

Non-Instructional Performance Review

Greenwood Leflore Consolidated School District

September 2022



GlimpseK12 is providing this report based on data and extrapolated information provided by the school district at the time of the report. GlimpseK12 does not independently verify the data or information provided to them from the district or its programs. If the district chooses to provide additional data or information, GlimpseK12 reserves the right to amend the report.

All decisions made by Greenwood Leflore Consolidated School District in respect to the contents of this report are understood to be the sole responsibility of Greenwood Leflore Consolidated School District. Additionally, GlimpseK12 shall be indemnified and held harmless, nor should any contents in this report be interpreted as legal advice or opinion. GlimpseK12 does not and will not in the future perform any management functions for Greenwood Leflore Consolidated School District.

This report is solely intended to be a resource guide for Greenwood Leflore Consolidated School District.

Administrative

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Central Office Administrative positions point to elements that influence service levels and district leadership. The primary purpose of Executive Leadership in a school district is to support the mission and objectives of the school district. The activities performed by district leaders include oversight of the instructional program, daily operations, and finances of the district as they support the staff and students in achieving the desired outcomes.

Greenwood-LeFlore Leadership Positions and Salary						
Position	2018-2019 (Greenwood)	2018-2019 (Leflore)	2019-2020 (Greenwood)	2019-2020 (Leflore)	2020-2021	2021-2022
Superintendent	\$150,000	Conservator	\$150,000	Conservator	\$150,000	\$150,000
Assistant Superintendent	NA	\$92,500	NA	\$92,500	\$108,000	\$108,000
CFO	\$78,500	\$85,000	\$78,500	\$75,000	\$85,000	\$85,000
Curriculum & Assessment Coordinator	\$105,000	\$92,000	\$106,000	\$92,000	\$120,000	\$120,000
HR Director	\$60,000	\$92,500	\$60,000	\$92,500	\$90,000	\$90,000
Director of Information Systems	\$59,000	\$73,284	\$59,000	\$73,284	\$80,000	\$71,615.70
Child Nutrition Director	\$69,000	\$70,000	\$69,000	\$70,000	\$85,000	\$85,000
Assistant SpEd Director	\$80,000	\$92,000	\$80,000	\$92,000	\$85,000	\$85,000
Transportation Director	\$52,000	\$65,000	\$52,000	\$47,200	\$70,000	\$70,000

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- District Performance
- Student Achievement
- Compliance with federal and local laws
- Adherence to state and local policy
- Enrollment
- Fiduciary Responsibility
- Ethical Standards

Transportation Services

Key Performance Indicators for Transportation Services point to elements that influence service levels and cost efficiency. Some indicators are comprehensive in nature, such as Cost per Mile and Transportation Cost per Rider, while other indicators are more indicative pinpointing to exact inefficiencies and excessive expenses. Attention should be paid to not only each indicator, but in the overall performance impact represented through the relationship of each indicator.

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Transportation as a Percentage of the Total District Expense	3.01%	1.93%	↘	4-6%	5.84%	A point of reference illustrating the general size of the transportation operation as a function of the district
Average Annual Cost per Active Route Bus Overall	\$22,759.62	\$43,619.22***	↘	\$53,227-\$95,744	\$49,308.18	Total direct transportation costs plus total indirect transportation costs, divided by total number of buses
Annual Cost per Rider	\$431.24	<i>District was Virtual, rider counts not available***</i>	↗	\$788-\$1,724	\$829.51	Total direct cost plus total indirect cost plus total contractor cost of bus services, divided by number of riders
Annual Cost per Mile	\$7.95	\$11.15***	↗	\$4.89-\$8.82	\$4.86	Total direct cost plus total indirect cost plus total contractor cost of bus services, divided by total miles operated
% of Spare Buses	4%	0%	↘	9%-15%	18.07%	Total spare buses divided by total scheduled for daily routes
Ratio of Active Route Buses per School	6.00	6.00	→	4-7	6.89	Total number of buses divided by total number of schools within the district
Ratio of Buses per Mechanic	37.50	36.00	↘		31.36	Total number of maintenance staff divided by the total number of buses

*** District operated virtually in SY 2020-2021 with limited bus services.

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- Types of transported programs served
- Bell schedule
- Effectiveness of the routing plan
- Spare bus factor needed
- Age of fleet
- Driver wage and benefit structure and labor contracts
- Maximum riding time allowed
- Earliest pickup time allowed
- Enrollment projections

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40+ School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Key Performance Indicators



Transportation Services

The Greenwood-Leflore Consolidated School District operated virtually in SY 2020-2021 with limited bus services. During this period:

- Overall transportation expenditures dropped by 38.78% (\$635,451)
- Average number of Miles Driven Daily dropped by 56.33% (645)
- Daily regular route buses dropped from 66 to 20
- Daily special education route buses dropped from 6 to 3

For the 2019-2020 school year, the transportation department met or beat most peer's average performance with two exceptions. Transportation expenses as a percentage of budget were significantly lower than both National and Regional peers and the number of spare buses available to support daily routes were low. Most of the bus fleet (91.67%) is greater than 10 years old.

The lack of spare buses creates strain on the district's ability to provide transportation to all students. When a bus goes down and there are no available spares, drivers must take additional loads. For this year, the district purchased 16 new buses - at the time of the assessment only 6 had been delivered

For a sustainable transportation program going forward, the district should consider the development of a fleet renewal plan as well as increasing the number of buses kept as spares - the district should push to increase spares to a number that is between 15 and 20% of the overall fleet. Both items may increase overall transportation expenses. Careful attention should be paid to overall transportation department expenditures so that the overall expenditures stay in line with peer's as compared as an overall percentage of budget.

Transportation Services

The transportation leadership spoke to not having participation in district/school level decisions such as setting bell schedules. The district should include transportation leadership in such decisions as route efficiency might be able to be improved by staggering certain school bell times to allow for improved route tiering.

