

Non-Instructional Performance Review

Kemper County 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 Kemper County School District in respect to the contents of this report are understood to be the sole responsibility of Kemper County 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 Kemper County School District.

This report is solely intended to be a resource guide for Kemper County 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.

Kemper Executive Leadership Positions and Salary

Position	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
Superintendent	102,785.00	\$102,687	\$105,000	\$115,000
Assistant Superintendent	NA	NA	\$84,000	\$84,000
CFO	73,971.00	\$27,230	\$65,000	\$70,000
HR Director	\$11,503	\$18,051	\$8,304	\$8,750
Director of Information Systems	\$73,055	\$71,587	NA	NA
Child Nutrition Director	\$34,901	\$47,434	\$47,434	\$39,322
Assistant SpEd Director	\$77,438	\$49,332	\$65,000	\$65,000
Transportation Director	\$49,788	\$49,332	\$49,332	\$54,332

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	8.16%	7.93%	↘	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 Bus Overall	\$33,127.13	\$29,967.14	↘	\$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	\$1,794.12	\$1,712.41	↘	\$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	\$2.51	\$2.40	↘	\$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	18%	20%	↗	9%-15%	18.07%	Total spare buses divided by total scheduled for daily routes
Ratio of Buses per School	5.60	6.00	↗	4-7	6.89	Total number of buses divided by total number of schools within the district
Ratio of Buses per Mechanic	14.00	15.00	↗		31.36	Total number of maintenance staff divided by the total number of buses

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

Transportation expenditures reduced slightly over the two-year review period. Transportation expenditures as a percentage of total district budget remains higher than both national and regional peers.

The district has 22 daily regular bus routes and 2 daily special education routes. These routes service 5 schools transporting 525 students (2020-2021 SY) averaging 2,077 miles driven daily. Of the daily routes, 6 are single runs supporting individual schools. The remaining 18 routes use the “domino” method – loading all students on a single run and drop/pick up students at multiple schools. It was noted that 5 to 6 routes were approximately 1.5 hours long. The district maintains these routes manually without the assistance of any software system. Most of these routes have existed for years with minor adjustments. Kemper County High School and West Kemper County Middle School are on the same campus. West Kemper County Elementary School is approximately 1.3 miles from that campus. East Kemper County Elementary School is approximately 13.8 miles.

The ratio of buses to mechanic (15 buses per mechanic) is significantly lower than regional peers (31.36 buses per mechanic).

A route efficiency review should take place to see if there could be any reduction in daily routes by staggering bell schedules to allow route tiering versus the current domino method. Potentially this could reduce 2 to 3 daily route buses. If routing efficiency improved to the point of reducing buses the district should review maintenance labor needs. Through these actions the district may be able to bring their overall transportation expenditures as a percentage of total district expense in line with national and regional peers which would reflect an expenditure reduction of between \$89,000 to \$124,000.

Potential Improvement Opportunities



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
Operations as a Percentage of overall District Expense	5.0%	5.0%	→	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	\$467.99	\$475.11	↗	\$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	\$235.74	\$244.33	↗	\$245-\$430	\$210.65	Total custodial work costs (contractor and district operated), divided by total student enrollment.
Maintenance Cost per SqFt	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		\$0.91-\$1.52	\$2.34	Cost of maintenance work divided by total square footage of all buildings.
Custodial Cost per SqFt	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		\$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 SqFt	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		\$0.09-\$0.18	\$0.17	Total custodial supply cost divided by total square footage of all buildings.
Utility Costs per Square Foot	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		\$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	2	2	→	0-24	7.75	Total aggregate number of days to complete all work orders, divided by total number of work orders.
Maintenance workload (SqFt per Maintenance Tech)	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>			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 (SqFt per Custodian)	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		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	43	43	→		154.51	Total acreage of maintained property divided by total number of Landscape Technicians

Operations

Operation expenditures as a percentage of overall district expense was lower than both national and regional peers. Maintenance and operation costs per student was also lower than both national and regional peers. Custodial cost per student was in line with national peers and slightly higher than the regional peer average.

At the time of the assessment the district did not have the total facility square foot under management. During the assessment interview, the statement was made that in order to get this number each school building would have to be walked and measured. Time constraints prevented this option. As a result, several key performance indicators are not available for this department. This prevents the assessment from being able to identify opportunities for improvement.

