



ont of  
P]vv]vPU  
e to be  
μ P š (]  
sented  
d  
the  
tion  
•š]v / ^ [•  
ail

negative impact on certain parts of the district, namely east Austin. As a Task Force, we could not ignore that where and how the district solves its structural budget deficit will speak the loudest as to its commitment to finally address decades of disparate impact on the most vulnerable parts of our community.

In very rare and unique instances are large institutional systems confronted with a crisis that simultaneously presents the opportunity for bold, holistic, systemic and transformative change. transformation that will change the educational, and therefore life, trajectory of all of our children, not just a must seize this opportunity to address the structural budget deficit in a way that revisions the delivery of education for every one of our students in a way that materially improves educational attainment. To stabilize the budget crisis and solve the budget deficit in a fair, and generational way, will require the closure of schools and re-boundaries. Critical to this process will be breaking every vertical team. We need for access to specialized or magnet programs.

Our work are as follows:

We were able to come to consensus around challenging and sensitive issues by using the following criteria to guide our decision-making. This included a foundational impact on student achievement and equity were the two most

their

State Representative  
Kevin Garcia

## THE CHALLENGE

In June 2018, the Board of Trustees approved a budget that uses \$30 million of the district fund balance, or 2.8% of the district (entire) fund balance of \$1.08 billion, for the 2019-2020 fiscal year.



More information about the BSTF membership and meetings can be found at [www.austinisd.org/advisorybodies/bstf](http://www.austinisd.org/advisorybodies/bstf)

## THE PROCESS

Through a series of eleven-hour public meetings, additional subcommittee meetings and meetings with key staff, the task force evaluated and deliberated over roughly 150 options.

The Task Force first established a list of [criteria and guiding principles](#) against which each option would be assessed. While members acknowledged these criteria are somewhat subjective and difficult to measure, they represent an attempt to standardize the evaluation as much as possible to ensure each option received the same, comprehensive level of review.

From the onset, members committed to seeking input from and bringing back information to their respective communities. Time for public comment was structured into meetings and written feedback was compiled and shared with members electronically. To invite further input from the community, the Task Force participated in the online platform [MindMixer](#), which facilitated dialogue running parallel to their work.

Early on, members shared concerns about the implications of their work on equity in the district and identified the need to gain a shared understanding of the term. They began with the definition adopted by the district from the [National Equity Project](#). Through small group work that was brought back to the Task Force as a whole, members determined that three main concepts encapsulated what equity looks like: all students have access to rich resources and opportunities, well-maintained, inviting physical environments, and culturally responsive/engaging climate and instruction.

The initial approach was for key district departments to present to the Task Force how they spend their budgets, options for reducing expenses and what they saw as outstanding needs. Shortly into this pattern of presentations and discussion, the chairs determined that this approach would not support members fulfilling their charge in the time allotted. They developed an expedited approach and requested that the district provide members with a list of budget savings and revenue options, while departments continued to share their presentations with the Task Force electronically.

The district provided a list of measures AISD had considered in the past, those that have been implemented and other ideas that emerged out of efficiency studies and research into best practices. The list was by no means comprehensive and many of the options were blunt tools that were intended to act as a starting point for discussions.

Members poured over the list to identify what was missing in terms of potential savings and revenue options and outstanding needs. To allow for a deeper exploration of how the options might be tailored to the needs of AISD, the Task Force divided into subcommittees: Revenue and Programs, Efficiencies and Departments and Staffing and Compensation (note that a Contracts and Procurement subcommittee had formed and completed its work prior to

the formation of these three subcommittees and water absorbed into the Efficiencies and Departments subcommittee).

The subcommittees met separately and set up meetings with district staff to better understand various aspects of the budget and the implications of options. They narrowed and refined the list of options and developed options of their own, which were shared at the regular BSTF meetings. Members went through two rounds of voting, further refining options in order to

possible



Auxiliary Options: The district could look to a fair bidding group that has experience with large school districts.