Lastly, the Transportation department should consider tracking the provided KPIs annually to help identify future opportunities for improvement and ensure that performance levels are maintained over time.

Operations

Key Performance Indicators in Operations assess the cost efficiency and service levels of a district's facilities management and labor. Areas of focus include custodial, maintenance, and utility management activities. These indicators should give district leaders a general sense of both where they are doing well and where they can improve. Attention should be paid to not only each indicator, but in the overall performance impact represented through the relationship of each indicator.

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Maintenance and Operations as a Percentage of overall District Expense	9.1%	8.5%	↘	5.1%-13.9%	9.03%	A point of reference illustrating the general size of the operations department as a function of the district
Maintenance and Operations Cost per Student	\$1,053.39	\$1,027.48	↘	\$901-\$1,736	\$628.08	Total custodial costs plus total grounds work costs plus total routine maintenance costs) plus total major maintenance/ minor renovations costs plus total major rehab/ renovations divided by enrollment.
Custodial cost per Student	\$187.98	\$211.88	↗	\$245-\$430	\$210.65	Total custodial work costs (contractor and district operated), divided by total student enrollment.
Maintenance Cost per Sq Ft	\$4.60	\$3.96	↘	\$0.91-\$1.52	\$2.34	Cost of maintenance work divided by total square footage of all buildings.
Custodial Cost per Sq Ft	\$1.00	\$1.03	↗	\$1.35-\$2.17	\$1.10	Total cost of district-operated custodial work plus total cost of contract-operated custodial work, divided by total square footage
Custodial Supply Cost per Sq Ft	<i>Included with Maintenance Costs</i>			\$0.09-\$0.18	\$0.17	Total custodial supply cost divided by total square footage of all buildings.
Utility Costs per Square Foot	\$1.81	\$0.92	↘	\$1.01-\$1.55	\$1.48	Total utility costs divided by total square footage of all non-vacant buildings.

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- Cost of labor, supplies, and materials
- Size of schools
- Space usage rates
- Number of employees
- Scope of duties assigned to Custodians
- Work schedule assigned to Custodians
- Custodian cleaning methods
- Custodial cleaning equipment supplied
- Custodial cleanliness expectations/requirements

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Operations

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Average Number of Days to Complete a Maintenance Work Order	4	2	↘	0-24	7.75	Total aggregate number of days to complete all work orders, divided by total number of work orders.
Maintenance workload (Sq Ft per Maintenance Tech)	63,572	59,334	↘		182,563	Total square footage of non-vacant buildings that are managed by the district, divided by total number of district Maintenance Technicians/Tradesmen.
Custodial workload (Sq Ft per Custodian)	22,250	25,429	↗	20,381-31,601	47,302	Total square footage of non-vacant buildings that are managed by the district, divided by total number of district custodial field staff.
Square Acre per Landscape Technician	5,000***	5,000***	→		154.51	Total acreage of maintained property divided by total number of Landscape Technicians

*** Reported 25,000 square acres of maintained property, 5 Landscaping Technicians

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Operations

While maintenance and operations expenditures as a percentage of the overall district budget declined over both periods reviewed and were in line with both national and regional peers, supporting data shows potential opportunity for improvement.

Maintenance and Operations Cost per Student is significantly higher (\$1,027.48) than the regional peer average (\$628.08). Review of cost by individual function, data shows:

- Custodial cost per student is only slightly higher than the regional peer average.
- Custodial cost per square foot is below both national and regional peers.
- Custodial supply cost per square foot could not be measured as the district does not track this cost separate than those for the overall custodial function in 2020-2021
- Utility cost per square foot was below both national and regional peers.
- Maintenance cost per square foot is significantly higher than both national and regional peers.

Labor comparisons show similar trends:

- Custodial workload as measured by square foot per custodian is in line with national peers and better than regional peers.
- Maintenance workload as measured by square foot per maintenance technician was significantly lower than regional peers.
- Landscape workload as measured by square acre per technician seemed to reflect a data inaccuracy as the number was physically higher than possible to perform (5,000 acres per technician). This number reflects over 320% more acres than the regional peer average.

Operations

At the time of the assessment the district had lost some staff within operations and was down to eight maintenance technicians and four landscape technicians. The department was seeking to add two additional technicians to both maintenance and landscape functions.

The maintenance and operations function does not track formal key performance metrics. Informal school walkthroughs do occur. The department should consider establishing formal key performance metrics and tracking year over year performance to identify opportunities for improvement.

A deeper review should take place to better understand the current challenges and opportunities that exist to improve efficiency and reduce maintenance costs. The review needs to consider the condition of current facilities, future facility needs - student demographics (growth/decline), staffing levels and skill sets, contract analysis (do versus buy), as well as observe detailed processes associated with work management. Through such a deeper review the district may find approximately \$40,000 to \$100,000 of potential savings.

Nutrition Services

Key Performance Indicators in Nutrition Services include measures of productivity, broadly measured in Meals per Labor Hour; cost efficiency, as determined by Food and labor Costs per Revenue; and service levels as measured by meal participation rates. Attention should be paid to not only each indicator, but in the overall performance impact represented through the relationship of each indicator.

