



The Denton ISD supports the efforts of the Texas Association of School Boards, the Texas Association of School Administrators, and other educational agencies in the development of Core Principles.

Additionally the Denton ISD has identified the following legislative priorities that reflect local needs and concerns:

1. **Increase in Transportation Allotment-** *The district supports legislation that updates funding and increases services to students for school provided transportation. This update should occur each legislative session, reflecting actual transportation costs, and should include increased allotments and improved means of fund distribution for hazardous routes and special program services (i.e., special education, bilingual education, magnet programs, career and technology programs). This legislation should also change the current two-mile regular education requirement for transportation services to one mile.*
2. **Amend the “50-Cent Bond Test” the Attorney General uses to approve voter approved bond issues -** *Amend the “50-Cent Bond Test” to provide the necessary bonding capacity to allow school districts to cost-effectively construct voter approved school facilities to meet the demands of a growing student population and to address the increasing school construction costs, unfunded facility mandates and declining State funding assistance faced by school districts.*
3. **Review and adjustment of special education weights for inclusion districts-** *The weighted allotment system is beneficial to eligible school districts. However, there is a specific need for review and adjustment of special education weights for districts that are using the inclusion model for instruction of special education students. These students are currently being served Resource Classrooms and should be a part of mainstream classrooms with Special Education. This model is supported by the least restrictive placement of Special Education students. These students are currently being served in Resource classrooms and should be a part of mainstream education with regular students.*

4. **Appropriate State Funding To Replace Stimulus Funds-** *It is the recommendation of the Denton Independent School District that the state make appropriate budget adjustments to reinstate the funding for the “funding cliff” facing all Texas school districts. Should school districts be required to finance this loss of funding, it is recommended that school districts be allowed to increase taxes, without a Tax Ratification Election, in an effort to maintain current programs.*

5. **Alignment of State and Federal Accountability Systems Or At Least Removing Issues That Are Conflicting Between The Two -** *The Denton Independent School District recommends that in the development of new educational policy, including but not limited to accountability, our locally elected officials at both the state and federal levels work to implement a philosophy and spirit of collaboration and cooperation so that the Denton ISD has a clear and understandable set of guidelines and requirements from which to operate.*

6. **Additional Money For SSI -** *With the increasing requirements from TEA requiring accelerated services for students, the need for additional Student Success Initiative funding (ARI/AMI) is imperative. School districts are finding the need to provide instruction and support for all students to be academically successful in mathematics and reading to be increasingly expensive through personnel cost, technology, and other instructional support resources.*

7. **UIL Realignment For Travel Efficiency -** *The district supports legislation that would require the University Interscholastic League to place local district schools in a geographical advantageous alignment to help defray escalating transportation costs. Under the current U.I.L. alignment policies, the first criterion that is considered is based on school size, followed by geographical distribution. The district also supports any updates to funding patterns for local school districts whose travel budgets are adversely affected by district realignment. The district supports any activity of the U.I.L. to help alleviate economic and travel burdens faced by local districts related to U.I.L. activities based on the bi-annual district placement.*

8. **More Money For Early Childhood Programs -** *The need exists for a more comprehensive approach to provide services to prekindergarten students. Eligibility requirements for prekindergarten should be broadened so that more children are eligible for state funding. Also, for eligible students, prekindergarten should be funded for full day, including facilities for students who need more help and support developmentally. Additionally, the transportation allotment needs to be adjusted to support student transportation needs.*

9. **More Money For Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students** - *With the decreasing funding provided by the State of Texas as a result of the loss of funding through means such as the Student Success Initiative (ARI/AMI) funds, the State's use of federal stimulus funds to replace funds previously provided by the State, the use of "50 –Cent Debt Test," etc., school districts alone cannot fund the supplemental needs of socio-economically disadvantaged students who have traditionally benefitted from such funding sources. Without appropriate funding, the opportunity gap and achievement gap will only widen for socio-economically disadvantaged students.*

PRIORITY #1

Increase in Transportation Allotment

The district supports legislation that updates funding and increases services to students for school provided transportation. This update should occur each legislative session, reflecting actual transportation costs, and should include increased allotments and improved means of fund distribution for hazardous routes and special program services (i.e., special education, bilingual education, magnet programs, career and technology programs). This legislation should also change the current two-mile regular education requirement for transportation services to one mile.