### Eliminate property tax exemptions for historic properties

Level of Support: 96%

Financial Impact: \$1M

Context: AISD currently offers a tax exemption to a number of historic homes and buildings in Austin. The intent of the tax exemption is to make it easier for property owners to maintain the historic character of their properties. The City of Austin, however, does not require these property owners to restore or rehabilitate their properties in order to be eligible for the tax break and unlike most cities in Texas, the tax exemption is not limited to a number of years. The assumption is that maintaining the historic character of neighborhoods maintains or adds to the value of neighboring properties, which would positively impact revenue.

Rationale: Maintaining property tax exemptions has no bearing on student achievement. Given the district to eliminate this exemption, the properties would still benefit from the tax exemption the City has in place under current policy.

Some public opposition can be anticipated so the district would need to communicate its intentions and provide opportunities for public input before implementing the change.

While this option could potentially introduce risks to current and/or future bond projects that are or might be accelerated and supported by Preservation Austin and the City of Austin Landmark Commission, it is hoped that with adequate engagement, these entities will understand will continue to support th



Rationale: The only criteria meaningfully impacted by this option is financial. Infusing more dollars into the Maintenance and Operations fund has the potential to positively impact the other criteria.

Resources:

[AISDBABS Subsidy](#)

Pursue the possibility of generating additional revenue by increasing the availability of child care at district campuses and work sites

Level of Support: 96%

Financial Impact: \$6,000 per site

Context: The district offers childcare at twelve locations (Kiker, Mills, Williams, Hill, Wooldridge, Winn, Casis, Mathews, Pease, Patton, Highland Park and Lee). These facilities have been nominally profitable v roughly \$31k total in FY 2016 and \$72k in FY2017

better position to negotiate contracts for events such as SXSW to capture revenue for the general fund.

Safeguards: The plan should ensure specific campuses do not bear undue staff burden when sharing proceeds. In some instances, particular schools provide significant manpower and/or administrative to accommodate the use of the campus. In those instances, the district would need to ensure they are compensated for that effort so the incentive is not being taken away. Essentially, in some cases keeping 50% of revenue would be appropriate, in other cases the campus might keep a very small token contribution if the revenue reflects income that incurred no administrative overhead.

Dissenting Concerns: This option has a potentially high administrative burden. If acted upon, it should be carefully studied and planned out including a cost-benefit analysis.

### Implement district provided, tuition based extended day program until 6:00 or 6:30 for all elementary school campuses where not currently available

Stratify tuition fees based on income thresholds

Level of Support: 92%

Financial Impact: The program would be designed to be cost neutral but would help the district compete with charter schools, potentially boosting enrollment and bringing in more revenue.

Rationale: Quality afterschool programs have a positive impact on student achievement. There are currently gaps in afterschool offerings as grants run out and funding sources are inconsistent across campuses. There are also disparities in the quality of programming available with some offerings being highly enriching and others less so. Ensuring every elementary campus had highly enriching after school programming would increase equity across the district since some families can afford to pay for extracurricular enrichment while others cannot.

Resources: Pflugerville ISD extended day program <http://www.pfisd.net/Page/7025>

### Move investments into higher yield vehicles so long as it does not threaten the

Level of Support: 88%

Financial Impact: \$200K

Context: AISD is currently in a strong financial position and is able to easily meet its financial commitments. The rating allows AISD to borrow at a lower cost and makes it possible for the district to pass a \$1.05 billion bond as it did in 2017, to fund improvements to its facilities and technology, without increasing the tax rate.

Rationale: Higher yield vehicles presumably introduce greater risk. Since the Facilities Master Plan is critical to its ability to fund future bonds. The financial impact of this option mitigates the added risk so long as the district is confident the higher yield vehicles will not compromise its AAA bond rating.

### Sell services to charter schools, other districts and other organizations providing that the participating departments have the existing capacity to do so

Level of Support: 80%

Financial Impact: TBD

Context: The Task Force learned that the High Schools Office is in negotiations with Rock  
ISD to provide some administrative capabilities. The district has skilled personnel who could  
manage RRISD programs within their existing AISD responsibilities with little to no additional  
effort.