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	54.0%	47.0%	↘	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	77.0%	49.0%	↘	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	\$2.76	\$3.94	↗	\$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	\$1.31	\$1.49	↗	\$1.56-\$2.10	\$1.52	Total food costs, divided by the total meals equivalent served annually.
Fund balance as percent of revenue	35.6%	41.0%	↗	6.5%-36.0%	39.00%	Fund balance divided by total revenue
Food costs as a percent of revenue	22.4%	21.0%	↘	38.1%-47.9%	37.08%	Total food costs divided by total revenue
Labor costs as percent of revenue	18.4%	24.3%	↗	42.7%-58.6%	47%	Total labor costs divided by total revenue
USDA Commodities percent of total revenue	4.1%	0.0%	↘	6.1%-8.1%	5.72%	Total value of commodities received divided by total revenue
Meals Per Labor Hour	11.1	9.8	↘	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

Breakfast participation has declined over the two-year review period yet remains above national and regional peers. Lunch participation was above national and regional peers in the 2019-20 school year and dropped below in the 2020-21 school year. Most finance performance indicators are in line with peer performance. Meals per Labor Hour (MPLH) significantly dropped across the two-year review period. MPLH was below both national and regional peer performance for the 2020-21 school year.

The district should consider deployment of alternative breakfast programs:

- For elementary Schools - a "Breakfast in Classroom" service model (reference: Food Research and Action Center Publication: Making Breakfast Part of the School Day https://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/how_it_works_bic_fact_sheet.pdf)
- For middle and high schools - a "Second Chance" breakfast service model (reference: Food Research and Action Center Publication: Making Breakfast Part of the School Day https://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/how_it_works_bic_fact_sheet.pdf)

The district should also perform an entrée/participation analysis across a 9 week period (District is on a 3 week menu cycle) to see variations in participation by entrée by each school. Middle and High School students should be surveyed to gather insight on food appearance, taste, smell, and consistency. Both of these actions will provide information that can be used to dial in lunch entrées and increase lunch participation.

Increasing school breakfast participation by 10 - 20% will increase program revenues by \$39,000 to \$79,000 annually. Increasing lunch participation to meet peer performance levels would increase revenues by \$143,000 to \$202,000.

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	2.4%	1.9%	↘	1.85%-3.71%	1.9%	Total IT staffing, hardware, systems and service costs divided by total district operating budget.
IT Spending per student	\$291.29	\$227.79	↘	\$243-\$518	\$192.35	Total IT staffing, hardware, systems and service costs divided by total student enrollment
Network-Bandwidth per Student	4.22	8.60	↗	125.4-381.6	271	Total standard available bandwidth divided by total student enrollment
Network days usage exceeded 75% of capacity	30.00	45.00	↗	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	9.00	7.00	↘	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	0.25	0.46	↗	0.96-1.65	1.18	Total number of employee laptops and desktops divided by the total number of district employees
Devices per student	0.63	1.94	↗	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	0.46	0.58	↗	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	184	668	↗		772.17	Total student and employee devices (excluding presentation devices) divided by total number of IT staff FTEs.

Technology

Overall technology spend is in line with both national and regional peers. IT spending per student aligns with national peers and is higher than regional peers. The ratio of devices per student (1.94) is higher than national and regional peers. Using EDLA/ESSER funds the district deployed Chromebooks for all students in July of 2020. Computer labs are not used. During the assessment interviews, it was clear that the district was committed to using technology to enhance instruction. Instead of a traditional technology plan the district has developed an Innovation Plan that aligns technology with the Superintendents instructional vision.

The district reported that the average age of devices was 7 years. This number seemed odd in relationship to the new Chromebook roll out. The assessment team believes that this data referred to all the devices prior to the roll out.

Devices per technology staff member was better than the regional peer average.

Network infrastructure may require additional investment going forward. While Network-Bandwidth per Student more than doubled across the two-year review period, bandwidth was still below national and regional peers. The number of days annually that the daily internet usage reached more than 75% of standard available bandwidth for 5 minutes or longer increased over the two-year review period. The number of days was higher than national peers and about half that of regional peers.

