

**COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
DRAFT COMMITTEE REPORT**

1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20004

TO: All Councilmembers

FROM: David A. Catania, Chairperson
Committee on Education

DATE: November 25, 2013

SUBJECT: Report on Bill 20-309, the “Fair Student Funding and School-Based Budgeting Amendment Act of 2013”

The Committee on Education reports [favorably] on Bill 20-309, the “Fair Student Funding and School-Based Budgeting Amendment Act of 2013” and recommends approval by the Council.

CONTENTS

I.	Background And Need.....	1
II.	Legislative Chronology.....	7
III.	Position Of The Executive	7
IV.	Comments Of Advisory Neighborhood Commissions	8
V.	Summary Of Testimony.....	8
VI.	Impact On Existing Law	10
VII.	Fiscal Impact.....	12
VIII.	Section-By-Section Analysis	12
IX.	Committee Action.....	12
X.	Attachments	13

I. BACKGROUND AND NEED

The future of the District of Columbia depends on effective schools that prepare students for success in life. Addressing all of the District’s challenges, from creating a robust economy to affordable housing and public safety, depends on improving the way our students are educated.

Yet on the current trajectory it may take District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) up to 30 years to reach its stated educational goal of 75 percent proficiency in math and reading. Properly measured, achievement at the most challenged public schools has declined over the past several years, and nearly half of District children do not graduate from high school. Every resident has a stake in the improvement of our schools, regardless of what neighborhood they live in or if they have children in school. We all pay the price for failing to take action.

This is why, on June 4, 2013, Councilmember David Catania introduced seven pieces of legislation that will remove barriers to providing an effective, challenging, and motivating educational experience for every District student. Bill 20-309, the “Fair Student Funding and

School-Based Budgeting Amendment Act of 2013” will help achieve this goal by providing additional funding to local education agencies to help promote student achievement; support career and technical education; enhance transparency and accountability within the budget development process; and ensure that there is greater stability in funding at the individual school level. The bill was co-sponsored by Councilmembers Barry, Grosso, Bonds, Bowser, Cheh, Alexander, Evans, McDuffie, Orange, and Chairman Mendelson.

Following the two public hearings for government and public witnesses held by the Committee in July 2013, Councilmember Catania held eight community conversations in each ward of the city and was joined by Councilmember Grosso and representatives from the District’s State Board of Education to receive additional feedback from stakeholders regarding the proposed legislation.

UNIFORM PER STUDENT FUNDING FORMULA

The Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) is a budget development tool used to determine the local funds allocation for DCPS and each of the public charter schools. Enacted into law in 1998, the UPSFF is based upon a foundation level of funding and a series of weights tied to certain student characteristics. The weights are applied to the foundation in order to determine a per pupil allocation, which is then multiplied by the projected enrollment for each weighting category. This calculation results in the local funds allocation for the local education agency.

Bill 20-309 as introduced recommended including three new weights within the UPSFF. After receiving input from community members and education stakeholders, the bill has been refined to include one new weight for students identified as “at-risk” and a citywide grant program to enhance career and technical education programs at DCPS and public charter schools.

At-Risk Students

Research shows that there is a significant achievement gap between our low-income and higher-income students. A 2012 report from the Annie E. Casey foundation found that low-income children did not perform as well as their higher-income peers; results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress showed that 83 percent of low-income fourth graders had reading skills considered to be below proficient as compared to 55 percent of fourth graders in middle- and high-income families – a 28 percent gap.¹ The report also found that 22 percent of children who lived in poverty at some point during childhood did not graduate from high school, a rate that is significantly higher than the 6 percent of children with no family poverty experience.²

Research also shows that this achievement gap is widening. A 2011 research study shows that the gap in test scores between children at the 10th percentile of income versus children at the 90th percentile has expanded by as much as 40 percent in the last 25 years.³

¹ “Double Jeopardy: How Third-Grade Reading Skills and Poverty Influence High School Graduation” Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2012

² Ibid.

