

The background of the image is a blurred classroom scene. In the foreground, there are rows of wooden desks and metal chairs. The desks have some papers and small items on them. The chairs are blue. In the background, there are more desks, chairs, and some colorful decorations on the wall. A semi-transparent blue rectangle is overlaid on the center of the image, containing the text.

Public Education Funding Commission

April 28, 2025



Welcome from the Chair



Roll Call



Approval of Meeting Minutes

April 14th

Five Values

1. Adequate
2. Equitable
3. Flexible with guardrails
4. Transparency
5. Connecting student outcomes to funding

Parking Lot

Accountability and transparency	Guardrails
Acute treatment centers	Immersion schools
Behavioral and mental health services	LEA funding flexibility
Capital funding	Literacy and math improvements
Career & Tech Education	Pre-school/Early Learning
Community Schools	Referendum reform
Charter funding (i.e., tuition tax, capital funding)	Revenue (state and local)
Educator recruitment & retention	Transportation
Equalization	Wraparound services

Proposed Work Plan to Address Committee Member Questions

April 28 th	Formula revisions, discussion Committee consensus building	September 29 th	CTE; Immersion Schools; Overview of Guardrails (i.e. mental health professionals, class sizes, co-teachers, etc.); Commission Recommendations
May 5 th	Committee action	October 27 th	Equalization Revenue
May 19 th	If needed	November 10 th	Accountability and Transparency Literacy and Math Improvements
June 2 nd	Share Progress on Resolution Capital funding (presentation on other states) Transportation	January 12 th	Referendum Reform
July 14 th	Pre-school/early childhood	February 9 th	Redistricting/Christina (Redding Consortium presentation)
August 11 th	Wraparound Services and Community Schools Acute Treatment Centers/Behavioral mental health services Charter funding (i.e., tuition tax, capital funding)	March 9 th	Educator Recruitment and Retention

Agenda

Committee to discuss and provide additional direction to Committee Consultant on funding formulas.

PEFC Hybrid **Framework:**

- All school funding is equity-based
- Hold harmless provisions protect school stability
- Student needs calculated based on:
 - Ideal student-teacher ratios
 - Type of program in which student is enrolled
 - Student equity gaps

April 28th **Model:**

- One possible scenario under the PEFC Hybrid Framework
- Considers grade level, Special Ed and VoTech for the unit count
- Considers low-income and MLL status for the Opportunity Fund
- Anticipates PEFC direction on changes to the process

A blue-tinted background image showing a group of people in a meeting or workshop. A woman with glasses and a scarf is in the center, looking towards the camera. To her left, a man is looking off to the side. In the foreground, the back of a person's head is visible. The overall atmosphere is professional and collaborative.

Modeling the Proposed PEFC Framework

Inputs



Possible Funding Scenarios

All funding scenarios were modeled at the state-level and for 7 sample schools*

- Flat funding: 2024-25 level
- Moderate increase: Plus \$200 million
- AIR increase: Plus \$600 million
- Professional Judgment Panel increase: Plus \$1 billion

* Funding scenarios do not include local or federal funding. Equalization to be added once reassessment data is available.

What is in Each Funding Category?

- **Base**

- A Resource-based funding stream (formerly known as a Unit Count), based on a weighted formula, providing schools with authorization to charge the state for its share of a Unit/position.
- Funds the personnel costs required to open the doors at a school
- Includes building-level personnel: mental health counselors, drivers ed, nurses, instructional support positions, principals, administrative/clerical support
- Includes central office administration and district-wide support staff
- Accounts for approximately 80% of all current state spending
- Minimal state contribution to a Unit remains 70%

- **Opportunity**

- Flexible, student-based allocation created to support the greater needs of our most vulnerable students.
- Current 3% spending level (under the Opportunity Fund settlement) is insufficient

- **Flex**

- Non-personnel funding (although schools could choose to apply to personnel)
- Dollars to keep the lights on, outfit the classrooms, provide, curriculum, wrap-around services, etc.