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	\$82.54	\$66.89	↘	\$408-\$792	\$288.41	Total HR department costs, divided by total district operating revenue over \$100,000
HR Cost per District Staff Member	\$37.63	\$29.45	↘	\$417-\$1,047	\$237.95	HR Department costs divided by total number of District Staff (FTEs)
Number of Employees per HR Staff Member	1224	1128	↘		371.36	Total number of district staff (FTEs) divided by total number of HR staff.
Overall Employee Separation Rate	14%	11%	↘	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	29%	18%	↘	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	3.27	3.55	↗	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	3.27	3.55	↗	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

As a small district Kemper County Schools employs approximately 282 staff members. The Human Resource function is performed by personnel that also works in payroll. During assessment interviews it was determined that the individual splits their time as follows: 75% Payroll and 25% Human Resources. As a result, Human Resource cost indicators are significantly below both national and regional peers. At the same time the ratio of district staff members to Human Resource staff is significantly higher than peers.

The above noted structure appears to be functioning well when we assessed key performance indicators tied to teacher separation and overall employee separation. Both of these declined over the two-year review period and were better than both national and regional peers. Employee misconduct investigations had slightly risen yet remained below national and regional peers.

A deeper look should be taken on what is driving employee discrimination investigations. These trended slightly up and at the same time were significantly higher than both national and regional peers.

In the assessment interviews it was evident that several processes were manual and paper-based or paper-assisted within the department. Some of these processes may be able to be improved to drive efficiency and eliminate paper usage. Lastly, the department should consider tracking key performance measures on an ongoing basis in order to maintain performance, identify issues early on, and understand where there might be further opportunities for improvement.

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	\$344.60	\$382.38	↗	\$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	\$7.84	\$10.82	↗	\$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	<= 30	11	↘	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	510.8	365.6	↘	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	0.0%	0.0%	→	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	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		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

Performance Indicator	2019-2020	2020-2021	Trend	National Peers	Regional Peers*	Description
Procurement Costs per \$100K	\$405.86	\$429.09	↗	\$70-\$133	\$80.52	Total Procurement department costs, divided by total district revenue over \$100,000
Costs per PO	\$41.15	\$45.57	↗	\$48-\$134	\$71.10	Total Purchasing department costs, divided by the total number of purchase orders that were processed by the Purchasing department, excluding P- card transactions and construction.
Procurement Savings Ratio	0.00%	0.00%	→	0.5%-4.4%	8%	Total savings from Invitations for Bids, Requests for Proposals and informal solicitations, divided by total procurement outlays (excluding P-cards and construction).
Competitive Procurement Ratio	0.00%	0.00%	→	40.6%-83.6%	49.30%	Total amount of purchasing that was through competitive procurements, divided by the sum of total procurement outlays, total P-card purchasing and total construction spending.
Procurement staff with professional certification	0.00%	0.00%	→	0%-33.3%	13%	Number of Purchasing department staff with a professional certificate, divided by total number of Purchasing staff (FTEs).
Warehouse Operating Expense Ratio	<i>Not provided</i>	<i>Not provided</i>		7.3%-32.1%		Total operating expenses of all measured warehouses (including school/office supplies, textbooks, food service items, facility maintenance items, and transportation maintenance items), divided by total value of all issues/sales from the warehouse(s).

Factors that influence performance and can steer improvements include:

- Procurement policies
- Utilization of blanket purchase agreements
- Number of highly complex procurements
- Departmental and individual employee responsibilities and competencies
- Performance management systems
- Level of automation

* 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

Kemper County Schools has one procurement person, and one accounts payable. The district's total procurement outlay ranged between approximately \$5.4 to \$6.4 Million annually over the two-year review period. The district does not do many formal bids or request for proposals. This was a new process for the district during recent construction activities. Most large purchases such as buses are done from the state contract list. Small purchases are made using a minimum of two quotes.

The district would benefit from looking at optimizing both the Accounts Payable and Procurement processes currently being used to identify opportunities to gain efficiency and reduce errors through standardization, setup performance measurement practices, and increased competitive bidding. Through standardizing, measuring, and increasing competitive bidding the district could see between 5-20% reduction on cost of purchasing goods and services. Due to the district's limited experience with the formal bid process the district may be limited on how much competitive bidding can be initially started. If the district was able to bid 25% of the items and services purchased in the 2020-21 fiscal year, the district could potentially save between \$80,000 to \$320,000.

