

EDUCATION FUNDING

Keep education funding current. Education funding self-corrects for loss of student numbers within districts.

1. Wyoming students can be negatively affected because of cuts to funding. Districts would have to increase class sizes, lay off staff and cut employee hours – all of **which lead to less one-on-one time**, leaving some students struggling.
2. We must ensure that every child's teacher in Wyoming has the technology, books, etc. they need to reach, teach, and inspire.
3. Students in Wyoming's smaller, more rural districts must be given the same opportunities as those students in larger districts. **The chance for success shouldn't depend on where you live in Wyoming.**

Excerpts from the findings of the Recalibration Committee Report (Completed Summer 2015) –

“There is substantial benefit to continuing to fund schools via the statutory model by providing consistency in the funding for school districts.”

“The evidence-based recommendations are no more likely to reflect the method of delivery of educational services in Wyoming's schools, than those services delivered with the resources provided by the current statutory model.”

-What both of these captions ultimately say is, “What we're doing is working.”

“As a result of public input and testimony, over the course of the 2015 interim and specifically at the November 15 and 16 meeting of the Select Committee, not a single district or person in attendance supports moving to a funding model incorporating the evidence-based recommendations.”

-The districts want to keep funding current, we don't want to take steps backward.

4. We agree with the Legislature investigating additional revenue streams for education funding.

Accountability Talking Points

Changes to Phase I Accountability Requirements

1. It is best to have **one**, congruent accountability system for education that accounts for both state and federal (ESSA) requirements.
2. Schools that are meeting or exceeding WAEA expectations should be rewarded by not having additional requirements thrust upon them. Schools that are partially or not meeting expectations should be provided assistance, not punished; thus the change to provide “support and intervention” would be a positive change.

Teacher Accountability and Evaluation (Phase II)

1. Teacher evaluation and accountability are best left to the districts themselves and do not need to be legislated.
2. If we hold the schools accountable (i.e., Phase I), the school district and building leaders will hold the teachers accountable (thus, no need for Phase II teacher accountability).
3. Teacher evaluation is already covered in Rules and Regulations, which require every district to have an approved teacher evaluation system.
4. Effective evaluation of teachers hinges on the knowledge and skills of the evaluator. The evaluator needs good professional development on the use of the evaluation instrument, and there should be calibration among building leaders within the district in order to ensure consistency between schools.

Leader Accountability and Evaluation (Phase II)

1. School accountability already accounts heavily for student performance; accountability of individual leaders should not also be tied directly to student performance.
2. Districts should have flexibility in determining the best evaluation system for its district and building leaders.
3. Districts should be involved in the development of Rules & Regulations that will specify the competencies and expectations of their leaders.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

1. Keep funding current to ensure educational opportunities will be around in the future.