TEA's transportation funding formula has not been modified or updated since 1985. For the last 25 years the reimbursement rate for transportation programs has remained at the same level and the diminished effects of the **actual funding** received are as follows:

- Increased fuel cost
- Increased vehicle insurance rates
- Increased transportation staff wages & benefits cost
- Increased vehicle & equipment maintenance cost
- Increased staff, equipment and program cost due to ongoing requirements to be in compliance with local, state, and federal mandates.

The district clusters and assigns campuses to a "bilingual servicing campus." Currently the district transports students participating in the bilingual program to their servicing campus by employing dedicated bussing. These transportation costs are not reimbursed because students must first be bused to their home campus and then transferred to their bilingual campus to qualify for funding. Dedicated bussing ensures that bilingual students are not negatively impacted by reduced instructional time in the classroom. The district sees these services as critical to the future success of Non-English language students and, as such, requests that these transportation costs to be covered along the same line as special needs students.

The current method to establish reimbursement to a district for hazardous transportation is based on TEA's dated 10% rule. A district's hazardous funding is determined by calculating 10% of the district's regular education allotment. This amount does not cover actual hazardous transportation needs. Denton ISD is able to fully fund 1 hazardous route when in fact, the district needs funding for an additional 25-30 hazardous routes. These additional routes, which are indeed hazardous, are currently subsidized by funds that should be directed to instructional programs.

The current regular education funding formula only addresses students living two miles or more from their assigned campus. Given our changing society and concerns for student safety, the two-mile limit should be reduced to at least one mile.

Transportation costs should be updated each biennium based on actual costs and market conditions.

PRIORITY #2

Amend the “50-Cent Bond Test” the Attorney General Uses To

Approve Voter Approved Bond Issues

Amend the “50-Cent Bond Test” to provide the necessary bonding capacity to allow school districts to cost-effectively construct voter approved school facilities to meet the demands of a growing student population and to address the increasing school construction costs, unfunded facility mandates and declining State funding assistance faced by school districts.

Under current law, prior to the issuance of any voter approved bonds a school district must demonstrate to the Attorney General it has the ability to repay such bonds and its existing bonds from a maximum Interest and Sinking (“I&S”) tax rate of 50-cents. The growth in a local district’s tax base has historically resulted in an adopted tax rate below this level, but with the number of school districts having an I&S tax rate of 40-cents or higher increasing by 305% over the last 3 years, some fast growth districts are currently faced with the following:

- Structuring the repayment of a portion of its bonds over a longer time period (i.e. up to 40 years); thereby increasing the cost to the district and taxpayers;
- Pledging the use of Tier I State funds to the payment of bonds; thereby potentially further reducing the funds available for instruction, etc., and/or
- Delaying the construction of voter approved school facilities.

The Denton ISD is a fast growth district and is approaching the 50-cent cap. Denton ISD recommends the 50-Cent Debt Test be revised so districts can be provided with the local option of increasing their I&S tax rate above 50-cents to shorten the repayment period on new bond sales and reduce the interest costs of school districts and their taxpayers.

Assuming Denton ISD had an additional \$250 million bond sale (i.e. the approximate dollar amount required to be sold over the last 3 years), the district could comply with the existing 50-Cent Debt Test, but would need to repay the bonds over a 40-year period and have an I&S tax rate of 49.9 cents. The District’s interest cost would be \$732 million under the terms of the existing 50-Cent Debt Test.

In comparison, with an amendment to allow the local option, Denton ISD could use a repayment period of 30-years for a \$250 million bond sale. Denton ISD’s I&S tax rate would be approximately 57.5 cents; however, the interest cost incurred by Denton ISD and its taxpayers would be reduced by over \$450 million. This savings would provide

additional bonding capacity for future voter-approved school facilities without the need to increase the district's I&S tax rate and/or allow the district's I&S tax rate to be reduced in subsequent years.

PRIORITY #3

Review and Adjustment of Special Education Weights for Inclusion Districts

The weighted allotment system is beneficial to eligible school districts. However, there is a specific need for review and adjustment of special education weights for districts that are using the inclusion model for instruction of special education students. These students are currently being served Resource Classrooms and should be a part of mainstream classrooms with Special Education. This model is supported by the least restrictive placement of Special Education students. These students are currently being served in Resource classrooms and should be a part of mainstream education with regular students.

