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Building the Foundation for the Future

BPS High Quality Student Experience

- rigorous & culturally affirming learning experiences
- supportive network of caring adults
- wellness & enrichment

physical spaces that support learning
Building the Foundation for the Future

More inclusive school communities will help close the opportunity gaps for our Black and Brown students and provide a continuum of services to meet the needs of all students, especially our Students with Disabilities and Multilingual Learners.

The work over the next 5 years require transformational shifts to the way we currently operate.

- Reimagine school funding and transition away from Weighted Student Funding
- Make historic investments to transform all BPS schools to support inclusive education opportunities
- Shift the BPS physical footprint to better support the High-Quality Student Experience
## Inclusive Education Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Planning Year FY24</th>
<th>Year 1 FY25</th>
<th>Year 2 FY26</th>
<th>Year 3 FY27</th>
<th>Year 4 FY28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phased Implementation</td>
<td>Inclusion Planning Teams formed at all School</td>
<td>Implement in K0, K1, K2, 7, 9</td>
<td>Implement in 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10</td>
<td>Implement in 3, 4, 11, 12</td>
<td>Sustain implementation at all grade levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future investments

**Building the Foundation for the Future**
# FY25 Budget Process

## Building the Foundation for the Future

### SCHOOL COMMITTEE BUDGET PROCESS
- **Sep**: Initial budget presentation
- **Oct**: Department and Division Reviews
- **Nov**: Budget Reviews & Revisions
- **Dec**: Budget Reviews & Revisions
- **Jan**: Budget Reviews & Revisions
- **Feb**: First Budget Proposal
- **Mar**: SC Budget Vote

### CITY COUNCIL BUDGET PROCESS
- **Feb 7**: First Budget Proposal
- **Mar 27**: SC Budget Vote

### CENTRAL OFFICE BUDGET DEVELOPMENT
- **Investment Requests**
- **Department and Division Reviews**
- **Budget Reviews & Revisions**

### SCHOOL BUDGET DEVELOPMENT
- **IPT Plans Developed**
- **IPT Plans Reviewed**
- **IPT Staffing Allocations**
- **IPT Budget Feedback**
- **Projections and Budget Development**
- **Budgets Released**
- **Budget Reviews**
- **Budget Revisions**
# Budget Presentations and Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, February 7:</strong></td>
<td>Overall FY25 Budget Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, February 15:</strong></td>
<td>Budget Hearing: Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, March 4:</strong></td>
<td>Budget Hearing: Central Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, March 20:</strong></td>
<td>Final Budget Review Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, March 27:</strong></td>
<td>School Committee FY25 Budget Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April – June:</strong></td>
<td>City Council Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2024:</strong></td>
<td>City Council FY25 Budget Vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need more information: [BostonPublicSchools.Org/Budget](https://www.BostonPublicSchools.Org/Budget)

Questions and Comments?
Team Based Approach for FY25 School Budgets

For FY25, BPS is transitioning from Weighted Student Funding (WSF) to new system to allow our Inclusion Planning work to happen first.

- Provided Schools with a baseline budget: Used existing Fund 100 Allocation from FY24
- Classroom needs assessment: Increased or decreased based on changes in the number or type of classrooms
- Investment in our highest need students: Increased funding for Inclusive Education and changes in needed ESL and Special Education Services
- Targeted investment in schools with increasing enrollment: Allowed schools with increasing enrollment to move hold harmless funds from ESSER to Fund 100
FY25 Budget $81 Million Dollar Investments

New Investments from City:

- **School-directed Investments** for our highest needs students ($30M)
- **Planning Beyond ESSER** ($6M) – Equitable Literacy, Student Supports, Capital, etc.
- **Building our Foundation**: Universal Pre-K ($11M), BTU Collective Bargaining Agreement from ESSER ($17M)
- **Increased Costs**: Facilities ($11M), Transportation ($12M), Extended Learning Time Costs ($8M), Food Services ($4M), Other ($9M)

Cost Savings:

- **Efficiencies in Central Office** Budgets (−$17M)
- **Classroom Consolidation and Reconfigurations** (−$10M)
School Directed Investments
FY25 Implementing Inclusive Ed (Planning Year)

School-Based Inclusion Planning Teams (IPT): Teams of educators, families, and partners who collaborate to make recommendations regarding their schools’ vision and implementation plan for inclusive education through ongoing facilitated reflection and discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year 23-24 Implementation Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPT Process: Each school assessed their current status and created a vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June-October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Education Plan Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Process: Review of current staffing to align to student needs (Realignment Plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November-December</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Review of IPT Realignment Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December - January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final English Learner Education (ELE) Program Proposals Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with school leaders, finance, specialized services, HR, &amp; OMME, to review and balance proposed budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Budget and Staffing Checkpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning in May</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School-Directed Investments

Review of Inclusion Plans and Allocations

School requests generally fell into three broad categories:

- **Requests for student facing instructional staff**
  - These were prioritized
  - First reviewed by school regional teams who provided feedback
  - Then reviewed by a cross-functional team that:
    - Reviewed feedback from the regional teams
    - Compared requests & proposed funding across schools with different levels of need