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Breakfast participation rates	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		24.5%-44.5%	35.00%	Total breakfast meals served, divided by total district student enrollment times the number of school days in a year.
Lunch participation rates	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		41.7%-61.4%	66%	Total lunch meals served, divided by total district student enrollment times the number of school days in a year.
Cost per meal	\$3.96	\$6.59	↗	\$3.70-\$5.03	\$3.48	Total direct costs of the food service program divided by the total meals equivalent served annually.
Food costs per meal	\$1.01	\$0.82	↘	\$1.56-\$2.10	\$1.52	Total food costs, divided by the total meals equivalent served annually.
Fund balance as percent of revenue	50.2%	38.5%	↘	6.5%-36.0%	39.00%	Fund balance divided by total revenue
Food costs as a percent of revenue	16.9%	7.6%	↘	38.1%-47.9%	37.08%	Total food costs divided by total revenue
Labor costs as percent of revenue	20.6%	36.9%	↗	42.7%-58.6%	47%	Total labor costs divided by total revenue
USDA Commodities percent of total revenue	3.1%	6.9%	↗	6.1%-8.1%	5.72%	Total value of commodities received divided by total revenue
Meals Per Labor Hour	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		10.8-16.0	13.38	Annual meal equivalents divided by the average daily labor hours annually.

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- Menu selections
- Provision II and III and Universal Free
- Free/Reduced percentage
- Food preparation methods
- Attractiveness of dining areas
- Adequate time to eat
- School opening procedures
- Timing of morning student arrival
- Participation in after school programs, supper programs, and summer feeding

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Key Performance Indicators



Nutrition Services

A deeper review should be conducted of Nutrition Services. Several requested key data points could not be provided. These include:

- Annual overall breakfast participation
- Annual overall lunch participation
- Total annual labor hours worked (therefore Meals per Labor Hour could not be calculated)

When comparing provided data for the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school year the following data points raise questions:

- Total meal equivalents served annually dropped by 41.2% (307,659 meal equivalents)
- Total annual revenue increased by 5.5% (\$246,018.71)
- Total food cost decreased by 52.7% (\$398,891.52)
- Total labor cost increased by 88.8% (\$819,658.29)

The district should review the provided data points for accuracy. A deeper review should be conducted to get a better understanding of student participation, meals per labor hour, labor costs, food costs, and revenues. The state review should be for the program overall and broken down by individual school. As identified, an improvement plan should be developed and implemented. At a minimum, the district should begin tracking the provided Key Performance Indicators on a yearly or semi-yearly basis. If overall meal cost could be reduced to better align with national or regional peers, the department would see a potential savings between \$340,000 to \$680,000.

Potential Improvement Opportunities

Technology

Key Performance Indicators in Technology assess the productivity, cost efficiency, and service levels of the Technology Department. As more districts employ technology to deliver and aide in student instruction, focus should be on the effective deployment and maintenance of technology verses reducing expenditures. Attention should be paid to not only each indicator, but in the overall performance impact represented through the relationship of each indicator.

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
IT Spending as percent of District Budget	0.8%	0.7%	↘	1.85%-3.71%	1.9%	Total IT staffing, hardware, systems and service costs divided by total district operating budget.
IT Spending per student	\$90.30	\$82.80	↘	\$243-\$518	\$192.35	Total IT staffing, hardware, systems and service costs divided by total student enrollment
Network-Bandwidth per Student	8.46	9.27	↗	125.4-381.6	271	Total standard available bandwidth divided by total student enrollment
Network days usage exceeded 75% of capacity	0.00	0.00	→	0-12	88.5	Number of days that peak daily internet usage reaches more than 75% of standard available bandwidth for 5 minutes or longer.
Average Age of Computers	3-4 Years	4-5 Years	↗	2.98-3.56	3.98	Total age of computers, divided by the number of district-owned computers

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- School board and administrative policies and procedures
- School District Strategy regarding instructional technology pedagogy
- Existing School District Business Systems
- Implementation and project management for new software applications in both instructional and operations areas
- Type of devices in use by district (i.e., desktop, laptop, netbook, tablets, etc.)
- Age of technology and applications
- District Technology Standards and Support Model deployed

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Technology

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Devices per employee	1.04	1.19	↗	0.96-1.65	1.18	Total number of employee laptops and desktops divided by the total number of district employees
Devices per student	1.73	1.89	↗	0.94-1.50	1.04	Total number of desktops, laptops and tables that are for student use only or mixed-use divided by total student enrollment
Advanced-presentation Devices per teacher	0.45	0.63	↗	1.54-2.59	1.19	Total number of devices (video/data projectors/document cameras/whiteboards, etc.) divided by total number of teachers
Devices per IT Staff	2250	3134	↗		772.17	Total student and employee devices (excluding presentation devices) divided by total number of IT staff FTEs.

Technology

Technology spending as a percentage of district budget (0.7%) is significantly below both national (1.85-3.71%) and regional peers (1.9%). No capital investment has been made in Technology over the two periods reviewed. The overall dollars being invested in technology has dropped over the two-year review period even outside of the technology department.

- Business Systems Cost has reduced by 60.78%
- Staff numbers reduced by 5.07% during the same period
- Instructional Systems Cost has reduced by 12.85%
- Students reduced by 8.07% during the same period

The network-bandwidth per student was very low compared to both national and regional peers. In interviews with Technology staff, it was noted that existing network switches were ten years old.

The district has a total of 8,532 student devices and 870 employee devices. The number of devices per employee is in line with both national and peer averages. The number of devices per student is higher than both national and regional peers. The average age of computers within use is between 4 to 5 years. The number of devices per Technology staff member is skewed by the large quantity of devices within the district. If we compared Technology staff member per staff and students, this ratio would drop but remains almost double the number of devices per technology staff member of that at regional peers. Pre-Consolidation of the districts, each district had a technology plan. Since the districts have combined there has not been a unified technology plan developed. The district should develop a technology plan. When developing this plan, the district team should consider reducing the number of devices, especially if those devices are aged and not used regularly, future technology needs - student demographics (growth/decline), and ensure the balance of available technology, technology support team members, and intended benefits technology in order to build a sustainable technology program.

Potential Improvement Opportunities



Human Resources

Key Performance Indicators in Human Resources include districtwide effectiveness measures such as Teacher and Employee Separation Rates as well as indicators that focus more narrowly on the operation of the district's Human Resources department. Attention should be paid to not only each indicator, but in the overall performance impact represented through the relationship of each indicator.