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	0.97%	0.43%	↘	3.9%-11.2%	3.06%	Total debt servicing costs, divided by total operating revenue
Fund Balance Ratio	133%	162%	↗	9.7%-20.8%	7.36%	Total fund balance, divided by total district operating expenditures
Expenditure Efficiency - Adopted Budget as a Percent of Actual	172%	154%	↘	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	139%	152%	↗	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	135%	151%	↗	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	44.5	56.1	↗	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	\$945.49	\$421.51	↘	\$110-\$295	\$188.12	Total Payroll personnel costs plus total payroll non-personnel costs, divided by total district payroll spend over \$100,000
Payroll cost per paycheck	\$27.07	\$12.34	↘	\$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	682.4	63.2	↘	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	100.2%	99.0%	↘	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

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

- Expenditure Efficiency-Adopted Budget as a percent of actual (154% - 2019-20 SY)
- Expenditures Efficiency - Final Budget as a percent of actual (152% - 2019-20 SY)
- Revenues Efficiency - Final Budget as percent of actual (151% - 2019-20 SY)

The most effective budgets are those that are close predictors to actual performance. The closer aligned the budget is to actual spend, the better control, vision, and management capability district leaders have. 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.

The district would benefit from a deeper review of Payroll processes. Currently this department is staffed by four people (one also splits time with Human Resource functions). Most performance measures within the department do not meet national or regional peer performance. In the assessment interviews it was evident that several processes were manual and paper-based or paper-assisted within the department. Some of these processes may be able to be improved to drive efficiency and eliminate errors.

The district reported that they received \$9,890.25 of competitive grant funding in 2020-21. This is significantly less than most districts of similar size. The district may not have been able to report on all competitive grant funds. A deeper review should occur. The district may need to be more aggressive in pursuing competitive grant funds. If the district was able to do half or meet regional peers' performance this would provide an additional \$300,000 to \$600,000 annually.

Potential Improvement Opportunities



Instructional Process Review

Kemper County 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. IXL and iReady were evaluated for Kemper 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 showed any positive impact on Learning Loss.

Instruction

IXL Math Utilization Rate

Utilization rate shows the percentage of students that met the vendor’s recommended threshold. The overall utilization rate across the district for IXL was 20.9%. 3rd grade had the lowest utilization (0%) and 4th grade had the highest utilization (37%).

Key Takeaways

- The lack of implementation fidelity for the district most likely led to lower academic performance and increased the amount of underutilized spending.
- Underutilized spending due to lack of usage totaled 79.1% of the total expenditure.
- There was no documented evidence provided showing implementation fidelity expectations, agreement to, 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
3	0%
4	37%
5	4%
6	30%
Overall	20.9%

Instruction

IXL Math 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%. This was higher than the growth rate seen for the User group, -.29%.

Key Takeaways

- Overall the Non-User group outperformed the user group
- Investigation into whether IXL Math meets the district’s curriculum alignment standards is warranted.
- Additional investigation into methods of implementation should be explored to make sure best practices are followed.

Grade Level	User Growth	Non-User Growth
3	NA	1.16%
4	.12%	-.25%
5	-2.45%	1.32%
6	-.4%	1.22%
Overall	-.29%	1%

Instruction

IXL Math Learning Loss Analysis

Learning Loss is the situation where a student loses academic ground between a Pre and Post or year over year assessment. 57.85% of students in the User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests. However, 49.51% 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 less than in the User group.
- Investigation into why IXL is not reducing Learning Loss in the User group is warranted.
- Increasing implementation fidelity is highly recommended if continuing to purchase this resource.

Grade Level	% of Users with Learning Loss	% of Non-Users with Learning Loss
3	NA	49.51%
4	55.56%	56.52%
5	100%	35.29%
6	53.85%	68.97%
Overall	57.58%	49.51%

Instruction

IXL Reading Utilization Rate

The overall utilization rate across the district was 2.3%. 4th grade had the highest utilization (5.8%) and 3rd & 5th grades had the lowest rate (0%).