- **Requests for staff to support staff, but not to work directly with students**
  - These were not approved as our focus is on the instructional staff needed to provide direct student services, with staff support provided through the regional model or existing school-based staff

- **Requests for staff that were outside of the scope of our IPT review**
  - These were not approved through the IPT process, but are being reviewed as part of more general budget reviews
Planning for FY25 Implementing Inclusive Ed

**Current Staff:** Reviewed current staffing at schools to maximize existing resources

**Student Need:** Reviewed level of expected need to support both students with disabilities and multilingual learners. Can the current staff support these students? If not, additional resources were added

### Student to Staff Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Student to Teacher</th>
<th>Student to Total School Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educator Credentials:** Existing homeroom teachers with multiple licenses did not reduce a school’s allocation. There is value in staff holding more than one license to match the needs of the students. However, multiple licenses alone will not be considered as the first step or sole service model to deliver the support our students require and deserve.
$30 Million for School-Directed Investments

$20 Million Went to Inclusive Education:

$15.1 M Allocated to approved Inclusion Planning Team requests for staffing needs to Students with Disabilities and Multilingual Learners

$2.7M In non-IPT grades: Increased special education services and supports for Multilingual Learners with Disabilities in substantially separate separate classrooms

$2.2 M in Reserves to provide additional funding to schools later in the process

Team Based Approach to Education:

Every classroom with a homeroom teacher serving Students with Disabilities and/or Multilingual Learners will have additional resources.
$30 Million for School-Directed Investments

$10 Million Went to Additional School Investments

$6 M Investments in continuing to build the foundation for the future. This was due to increases in:

- Coordinators of Special Education
- School Psychologists and Guidance Counselors
- Instructional Coaches & Specialist Teachers in new Transformation Schools
- MassCore Implementation (High School Graduation Requirements)

$4 M Transitioning ESSER Hold Harmless for Schools with increasing enrollment
Planning Beyond ESSER
Planning Beyond ESSER

Steps to Prepare for ESSER Transition

In FY24:

➔ We gave schools $15M to invest in sustaining ESSER
➔ We moved 50% of schools Hold Harmless budgets to ESSER

This Year:

➔ Schools with increasing enrollment got $4M to move Hold Harmless back from ESSER
➔ $6M of centrally budgeted positions funded with new investment dollars
➔ $5M of centrally budgeted positions funded by offsets from central budgets
➔ Maximizing underspending and vacancy savings $12M
We will spend $11M in continuing what is working on ESSER funded on Central Budgets both through ongoing commitments and offsets in existing budgets.

### Ongoing Commitments with new operating investment
- **$1.35m** - Capital Planning & Operations
- **$1.30m** - Student Support Personnel
- **$965k** - Inclusion Infrastructure
- **$890k** - Equitable Literacy Coaches
- **$740k** - Recruitment & Retention
- **$598k** - Family Helpline and Communications
- **$582k** - Hub School Expansion

**$6.4 million total, 62 FTE**

### Ongoing Commitments funded by offsets within current budget
- **$2.1m** - Academic Professional Development and Coaching
- **$990k** - Capital Planning & Operations
- **$618k** - Student Support Personnel
- **$453k** - Transportation Personnel
- **$435k** - Secondary and CTE

**$4.6 million total, 41 FTE**
We will spend $12.8M to continue in our schools what is working in our schools.

**Extend programming for one or more years**
- **$2.35m** - Academic Programs
- **$2.25m** - Wraparound Supports
- **$1.30m** - Outdoor Learning Partnerships
- **$680k** - Recruitment & Retention

**One time only purchases**
- **$3.95m** - Academic Interventions & Materials
- **$1.45m** - Partnerships
- **$800k** - Indoor Air Quality Supplies

**$6.6 million total**

**$6.2 million total**
Recruiting and retaining our highly qualified educators and ensuring our youngest learners have access to high quality programs and instruction from a young age is critical to our students’ success.

$17M  Salary costs from ESSER
$11M  UPK Costs from ESSER and the UPK Trust
Increased Costs
We strive to be efficient and effective to best serve our schools and students but we are also dealing with rising costs that affect us all.

$11M  High Quality Facilities
$12M  Transportation Costs
$8M  Extended Learning Time Costs
$4M  Food Service Costs
$9M  Other Costs
Finding Efficiencies
This year, we identified $17 Million in offsetting cost savings from Central Office. More details will be provided at the March 4 Central Budget hearing, but some examples include:

- Consolidating vacant positions
- Reducing duplication of overlapping programs
- Eliminating non-personnel expenses tied to old initiatives
Finding Efficiencies

Classroom Consolidation & Reconfiguration

Classroom Consolidation:
- Closing 68 classrooms across 36 schools (−$10.6M)
- Adding 16 new classrooms across 12 schools (+$3.2M)
- Net Change −52 classrooms (−$7.4M)

Mergers & Reconfigurations:
- 8 Reconfigurations Impacting 9 schools
  - Adding or removing entire grades
  - Internal structure changes with no budget implications (ex: closing 6th grade, but moving staff to expand 7th & 8th)
- School merger (UP Boston and UP Dorchester)
Finding Efficiencies

Merger Example: UP Boston & UP Dorchester

UP Academy Boston – Before

8th
30/30  19/30  0/30  8/8

7th
30/30  1/30   0/30  8/8

6th
30/30  5/30   0/30

UP Academy Dorchester – Before

8th
30/30  10/30

7th
30/30  13/30

6th
30/30  19/30  0/30
Merger Example: UP Boston & UP Dorchester

- Reduction of 7 classrooms
- Approximately $1.2M in savings
BPS Budget by the Numbers
Thanks to the continued Support of Mayor Wu and the City of Boston, each year, BPS has had more resources to invest in students.
Total enrollment in BPS has declined by 7,937 students (14%) over the last 7 years, but declines have slowed in recent years.

- Total enrollment has declined in each of the last seven years, with the largest single year declines occurring during the pandemic.
- Enrollment dropped by 270 students this school year and by 545 students the prior year, as compared to a prior 4 year average of 1,635 students per year.
Our budget has seen a 46% increase in per pupil spending over the last 5 years.
These historic investments help significantly offset the impact of the ESSER fiscal cliff.
94% of the BPS budget goes to student services

- **Direct School Expenses**
  Ex: School Budgets

- **School Services Budgeted Centrally**
  Ex: Transportation, Special Education, Facilities, Benefits, Regional Support Teams

- **Non-BPS Student Services**
  Ex: Services and transportation legally required to provide for non-BPS students

- **Central Administration**
  Ex: Superintendent’s Office
We provide extensive information available online, including:

- Tonight’s budget presentation
- Allocation Overview
  School-by-School comparison
- Allocation Summaries for all schools
- FY25 preliminary general fund
  account code budget
- All documents will be translated

For more information, please visit:
www.bostonpublicschools.org/budget
Enrollment grew by an average of 700 students during each of the last two school years, which led to smaller declines.

- Enrollment grew by 710 students between October and June of last school year and by 691 students during the prior school year.
- This growth was driven almost exclusively by an influx of new Multilingual Learners, similar to SY.
- The mid-year growth led to smaller year-over-year enrollment declines.
Elementary declines are driven by fewer resident births and smaller K2 classes entering and moving through the system.

- There is a consistent relationship between the number of Boston resident births and the number of BPS K2 students 5 years later.
- Boston Resident Births declined by 13% between 2012 and 2020.
- The decline in resident births in 2019 and 2020 could lead to smaller K2 cohorts over the next 2 school years.
K2 enrollment among Boston residents across all school types declined by 1,278 students, or 22%, between SY1314 and SY2223, with the largest declines occurring during the pandemic.

The fact that K2 enrollment has not yet rebounded suggests this may not be just a pandemic effect.

Boston resident enrollment across all grades also declined by 12% over 6 years, from 79,016 in SY1617 to 69,522 in SY2223.

- K2 enrollment among Boston residents across all school types declined by 1,278 students, or 22%, between SY1314 and SY2223, with the largest declines occurring during the pandemic.
- The fact that K2 enrollment has not yet rebounded suggests this may not be just a pandemic effect.
- Boston resident enrollment across all grades also declined by 12% over 6 years, from 79,016 in SY1617 to 69,522 in SY2223.
Enrollment in grades K2 to 5 declined by 4,949 students (20%) in the last 7 years, driven primarily by smaller cohorts entering the system.

Enrollment in grades 6 to 8 decreased by 1,507 students (14%) in the last 3 years as smaller elementary cohorts have aged up.

Enrollment in grades 9-12 has been stable over the last 3 years.

- Enrollment in grades K2 to 5 declined by 4,949 students (20%) in the last 7 years, driven primarily by smaller cohorts entering the system.
- Enrollment in grades 6 to 8 decreased by 1,507 students (14%) in the last 3 years as smaller elementary cohorts have aged up.
- Enrollment in grades 9-12 has been stable over the last 3 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY24 Current ($M)</th>
<th>FY25 Proposed ($M)</th>
<th>Change ($M)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct School Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Budgets</td>
<td>$775</td>
<td>$796</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning Time</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits &amp; Salary Savings</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>-$15</td>
<td>-$6</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Schools</strong></td>
<td>$893</td>
<td>$908</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Services Budgeted Centrally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>-$4</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits &amp; Salary Savings</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>-$1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total SSBC</strong></td>
<td>$342</td>
<td>$378</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits &amp; Salary Savings</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Central</strong></td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-BPS Student Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-BPS</strong></td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1.446B</td>
<td>$1.527B</td>
<td>$81M</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New Investments Partially Offset ESSER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Plan (funded on a per pupil basis)</td>
<td>231.7</td>
<td>$38.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold Harmless moved to ESSER</td>
<td>258.4</td>
<td>$31.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally Funded School Programs</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>$11.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally Funded Student Programs</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>$13.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator or School Supports</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$19.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Program Management</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>$6.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Operations and Infrastructure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$5.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>660.8</td>
<td>$125.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transition

- **$30M in new school-based investments**
- **$6M in new investments and $12M in Temporary Funding**