment, assessment tools, online PD, etc.; includes supervision and management of budgets for district programs such as Reading Recovery, LLI and DPS Success. All schools have access to the curriculum tools.
4.Operating Expenses	No	\$43,500	Office supplies, telephone, copying, mileage reimbursement and non-capital equipment
5.CORE Matters Year 2	No	\$385,204	We are honoring our commitment to schools that signed on for two years of CORE Matters intensive school-reform. The second year of CORE Matters will be rolled into the PCK Intensive structure.
6.Leveled Literacy Intervention	No	\$291,790	LLI is the district-supported literacy intervention program. The training and materials are available for 100 teachers grades K-3 in the 2010-2011 school-year.
7.High School	No	\$10,000	Funding for Forensics National Competition to offset travel and hotel for students involved in Speech.

Forensics			
8. Professional Development Travel and Registration Books and Periodicals	Yes	\$68,305	Per pupil \$1.05
Math/Science Curriculum <i>Items 1-5 below</i>	Further Discussion	\$501,159 \$8/student	Owner: Susana/ <b>Cathy</b> <b>See breakout below</b>
1. PCK Intensives	Further Discussion	\$94,349	All schools have the opportunity to opt-in to this school-based professional development project. Schools that don't opt-in don't receive the resources.
2. Salary & Benefits for Director, 3 employees at SRC and manager of district planetarium	No Title II	\$336,260	Math/Science staff creates curriculum documents, Teacher Portal, Standards alignment, assessment tools, online PD, etc. All schools have access to the curriculum tools. SRC provides refurbishment of all science materials (K-12).
3. Operating Expenses for Science Resource Center	No	\$20,000	In addition to the 8% math/science department cut, and \$59,734 was cut from general supplies at SRC. Funds are used to repair microscopes, copying, and non-capital equipment
4. Operating expenses for math/science department	No	\$30,500	Office supplies, copying, mileage reimbursement and non-capital equipment
5. Professional development travel, registration, and books	Yes	\$20,050	Per pupil \$0.31
Interdisciplinary	No	\$67,029	Owner: Susana /Antwan

Curriculum		\$1/student	Salary for office support and National Student Clearing House staff member. Pulling this funding will negatively impact the ability to provide data collection and support to the other schools.
Leadership Development	Yes	\$182,873 \$3/student	Owner: Pat (Fund 10/BR 4154) Funds support the office of Leadership Development by providing the director's salary and expenses related to leadership development (\$42,382) which include copying, mileage, books, postage, electronic media, presenters, extra-duty pay for teachers to attend June/August sessions, equipment, etc. The amount of funds allocated to supplies could possibly be released to innovation schools, but will greatly impact the support provided to remaining schools.
Textbook Acquisition	Yes	\$102,871 \$2/student	Owner: Susana
Gifted and Talented K-8	Further discussion	\$1,366,738 \$29/student	Owner: Susana/Beth \$20,000 in the GT General Fund can be reduced in four areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 580 account; \$5,000 reduction from the \$20,124 previously budgeted to help fund school teams going to the national Destination Imagination tournament, reducing our percentage contribution</li> <li>○ 580 account; \$5,000 reduction to reduce the number of teachers attending the state GT conference and central staff to attend the national GT conference</li> <li>○ 735 account; \$5,000 reduction for upgrading office computers</li> <li>○ 150 account; \$5,000 reduction for office staff extra pay</li> </ul> The remainder of the \$1,366,738 original GT General Fund budget is used for salaries of itinerant teachers assigned to schools through school-reimbursed GT Option 2 choices that reimburse the GT General Fund for .25 FTE's; necessary and minimal central staff considering ongoing oversight and programming and new state laws for ALP's for all GT students (this includes 1 secretary, 1 manager, 1 activities coordinator, and .5 GT specialist); all expenses for Destination Imagination and the Shakespeare Festival currently funded at minimum levels; all general office expenditures (duplicating, mailing, mileage, copying, general supplies) not allowed in grant funding; funding for one additional school .25 FTE if a school budget change results in an additional .25 itinerant teacher or if a sub is needed; and, necessary teacher extra pay for summer staff development.
Career & Technology programs	No – HS  Yes – MS – see	\$841,930 \$29/student	Owner: Antwan These funds are allocated to district by state Career and Technical Act Funding. By statute, only high schools with approved CTE programs may receive these funds. MS is from the general fund side, the CTE department accepts RFP's from any MS who needs technology assistance in their technology departments. Example: Several years ago the department funded an entire new computer lab for Cole.