Key Takeaways

- The lack of implementation fidelity for the district most likely led to lower academic performance and underutilized spending.
- Underutilized spending due to lack of usage totaled 97.7% of the total expenditure.
- There was no documented evidence provided showing implementation fidelity expectations, agreement to, 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
3	0%
4	5.8%
5	0%
6	2%
Overall	2.3%

Instruction

IXL Reading Impact Analysis

The overall academic growth seen in the Non-User group on their Pre to Post formative assessment was 1.51%. This was significantly lower than the growth rate seen for the User group, 2.58%.

Key Takeaways

- Overall the User group outperformed the Non-user group by 1%.
- However, 2/3 grade levels had almost no usage.
- Given that 97% students did not meet the User group threshold, increasing the utilization rate of IXL will most likely increase the overall academic growth for the school district.

Grade Level	User Growth	Non-User Growth
4	2.58%	.61%
5	NA	1.29%
6	NA	2.34%
Overall	2.58%	1.51%

Instruction

IXL Reading Learning Loss Analysis

Learning Loss is the situation where a student loses academic ground between a Pre and Post or year over year assessment. 50% of students in the User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests. 38.85% 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 less than in the User group. Close monitoring of this trend is recommended with a larger User group once the implementation fidelity issues are corrected.
- Increasing the number of students in the User group will reduce underutilized spending and potentially reduce the amount of Learning Loss in the school district assuming the resource is well aligned.

Grade Level	% of Users with Learning Loss	% of Non-Users with Learning Loss
3	NA	38.30%
4	50%	45%
5	NA	41.70%
6	NA	30.23%
Overall	50%	38.85%

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:
 - 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

- A thorough analysis of IXL Math's impact should be conducted to determine why the User group showed less growth than the Non-User group.
- Conduct a deeper dive into why utilization on IXL reading did not reduce more Learning Loss.
- Key areas to explore within these grade levels are how IXL was implemented, whether the personalized 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 IXL Math & Reading

Recommendations

Instruction

iReady Math Utilization Rate

Utilization rate shows the percentage of students that met the vendor’s recommended threshold. The overall utilization rate across the district was 38.80%. 3rd grade had the highest utilization (97.87%) and 5th grade had the lowest utilization (3.85%).

Key Takeaways

- The lack of implementation fidelity for the district most likely led to lower academic performance and increased the amount of underutilized spending.
- Ineffective spending due to lack of usage totaled 61.2% of the total expenditure.
- There was no documented evidence provided showing implementation fidelity expectations, agreement to, and monitoring procedure.
- The absence of a defined implementation fidelity procedure contributed to the lower-than-expected utilization rate.

Grade Level	Utilization Rate
3	97.87%
4	46.34%
5	3.85%
6	9.30%
Overall	38.80%

Instruction

iReady Math 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 .03%%. This was significantly lower than the growth rate seen for the User group, 2.46%.

Key Takeaways

- The User group grew exponentially more than the Non-User group.
- Given that approximately 2/5 students did not meet the User group threshold, increasing the utilization rate of iReady Math would significantly increase the overall academic growth for the school district.

Grade Level	User Growth	Non-User Growth
3	1.2%	-.86%
4	.32%	-.43%
5	14.36%	.67%
6	15.00%	-.46%
Overall	2.46%	.03%

Instruction

iReady Math Learning Loss Analysis

Learning Loss is the situation where a student loses academic ground between a Pre and Post or year over year assessment. 40.85% of students in the User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests. However, 54.56% 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 significantly higher than the User group.
- Increasing the number of students in the User group would dramatically reduce the amount of Learning Loss in the school district.

Grade Level	% of Users with Learning Loss	% of Non-Users with Learning Loss
3	41.30%	100%
4	52.63%	59.09%
5	0%	40%
6	0%	69.23%
Overall	40.85%	54.56%

Instruction

iReady Reading Utilization Rate

The overall utilization rate across the district was 1.42%. 6th grade had the highest utilization (2.27%) and 4th grade had the lowest rate (0.00%).