Currently students who are served in the Resource Room instructional arrangement receive a weight of 3.0, whereas students who are served in the mainstream (inclusion) instructional arrangement receive a weight of 1.1. At the present time, Denton ISD has approximately 573 students being served in Resource classrooms and approximately 891 students being served through mainstream classrooms through the inclusion model. Based on our present Summary of Finance Report, April 27, 2010 this equates to approximately \$8,434.27 Adjusted Basic Allotment (ABA) per student being served in Resource Rooms and approximately \$5,474.75 Adjusted Basic Allotment (ABA) per student for mainstream (inclusion). Based on these amounts, ARD committee student placements from Resource Room to regular classroom Inclusion is approximately \$3,000.00 net difference of funding per student. A total of 891 students are placed in Mainstream Inclusion model classes from Resource classrooms. This amounts to a loss in funding of \$2,673,000 for the current year budget.

It is important to note that all districts who participate in the Inclusion models serving students in the Mainstream Classrooms are experiencing similar losses in Special Education Funding. Research and TAKS Tests results indicate that the Inclusion Model is highly effective in improving student performance. However it is costly and in the majority of cases it involves the need for more personnel to support students in the regular classroom than in a resource setting wherein students are in larger groups.

PRIORITY #4

Appropriate State Funding To Replace Stimulus Funds

It is the recommendation of the Denton Independent School District that the state make appropriate budget adjustments to reinstate the funding for the “funding cliff” facing all Texas school districts. Should school districts be required to finance this loss of funding, it is recommended that school districts be allowed to increase taxes, without a Tax Ratification Election, in an effort to maintain current programs.

The State of Texas used the Stabilization funding from the Federal Government to complete the cost of funding the public school system during the last biennium. During the 09-10 school year this funding was \$6.6 million for Denton Independent School District. The Stabilization funding is estimated to be \$6.5 million for the 10-11 school year. There is a proposed “funding cliff” projected for the next biennium that is a result of the loss of funding from the Federal Stabilization. In addition, it is our understanding that due to the shortages in the state budget, there is no funding available to cover the “funding cliff” created by the use of the Federal funding in the prior biennium. School districts are limited in the ability to generate funding from property taxes due to the Property Tax Relief efforts at the state level two sessions ago.

PRIORITY #5

Alignment of State and Federal Accountability Systems Or At Least Removing Issues That Are Conflicting Between The Two

The Denton Independent School District recommends that in the development of new educational policy, including but not limited to accountability, our locally elected officials at both the state and federal levels work to implement a philosophy and spirit of collaboration and cooperation so that the Denton ISD has a clear and understandable set of guidelines and requirements from which to operate.

Since the inception of the No Child Left Behind Act, Texas school districts have had to balance discrepancies and conflicts between state requirements for accountability and those mandated by the federal government. With the decision by the Texas Legislature to modify the state's plan for public school accountability, and the determined need to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the potential exists for conflicts to continue. However, the same potential exists for the state and federal education entities to work together to develop systems that are aligned at both levels of government and to develop systems that promote and measure a continuum of student growth and school improvement instead of systems designed around high-stakes, one-shot measures that are punitive in scope.

The Denton ISD, like all other Texas school districts have struggled to balance the requirements of two separate accountability systems. While these issues were discussed in previous sessions, no actions were taken. There exists little to no trust between the state and federal educational agencies or between the state and federal executive offices. This strained relationship has caused a spirit of competition rather than one of collaboration to evolve on issues of educational policy. The end result has been and could continue to be the development of separate, individual educational requirements for which the local education agencies have to address. Ultimately, local educational agencies like the Denton ISD have to attempt to reconcile competing and at times conflicting policy.

PRIORITY #6

Additional Money For SSI

With the increasing requirements from TEA requiring accelerated services for students, the need for additional Student Success Initiative funding (ARI/AMI) is imperative. School districts are finding the need to provide instruction and support for all students to be academically successful in mathematics and reading to be increasingly expensive through personnel cost, technology, and other instructional support resources.

In 1999, the Texas Legislature enacted the Student Success Initiative requiring school districts to provide appropriate opportunities to be successful in mathematics and reading. Significant changes were made by the 81st Texas Legislature in 2009. Funding has been appropriated to school districts during the past ten years through the Accelerated Reading Initiative/Accelerated Mathematics Initiative (ARI/AMI) to assist in providing the needed instruction for any student failing to meet proficiency in either or both the TAKS Reading and Mathematics exams.