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
HR Cost per \$100K Revenue	\$472.74	\$487.81	↗	\$408-\$792	\$288.41	Total HR department costs, divided by total district operating revenue over \$100,000
HR Cost per District Staff Member	\$286.10	\$314.64	↗	\$417-\$1,047	\$237.95	HR Department costs divided by total number of District Staff (FTEs)
Number of Employees per HR Staff Member	256	243	↘		371.36	Total number of district staff (FTEs) divided by total number of HR staff.
Overall Employee Separation Rate	7.2%	7.0%	↘	9.8%-12.5%	15.28%	Total number of employees that left the district divided by the total number of district employees (FTEs).
Teacher Separation Rate	15.2%	13.3%	↘	6.4%-11.3%	17.43%	Total number of Teachers that left the district divided by the total number of district teachers (FTEs).
Employee Misconduct Investigations per 1,000 Employees	0.00	1.37	↗	7.9-33.0	8.09	Number of misconduct investigations, divided by total number of district employees (FTEs) over 1,000.
Employee Discrimination Investigations per 1,000 Employees	0.00	0.00	→	0.52-1.16	1.36	Number of complaints/charges of discrimination filed by employees) divided by total number of district employees (FTEs) over 1,000.

Factors that influence Human Resources performance and can steer improvements include:

- Human Resource role definition within district
- Ability of existing technology to automate work
- Hiring practices
- School culture and staff supports
- Local or regional competition
- Effectiveness of recruiting efforts
- Salary and benefits offered
- Employee satisfaction and workplace environment
- Availability of skills in local labor market
- Personnel policies and practices

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Key Performance Indicators



Human Resources

Human Resource cost comparisons as measured by cost per \$100K in revenue and cost per district staff member meet the national peer average but are higher than most regional peers.

The separation rate of both teachers and overall staff reduced over the two years reviewed and are significantly better than regional peers. Employee misconduct and discrimination investigations are significantly below both national and regional peers.

The department is currently structured with a director, secretary, and clerk. The department handles employee onboarding and retirements. Employee grievances are processed/investigated by the superintendent. Insurance and leave are processed by Payroll. Professional development is overseen by Curriculum. The annual review of compensation is led by the Finance department with Human Resources entering changes/implementing as assigned.

While the department uses a software system to automate the new hire application and selection process, onboarding of new employees is a manual process.

The district may benefit from a deeper review to better understand opportunities associated with optimizing/automating processes along with improving staffing levels and roles. This review should take place in combination of a deeper review of finance and supply chain functions to identify potential efficiency gains that might be achieved with a broader restructuring. The district might be able to realize an annual savings between \$55,000 to \$100,000 total across all departments.

Potential Improvement Opportunities



Supply Chain

Key Performance Indicators in Supply Chain include an Accounts Payable (AP) focus on the cost of efficiency, productivity, and service quality of invoice processing, as well as a focus on improving efficiency and effectiveness of the procurement practices. Attention should be paid to not only each indicator, but in the overall performance impact represented through the relationship of each indicator.

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
AP Cost per \$100K revenue	\$128.88	\$154.69	↗	\$38.00-\$60.60	\$116.67	Total AP department personnel costs plus AP department non-personnel costs divided by total district operating revenue over \$100,000
AP Cost per invoice	\$5.66	\$8.69	↗	\$4.61-\$10.72	\$22.41	Total AP department personnel costs plus AP department non-personnel costs, divided by total number of invoices handled by the AP department.
Avg Days to Process Invoices	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		6.2-20.1	21.31	Aggregate number of days to process all AP invoices, divided by the total number of invoices handled by the AP department
Invoices processed per FTE per month	883.1	349.3	↘	517-1,213	799	Total number of invoices handled by the AP department, divided by total number of AP staff (FTEs), divided by 12 months
Invoices past due at time of payment	2.58%	3.80%	↗	6.22%-18.84%	1%	Number of invoices past due at time of payment, divided by total number of invoices handled by the AP department.
Payments voided	0.68%	0.70%	↗	0.58%-1.31%	1.64%	Number of payments voided, divided by total number of AP transactions (payments)
P-card Purchasing Ratio	0.00%	0.00%	→	0.9%-7.4%	6%	Total dollar amount purchased using P- cards, divided by total procurement outlays (including P-card purchases).

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- Administrative policies and procedures
- Level of automation
- Existing business technology systems
- Departmental and individual employee responsibilities and competencies
- Performance management systems
- Monitoring and reporting systems
- Total dollar amount of invoices paid annually
- Utilization of Purchasing Cards (P-Cards)

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Supply Chain

Invoices processed per FTE per month is significantly lower than both national and regional peers. Invoices past due at time of payment has increased over the last two years and is significantly higher than regional peers. The number of voided payments as a percentage of total payments have increased but remains below both national and regional peers. During the interview process it was noted that the department has a hard time getting staff members to send all invoices to AP verses to individual schools.

Procurement costs per \$100K is higher than both national and regional peers. Costs per purchase order was unavailable as was the ratio of competitive verses non-competitive procurement. Zero percentage of procurement staff have professional certifications. There may be efficiency gains in formal bidding/requesting proposals by further centralizing school purchases.

The district may benefit from a deeper review to better understand opportunities associated with optimizing/automating processes along with improving staffing levels and roles. This review should take place in combination of a deeper review of finance and supply chain functions to identify potential efficiency gains that might be achieved with a broader restructuring. The district might be able to realize an annual savings between \$55,000 to \$100,000 total across all departments.

Historically, districts have seen a 5 - 20% reduction in overall cost of goods and services when formal competitive procurement practices are deployed. If the district was able to begin competitive bidding a minimum of 25% of procured items and services, it could be possible for the district to realize an annual savings between \$140,000 and \$560,000.