	justification		Cole would lose out on these opportunities if funds were allocated to the school.
Security	No	Actual for staff	Owner: David S <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believe decentralizing security creates a health &amp; safety risk for the schools.</li> </ul>
Educational Resource Services	Yes, in part	\$1,096,934 \$17/student	Owner: Susana/ Dave Sanger <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These are restricted funds from the 1998 mill levy override</li> <li>\$6 per pupil is designated for building level library books and can be moved to the school budget</li> <li>Funds (\$283,573 this year) are reserved as “library boost” to improve school library collections on a competitive, application basis. All schools can apply.</li> <li>The remainder of the fund provides equitable access for all students to centrally held resources available to all schools including; databases, classroom and professional library, video library, art, music, and P.E. resources.</li> </ul>
Indian Education	No	\$253,417 \$16/student	Owner: Susana/ Rose Marie Maguire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$ 253,417 from Mill Levy covers the salaries of 1 non exempt employee as office support for Indian Education , and 2 pro-techs who provide direct services to Indian Ed Students in Center based programs.</li> </ul>
Assessment Program (fund 16 or 12)	No	\$854,076 \$13/student and \$357,938 \$6/student	Owner: Stephen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These dollars represent people that serve the district in terms of communicating rules, protocols, and risks in the administration of CSAP, CSAP-A, CELA, and CBLA, the logistics of printing, embargo-ing, distributing, administering, collecting, reporting, and analysis of these assessments required by statute. The funds support the entire district, and NO monies are used to purchase or support particular assessment tools for any schools.</li> <li>Carving out the “share” for the innovation schools would mean that they were making a request to administer CSAP, CBLA, CSAP-A, and CELA independently, which is going to be awkward at best. Our relationship with CDE advocates for a single point of contact and as much as possible, no particular interest in the scores of each school. If the \$ are released to manage that process by innovation schools, it increases the likelihood of error, raises our vulnerability when there are mistakes made in terms of protocol, and assignment of responsibility to manage and monitor the assessment calendar and process to Manual, Randolph, Cole, Montclair, and others independent of DPS.</li> <li>My conversation with the principal from Manual suggested an interest in these \$ to purchase assessments (e.g. Aspen which is used at DSST and now at Manual to some degree) and training and support for internal formative assessments. We are not funded for these purposes,</li> </ul>

