

Mecklenburg County Public Schools

Fiscal Year 2015–2016 Proposed Operational Budget

February 4, 2015

Presented by James Thornton, Ed.D.

Investing in the Future of Mecklenburg County

Mission

Foster a culture of excellence where proud students and educators become the craftsmen of beautiful, quality work.



Budget Goals

Goal 1

- ▶ Promote high expectations and academic rigor and ensure that every student has access to multiple pathways to graduate and be fully prepared for post-secondary learning opportunities and a rewarding career.

Goal 2

- ▶ Promote effective educators by investing in human capital that will directly and positively impact student learning and achievement.

Goal 3

- ▶ Promote student personal growth so that each can become a responsible, contributing citizen.

Goal 4

- ▶ Promote community support and involvement in the schools by engaging parents and our community in education.

Goal 5

- ▶ Promote organizational efficiency and professionalism.



Key Points

- ▶ Excellence and Equity drive our daily decisions
- ▶ Budget is flexible to meet unanticipated or new priority needs
- ▶ The world will look a lot different for an entering kindergarten student than a rising senior—we need to prepare both for the opportunities that await
- ▶ High expectations for learning and investing in personnel are essential for continuous improvement
- ▶ Not everything can be funded and not everything can be funded at current levels
- ▶ Mecklenburg County Public Schools Economically Disadvantaged student population is significantly higher than the state average
 - F/R Lunch State Average = 37%; F/R Lunch MCPS average = 62%
- ▶ *The “whole child” is our focus*



Accomplishments

- ▶ On-Time graduation has improved to above the state requirement
- ▶ Dual enrollment credit has increased
- ▶ Advance Studies Diplomas have increased
- ▶ Higher percentage of middle school students successfully completing and receiving high school credit
- ▶ Integrated Arts with violins and piano at two elementary schools
- ▶ Biz Entrepreneurship Class at both high schools
- ▶ Summer school and after school enrichment programs
- ▶ Expansion and upgrades of instructional technology
- ▶ Expansion and upgrades of parent portal system
- ▶ So many more...



Challenges

- ▶ School systems across Virginia continue to be challenged in preserving quality in the face of continued funding reductions and mandated cost increases
- ▶ In FY 2010 our operating budget was \$50 million
- ▶ In FY 2015 our operating budget is \$47 million
- ▶ We are operating on \$3 million less than we did 6 years ago
- ▶ We have 74 fewer employees than we did 6 years ago



Challenges

- ▶ Attracting and retaining exceptional staff to meet the diverse needs of our students
- ▶ Shortage of math teachers
- ▶ 62% free and reduced lunch population
- ▶ Classrooms designed for 20th century learning strategies
- ▶ Antiquated facilities
 - lighting– heat– air
 - sewer– water
- ▶ We rank **135th, last in state**, in percentage of local effort for incentive programs and we rank **133th** in percentage of local effort for SOQ programs
- ▶ Yet we rank **64th** for the ability to pay locally out of 135 divisions
- ▶ And we rank **number 1** in the region for the ability to pay.
These numbers do not add up.



New Opportunities for 2015–2016

- ▶ Integrated Arts at Clarksville Elementary
- ▶ STEM program at South Hill Elementary
- ▶ Expansion of CTE at Advanced Knowledge Learning Center to include:
 - HVAC
 - Welding
 - High Performance Technology



Budget Notes

- ▶ Budgeted ADM for FY 16 is 4,350
- ▶ State revenues are based on the Governor's budget proposal, dated 12/17/14
- ▶ The budget development process compares expenditures and revenues to the approved 2014–2015 budget, which does not include supplemental appropriations.
- ▶ Assumes Health Insurance increase: \$520,056
- ▶ Increase in VRS 1%/1%: \$62,069



Budget Notes

- ▶ Assumes Teacher Pay Increase: \$857,189
- ▶ Assumes Instructional Aide Salary Scale Adjustment: \$146,191
- ▶ Assumes Speech Salary Scale Adjustment: \$31,082
- ▶ Assumes 14 new elementary and 9 new secondary teachers: \$1,145,492
- ▶ Assumes 2 new Special Education teachers and a psychologist: \$168,089
- ▶ Assumes 5 new aides: \$93,383
- ▶ Increase in CTE Dual Enrollment expenditures: \$195,000
- ▶ Increase in instructional materials and supplies: \$164,855
- ▶ Increase in required data collection and instructional remediation: \$296,000



Personnel Requests

- 2 teachers at Chase City Elementary
- 2 teachers at South Hill Elementary
- 1 teacher and 4 instructional aides at LaCrosse Elementary
- 3 teachers at Clarksville Elementary
- 6 teachers at Bluestone Middle School
- 2 teachers, reading and math specialist at Park View Middle
- 2 teachers and 1 instructional aide at Bluestone High School
- 5 teachers at Park View High School
- Two Special Education teachers and a School Psychologist
- One full-time athletic director (pilot at BHS)
- One transportation dispatcher



Expenditures – By Function

Function	FY15	FY16	Change	% of
Instruction	30,050,374	33,363,985	3,313,611	11.03%
Admin, Attend, & Health	1,585,627	1,613,076	27,449	1.73%
Pupil Trans.	3,461,907	3,712,261	250,354	7.23%
Maintenance	2,849,393	2,913,073	63,680	2.23%
Debt	867,218	867,218	–	–
Technology	1,768,338	2,112,406	336,833	19.05%
General Fund	40,582,858	44,574,784	3,991,926	9.84%
School Food	2,360,700	2,360,700	–	–
Federal	4,013,730	4,013,730	–	–
Overall Total	46,957,288	50,949,215	3,991,926	8.50%



Current Expenditures – By Object

<u>Object</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Personnel Svcs	26,374,929	55.21%
Employee Svcs	9,960,215	20.85%
Purchased Svcs	2,379,153	4.98%
Other Charges	2,133,150	4.47%
Materials & Supplies	1,893,574	3.96%
Joint Operations	3,478,098	7.28%
<u>Capital Outlay</u>	<u>1,553,429</u>	<u>3.25%</u>
	47,772,548	100.00%



Revenues – By Source

Source	Approved FY15	Proposed FY16	Dollar Change	Percent Change	Percent of Total
State	25,808,695	25,735,954	(72,741)	(.002%)	50.5%
County	12,932,714	16,829,611	3,896,262	30.1%	33.0%
Recov'd Costs	1,841,479	2,009,219	167,740	9.1%	3.9%
Food Service	2,360,700	2,360,700	–	–	4.6%
Federal	4,013,730	4,013,730	–	–	7.8%
	47,060,188	50,956,450	3,991,926	8.50%	



Summary

- ▶ This budget may seem radical to some
- ▶ The alternative is risk of instructional quality (or more drastic cuts to an organization operating \$4 million below where it did 6 years ago)
- ▶ We face sequestration reductions for the next 8 years with little possibility of increased funding from other sources



Summary

- ▶ It makes perfect sense for the parents and community to want the schools to be back where they were 6 years ago.
- ▶ What does not make sense is to do that with more rigorous tests that have a higher cut score than the old tests and to do it with less teachers and staff and \$4 million dollars less in the budget.



Upcoming

- ▶ The School Board will have a public hearing to seek input from stakeholders.
- ▶ The School Board will make revisions to this proposal and will submit their adopted budget to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.