Potential Improvement Opportunities



Financial Services

Key Performance Indicators in Financial Services assess operational efficiency and effectiveness regarding debt servicings, budgeting, payroll processing, worker's compensation management, and grant management. Attention should be paid to not only each indicator, but in the overall performance impact represented through the relationship of each indicator as to the overall financial health of a district.

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Debt Service Costs Ratio to District Revenue	0.66%	0.65%	↘	3.9%-11.2%	3.06%	Total debt servicing costs, divided by total operating revenue
Fund Balance Ratio	32.8%	33.6%	↗	9.7%-20.8%	7.36%	Total fund balance, divided by total district operating expenditures
Expenditure Efficiency - Adopted Budget as a Percent of Actual	83.3%	111.2%	↗	94.6%-106.9%	87%	Total budgeted expenditures in the adopted budget, divided by total district operating expenditures
Expenditure Efficiency - Final Budget as a Percent of Actual	186.4%	169.8%	↘	96.8%-110%	102%	Total budgeted expenditures in the final budget, divided by total district operating expenditures
Revenue Efficiency - Final Budget as a Percent of Actual	150.2%	162.4%	↗	93.9%-105.3%	94%	Total budgeted revenue in the final budget, divided by total district operating revenue

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- Leadership and governance
- School board and administrative policies and procedures
- Budget development and management processes
- Revenue experience, variability, and forecasts
- Expenditure trends, volatility, and projections
- Per capita income levels
- Real property values and/or Local retail sales and business receipts
- Age of district infrastructure
- Monitoring and reporting systems

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Financial Services

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Paychecks processed per FTE per month	401.3	376.3	↘	1,123-2,636	763	Total number of pay checks processed by Payroll department, divided by total number of Payroll staff (FTEs), divided by 12 months.
Payroll costs per 100K spent	\$276.45	\$288.49	↗	\$110-\$295	\$188.12	Total Payroll personnel costs plus total payroll non-personnel costs, divided by total district payroll spent over \$100,000
Payroll cost per paycheck	\$10.92	\$11.90	↗	\$2.36-\$6.75	\$7.23	Total Payroll personnel costs plus total payroll non-personnel costs, divided by total number of payroll checks
Paycheck errors per 10K	145.4	15.5	↘	3.7-33.9	28.18	Total number of pay check errors, divided by total number of pay checks handled by Payroll department over 10,000
Paychecks Direct Deposit	100%	100%	→	94.2%-99.7%	92.00%	Total number of pay checks paid through direct deposit, divided by the total number of pay checks issued

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- School board and administrative policies and procedures
- Pay practices
- Number of annual payroll runs
- Implementation of Direct Deposit
- Level of automation
- Departmental and individual employee responsibilities and competencies
- Performance management systems

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Financial Services

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers*	Regional Peers**	Description
Workers' Compensation Cost per \$100K Payroll	\$412.97	\$488.97	↗	\$411-\$1098	\$715.46	Total workers' compensation premium costs plus workers' compensation claims costs incurred plus total workers' compensation claims administration costs for the fiscal year, divided by total payroll outlays over \$100,000.
Workers' Compensation Cost per Employee	\$204.27	\$249.45	↗	\$162-\$486	\$340.15	Total workers' compensation premium costs plus workers' compensation claims costs incurred plus total workers' compensation claims administration costs for the fiscal year, divided by total number of district employees
Grant Funds as Percent of Total Budget	10.7%	13.1%	↗	9.2%-13.2%	5.69%	Total grant funds expenditures, divided by total district operating revenue
Grant-Funded Staff as Percent of District FTEs	25.7%	24.7%	↘	7.3%-11.9%	12.83%	Number of grant-funded staff (FTEs), divided by total number of district employees (FTEs)
Days to Access New Grant Funds	12	12	→	14.7-61.8	25	Total aggregate number of days that passed after new grant award notification dates to the first expenditure date, divided by the total number of new grant awards in the fiscal year

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- Existing policies and procedures to help prevent injuries
- An organizations overall Worker's Compensation claim history - number of claims and severity of claims
- Size of district's payroll and staff member classification
- Effective claim management
- Grant seeking tied to district's strategic plan
- Knowledge of available grants
- Availability of resources required to pursue grants
- District competitive attributes to meet grant criteria in comparison to peers
- Grant writing experience

* National Peer Data gathered from the National Council for Great City Schools

** Regional Peer Data based on the performance assessments of 40 School Systems in the Southeastern United States from 2015-2021

Financial Services

There are three indicators that speak to the effectiveness of the budgeting process:

- Expenditure Efficiency - Adopted Budget as a percent of actual (111.2% - 2020-21 SY)
- Expenditures Efficiency - Final Budget as a percent of actual (169.8% - 2020-21SY)
- Revenues Efficiency - Final Budget as percent of actual (162.4% - 2022-21 SY)

The most effective budgets are those that are close predictors to actual performance. The closer aligned the budget is to actual spend, gives better control, vision, and management capability to the district leaders. There is a wide disparity between regional peers median performance and the performance range of national peers. Best practice would be to hold the budget to actual within +/- 7%. The district would benefit from reviewing the current budget process being used, identifying improvement opportunities, and deploying those for the upcoming budget season.

Most payroll efficiency indicators had performance below both national and regional peers. One of the only positive measures was that the district has achieved 100% of employees' paychecks being directly deposited. This is a commendable feat. Paycheck errors were highest during the district consolidation and have reduced to a level better than both national and regional peers. In the assessment interview, it was noted that the payroll process is mostly electronic with the exceptions of leave being entered/corrected, addressing staff member missed punches, and Substitutes that do not have a punch card. It was noted the district is still facing problems with missed punches or late paperwork from one department and that Principals sometimes are starting new employees before they have been fully setup in the system.

Workers' compensation measures were in line with both national and regional peers.