³ “The Widening Academic Achievement Gap between the Rich and the Poor: New Evidence and Possible Explanations” as published in *Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children’s Life Chances*. Sean F. Reardon, July 2011

In the District, there is a clear correlation between income and performance on Districtwide assessments. Economically disadvantaged students do not perform as well on the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) when compared to students that are considered non-economically disadvantaged:

<i>DC CAS Proficiency</i>	<i>Non-Economically Disadvantaged</i>			<i>Economically Disadvantaged</i>		
Year	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Overall	59.1%	60.0%	61.1%	40.4%	39.0%	39.7%
Math	57.9%	59.0%	60.6%	40.5%	39.5%	41.0%
Reading	60.3%	60.9%	61.5%	40.3%	38.4%	38.3%

Source: OSSE NCLB Reporting

Efforts to eliminate this growing gap include individualized academic interventions, home visitation programs, and enhanced before and afterschool programming – all of which require additional resources. To ensure schools have sufficient funding to meet these needs, the majority of states include a low-income weight within their education funding formulas. These low-income weights on average provide an additional 25 percent in funding to school districts for every eligible student.

B20-309 as introduced aligned with this practice and recommended a similar weight be added to the UPSFF based on eligibility for free and reduced meals. To provide additional support, the introduced version also recommended a new weight for students attending high schools with low graduation rates.

After working with education stakeholders, community members, parents, and government officials, these recommendations were refined so as to better target specific students in need. The legislation now includes a single weight for “at risk” students, based on a combination of economic and academic indicators. Specifically, the UPSFF would provide additional funding to each local education agency (LEA) for students that falls into any of the following categories:

- Is eligible for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program;
- Is homeless;
- Is within the District’s foster care system; or
- Is a high school student that is at least 1 year older than the expected age of the grade for which the student is enrolled.

While the bill defines the weighting category, it does not include a recommendation for a specific weighting factor. As stated in the legislation, the decision about the weighting factor itself would be left to the Mayor. This allows the Mayor to take into account a variety of factors, including the yet-to-be completed Adequacy Study being undertaken by the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education, which is likely to contain recommendations for a new UPSFF foundation level and updated weighting factors for both grade levels and special education.

Career and Technical Education

As in the case of for low-income students, many states provide additional funding for students participating in career and technical education (CTE) programs. By their nature, these highly specialized programs are often more expensive than their general education counterparts. Costs often include capital investments needed to create or maintain programs in targeted industries and operating expenses associated with facilities, equipment maintenance and repair, and necessary supplies.

B20-309 as introduced recommended including a similar weighting category for the District's UPSFF, to begin in the 2016-2017 school year. The bill has been updated to instead provide for additional CTE funding through a citywide grant program to be administered by the Office of the State Superintendent for Education (OSSE), which currently oversees certain CTE programs and strategies. Establishing a grant program will enhance CTE funding already incorporated into the UPSFF high school weighting factor while also allowing for needed flexibility to support a range of costs associated with specific programs. A grant program will also help to support many of the recommendations outlined in OSSE's CTE Strategic plan, including:

- Encouraging efficiencies in CTE programming by providing flexible funding to allow partnerships across schools and local education agencies; and
- Creating opportunities for industry experts to teach or co-teach CTE courses by supporting additional costs associated with teacher compensation and professional development.

Review of UPSFF

In discussions with parents, education stakeholders and community members regarding the bill's recommended UPSFF weights, the Committee also received numerous comments about the UPSFF review and revision process. Specifically, the Committee heard about the need to strengthen the existing review process in order to ensure that students are provided with an appropriate level of funding on an annual basis.

In 2001, responsibility over UPSFF revisions was placed within the State Education Office (SEO). Each year SEO staff and a Technical Working Group comprised of public officials and community members reviewed costs associated with educating District students and presented the Mayor with recommendations regarding the Formula for the upcoming fiscal year.