			generally, and the funds for the assessment system role out are not allocated to the department. What funding we do have is found in Fund 10, where the total \$ devoted to supporting specific assessments (ITBS/ACT/Map/Ravens/CBLA/COGAT-GT) is \$94,700 including supplies. These moneys represent all our assessment purchases, while the lines in fund 16 and 12 represent salaries and equipment support (e.g. Processing Center).
Professional Development (fund 16 and 20)	Yes	\$439,449 \$7/student and \$1,200,689 \$29/student	Owner: Debbie
Unallocated Textbooks	Yes	\$2,827,740 \$44/student	Owner: Susana
UNC Paraprofessional Program	No	\$272,687 \$4/student	Owner: Shayne <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District partnership</li> </ul>
Library Automation	No	\$177,235 \$3/student	Owner: Susana/Dave Sanger <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For library automation the district is seen as one library with multiple branches—it is one contract.</li> <li>The system is administered centrally</li> <li>Administering a library automation system at the site level would not be economically feasible</li> </ul>
Central Receiving (support for Library/Textbook, etc)	No	\$204,055 \$3/student	Owner: Susana/Dave Sanger <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All schools, including innovation schools order Library materials through LION with books received bar-coded and tracked through the automated Lion checkout system.</li> </ul>
Costume Dept	No	\$45,133 \$1/student	Owner: Susana Funding covers minimal expenses to staff district wide access to costume shop
ARRA & Federal funds (Funds 20 & 28)	General Overview		Owner: Nancy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because of terms of contract of law, we'd have to give all funds or none.</li> <li>According to allocation rules, if the district sets aside funds for district wide programs, an equitable amount must go to charter school students.</li> <li>Should CDE and/or USDoE allow it, the district could choose to treat innovation schools like charter schools and distribute the funds on a \$/pupil amount. <b>WE CANNOT MOVE FUNDS UNTIL CDE</b></li> </ul>

			<p><b>APPROVES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no provision under these allocation rules for picking and choosing among the programs.</li> <li>• If allowed, the innovation schools could receive the \$/pupil amount, and then buy back those services from the district in alignment with the schoolwide/improvement plan.</li> <li>• The same rationale would work for the Title II dollars.</li> </ul>
Student Engagement	No	\$1,649,192 \$40/student	<p>Owner: Antwan Title I ARRA program</p> <p>These funds are used for purposes that are clearly spelled out in the grant. One is to purchase APEX seats. Manual and Bruce Randolph both received an allocation this past year based on need and will again next year. They both can request more seats if need grows. I would not support schools having a different CR system than the district when their numbers show there is a need. We have had a system that wasn't uniform in the past and that didn't work. Two is the running of engagement centers. Dropout students are referred to these centers at West, ALHS, Montbello, and North (These are students from throughout the city). If the innovation schools take funds rather than service, they also must admit the students we recover who are overage and under credited back into their schools without question. As things stand, when we recover these students they are not required to enter their home schools. Requiring them to enter their home schools when the school doesn't have this program hurts district-wide efforts to recover dropouts.</p>
Reading Recovery	No Title 1	\$591,686 \$14/student	<p>Owner: Susana Title I and Title I ARRA program</p>
ELA Summer School	No Title 1	\$1,538,352 \$37/student	<p>Owner: Susana, Debbie Title I ARRA program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These dollars are designed to follow kids in ELA program, not divided among all students.</li> </ul>
Summer School (6 <sup>th</sup> & 9 <sup>th</sup> academy)	Yes Title 1	\$1,500,000 \$36/student	<p>Owner: Antwan Title I ARRA program</p>
Special Education Support	Further discussion	\$9,398,265	<p>Owner: John</p> <p>The highlighted amounts in the attached document indicate funds that may be able to be directed by the innovation schools. The total amount is \$6,798,481. On a per student basis, this equals \$104.59 (<math>6,798,481/65,004=104.59</math>). Schools would receive funds on the following basis:</p> <p>Randolph – 863 students * \$104.59 = \$90,261.17. They are currently paying their DAT \$59,523. This would leave \$30,738.17 as their share of additional ARRA Title 6 funds.</p> <p>Manual – 350 students * \$104.59 = \$36,606.50. Their DAT salary is \$45,023, leaving a negative balance</p>