Financial Services

Lastly, the district appears to be heavily reliant upon grants to fund staff positions. While the percentage of grant-funded staff did slightly reduce over the reviewed period, the district remains at levels that are almost double both national and regional peers.

As mentioned earlier, the district may benefit from a deeper review to better understand opportunities associated with optimizing processes along with improving staffing levels and roles within Human Resources, Supply Chain Management and Finance. The district might be able to realize an annual savings between \$55,000 to \$100,000 total across all departments.

Instructional Performance Review

Greenwood Leflore Consolidated School District

June 2022



Instruction

The purpose of the core instructional resource analysis is to assess the performance of a target education resource and determine if the resource is utilized to fidelity and generating the expected student outcomes. The analysis has two primary components: Utilization Fidelity & Impact Analysis. Imagine Learning was purchased and evaluated for Greenwood-Leflore ELL students on the following metrics:

Utilization Fidelity

Utilization analysis leverages published studies and documentation from the resource vendor related to the minimum amount of utilization (exposure to the resource) that ensures it is additive to the instructional process. Student utilization data is used to segment the targeted students into User Groups (those that met the fidelity threshold) and Non-User Groups (those that did not meet the threshold).

Impact Analysis

Impact analysis reviews student academic performance in the context of resource utilization or lack thereof. Impact analysis uses growth on formative assessments and year over year summative growth to assess the performance of the two groups. Impact Analysis also includes Learning Loss analysis. Student Learning Loss is when a student loses academic ground from the start of the year to the end of the year. The Learning Loss analysis determines whether utilization of the resource had any positive impact on Learning Loss.

Instruction

Imagine Learning

Utilization rate shows the percentage of students that met the vendor's recommended threshold. The overall utilization rate across the district was 22.06%. Kindergarten and 3rd grades had the lowest utilization (0% and 8.70%) and 6th and 7th grades had the highest (50% and 50%).

\$35,000 of Imagine Learning licenses were purchased for ELL students in 21.22 school year.

Key Takeaways

- Underutilized spending due to lack of usage totaled 77.94% of the total expenditure.
- There was no documented evidence provided showing implementation fidelity expectations, agreement to expectations, and monitoring procedure.
- The absence of a defined implementation fidelity procedure most likely contributed to the lower-than-expected utilization rate.

Grade Level	Utilization Rate
K	0%
1	50%
2	42.86%
3	8.70%
4	18.16%
5	14.29%
6	50%
7	50%
8	20%
Overall	22.06%

Instruction

Imagine Learning Impact Analysis

Impact Analysis shows overall academic growth of the User and Non-User segments and amount of Learning Loss. The overall academic growth seen in the Non-User group on the Pre to Post formative assessment was 1.62%. This was significantly lower than the growth rate seen for the User group, 4.19%.

Key Takeaways

- The User group grew more than 2x the Non-User group.
- Given that 78% of students did not meet the fidelity mark, increasing the utilization rate of Imagine Learning would likely increase the overall academic growth for the school district.

Grade Level	User Growth	Non-User Growth
K	NA	7.37%
1	12.58%	7.39%
2	9%	5.69%
3	3.57%	2.97%
4	1.5%	1.1%
5	-3.78%	-.95%
6	-18.81%	0%
7	-13.13%	-14.26%
8	10.43%	-13.56%
Overall	4.19%	1.62%

Instruction

Imagine Learning Loss Analysis

Learning Loss is the situation where a student loses academic ground between a Pre and Post or year over year assessment. 26.67% of students in the User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests. However, 38.68% of students in the Non-User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests.

Key Takeaways:

- The percentage of Learning Loss students seen in the Non-User group was 12.01% more than in the User group.
- Most grade levels showed less learning loss in the user vs. non-user groups.
- However, 4th and 5th grades showed more learning loss in the user group. Investigation into implementation and alignment is recommended to maximize the resource's impact.

Grade Level	% of Users with Learning Loss	% of Non-Users with Learning Loss
K	NA	100%
1	0%	11.11%
2	0%	12.5%
3	0%	42.86%
4	50%	27.78%
5	100%	44.44%
6	100%	100%
7	100%	100%
8	0%	100%
Overall	26.67%	38.68%

Instruction

Utilization Fidelity

- Develop an employee communication plan to set appropriate implementation fidelity expectations
- Capture confirmation from educators confirming both receipt and intention to comply with the expectations
- Create a monitoring process to manage implementation fidelity throughout the year
- Increasing implementation fidelity will likely:
 - Increase the amount of student growth each year
 - Reduce the number of students suffering from learning loss each year
 - Reduce the amount of underutilized spending due to lack of utilization

Impact Analysis

- Only one academic product for ELL students was provided for analysis. Several others were identified in the Accounts Payable file but no access was provided.
- Conduct a deeper investigation into why certain grade levels (4th and 5th) did not see greater growth in the Imagine Learning user group vs. the non-user group.
- Key areas to explore within these grade levels are how Imagine Learning was implemented, whether the learning paths were well aligned and determine if additional training is required to get the full benefit from the resource.
- Identifying root causes for lower growth in certain grade levels will:
 - Increase the amount of student growth
 - Increase the academic return on investment for Imagine Learning

Recommendations

Instruction

Closely monitoring a student's learning path throughout the year is critical for educators to personalize instruction. Educators accomplish this using formative assessments. Formative assessments provide educators a means to monitor the progress of students throughout the course of the year and inform instruction for each student. Similarly, course grades are the primary vehicle to communicate student progress to students and parents.

Given that educators rely on formative assessments to gauge standards mastery and grades to communicate mastery, it is imperative that both have a high correlation to state assessments. Poorly aligned formative assessments will both misguide educators on student needs and inhibit their ability to ensure students demonstrate standards mastery on state assessments. Poorly aligned grading practices with standards mastery inflate course grades. Inflation sends the wrong messages to students and parents regarding students' level of mastery.