Seven Sample Schools

- Brandywine High School (#190) – Brandywine School District
- Delcastle Technical High School (#80) – New Castle County Vo-Tech
- Fredrick Douglas Elementary (#762) – Seaford School District
- Ross (Lulu M.) Elementary School (#672) – Milford School District
- Stanton Middle School (#423) – Red Clay School District
- Warner Elementary School (#272) - Red Clay School District
- Charter School of Wilmington (#295)

Outputs

A blue-tinted background image showing a group of people in a meeting or workshop. A woman with glasses and a scarf is in the center, looking forward. To her left, a man is looking towards her. In the foreground, the back of a person's head is visible, looking towards the woman in the center. They appear to be sitting around a table with papers and a pen.

Funding Estimates with New Hybrid Model

Using an Average of the PJP and ECM Weights

	Current Formula	Hybrid Formula		
	2024-25 Funding Estimates	2024-25 Funding	AIR-ECM Funding	AIR-PJP Funding
Brandywine High School	\$9,700,000	\$11,255,202	\$18,885,048	\$24,462,612
Delcastle Tech H.S.	\$15,600,000	\$18,682,430	\$31,814,021	\$41,413,467
Fredrick Douglas Elementary	\$4,200,000	\$4,467,525	\$7,704,145	\$10,070,177
Ross (Lulu M.) Elementary School	\$7,200,000	\$7,018,242	\$10,971,413	\$13,861,257
Charter School of Wilmington	\$6,000,000	\$7,138,903	\$11,401,438	\$14,517,434
Stanton Middle School	\$6,300,000	\$7,261,534	\$12,708,342	\$16,690,063
Warner Elementary School	\$4,800,000	\$5,533,466	\$9,675,468	\$12,703,352

Funding Notes: Opportunity and Flex

- Future adjustments by the committee may include altering the weights for each student group
- The following weights were used in each of the models:

Low-Income	0.675
Multi-Language Learners	0.465
Special Education - Basic	2.34
Special Education - Intense	5.535
Special Education - Complex	5.535
Vocational - Education	1.78
Student/teacher ratios based on grade level	
Students experiencing homelessness	
Students In the foster care system	
Military and highly mobile students	

- These weights were an average of the weights used in the AIR study

Why the PEFC Approach?

- **Emphasizes equity**
 - additional weight funding for students with greater needs, such as low-income backgrounds, English learners, and students with disabilities.
- **Increased flexibility**
 - allows districts to allocate funds based on local priorities while ensuring accountability.
- **Enhanced transparency**
 - aims for clarity in how funds are generated and spent, reducing administrative burden.
- **Values-based**
 - creates a Delaware-specific solution guided by values of adequacy, equity, flexibility, transparency, and outcome linkage.
- **Holds Harmless**
 - Includes protections to ensure districts do not receive less funding during the transition to the new formula. Implementation will depend on available revenue.

Committee Consensus Building



Public Comment

Public Comment

- Members of the public are welcome to speak before the PEFC during the scheduled public comment period as noted on the publicly posted meeting agendas. Interested persons should:
 - (1) send their name, the name of the group they represent and the topic of their comment via **email to Anna Sullivan (asulliv@wested.org)**, ideally 7 days in advance of the meeting, to request to have their name put on the public comment list for the upcoming meeting;
 - OR (2) raise their hand during the meeting. Those who register ahead of time will be called on by the facilitator to provide public comment first, followed by those who raise their hand during the meeting.
- In order to provide all members of the public with an equal opportunity to speak before the PEFC, each individual is limited to two minutes, unless otherwise noted at the beginning of the meeting.
- Public comments received by DOE 7 days in advance will be sent to members with advance meeting materials via email. All written public comments will be included with the meeting minutes and publicly posted following each committee meeting.

Adjourn