

Prince William County Schools Budget Presentation

April 16, 2020

Questions Regarding \$5 Million Mobile Computing for Students Request:

1. Can the results of the telephone survey be shared with the Board of County Supervisors?

Response: Yes. (The phone survey provided in all home languages to High School families, indicated the need for a device for their High School student(s) totals a need for 10,352 devices.)

2. What mechanisms are in place to repair devices, control assets with taxpayers in mind?

Response: Every device being provided is asset tagged and assigned to a specific student. Each student family will acknowledge receipt of the device and their responsibility to return it. If not returned, families will be responsible for payment, similar to a textbook or musical instrument. All newer devices will also include remote tracking software.

3. Will a deposit be required to accept a tablet?

Response: No. (As mentioned in #2, all families will be assigned a specific asset tagged device and will be responsible for its return).

4. How much does PWCS have in contingency funds to fund these devices (Chairman Lateef said \$17 million)?

Response: PWCS has a fund balance policy that requires 1.5% of General Fund revenues to be set aside for emergency. At the end of FY 2019 this amount was \$17.7 M.

5. A Board member referenced a four-year State plan for providing laptops that was unsuccessful. What were the details of that plan and does this request accelerate the plan?

Response: These are two separate programs that have been conflated in this question. First, the referenced “unsuccessful state plan” was first implemented six years ago and is known as the Virginia e-Backpack Program. This program was well intentioned but, in hindsight, ultimately faced a number of challenges to be successful:

- i. The program was targeted by the State only for select schools chosen by the State.
- ii. Limited professional development support was provided by the State to teachers to accompany the device.
- iii. Providing devices alone does not improve accreditation.
- iv. The infrastructure to support devices was not robust enough, including WiFi and network bandwidth (was 2G).

- v. A comprehensive use of a learning management system was not incorporated into the rollout and the Student Information System was not cloud-based, nor had Microsoft 365 cloud been implemented.
- vi. The program lacked local building support.
- vii. The State selected the devices that had to be used and did not meet our specifications.

The four-year Digital Equity plan provided and presented to the School Board in January 2020 provides a comprehensive strategy to ensure equitable access to devices across the County within four years (was developed pre-COVID-19 impact). It includes the following components, built in part on lessons-learned from e-Backpack:

- i. First, the plan was based on principal, teacher, and student feedback. This included surveys, interviews, classroom visits and focus groups at all levels.
- ii. Second, the plan incorporated lessons-learned from a number of schools that are already implemented such programs on a pilot-basis.
- iii. Third, the infrastructure across PWCS has been significantly upgraded. All schools, as of this year, have 10G internet access and WiFi access points for all classrooms, and plans are in place to begin upgrades to 20G.
- iv. Fourth, the devices chosen will be of a high-quality, while still being economical. They will be Windows-based devices that include tracking software and remote management.
- v. Fifth, the plan includes use of a modern, industry-leading, and robust cloud-based learning management system that integrates into other cloud-based tools including The Hub (running on AWS) and Microsoft 365 (running on Azure).
- vi. Sixth, the plan as presented envisioned comprehensive training for administrators and teachers in how to best incorporate devices into classroom learning – to support teaching, not supplant it.

6. Where did the funding come from (in the Schools budget) to pay for the devices/laptops?

Response: The funding for the laptops came from two sources. The first source was a \$2.4M amount the Division receives every year for the purpose of buying computers. This is funded through the state’s sale of bonds through the Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA). The \$4.1 M was funded through equitable contributions from each school and central office departmental budget across the School Division. The funding from school and central office department flex funds (non-salary) is available as a result of the savings that are generated by the Division being closed. Flex funds are typically used for the purchase of technology and other instructional materials and supplies.

7. What are operational savings from school facilities being closed (Chairman Lateef mentioned facilities may be closed but Schools receiving less revenue due to decreased sales tax revenue, etc.)?

Response: It is the current belief that the utility and fuel accounts will generate \$7 to \$8 million dollars in savings during Division closure. However, these savings will be more than offset by reductions in revenues. Recall that the Division will have to absorb at least \$1.4M in revenue loss from the County in FY 2020 and as much as \$10M in lost sales tax revenue from the state in FY 2020.

8. How much has the Schools budget grown during the past ten (10) years?

Response:

FY 2010 adopted budget - \$785,893,698

FY 2020 adopted budget - \$1,346,994,568

This is a \$561,100,870 dollar increase which is equal to 5.5% average annual growth rate. Please recall that 2010 was during the great recession exaggerating the growth rate over the ten-year period. At FY 2020 funding levels, PWCS is still be below the inflation adjusted per pupil spending of FY 2007. FY 2021 funding levels are still in question.

9. What is the Schools’ teacher retention rate (Chairman Lateef said 92%)?

Response:

Licensed staff (not including admin) retention rate including retirements for SY 18-19

| Division | Retention % |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Arlington | 90.4 |
| Fairfax County Public Schools | 91.75 |
| Falls Church City Public Schools | 90.4 |
| Fauquier County Public Schools | 87.3 |
| Loudoun County Public Schools | 93.48 |
| Prince William County Public Schools | 89.4 |
| Stafford County Public Schools | 86% |
| Warren County Public Schools | 87% |

PWCS Licensed staff (not including admin) retention rate

| School Year | Retention % without Retirements | Retention % including Retirements |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2018-19 | 91.20 | 89.4 |
| 2017-18 | 91.43 | 89.7 |
| 2016-17 | 91.21 | 90.0 |

10. What is the percentage of teachers leaving the County to work for other jurisdictions?

Response: Historically, we have not captured this number. However, we do know that 28.4% of our licensed professional staff (excluding admin) reported leaving PWCS after the 2018-19 School Year for “Other employment.”

11. How many positions work or are located at the Kelly Leadership Center?

Response: We estimate that there are 356 employees that work at the KLC.

12. Are there discussions about moving high school graduation dates back to later in the summer?

Response: The high school principals, working with the Superintendent, already communicated that we are looking at a possible commencement date in early August 2020.

13. What is the long-term goal of where PWCS wants to be on the WABE Per Pupil Spending chart?

Response: Although the School Board has never set a target, as stated by the Chairman, we would like to be better than our current position of second to last on the WABE per pupil spending chart. The goal is to have funds sufficient to provide a world-class education for the children of Prince William County.

14. What is projected student enrollment growth for the next School year? Is it 522 students or 953 students (referenced slide #4 from Chairman Lateef’s presentation)?

Response: The numbers you cite from the chart in Dr. Lateef’s presentation disclosed the *actual* September 30 enrollment number for FY 2020 not the budgeted FY 2020 enrollment number. The budget to budget growth is 953.

15. What is PWCS student enrollment growth compared to other counties/jurisdictions in the WABE report? Is the County growing faster than other jurisdictions and more resources used to manage student growth in the CIP that is not captured in the Per Pupil Spending metric used in WABE?

Response: The attached table from the Washington Area Board of Education report details several approved fund expenditures. The first two columns detail the General (Operating) Fund and the Construction Fund. Of note is the Loudoun County Operating Fund. Loudoun County is approximately 8,000 students smaller than PWCS but has an Operating Fund budget that is \$180,893,173 million greater than Prince William’s. Per pupil expenditures in Loudoun County are \$15,241 and \$11,875 in Prince William. If Prince William received the funding sufficient to have a per pupil expenditure of \$15,241 the Division budget would

increase by \$310.2 million. The same calculation relative to Fairfax County would generate an additional \$384.1 million. (All numbers for this question are sourced from the FY 2020 WABE report).

Y 2020 Approved Fund Expenditures

| School Division | Operating Fund ¹ | Construction Fund | Debt Service ⁵ | Food Fund | Other Governmental Funds ² | Total Expenditures ³ |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Alexandria City | \$293,893,552 | \$36,829,355 | \$28,112,251 | \$10,831,477 | \$5,874,328 | \$375,540,963 |
| Arlington County | \$561,815,022 | \$105,323,495 | \$59,160,563 | \$10,728,000 | \$31,392,626 | \$768,419,706 |
| Fairfax County | \$2,997,355,697 | \$202,818,308 | \$200,612,683 | \$104,653,289 | \$41,825,197 | \$3,547,265,174 |
| Falls Church City | \$52,300,119 ⁴ | \$0 | \$8,347,486 | \$1,103,600 | \$2,419,126 | \$64,170,331 |
| Loudoun County | \$1,309,557,736 | \$181,500,500 | \$144,669,817 | \$35,128,649 | \$31,221,377 | \$1,702,078,079 |
| Manassas City | \$107,874,812 | \$3,000,000 | \$6,200,482 | \$4,169,583 | \$0 | \$121,244,877 |
| Manassas Park City | \$43,177,694 | \$0 | \$6,988,577 | \$1,987,392 | \$186,009 | \$52,339,672 |
| Montgomery County | \$2,778,009,810 | \$274,865,000 | \$154,899,000 | \$58,107,965 | \$30,581,998 | \$3,296,463,773 |
| Prince George's County | \$2,183,122,900 | \$211,627,000 | \$67,228,000 | \$74,272,815 | \$0 | \$2,536,250,715 |
| Prince William County | \$1,128,664,563 | \$87,039,323 | \$106,159,888 | \$51,595,000 | \$5,756,889 | \$1,379,215,663 |

¹ Funds for entitlement grants are included in Operating Funds, even for districts that do not include those expenditures in their operating funds.

² Includes Adult Education, Summer School, competitive grants and other. Numbers will not necessarily match the approved operating budget.

³ Governmental Funds only - excludes Proprietary and Fiduciary Funds.

⁴ For Fairfax County Public Schools district, the operating fund excludes transfers to other funds of \$32.3 million, textbook replacement reserve of \$6.6 million.

⁵ School Debt Service might not be appropriated in the local school divisions, for example, Manassas Park City Public Schools division.