Accelerated instruction allows students to receive additional instruction in a manner that is differentiated and on-grade level. Providing additional instruction typically requires students to participate in individual, small group, or other instructional arrangements outside of the school day. Whenever students need additional help, the assistance must be received from a certified teacher that is considered Highly Qualified by definition of *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*.

*Beginning in spring 2010, the SSI grade advancement requirements apply to the TAKS mathematics and reading tests at grades 5 and 8. If a student does not demonstrate proficiency on one or both of these tests, the student may advance to or be placed in the next grade level only if (1) he or she completes **all** accelerated instruction required by the Grade Placement Committee, and (2) the GPC determines that the student is likely to perform at grade level.... (2009-2010 Grade Placement Committee Manual)*

There are several instances whereby a student is **required** to receive accelerated instruction:

- a) After the first TAKS administration and the student failed to reach proficiency;
- b) After the second TAKS administration and the student failed to gain proficiency; and,
- c) After the third administration and the student failed to reach proficiency, regardless of the decision to retain or place by the GPC.

Because the number of students requiring accelerated instruction is always an unknown during budget building time, local funding may likely fall short. The required amount of accelerated instruction is dependent on the performance of students near the end of the school year and in some cases, at the end of the summer. Furthermore, accelerated instruction is required regardless

Priority #7

U.I.L. Realignment For Travel Efficiency

The district supports legislation that would require the University Interscholastic League to place local district schools in a geographical advantageous alignment to help defray escalating transportation costs. Under the current U.I.L. alignment policies, the first criterion that is considered is based on school size, followed by geographical distribution. The district also supports any updates to funding patterns for local school districts whose travel budgets are adversely affected by district realignment. The district supports any activity of the U.I.L. to help alleviate economic and travel burdens faced by local districts related to U.I.L. activities based on the bi-annual district placement.

The University Interscholastic League (U.I.L.) realigns Texas high schools into districts based on school size first, followed by geographical distribution bi-annually. These realignments place specified local school districts in a subsidy dilemma since current funding does not take into account increased travel cost associated with realignment.

Local school districts that are required by realignment to travel further than in previous realignments are placed with a financial burden in which there is no additional funding allocated to cover those increased expenditures. Because local property taxes are used to meet increasing academic requirements from state and local governments without additional funding, additional transportation costs related to U.I.L. realignment are entirely covered by the local school districts. It is a financial burden that is only incurred by those school districts that have been placed in a district that requires more travel. The districts that do not have to travel as far are immune from the financial ramifications associated with the U.I.L. realignment. Their budgets are not unfavorably affected and therefore allow their local funding to address their educational priorities instead of disbursing them on increased transportation costs.

PRIORITY #8

More Money for Early Childhood Programs

The need exists for a more comprehensive approach to provide services to prekindergarten students. Eligibility requirements for prekindergarten should be broadened so that more children are eligible for state funding. Also, for eligible students, prekindergarten should be funded for full day, including facilities for students who need more help and support developmentally. Additionally, the transportation allotment needs to be adjusted to support student transportation needs.

QUESTION:

Why do we need more funding for Prekindergarten educational programming?

In answering the question, one immediately has to look at the benefits for all those involved. Otherwise, if there are no benefits, why would it be necessary to contribute more? Benefits for students, their families, and their communities, the short- and long-term benefits of high quality Prekindergarten (Prek) have been well documented by researchers over the last 50 years.

By now, even many outside the education field have heard about the academic and lifetime gains and the significant returns on investment yielded from the High/Scope Perry Preschool Project and the Chicago Child-Parent Centers.

What many may not be aware of, however, is that a vast and emerging body of research continues to demonstrate the potential of publicly funded large-scale Prek programs as a strategy for school reform and turning around a record of underachievement.

For instance, two more recent survey studies looked back at decades of early education data to capture and synthesize the body of research on Prek efficacy. One review, published in 2000, (Source *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 15, no. 4 2000), examined 13 evaluations of state Prek programs and found that they generally led to significant cognitive and social development among children, higher performance on achievement tests in the early grades and in some cases, reduced retention rates, producing substantial cost savings for school systems. Similarly, a 2010 analysis of 123 evaluations (Source *Teachers College Record* 112, no. 3 2010) determined that Prek programs “provide a real and enduring benefit to children,” which persists beyond the early elementary years. Together with those studies featured in this brief, these results show that high-quality Prek is an essential part of each state and the nations’ efforts to

improve publicly funded education as a means to have a more productive, competitive workforce for the 21st century.

FACTS:

High-quality Prek programs benefit students, their families, and their communities. From improved academic outcomes to the economic savings to schools and states, the benefits of high-quality Prek are irrefutable.

Successful Students

Prek increases high school graduation rates.

Chicago children who attended a Prek program were 29 percent more likely to graduate from high school than their peers who did not have Prek (Source: Chicago Longitudinal Study)

Prek helps children do better on standardized tests.

Michigan fourth graders who had attended Prek passed the state's literacy and math assessment tests at higher rates than their peers who had no Prek. (Source: "State Efforts to Evaluate the Effects of Prekindergarten", Yale University Child Study Center)

Prek reduces grade repetition.

Maryland fifth graders who attended Prek were 44 percent less likely to have repeated a grade than their peers who did not attend Prek. (Source: "State Efforts to Evaluate the Effects of Prekindergarten", Yale University Child Study Center)

Prek reduces the number of children placed in special education.

Among Chicago children, those who attended Prek were 41 percent less likely to require special education services than their peers who did not attend. (Source: Chicago Longitudinal Study)

Responsible Adults

Prek reduces crime and delinquency.

Chicago children who did not attend Prek were 70 percent more likely to be arrested for a violent crime by age 18 than their peers who had been Prek participants. (Source: Chicago Longitudinal Study)

Prek lowers rates of teen pregnancy.

North Carolina children who attended Prek were less likely to become teen parents than their peers who did not attend Prek (26 percent vs. 45 percent) (Source: The Carolina Abecedarian Project)

Prek leads to greater employment and higher wages as adults.

Forty-year-old adults in Michigan who attended Prek as children were more likely to report that they were getting along very well with their

families than their peers who did not attend Prek (75 percent vs. 64 percent). (Source: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project)

Prek participants were more likely than non-participants to own their own homes and cars and be financially independent as well:

- At age 27, more than one-quarter (27 percent) of participants owned their own home, compared to just 5 percent of non-participants. At age 40, the difference in home ownership was smaller, but participants still maintained an advantage over non-participants (37 percent versus 28 percent).
- A higher percentage of those who had been in the preschool program owned a car than those who had not been in the program (73 percent versus 59 percent at age 27, 82 percent versus 60 percent at age 40).
- At age 27, a significantly greater proportion of participants owned a second car (30 percent versus 13 percent for non-participants).
- At age 27, only 2 percent of participants received regular income from family or friends, compared to 16 percent of non-participants.
- At age 40, about three-quarters (76 percent) of participants had savings accounts compared to only half (50 percent) of non-participants. (Source: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project)

Prek participants also differed from those who had not participated when it came to decisions about marriage and having children and in their family relationships:

- Women who had participated in the program were much more likely to be married at age 27 than women who had not participated—40 percent versus 8 percent.
- Men who had participated in the program and men who had not participated were equally likely to be married at age 27, but those who had participated had been married an average of 6.2 years by that point compared to 3.3 years for non-participants.
- At age 27, more than half (54 percent) of female non-participants were single mothers compared to only 32 percent of female participants.
- At age 27, female participants had an average of 1.0 out-of-wedlock births compared to an average of 1.7 for non-participants. Fifty-seven percent of births to female participants were out-of-wedlock, while 83 percent of births to non-participants were out-of-wedlock.
- Nearly one-quarter (23 percent) of female non-participants had ever had an abortion by age 27; only 4 percent of participants had done so.
- A higher percentage of male participants than non-participants were raising their own children as of age 40 (57 percent versus 30 percent).
- At age 27, a significantly higher percentage of participants said they found it easy to feel close to family and friends (66 percent versus 48 percent).

- At age 40, participants were more likely to report that they were getting along very well with their families (75 percent versus 64 percent).
(Source: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project)

Other outcomes suggest that participants were more likely to act cautiously and take care of their health and well-being:

- Participants at age 27 were more likely to report usually or always wearing seat belts—57 percent versus 34 percent.
- Participants were less likely to drink. At age 27, 44 percent of participants reported that they never drank, compared to 36 percent of non-participants; 16 percent of participants drank several times a week or daily, compared to 26 percent of non-participants.
- Smoking was less prevalent among participants at age 27; with 45 percent saying they smoked cigarettes compared to 56 percent of non-participants.
- At age 40, participants were less likely than non-participants to report using sedatives, sleeping pills or tranquilizers (17 percent versus 43 percent), marijuana or hashish (48 percent versus 71 percent), or heroin (0 percent versus 9 percent).
- At age 27, a higher percentage of participants (30 percent) than non-participants (15 percent) had been hospitalized in the previous 12 months. This may not reflect poorer health among participants but rather greater access to health care, awareness of their health, and ability to pay for treatment.
(Source: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project)

Stronger Communities

Every \$1 invested in high-quality Prek saves taxpayers up to \$7.

Prek results in savings by reducing the need for remedial and special education, welfare, and criminal justice services, according to a number of studies. (Sources: “The Economics of Investing in Universal Preschool Education in California; Rand Corporation; The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project)

Prek improves efficiency and productivity in the classroom.

Children who attended Prek at Head Start centers had more advanced skills in areas such as following direction, problem-solving, and joining activities, all of which allow teachers to spend more time working directly with children and less on classroom management. (Source: “The Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey”, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services)

There are significant overlooked benefits of a quality Prek program. Numerous studies have shown that high-quality Prekindergarten programs can place children on a positive lifetime trajectory.

A good early education experience can teach children not only academic knowledge and skills, but it can shape their attitudes, dispositions, and habits regarding learning and influence their social and emotional development. For example, preschool education can help children begin to understand that there are consequences to their actions and that they can be responsible for what happens to them. As they go through life, successes in school and work and with their families can reinforce the sense that, by working hard and acting responsibly, they can control their own futures.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The results from research presented here—a compilation of impressive work done by experts across the country—shows that **high-quality early childhood education is a wise investment.**

Priority #9

More Money For Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students

With the decreasing funding provided by the State of Texas as a result of the loss of funding through means such as the Student Success Initiative (ARI/AMI) funds, the State's use of federal stimulus funds to replace funds previously provided by the State, the use of "50 –Cent Debt Test," etc., school districts alone cannot fund the supplemental needs of socio-economically disadvantaged students who have traditionally benefitted from such funding sources. Without appropriate funding, the opportunity gap and achievement gap will only widen for socio-economically disadvantaged students.

It is both urgent and imperative for the state legislature to advocate for adequate state and federal funding to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. In the *A Blueprint for Reform, The Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* released in March 2010, President Barack Obama states, "Today, more than ever, a world-class education is a prerequisite for success." A world-class education does not come without a significant investment at both the state and federal level. While the current blueprint for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is "a plan to renovate a flawed law [the No Child Left Behind Act]," the emphasis remains on accelerating student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

Funding for socio-economically disadvantaged students comes through a variety of means such as Title I, Part A (federal) funding and State Compensatory Education (state) funding. It is essential such funding continues as the number of students reaching poverty level increases. Currently, Denton ISD utilizes State Comp Ed funds to support initiatives, programs, and/or services designed to supplement the regular (state-funded) education program for students identified as at risk of dropping out of school. Title I, Part A funds have been allocated to eligible elementary and middle schools (14 of the 35 Denton ISD campuses) to supplement both the regular (state-funded) education program and the supplemental (State Comp Ed) programs. For Denton ISD schools, Title I, Part A funds provide additional Reading and Math Interventionists and Coaches, additional Reading Recovery teachers, additional before and after school tutoring, supplemental supplies and materials to provide differentiated instruction for students at risk of failing to meet proficiency on state academic assessments.

While the Denton Independent School District currently receives \$2.7 million in Title I, Part A funds, the number of eligible campuses is increasing with two and possibly three campuses meeting the poverty threshold in 2010-11. However, because federal funding is not increased based on the number of qualifying campuses, but on a state formula, the current 14 campuses that receive Title I, Part A funds will receive fewer dollars, which will significantly impact the ability of the currently identified campuses to provide

the level of services necessary including the loss of supplemental staffing at these campuses. President Obama suggests that providing our students with a “world-class education” is a “moral imperative.” As the President emphasizes in his blueprint, “this effort will require our best thinking *and resources* [emphasis added].”