Explore the use of SB 1882 opportunities to gain approximately \$600,000 in funding per campus, providing that at least the following safeguards are in place:

- x The community served is involved (parents, teachers, CACPTA)
- x Campus practices do not exclude students requiring special education services
- x Disciplinary policies and procedures are aligned with those of AISD
- x The school is integrated into its vertical team
- x Include the right to cancel the contract with 30 days of notice
- x Ensure teachers that work under these agreements have the same protections as other AISD teachers, such as year contracts
- x Schools that exercise this option should offer varied programming and not all be STEM oriented

If the district pursues these opportunities, members would like to see the district ~~report~~ the



CE μ /d[• }•š vAPZ uō CE (} CE /d[• ]vš CE v o v Æš CE v o μ• CE•X  
v v v o CE (} CE šZ ]•š CE ] š[• μ š}}v o À]•}}v X

Resources:

2017-18 PEIMS district financial budget reports:

[https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/school.finance/forecasting/financial\\_reports/1718\\_FinBudRep.html](https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/school.finance/forecasting/financial_reports/1718_FinBudRep.html)

## Optimize maintenance spending

- x Prioritize the most expensive maintenance items across the district for removal or replacement through I&S funds as part of an annual evaluation. Clearly explain to taxpayers the tax costs to maintain vs. replace.
- x Establish a districtwide facility equity scorecard and apply to each student facility for use in public view.
- x Prioritize maintenance and I&S work based on the scorecard with a focus on every campus being inviting.
- x Consider creating outsourced citywide contracts with fair wage partners for maintenance work vs. incremental staffing.

Level of Support: 92%

Financial Impact: TBD

Rationale: AISD outspent the average of its peers in maintenance costs by nearly \$15 million in SY 2016-17 (The most recent year of data currently on TEA website as of this writing). At the same time, there is an overwhelming sense that most communities feel their school is not adequately maintained.

About 30% of the roughly \$10M annual cost of maintenance labor was spent at four district sites, and about 30% more was spent at 15 of 136 local. Prioritizing those sites for removal or replacement could in turn reduce the recurring annual cost of maintenance labor by up to 60%. Since the district keeps 100% of the property tax revenue from the I&S tax rate yield while it keeps just under half the dollars it collects for the M&O tax yield, it effectively costs taxpayers half as much to pay for maintenance out of the I&S fund.

The facility equity scorecard would be in response to the belief that cosmetic appearance (wall hangings, paint, etc.) has a psychological impact on students, teachers and parents. The intent is that every student at every campus believes their school is inviting and well maintained without the need of PTAs to subsidize. The rating could easily be accomplished by adding question on the annual Parent, Student and Teacher Surveys about the visual and functional quality of their school. The maintenance team could then respond to and report back the work they do to address deficiencies.

The district could also potentially save costs by contracting fair wage partners to provide quality work, while having increased capacity to rapidly address campus issues.

Safeguards: Equity should also be a priority when determining the order of facilities receiving attention.

Dissenting Concerns: Outsourcing has the potential to lead to an inferior product and poorer treatment of employees and fewer employment protections.

Resources:

AISD Work Orders:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/13vOITpZ3Sgqf4fdfyBdBAb9CviKJm0C52pGTuQKxk4/edit>

AISD peer comparisons:





program or partnership was beyond the scope of their work and expertise. This recommendation was developed instead to outline what the district can offer more focused programming with the end goal of ensuring that demonstrable, positive student outcomes are at the center of decisionmaking.

The DMGroup is currently working with the district to strengthen its ability to demonstrate the effectiveness of both in-house and external partner programs. What is key for the Task Force is that this work result in standard operating procedures for sunseting programs that do not meet expectations.

Rationale: AISD has many internal and external partner-based programs that aim to accomplish

structure the time of adults providing these services, simultaneously saving money and getting better outcomes. This can be done not by taking service minutes away from students but instead by standardizing time staff members spend serving students, which research shows can vary anywhere between 30-70%.