Following enactment of the Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007, the Technical Working Group was disbanded and the SEO – now known as OSSE – discontinued its role in overseeing the UPSFF. The last Technical Working Group report was issued in January 2008 in preparation for the Fiscal Year 2009 budget. Since then, decisions regarding the UPSFF have been made by the Mayor's office, seemingly driven by revenue availability rather than a thoughtful review of educational costs – despite the fact that District law requires a periodic review of the UPSFF.

In recognition of this shortcoming, in 2010 the Council authorized the creation of the Public Education Finance Reform Commission (PEFRC) to review the UPSFF and related issues. In February 2012, the PEFRC released its final report, making a series of recommendations regarding equity, uniformity, adequacy and transparency of education funding in the District. In

addition, the PEFRC recommended that the Mayor undertake a full-scale adequacy study to analyze the costs of an adequate education in the District and re-establish OSSE's Technical Working Group in order to make regular revisions to the UPSFF as needed.

In late 2012, the Deputy Mayor for Education contracted with a consultant to undertake a formal review of the UPSFF and make recommendations to ensure adequacy in funding and parity across the traditional and charter systems. A draft of the report has been made available to the public for review, with a final report expected before the end of the calendar year.

Based on the recommendations contained in both the PEFRC report and the draft adequacy study, along with comments received from the public, B20-309 was updated to improve accountability within the UPSFF review process. Specifically, the bill requires the Mayor to submit a biennial report to the Council that includes a review of the UPSFF and recommendations for revisions. The report must be submitted in January to ensure ample public review before the Council begins its budget review process in the Spring. In addition, the bill requires OSSE – the agency responsible for the UPSFF process generally – to re-establish its UPSFF working group and to review items such as the definition of “at-risk” to ensure that the District is using the most appropriate measurements in determining budget allocations.

In addition, B20-309 also includes new requirements regarding budget transparency so that the Council and the public alike have sufficient information to review the UPSFF generally and the DCPS budget in particular, including a detailed description of proposed central administration spending along with information on expenditures that directly support school activities but are not directly budgeted in a school.

SCHOOL-LEVEL SPENDING

Providing the appropriate level of funding to an LEA is only the first step; the LEA itself must spend those funds in a way that maximizes the educational benefits for its students. One such methodology for making school-level allocations is known as student-based budgeting. Also known as fair student funding, student-based budgeting allocates funds to a school based on the individual characteristics of its enrolled students. In addition, these models often provide greater autonomy to school principals and their communities to make spending decisions, including decisions about staffing and enrichment programs.

In recent years, more and more school districts have transitioned to a student-based budgeting model, including: Baltimore, Maryland; Hartford, Connecticut; Cincinnati, Ohio; Clark County, Nevada; Denver, Colorado; Houston, Texas; Oakland, California; New York, New York; Prince George's County, Maryland, and San Francisco. Benefits of this transition have included greater transparency in budgeting, a substantial shift in resources from the central office to schools, the ability to better align resources with the individualized academic needs of at-risk students, a more equitable distribution of resources, and overall improvements in student achievement levels.⁴

⁴ Educational Resource Strategies, Fair Student Funding Implementation Review. Available at http://www.erstrategies.org/library/fsf_district_summaries

Unlike many of its counterparts, DCPS funds its schools based on a staffing model; a school gets the resources it needs to support staffing requirements based on enrollment projections and student-teacher ratios. Some of the staffing positions are required (i.e. principal, custodian) whereas others are considered flexible. However, this flexibility is somewhat limited based on central administration requirements. For example, in school year 2013-2014, DCPS set a scheduling requirement on top of the staffing requirements for elementary schools that dictated certain types of classes that must be taught. This greatly reduced the flexibility and autonomy previously allowed with respect to certain positions on the elementary school level; principals had to develop staffing models based on meeting the Chancellor's scheduling requirements, and then were allocated funds accordingly.

B20-309 as introduced shifted the focus away from funding the school and its staff to instead funding students by distributing UPSFF funds based on student characteristics, increasing principal autonomy over UPSFF funds, limiting the amount of money that could be spent for non-school based services, and ensuring budget stabilization at the school level. After working with parents, stakeholders, and education officials, the language was refined to allow for an appropriate balance between system-wide continuity and the needs of an individual school.

- The bill directs that of the total at-risk allocation provided to DCPS as an LEA, at least 90% must be spent at the school-level. These funds are to be distributed to individual schools based upon student characteristics at each school. In other words, if a particular school has 10% of DCPS's at-risk students, then it should receive 10% of the at-risk funds that DCPS is required to spend at the school-level.
- B20-309 provides principals with greater autonomy over the use of these at-risk funds, provided that spending is tied to improving performance of those students and is subject to oversight by the Chancellor.
- Rather than prescribe what expenses can and can't be covered within the central office and schools, B20-309 provides for a general 5% spending cap on central administration. This is similar to how Hawaii – the only other state with a single statewide school district – has acted legislatively to help ensure school dollars are directed to students. The proposed 5% cap is in line with current DCPS central administration spending levels:

Percent of Gross Budget spent by DCPS on Central, School Support and Schools			
	Central	School Support	School
FY12	5%	17%	79%
FY13	5%	16%	79%
FY14	4%	17%	79%

- The bill also ensures stability in school level funding by prohibiting more than a 5% loss in UPSFF funds from year to year, excluding situations where a school has been closed or has undergone a significant change in programming that impacts enrollment.

By improving budget transparency, enhancing funds available to students in need, providing for an appropriate balance of school and non-school based spending, and empowering DCPS principals to make decisions that best meet the needs of their students, B20-309 as presented by the Committee will improve educational opportunities for all students across the District.

II. LEGISLATIVE CHRONOLOGY

June 4, 2013	B20-309, the “Fair Student Funding and School-Based Budgeting Amendment Act of 2013,” is introduced by Councilmember Catania and is co-sponsored by Councilmembers Barry, Grosso, Bonds, Bowser, Cheh, Alexander, Evans, McDuffie, Orange, and Chairman Mendelson. The bill was referred to the Committee on Education.
June 14, 2013	Notice of Intent to Act on B20-309 is published in the <i>District of Columbia Register</i> .
June 14, 2013	Public Hearing Notice on B20-309 is published in the <i>District of Columbia Register</i> .
July 2, 2013	The Committee on Education holds a public hearing on B20-309 to receive testimony from government representatives.
July 11, 2013	The Committee on Education holds a public hearing on B20-309 to receive testimony from public witnesses.
November 25, 2013	<i>The Committee on Education marks-up B20-309 and adopts Committee’s report.</i>

III. POSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Committee on Education held a public hearing on B20-309 on July 2, 2013 in order to receive testimony from government witnesses. At that time, DCPS was the only government agency to provide specific comments regarding B20-309. A copy of the testimony is attached to this report.

Kaya Henderson, Chancellor, DCPS

Ms. Henderson opened her testimony by stating that she agreed with the goals of B20-309 but had reservations about implementation. For example, she stated her belief that “poverty contributes significant costs to educating a child” but was concerned about adding a new weighting category without also undertaking a full review of the UPSFF. The Chancellor also stated her support for ensuring that principals have the resources they need to effectively manage their schools, but that such allocations needed to be tempered by the fact that certain resources are best managed through a central structure. In addition, the Chancellor spoke about inequities that resulted across schools when DCPS utilized a weighted student formula, including decisions by certain principals to prioritize “support for low performing students to the exclusion of many other equally important educational components.” Finally, the Chancellor raised concerns about the strict division of funding between school and central functions and how that might impact districtwide initiatives.

IV. COMMENTS OF ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSIONS

The Committee received no testimony or comments from any Advisory Neighborhood Commission.

V. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

The Committee on Education held a public hearing on B20-309 on July 11, 2013. The testimony summarized below is from that hearing, along with the written statements the Committee received prior to the closing of the official record on July 19, 2013. A copy of the testimony is attached to this report.

Ahnna K. Smith, Executive Director, Teach For America, Executive Director

Ms. Smith provided general support of the bill's effort to re-examine how resources are allocated to traditional public and public charter schools, but stated that such work should not be undertaken in isolation. Specifically, Ms. Smith stated that the Committee should review all resources, supports, and factors that are necessary to ensure success for our schools.

To this end, Ms. Smith recommended that further analysis be done to understand why some District schools have been successful whereas others have not, in order to "identify the enabling factors that have allowed them to be successful - even under [the District's] current funding formula." Focusing on school leadership, Ms. Smith stated the analysis should review how successful schools can access talented teachers and school leaders, what resources successful schools have leveraged to equip and train teachers to work with students "suffering from the traumatic stress of growing up in poverty and fear," and what professional development opportunities the school provides to attract and keep great people in our highest-need classrooms.

Anne Abbott, Policy Analyst, DC Alliance for Youth Advocates

Ms. Abbott testified in support of amending the current uniform per student funding formula, stating that additional funds for economically disadvantaged students, high school students in schools with low graduation rates, and career and technical education students "will go a long way in helping to ensure that schools and students have the resources they require to succeed." Ms. Abbott also stated that while these additional funds are critical to preventing issues like low educational attainment, truancy, and dropout, she believes additional resources are necessary to support efforts to re-engage District youth who have left school. Specifically, Ms. Abbott recommended amending the existing UPSFF weights for "alternative" students and "adult" students to reflect actual costs associated with educating these students - especially given that many of the District's "adult" serving schools are actually serving as the educational re-engagement function for many youth between the ages of 16 and 24. Ms. Abbott also recommended that the District review how much funding it actually takes to successfully re-engage a dropout and consider adding a weight for those students that chose to re-engage.

In addition, Ms. Abbott recognized that the Council had already taken critical steps to reduce transportation barriers for students but raised concerns that such subsidies only support students up to age 21. She testified that transportation subsidies should be expanded to older students who have re-engaged with the educational system, either through a traditional school or an

adult/alternative program. Finally, Ms. Abbott highlighted that getting students to complete high school is just the first step in ensuring they are on a path to success and recommended that the District establish better supports at the postsecondary level.

Cathy Reilly, Executive Director, S.H.A.P.P.E.

Ms. Reilly offered her strong support of the bill's efforts to increase funding for students who are eligible for free and reduced meals and to provide transportation subsidies to students. Ms. Reilly also applauded the effort to send additional resources to high schools with low graduation rates but raised a concern that linking a weight within the funding formula to a specific graduation rate could result in a perverse incentive for schools.

Ms. Reilly also spoke about a proposed division of funds between the central office and schools, commenting that while she agrees that not enough money is flowing into schools, she is also concerned that a rigid formula could create more difficulties. As such, she asked the Committee to take additional time to review the proposal to ensure that it meets its intended goals.

Joe M. Smith, Chief Financial Officer and Chief Operating Officer, Eagle Academy Public Charter School

Mr. Smith testified in support of Bill 20-309 and stated that he is "in full agreement with the proposal to amend the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula for Public Schools and Public Charter Schools to better serve low-income students in the District of Columbia." Mr. Smith spoke about his work at Eagle Academy, stating that it has been their experience that successfully educating low-income children generally requires more resources – especially when such students are often developmentally behind by several months as compared to their higher income peers. These resources extend beyond the traditional classroom and include three full-time school nurses, a dental program, an asthma program, and a vision program. In addition, Eagle Academy offers a comprehensive Special Education Department with full-time speech and language therapists, occupational and physical therapists, psychologists, an audiology room, and a multi-sensory room. The school also provides wrap-around services such as information and referrals on affordable housing, homelessness prevention, job training, educational opportunities, mental health and substance abuse counseling, and parenting support, among others.