There are three primary components of the analysis: Proficiency Correlation, Non-Proficiency Correlation, and Grading Correlation.

Math

The Greenwood-Leflore school district selected the iReady for their Math formative assessment.

Key Takeaways:

- 4th and 5th grade had high return on proficiency prediction between iReady Math and MAAP Math
- 6th grade had lower than expected correlation. An investigation into 6th grade alignment is recommended

Grade Level	Proficiency Correlation	Non-Proficiency Correlation
3 rd	NA	84.19%
4 th	100%	94.2%
5 th	NA	97.48%
6 th	100%	78.57%
7 th	NA	83.03%
8 th	66.67%	80.26%

Instruction

Reading

The Greenwood-Leflore school district selected the iReady Reading for their Reading formative assessment.

Key Takeaways:

- 3rd- 5th grades had high proficiency correlation between iReady Reading and MAAP Reading
- 6th- 8th grades experienced lower than expected correlation. An investigation into alignment is recommended.

Grade Level	Proficiency Correlation	Non-Proficiency Correlation
3 rd	89.47%	91.53%
4 th	100%	87.46%
5 th	100%	83.63%
6 th	66.67%	82.16%
7 th	75%	86.56%
8 th	NA	84.31%

Instruction

Math

Greenwood-Leflore’s end of year Math grades were correlated to standards mastery on their Math formative assessments. Grade inflation is broken down by students receiving As, Bs, Cs. The following chart highlights the level of grade inflation seen in 3rd through 8th grades.

Takeaways:

- Significant grade inflation exists across all grade levels.
- A review of grading practices is recommended to ensure grading practices represent mastery.
- Areas of investigation include instructional rigor, weightings, number of graded items, activity types.

Grade Level	‘A’ Math Inflation	‘B’ Math Inflation	‘C’ Math Inflation
3 rd	93%	83%	73%
4 th	90%	83%	84%
5 th	40%	69%	70%
6 th	72%	90%	85%
7 th	88%	73%	61%
8 th	85%	71%	48%

The negative impact of grade inflation is that students and parents receive a false message on the actual progress of their students

Instruction

Reading

Greenwood-Leflore's end of year Reading grades were correlated to standards mastery on their Reading formative assessments. Grade inflation is broken down by students receiving As, Bs, Cs. The following chart highlights the level of grade inflation seen in 3rd through 8th grades.

Takeaways:

- Significant grade inflation exists across most grade levels.
- A review of grading practices is recommended to ensure grading practices represent mastery.
- Areas of investigation include instructional rigor, weightings, number of graded items, activity types.

Grade Level	'A' Math Inflation	'B' Math Inflation	'C' Math Inflation
3 rd	67%	89%	94%
4 th	86%	100%	99%
5 th	94%	99%	100%
6 th	84%	98%	95%
7 th	71%	58%	79%
8 th	89%	71%	83%

The negative impact of grade inflation is that students and parents receive a false message on the actual progress of their students

Non-Instructional Performance Review

Appendix: Supporting Data

Greenwood Leflore Consolidated School District



Transportation Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Transportation	Annual transportation operational costs	\$ 1,638,693.00	\$ 1,003,242.00
Transportation	Average number of students transported daily	3,800	0
Transportation	Average number of miles driven daily	1,145	500
Transportation	Regular education route buses in operation	66	20
Transportation	Special Education route buses in operation	6	3
Transportation	Spare route buses	3	0
Transportation	Number of bus mechanics	2	2
General District	Total number of schools within system	12	12
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 54,457,227.31	\$ 52,109,318.50
General District	Number of school days annually	180	180

Provided Performance Data



Operations

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Operations	Annual maintenance costs overall	\$4,092,480.56	\$3,520,970.54
Operations	Annual custodial costs overall	\$888,978.57	\$914,679.11
Operations	Annual custodial supply costs	<i>Included with Maintenance Costs</i>	
Operations	Total square feet maintained by district	890,004	890,004
Operations	Number of maintenance technicians/tradesmen employed by district (FTE)	14	15
Operations	Total square acres of maintained property	25,000	25,000
Operations	Number of custodians employed by district (FTE)	40	35
Operations	Average number of days to complete a maintenance work order	4	2
Operations	Total utility costs (including electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer)	\$ 1,607,916.00	\$ 819,082.00
General District	Total number of students enrolled	4,729	4,317
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 54,457,227.31	\$ 52,109,318.50

Provided Performance Data



Nutrition Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Child Nutrition	Total meal equivalents served annually	745,704	438,045
Child Nutrition	Total annual labor hours	Not Provided	Not Provided
Child Nutrition	Total annual revenue	\$ 4,472,815.36	\$ 4,718,834.07
Child Nutrition	Annual fund balance	\$ 2,246,257.47	\$ 1,817,699.72
Child Nutrition	Total value of USDA Commodities	\$ 138,928.00	\$ 327,680.26
Child Nutrition	Total annual food costs	\$ 755,927.34	\$ 357,035.82
Child Nutrition	Total annual labor costs	\$ 922,894.40	\$ 1,742,552.69
Child Nutrition	Total annual direct costs	\$ 1,274,950.57	\$ 787,592.28
Child Nutrition	Total annual indirect costs	\$ 141,360.00	\$ 298,790.74
Child Nutrition	Breakfast participation rates	Not Provided	Not Provided
Child Nutrition	Lunch participation rates	Not Provided	Not Provided
General District	Total number of students enrolled	4,729	4,317
General District	Number of school days annually	180	180

Provided Performance Data



Technology

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Information Technology	Total IT staff	4	3
Information Technology	Total student devices	8,200	8,532
Information Technology	Total employee devices	800	870
Information Technology	Total advanced-presentation devices	120	184
Information Technology	Total IT staffing costs	\$ 275,861.27	\$ 249,793.64
Information Technology	Total IT hardware, systems and service costs	\$ 74,990.87	\$ 52,657.49
Information Technology	Business systems costs	\$ 23,773.47	\$ 9,324.79
Information Technology	Instructional systems cost	\$ 52,418.21	\$ 45,684.00
Information Technology	IT spending-capital investment	\$ -	\$ -
Information Technology	Total annual support/incident tickets	220	295
Information Technology	Average number of days support/incident tickets remain open	5	7
Information Technology	Total available bandwidth (in Mbit/s)	40,000	40,000
Information Technology	Average age of computers	3-4 Years	4-5 Years
Information Technology	Network days usage exceeded 75% of capacity	0	0
General District	Total number of students enrolled	4,729	4,317
General District	Total number of school personnel (FTE)	769	730
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 54,457,227.31	\$ 52,109,318.50
General District	Total number of teachers (FTE)	269	293

Provided Performance Data



Human Resources

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Human Resources	Annual human resource costs overall	\$ 220,013.00	\$ 229,685.00
Human Resources	Number of HR department staff	3	3
Human Resources	Total number of overall staff separations (FTE)	55	51
Human Resources	Total number of teacher separations (FTE)	41	39
Human Resources	Total number of employee discrimination complaints	0	0
Human Resources	Total number of employee misconduct investigations	0	1
Human Resources	Human resources as a percentage of overall district expense	0.60%	0.80%
General District	Total number of school personnel (FTE)	769	730
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 46,539,732.00	\$ 47,084,641.00
General District	Total number of teachers (FTE)	269	293

Provided Performance Data



Supply Chain

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Supply Chain	Total procurement dept. costs	\$ 175,012.00	\$ 131,321.00
Supply Chain	Total procurement staff	2	2
Supply Chain	Total procurement staff with professional certification	0	0
Supply Chain	Total # PO's/fiscal year (exclude P-card & construction)	NA	NA
Supply Chain	Total P-card Transactions	0	0
Supply Chain	Total construction Transactions	0	0
Supply Chain	Total amount of procurement outlay	\$ 10,365,810.00	\$ 11,231,702.00
Supply Chain	Total savings from invitations for bids, request for proposals & informal solicitations	\$ -	\$ -
Supply Chain	Average # days to administer invitations to bid	0	0
Supply Chain	Total purchasing through competitive procurement	n/a	n/a
Supply Chain	Total spent under cooperative agreements	n/a	n/a
Supply Chain	Total district warehouse operating expenses	\$ 98,460.92	\$ 48,071.05
Supply Chain	Total value sales/issues from district warehouse	\$ 14,564.40	\$ 20,826.99
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 46,539,732.00	\$ 47,084,641.00

Supply Chain

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Supply Chain	Total accounts payable dept. costs	\$ 59,979.38	\$ 72,835.77
Supply Chain	Total AP staff	1	2
Supply Chain	Total # invoices processed	10,597	8,383
Supply Chain	Average #days to process invoice	Unavailable	unavailable
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments	10,657	8,294
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments past due	275	315
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments voided	72	58

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	Total # staff in financial dept.	5	6
Finance	Total # directors/managers	2	2
Finance	Total # secretaries/admin assistants	0	0
Finance	Total # staff in payroll dept.	2	2
Finance	Total payroll dept. costs	\$ 105,152.56	\$ 107,436.12
Finance	Total district payroll	\$ 38,036,265.56	\$ 37,241,270.46
Finance	# paychecks processed	9,631	9,032
Finance	Total # paycheck errors	140	14
Finance	Total # paychecks direct deposit	9,631	9,032

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	Total debt principal	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 110,000.00
Finance	Total debt servicing costs	\$ 306,572.00	\$ 306,512.00
Finance	Total fund balance	\$ 17,886,093.83	\$ 17,504,297.62
Finance	Total budgeted expenditures	\$ 45,351,339.81	\$ 57,969,241.65
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 54,457,227.31	\$ 52,109,318.50
Finance	Total budgeted revenue	\$ 63,693,917.00	\$ 67,716,526.00
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 46,539,732.00	\$ 47,084,641.00
Finance	Total budgeted expenditures in final budget	\$ 101,520,644.00	\$ 88,504,275.00
Finance	Total budgeted revenue in final budget	\$ 69,881,348.00	\$ 76,472,476.00
Finance	Total liability premiums, claims & admin costs	\$ 157,080.00	\$ 243,169.00

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	# liability claims filed	22	2
Finance	# liability claims litigated	1	0
Finance	Total workers' comp premium, claims & admin costs	\$ 157,080.00	\$ 182,098.00
Finance	Total workers' comp claims filed	22	2
Finance	Total lost days for all workers' comp claims	19	0
Finance	Total workplace accidents reported	21	1
Finance	Total grant fund expenditures	4,990,529	6,164,342
Finance	Number of grant funded staff	198	180
Finance	Total grant funds returned	0	0
Finance	Total grant funds expenditures from competitive grants	\$ 1,549,765.00	\$ 1,896,966.00
Finance	Average days to access grant funds	12	12
Finance	Average days to process grant receivable invoices	12	12
General District	Total Number of School Personnel (FTE)	769	730

Date	Time	Department	Personnel
15-Jun-22	10:00 a.m.	Transportation	Talece Hudson, Ted Anderson
15-Jun-22	1:00 p.m.	Finance/Procurement	Kellia Washington, Lakeny Thomas
15-Jun-22	3:00 p.m.	Human Resources	Mario Miller
16-Jun-22	1:00 p.m.	Instructional Technology	Shannon Storms
16-Jun-22	3:00 p.m.	Nutrition Services	Jacqueline Howard, Yvette Totten
16-Jun-22	3:30 p.m.	Special Education	Andrea Parker
17-Jun-22	10:00 a.m.	Operations	Torien Howard

Department Interviews Conducted