One of the challenges identified by parents and teachers on the committee is meeting the district's goals. While these plans with fidelity, it often results in mediation where the district must then commit to expensive compensatory services to avoid even more expensive legal action. The bottom line is AISD outspends its peers in Special Education but is not necessarily able to boast better outcomes. More than anything there needs to be consistency, increased competency and greater equity in the delivery of these services.

Using FY2017 financial data, the AISD Special Education allotment from the state was \$55M while district expenses totaled \$93M.

Safeguards: The goal is to be more effective and equitable and not a budget reduction strategy.

Auxiliary Options: The district needs to increase training to support more inclusion and less pull outs and interventions for struggling learners. AISD has not had the delivery of progressive Special Education.

Resources:

For FY2017 Special Education student count is 8,647 (See TEA Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR), page 18:

[https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?\\_service=marykay&year4=2017&year2=17&debug=0&single=N&title=2017+Texas+Academic+Performance+Reports&program=perfreport.perfma st.sas&prgopt=2017%2Ftapr%2Ftapr.sas&ptype=P&district&search=district&namenum=Austin&district=227901](https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&year4=2017&year2=17&debug=0&single=N&title=2017+Texas+Academic+Performance+Reports&program=perfreport.perfma st.sas&prgopt=2017%2Ftapr%2Ftapr.sas&ptype=P&district&search=district&namenum=Austin&district=227901)

[Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most from School District Budgets](#)

Undertake a complete review of the use of interventions and consider reduction in expenditures

Level of Support: 88%

Financial Impact: TBD

Rationale: Studies have shown that the use of interventions cannot necessarily be linked to improved student outcomes. Interventions are widely used across AISD and come at a high cost. The district should be able to demonstrate with research and data from its own practices, a connection between the use of interventions and improved student outcomes should limit or discontinue the practice. Anecdotal evidence indicates that interventions may be used as a way to avoid the identification of students needing special education services. This is cost avoidance that comes at both a high fiscal cost and the expense of students not getting the individualized education plan they might need.

Safeguards: The goal is to be more effective and equitable and not a budget reduction strategy.

Dissenting Concerns: AISD needs to provide these services and must be able to identify the students needing them.

Resources:

[Evaluation of Response to Intervention Practices for Elementary Reading: Executive Summary](#)

## Centrally manage current uncoordinated district activities including professional development, travel, entertainment, etc.

Level of Support: 92%

Financial Impact: TBD

Rationale: **Spending Money Wisely** The District Management Group argued powerfully that professional development especially tends to be hidden all over in ISD budgets: travel and registration fees, contracted services, salaries and stipends, substitute costs, etc. The Task Force found AISD to be no exception. According to DMGroup, the first step to bringing down costs is gaining a full understanding of how much Professional Development is actually costing by bringing scattered expenses into single budget categories. Ultimately their recommendations can even help districts ensure a stronger connection between Professional Development and student achievement.

The Task Force has also discovered that the types of management or controls on travel, entertainment and purchasing that many in the private sector have long learned to live with, do not exist in AISD. The increased use of cards could help address this.

Resources:

[Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most from School District Budgets](#)

## Implement change in budget methodology to account for projected vacancy savings for wages, salaries, and most benefits

Continue to budget for health-related benefits at 100% per FTE.

Level of Support: 92%

Financial Impact: Revenue Neutral

Context: AISD budgets wages, salaries, and benefits for positions (FTEs) assuming 100% staffing

o}• l }v•}o] š • Z}}o•U Œ Œ Á }μv Œ] •U v %o Z •  
busing with these necessary conditions

80% of members felt the following conditions should be satisfied:

- x Elementary, middle and high schools throughout the district must be considered
- x Boundaries should optimize permanent capacity of schools, considering current and forecasted future enrollment patterns, including some transfers, and avoiding over enrollment and underenrollment
- x District must engage community in conversation about boundary changes and the need for all AISD schools to be great
- x Create fairly resourced and equitable schools across the district and promote them

76% of members felt the following conditions should be satisfied:

- x School closures, consolidations and boundary adjustments should increase the socio economic and cultural diversity at schools and should be balanced east and west of Lamar

72%...

- x Closures cannot occur exclusively in schools that are currently underutilized, in part due to small population in district created attendance zones
- x Schools to remain open must have equitable, rigorously culturally-responsive programs
- x Current Vertical Teams should be assessed for assignment based on new boundaries, with the intent to promote the boundary priorities through the high school level
- x If school consolidations are to be considered it must be...





Context: Six elementary schools in AISD (Pease, Barton Hills, Bryker Woods, Mathews, Lee and Maplewood) maintain 6th grade on campus.

Rationale: This can lead to smaller class sizes than is efficient at the middle school level and a lack of age appropriate equipment, resources and facilities. Moving the district to a consistent treatment of 6th graders by sending them to their zoned middle school (O. Henry and Kealing) could bring student to teacher ratios closer to the target, thereby increasing efficiency. The baseline savings is estimated at \$67K annually or 1.0 FTE, but it is likely greater if all efficiencies are considered.

Safeguards: This decision should be driven by the Academics Department to determine if the data shows an educational difference between 6th graders housed in elementary vs. middle school campuses.

### Partner with developers to build affordable, family friendly, and workforce housing or related services on unused AISD properties using 99 year leases or a land banking approach

Preference should be given to AISD teachers and staff, families who left AISD due to gentrification, and families with school aged children. Partnering with the City, Foundation Communities and other nonprofits, as well as commercial developers should be considered.

Level of Support: 84%

Financial Impact: Has potential to be a new revenue source or at the very least, help boost enrollment

Rationale: AISD is one of the larger landowners in the city with approximately 2,100 acres or 3.3 square miles of land

As the district considers consolidations and closures, it must also decide the fate of the properties it takes offline. Schools are a major community asset so the district needs to ensure that any community that stands to lose its neighborhood school can gain an alternative asset or resource.

Not only could these properties be a source of revenue, they could also help address enrollment challenges by making it easier for families to stay or return to their neighborhoods. It could also allow teachers and staff to live in the neighborhoods where they work, which can strengthen relationships with students and families and have a positive impact on recruitment and retention.

The use of 99 year leases or land banking would ensure that as the city grows and changes over time, the district will maintain the option of returning some of its land to educational purposes. Once land is developed it is very difficult to acquire the 4 12 Tf 1 0 a44(ear)-6( )-2(leas(6, )-2(( )-2(b)4



Auxiliary Options: These should not just be apartments/multi family. Families should have choices of varying housing type and ownership pathways.

Dissenting Concerns: The District is not a Realtor. Developers are about making money for their own benefit, which may not be in the interest of the District.

Resources:

<https://www.communityprogress.net/landbankingfaq-pages449.php>

Update the Magnet school model by investing in every campus equitably to build great community schools

AIISD should reevaluate transporting students across the city for specialty programs and re invest the incremental funding to make middle schools and high schools across the district equally effective

Rationale: District provides fantastic opportunities for those enrolled. Without magnets, parents worry their child will miss out on important technology, language, and arts education, and many students believe their future is less bright going to their local campus.

This is the issue the Task Force wishes to see the district confront by thinking differently about the magnet model in this modern age. Several members whose kids attend magnets indicated that they would not be sending their kids to magnets if they felt their neighborhood school provided comparable opportunities. Members expressed a number of reasons for their discomfort with the current magnet model:

- x District's implementation and administration of magnet schools and specialty campuses.
- x Magnets are serving to divide local communities since models do not integrate students and doing so would unfairly burden neighborhood students by setting the bar higher to be guaranteed acceptance into UT or other programs based on class rank.
- x Neighborhood schools have their most academically advanced students leave the community for magnets
- x Magnet programs lack adequate diversity despite efforts to address the problem
- x Comprehensive schools with over 1,000 students should be able to support specialized/advanced art, music, or technology classes
- x Selectively offering opportunities to certain groups of students as though such opportunities are not suitable for all students is problematic
- x Magnets continue to benefit only a select group of students, similar to charter schools
- x The magnet model prevents resources from reaching a critical mass of students who are typically minorities, English Language Learners, and/or receive Special Education services
- x Magnet students' standardized STAAR scores mask under

district to make those opportunities more universally available and truly practice the belief that all students have the ability to thrive given such opportunities.