Mr. Smith testified that these services require substantial financial commitments, which Eagle Academy does within the current UPSFF by limiting bureaucracy and continuously submitting grant applications. Increased funding through the UPSFF would allow the school to make even greater investments in students, including technology improvements, targeting academic interventions, and enhanced professional development for teachers and aides.

Mary Nell Clark, Managing Attorney, University Legal Services (ULS)

On behalf of ULS, Ms. Clark presented testimony in support of the provisions of B20-309 that allocate additional funding to schools with low graduation rates and schools that offer CTE programs. Ms. Clark stated that this funding is critical to ensure the success of all students, but especially those students with disabilities. According to Ms. Clark, DCPS currently offers limited programs – both in scope and capacity – for students with disabilities to transition from high school to post-graduation employment. In fact, in 2012 these programs served only 80 students out of a high school-aged population of roughly 2,000 students with disabilities in

DCPS. In addition, Ms. Clark raised concerns that DCPS CTE programs are largely inaccessible to students with significant disabilities. As such, Ms. Clark recommended that enhanced CTE funding also be used to increase accountability with respect to special education students. Specifically, she requested that DCPS track and make available CTE program special education enrollment data, along with implementing better oversight, to ensure that programs are making necessary accommodations and modifications to serve students with significant disabilities.

Matthew Frumin, DCPS Parent

Mr. Frumin opened his testimony by thanking Councilmember Catania for introducing B20-309 to restore a weight within the UPSFF for students in poverty and seeking to push more funds to the schools and classrooms. He also offered suggestions for how the bill can be strengthened to support local DCPS schools, including reducing the requirement of 80 percent of UPSFF funds in schools to 75 percent in order to provide DCPS with additional flexibility to assure an equitable distribution of funding, to stabilize budgets, and to strengthen programs where they most need reinforcement.

Rene Wallis, Executive Director, People Animals Love

Ms. Wallis testified in support of a weighted student formula that provides schools with additional funding for low income students. Specifically, Ms. Wallis stated that such funding should be used to “level the playing field” for all students, including for: 1) extended learning opportunities for after school and the summer; 2) smaller class sizes with more aides; and, 3) early, long-term, and intensive reading support.

Ms. Wallis also spoke about her experience having to raise money to support outside programming for DCPS and testified that such a dependence on private funding isn’t fair to those students that aren’t at schools with successful fundraising efforts.

Richard Pohlman, Chief of Operations and Policy, E. L. Haynes Public Charter School

Mr. Pohlman offered general support of the legislation’s proposal to add an additional weight to the UPSFF for students from high poverty households. He cited research that supports a high correlation nationally between students’ poverty and lack of academic success and spoke about his own experience at E.L. Haynes, where high-poverty students need more support academically, socially, and emotionally in order to reach their full potential as compared to students from middle and high income households.

To address these disparities, E.L. Haynes provides additional social workers, academic interventionists, and behavior specialists, all of which require additional grant or private funds above what is allocated under the UPSFF. As such, Mr. Pohlman testified that providing additional funds to schools serving students from high-poverty backgrounds makes sense because it recognizes that it does not cost the same to educate every student. He added, however, that such funding should not come at the expense of other students.

Soumya Bhat, Education Finance and Policy Analyst, DC Fiscal Policy Institute

Ms. Bhat opened her testimony by strongly supporting the proposed supplemental weight for low-income students and encouraged the Committee to take into account the results of the DC Public Education Adequacy Study to determine the exact amount to be allocated. Ms. Bhat

stated that research shows that children who grow up in poverty face a number of challenges outside the classroom from housing instability to low levels of parent engagement that affect their ability to learn and increasing funding for these students could help overcome these challenges.

Ms. Bhat continued by stating that while DCFPI supported the intent of the proposed 80-20 division of funds between schools and central administration, she cautioned that such rigidity might have unintended consequences, including reduced funding for district-wide literacy interventions, professional development, or curriculum support outside the school budgets. Instead, Ms. Bhat proposed using increased budget transparency and assertive oversight to ensure adequate funding is driven to the school level.