		of \$8416.50.
		Cole – 597 students*104.59 = \$62,440.23. They do not have a DAT assigned to them.
		The schools would not have discretion on the focus of these funds. The ARRA Title VI grant is specific about the allowable uses. Also, we are not able to transfer these funds to the schools. We would need to maintain the integrity of the grant centrally. The schools would work through our office to purchase their selected personnel and services. I hope this helps to move the conversation forward.
	Yes	Denver Kids-Supplemental FTE 2.0- \$120,000- Serve at risk students throughout District.
	Yes	PBS Coaches- FTE 8- \$520,000- Coaches support all DPS schools cost per school 520,000/150=\$3,467
	Yes	Rtl Coaches- FTE 7.0- \$455,000- Coaches support all DPS schools cost per school 455,000/150=\$3,033
	Yes	Professional Development- \$1,802,963- Train all special education teachers on CDE compliance issues as per CDE corrective action.
	Yes	Community Engagement- FTE 1.0- \$89,901- Increase SPED family involvement per Denver Plan
	Yes	Supplies, equipment, Professional Services, Indirect Cost- - \$1,502,577- Majority of this is indirect costs, other is for upgrading technology for all special ed students.
	Yes	Regional Itinerant TOSA's- FTE 8.0- \$527,552- 1 Assigned to every Region
	Yes	DAT (Disability Access Teacher)- FTE 27.0- \$1,780,488- 1 DAT teacher is assigned to every middle and high school
	No	Center Program Teachers- FTE 2.0- \$131,888 New DHH program \$ Denver on-line transition program
	No	Center Program and Regional Paras- -\$776,711- Paras assigned to center programs that are above certain ratios.
	No	Early Intervening Services (EIS)
	No	Business Analyst- FTE 1.0- \$108,529- Develop systems to collect CDE required data requests.

	No		ATRT (Assistive Technology Resource Team)- FTE 1.0- \$65,944- Increased FTE's to lower caseloads throughout the District
	No		Autism- FTE 2.0- \$131,888- Increased FTE's to lower caseloads throughout the District
	No		BEST (Behavior Evaluation Services Team)- FTE 1.0- \$65,944- Increased FTE's to lower caseloads throughout the District
	No		Transition/Vocational Teachers- FTE 2.0- \$131,888- Increased FTE's to increase Transition knowledge to assist with CIMP compliance issues
	No		Child Find- FTE 3.0- \$197,832- Increased FTE's to assist with CIMP compliance issues.
	No		OT (Occupational Therapist)- FTE 3.5- \$230,804- Increased FTE's to lower caseloads throughout the District.
	No		PT (Physical Therapist)- FTE 2.5- \$164,860- Increased FTE's to lower caseloads throughout the District.
	No		SL (Speech Language)- FTE 8.0- \$527,552- Increased FTE's to lower caseloads throughout the District.
	No		Vision- FTE 1.0- \$65,944- Increased FTE's to lower caseloads throughout the District.
Title II	Further Discussion Yes	\$5,720,157 \$68/student	Owner: Susana, Debbie Should CDE and/or USDoE allow it, the district could choose to treat innovation schools like charter schools and distribute the funds on a \$/pupil amount. <b>WE CANNOT MOVE FUNDS UNLESS CDE APPROVES</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The same \$/ pupil amount would be available to the innovation schools, with CDE/USDoE approval. Any central curricular or PD support would then have to be purchased according to the Title II plan at each school.</li> <li>Title 11 Professional Development, Mentor training TLA- but schools will need to meet new teacher induction state requirements if they take these dollars.</li> </ul>
Title I	Further	\$1,513,613	Owner: Debbie

	Discussion		<p>Should CDE and/or USDoE allow it, the district could choose to treat innovation schools like charter schools and distribute the funds on a \$/pupil amount. <b>WE CANNOT MOVE FUNDS UNLESS CDE APPROVES.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Title 1 Teacher effectiveness coaches- these dollars are not allocated by pupil but by capacity of schools to implement SIP. To divide up dollars by schools makes us less able to support the needs of other schools in the district-- thus making it an equity issue for non-innovation schools.</li> </ul>
Urban Principals Leadership	No	\$769,265 \$12/student	<p>Owner: Pat</p> <p>Federal grant specific to the Administrator Intern program. Total remaining funds are listed on the spreadsheet even though it is a multi-year grant. The funds cannot be distributed to schools based on a per pupil allocation due to the requirements of the grant.</p>