Auxiliary Options: The Task Force voted on alternative options to this option below, however one member suggests that if the above recommendation is not advanced then the district could consider spreading the magnet schools out geographically across the m







Austin ISD should evaluate workloads across the district including central departments to determine appropriate workload for given roles before making changes to staff ratios

Level of Support: 96%

Financial Impact: TBD

Context: This option ties in with the conversation about secondary planning periods and the 6 of 8 model.

Rationale: This kind of analysis at both central and campus level would be appropriate before acting on changes to campus staffing allocations. If the district expects to make good decisions around staffing levels or how much planning time is needed, there needs to be a better understanding of expectations around standard workloads and compensation.

The evaluation should include core vs. non-core teachers, reductions in central departmental/functions according to enrollment, etc. A time study of counselors in particular would be helpful as there are many anecdotal stories of their time being used for tasks other than counseling.

This type of evaluation could also inform decisions around weighted student allocations for special populations such as ELLs, students receiving special education services, etc. This would help ensure the district allocates funds equitably based on students and their specific needs.

For example, if we had a clearer understanding of the additional time commitment associated with certain positions which positions might need additional weights.

Certain items should be examined in the future by creating accurate savings estimates and providing a cost-benefit analysis to clearly understand impacts before implementing.

Rationale: It is estimated that the cost of a single new hire for an urban school district is upwards of \$20K. AISD has a 14% annual turnover rate across approximately 1,800 employees, which can cost AISD up to \$33 million annually when factoring costs such as recruitment, hiring and training. When employees leave the district after just a few years, the district does not see a full return on its investment.

In particular, teacher turnover has a negative impact on student achievement. Since teacher effectiveness is a high predictor of student success and teacher effectiveness is generally not the highest in the first few years of teaching, the importance of reducing teacher turnover becomes self-evident.

Teacher turnover also has a negative impact on equity as AISD sees higher turnover rates in its



resources to accomplish transformative work. Furthermore, the membership of those bodies would have to be revisited if they were to take on this work, as the Staffing Guidelines committee is comprised only of central and campus administrators and the BFAC is largely comprised of parents with just one teacher at the table.

Auxiliary Options: The district could create a rubric or scoring as part of how applicants are selected so there is transparency. Strong consideration should be given to board appointments/approval of members and an appropriate balance of staff, community, parents should be attained.

Dissenting Concerns: This is a lot to ask individuals to commit to, particularly considering the district continues to do what it wants in spite of the work of Advisory Bodies like the BSTF.

### The district should manage operational expenditures toward peer averages while maintaining a focus on Community, Equity & Classroom

Level of Support: 88%

Financial Impact: A focus on Plant Maintenance and Operations, Transportation and Data Processing could render an eventual savings of \$32 million.

Rationale: AISD outspends peer averages in most categories. The focus here is on devising strategies for the district to work its way toward peer averages; this should not be a race to the bottom but an intentional trek toward the middle.

The Task Force acknowledges that peer comparisons have their limitations as one size does not fit all. For this reason, the district should look at both spending per student and spending as a percentage of total budget and should take into consideration district size, demographics and the distinction between rural/urban. All these elements should be used to determine the appropriate benchmark comparison for various functions in the budget.

There are likely areas where the district out-spends its peers for valid reasons, because we have different values or priorities. That is acceptable and welcome but the crux of the issue is that the district should be able to point to those areas with a compelling case as to why we are justifiably different and should be able to show how those extra dollars are resulting in better

services and security were left out as an acknowledgement that our values support greater investment in those areas, particularly if they are linked to increasing equity in outcomes. That being said, there should be an emphasis on ensuring that as spending is further from teachers and the classroom, the district needs to be ensuring that both data and teacher feedback can back up the effectiveness of the spending.

mitigated as new facilities come online and old ones are potentially phased out through consolidations.