Key Takeaways

- The lack of implementation fidelity for the district most likely led to lower academic performance and underutilized spending.
- Underutilized spending due to lack of usage totaled 98.58% of the total expenditure.
- There was no documented evidence provided showing implementation fidelity expectations, agreement to, 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
4	0.00%
5	1.82%
6	2.27%
Overall	1.42%

Instruction

iReady Reading Impact Analysis

The overall academic growth seen in the Non-User group on their Pre to Post formative assessment was 1.5%. This was slightly lower than the growth rate seen for the User group, 1.86%.

Key Takeaways

- Overall the User group marginally outperformed the Non-user group.
- A deeper dive into why the User group did not outperform the Non-User group to a greater degree is recommended.
- Given that all grade levels had less than 3% utilization of the resource, close monitoring of impact is recommended.
- 97% students did not meet the User group threshold. Increasing the utilization rate of iReady will most likely increase the overall academic growth for the school district.

Grade Level	User Growth	Non-User Growth
4	NA	.69%
5	.94%	1.31%
6	2.62%	2.27%
Overall	1.86%	1.5%

Instruction

iReady Reading Learning Loss Analysis

Learning Loss is the situation where a student loses academic ground between a Pre and Post or year over year assessment. 0% of students in the User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests. 40.29% of students in the Non-User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests.

Key Takeaways:

- While the User group sample size was small, the percentage of Learning Loss students seen in the Non-User group was significantly higher than in the User group.
- Increasing the number of students in the User group should reduce the amount of Learning Loss in the school district.

Grade Level	% of Users with Learning Loss	% of Non-Users with Learning Loss
4	0%	45.24%
5	0%	42.59%
6	0%	32.56%
Overall	0%	40.29%

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:
 - 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

- Conduct a deeper investigation into why certain grade levels did not see greater growth in iReady Reading in the User group vs. the Non-User group.
- There's potentially duplicate resource alignment between IXL and iReady that may be causing fidelity and impact issues.
- Conduct a deeper dive into why utilization on iReady Reading did not reduce more Learning Loss.
- Key areas to explore within these grade levels are how iReady was implemented, whether the personalized 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 iReady Math & Reading

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 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.

Instruction

Math

The Kemper school district selected ENCASE for their Math formative assessment.

Key Takeaways:

- ENCASE Math proficiency had a high correlation to proficiency on MAAP.
- ENCASE Math non-proficiency had a high correlation to non-proficiency on MAAP.
- Educators are receiving good guidance from their formative assessments to guide instruction.

Grade Level	Proficiency Correlation	Non-Proficiency Correlation
3 rd	78.57%	88.89%
4 th	88.89	94.12%
5 th	100%	98.11%
6 th	87.50%	89.19%
7 th	82.61%	84.62%
8 th	87.5%	88.1%

Instruction

Reading

The Kemper school district selected ENCASE Reading for their Reading formative assessment.

Key Takeaways:

- All grade levels except 7th had lower than expected Proficiency correlations.
- 3rd , 5th , 6th had exceptionally low correlations.
- 6th-8th grade low resource utilization rates which most likely contributed to the low proficiency correlation.
- A deeper dive into ENCASE’s curriculum alignment is recommended.

Grade Level	Proficiency Correlation	Non-Proficiency Correlation
3 rd	66.67%	96.77%
4 th	72.73%	84.38%
5 th	50%	95.74%
6 th	57.14%	92.11%
7 th	91.67%	88%
8 th	76.92%	87.76%

Instruction

Math

Kemper's end of year Math grades were correlated to standards mastery on their MS Math MAAP 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:

- Most grade levels did not see inflation in the 'A' student group and about half of the students had grade inflation in the 'B' group.
- A review of grading practices is recommended to ensure grading practices represent mastery to further reduce the amount of grade inflation.
- Areas of investigation include: weightings, number of graded items, activity types

Grade Level	'A' Math Inflation	'B' Math Inflation	'C' Math Inflation
3 rd	0%	40%	100%
4 th	0%	50%	85%
5 th	0%	40%	100%
6 th	40%	50%	70%
7 th	0%	50%	0%
8 th	42%	90%	86%

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

Instruction

Reading

Kemper'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:

- Most grade levels did not see inflation in the 'A' student group while the B group showed significant grade inflation.
- A review of grading practices is recommended to ensure grading practices represent mastery.
- Areas of investigation include: weightings, number of graded items, activity types

Grade Level	'A' Math Inflation	'B' Math Inflation	'C' