

**Roosevelt STAY Opportunity Academy  
SY 20-21 LSAT Committee Notes**

**Vision:** Equity and excellence for every student, every day

**Core Values:** Collaboration, Accountability, Respect, Diversity

**Date:** 12/4/20

**Time:** 11:35 am

**AGENDA**

Meeting Facilitator: Mr. Shell

Secretary: Ms. Mullins

Members: Ms. Crumlin, Mrs. Begazo, Ms. Feinberg, Ms. Hurt, Mrs. Mitchell, Ms. Mullins, Mr. Shell, Ms. Johnson and Mr. Little

I. Budget Projections

- Ms. Johnson reviewed FY '21 budget. \$11,555 per student (675 students); 695 projection is roughly \$8, 030, 725. Ms. Johnson shared budget projections for student enrollment #545 – 695;
- Mr. Shell noted per pupil money is not the “end all”. There have been additional funds available in the past. Once the dollar amount is determined, then allocations are made. There are certain positions determined by the district that cannot be adjustment; The district does go back and reallocate money to school based off of exceeding the projection.
- Mr. Little noted that categories are flexible (ELL/SPED/Adults). We can enroll beyond the projection number.
- Mr. Little recommended number – difficult reaching 675; Oct we were at 630; Mr. Little recommends 575 based off attendance, engagement; 57% engaged and 43% not engaged. Engagement to include Canvas login; Teams participation; Reports numbers would look great if we surpass our number. Reports he needs recommended number today. Mr. Little urged to go lower than 600
- Ms. Hurt – supports 590; inquired if 600 is an option.
- Ms. Johnson spoke on enrollment/audit and concerns to consider with projected recommendations. Noted our past increase has been attributed to increase in ELL population.
- Mr. Shell commented on the expectation of outcome as we make enrollment projections; He also noted that not making projections may not always equate to losing people.
- Ms. Begazon expressed attendance concerns; address student’s needs just as classes in the afternoon. This variable impacts our attendance.

**Q/A:** Ms. Hurt clarified types of students in budget projections; It was noted that we don't know staff impact at this time based on budget projections; Ms. Hurt inquired how recommended projection will impact certain categories (ELL, SPED); Ms. Mullins shared wondering if engagement is solely based off Canvas login in. Ms. Hurt inquired about district allowing us to drop as low 200 in reduction (ex: 675 to 475); Ms. Feinberg inquired about data totals given for FY '19, '20 and '21 being projected vs. actual numbers. Mr. Little confirmed they were actual numbers. Ms. Hurt inquired about perception of submitting a low number and exceeding it next year; Ms. Mullins asked if there was a capacity that you can't exceeded post projection (ex: Will district only fund up to 20% over projection of increase?). Mr. Little noted DCPS will fund as much money as available; Ms. Mullins inquired about the amount/% school must reach by deadline. Mr. Little confirmed that 100% of projection needs to be reached by Oct. deadline; if not reached, then adjustments will have to be made such as staffing. Ms. Begazo inquired about daily attendance/ 57% captured from Canvas and Teams log in. Ms. Mullins clarified Ms. Begazo's recommendation/rationale of 500. Mullins inquired about enrollment numbers close to Oct deadline this year/470's. Mr. Little attributed increase in numbers due to ELL population.

- LSAT members shared Ms. Mitchell, Hurt, Crumlin recommends 600; Ms. Begazo proposed 500 (reachable goal); Feinberg expressed reservation for 500. Feinberg recommends a little lower than 600; shared observations with data -difference between amounts in certain categories. Mr. Shell recommended 550Ms. Mullins is agreeable with 590 – 600 projection.

II. Recommendation

- Majority of LSAT recommends 550

III. Next Steps

- Mr. Little to follow up with Mr. Shell.

**Next LSAT meeting:** Dec. 7, 2020

**Action Items:**

N/A