Nathan A. Saunders, President, Washington Teachers' Union (WTU)

On behalf of the WTU, Mr. Saunders submitted a statement of general support of the goals of B20-309, including additional financial supplements for high-risk students, allocating funds directly to district schools, and stabilizing local school funding. Mr. Saunders also provided certain suggestions for amendments, including inserting an auditing requirement for local school budgets that includes the participation of local school advisory teams.

Elizabeth Davis, President Elect, WTU

In her submitted statement, Ms. Davis congratulated Councilmember Catania for his effort to address issues with the current uniform per student funding formula (UPSFF) and provided support for key components of the measure. For example, Ms. Davis provided her strong support for the addition of a poverty weight within the UPSFF and the general push to move back toward a weighted student formula for the distribution of funds within DCPS. She also supported efforts to institute budget stabilization at the school level while recognizing that even a 5 percent reduction can have a huge impact on a school budget.

With respect to the bill's efforts to provide greater budget autonomy for principals, Ms. Davis testified that this was a step in the right direction but that the measure should be amended to ensure coordination with the local school advisory teams. Ms. Davis also recommended that the Committee review related issues, such as improving the District's enrollment projection methodology and requiring greater transparency in DCPS's budget presentation to the public.

VI. IMPACT ON EXISTING LAW

B20-309 amends the following existing laws and regulations:

1. Amends the State Education Office Establishment Act of 2000, effective October 21, 2000 (D.C. Law 13-176; D.C. Official Code § 38-2601 *et seq.*) to establish a career and technical education grant program.
2. Amends section 6 of the Board of Education Continuity and Transition Amendment Act of 2004, Dec. 7, 2004, D.C. Law 15-211; D.C. Official Code § 38-2831) to include additional requirements regarding the annual DCPS budget submission to the Council.
3. Amends the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula for Public Schools and Public

Charter Schools Act of 1998, effective March 26, 1999 (D.C. Law 12-207; D.C. Official Code § 38-2901 *et seq.*) to add additional weights to the UPSFF, provide for principal autonomy within DCPS regarding school budgets, and update the UPSFF review process.

VII. FISCAL IMPACT

The Committee adopts the attached fiscal impact statement from the District's Chief Financial Officer.

VIII. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

- Section 2: Amends the State Education Office Establishment Act of 2000 to establish a career and technical education grant program.
- Section 3: Amends the Board of Education Continuity and Transition Amendment Act of 2004 to include new requirements for the annual DCPS budget submission to the Council, including narrative descriptions of proposed spending along restrictions on certain level of non-school based spending.
- Section 4: Amends the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula for Public Schools and Public Charter Schools Act of 1998 to add additional weights to the UPSFF, to direct the majority of such supplemental funds to the schools, to provide for principal autonomy within DCPS regarding school budgets, and to update the UPSFF review process.
- Section 5: States the applicability of section 4(b).
- Section 6: Adopts the fiscal impact statement in the committee report.
- Section 7: States the effective date.

IX. COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee on Education met on November 25, 2013 to consider B20-309, the "Fair Student Funding and School-Based Budgeting Amendment Act of 2013."

Chairperson Catania then moved the committee print for B20-309 with leave for staff to make technical and conforming amendments.

Committee members voting in favor:	X
Committee members voting against:	X
Committee members voting present:	X
Committee members absent:	X

Committee on Education
Draft Report on Bill 20-309

Chairperson Catania then moved the committee report for B20-309.

Committee members voting in favor:	X
Committee members voting against:	X
Committee members voting present:	X
Committee members absent:	X

X. ATTACHMENTS

1. B20-309 as introduced.
2. Written testimony
3. Fiscal Impact Statement.
4. Legal Sufficiency Determination
5. Comparative Print
6. Committee Print for B20-309.