Dissenting Concerns: Due to the complexities that every district has in accounting, comparing ourselves to peer averages is troublesome.

While peer averages can be considered, they should not be considered the "gold standard."

Lowering our expectations to match surrounding districts will surely prevent AISD from reinventing the urban school experience.

Resources:

[Peer Comparison Presentation 07302018](#)

The district should establish a uniform to peer-based staffing ratios and expenditures at Central Administration

- x Base Central Administration staff ratios on peer district comparisons and total student population
- x Establish a baseline of staff included in Central Administration for census in which roles are included in this definition
- x Establish a 3-year attrition-based plan to meet stated ratios
- x Utilize targeted functional limits and reassignment of roles to get there
- x



- x Determining which renovations are necessary at Southfield for remaining staff vs. those that are nice to have

We are not currently v ^ E ] š } Z À \_ μ P š v À ] Œ } v u  
Safeguards: This should only be done assuming it will not create additional challenges to serving children and communities effectively. There is an interest in a trial or pilot of this approach to provide meaningful insight on effectiveness and efficiency, however, the option is time-sensitive as renovations are currently underway.

It is understood that some operational functions need to be centralized and back office  
iency, hooooooooo912 0 n BT /F4 12 Tf 1 0 0 1 216.35 y be doly



have to allocate partial roles to one individual, e.g. one employee may be allocated as ½ teacher and ½ counselor.

Rationale: Many members were ambivalent about this option. While it did not make it out of subcommittee as an official recommendation, members chose to include it in the final survey to see where everyone stands.

It does not seem reasonable that a school with 450 students should have the same assistant principal allocations as a school with 1298 students. In reality, the smaller campuses are likely using those allocations for different positions.

Safeguards: Garza should not be included in the small school staffing model as it provides an alternative for the entire district and staff there provide online modules for the entire district.

Dissenting Concerns: Small schools already lack economies of scale and cannot offer many of the same benefits of a larger school. Reducing the allocations would create additional challenges for those campuses and have a negative impact on equity. The impacts of this option could be further studied after boundaries and consolidations are addressed and the district moves away from a very small school model.

The district should look at alternative staffing models, but must also simultaneously consider the impacts to equity and support at small campuses. This should not be hurried for the 2019 school year.

### Eliminate cell phone stipends and negotiate with cell phone providers for affordable data plans for staff, with staff providing their own device and coverage

Level of Support: 96%

Financial Impact: 209K

Context: Currently 428 staff receive a monthly stipend of \$60. Historically, AISD provided devices and plans for their staff before cell phones and data plans were ubiquitous. The district moved to stipends as the most effective way to compensate staff for the use of their personal devices.

Rationale: While employers may have the responsibility to provide their staff with the tools needed to perform their jobs, work related data puts an inconsequential burden on a modern cell plan. Furthermore, those who are required to be instantly reachable tend to be more highly compensated for their role. Ideally the district would limit hidden costs of programs such as the cell phone stipends as it is an administrative burden and likely has a trivial impact on recruitment and retention.

Safeguards: Any elimination of cell phone stipends for bus drivers, teachers, SROs etc. should be carefully studied for safety implications.

Resources:

[AISD Cell Phone Stipends](#)

### AISD should establish a rigorous process to factually and fairly evaluate all aspects of big decisions, such as staffing changes

Level of Support: 92%

Financial Impact: TBD

Identify and implement best practices for effective decisionmaking including:

- x Analysis of potential outcomes, pros, cons, who is affected, who opposes, who supports

- x Fiscal analysis across all ~~hds~~ for any proposal, including implementation cost
- x Methodology to consistently measure and review outcomes

Rationale: Policymakers and district leaders will benefit from having this information as they make decisions. Analysis as described above ~~will~~ bring clarity to the dialogue while also increasing and public understanding of the challenges and potential solutions. Awareness of all potential implications will help with prioritization of budget reduction efforts. Increasing understanding and ~~visibi~~ of the financial impact is particularly important.

Dissenting Concerns: The leadership team should have good ~~decision~~ making processes or they can't be true leaders. Making that decision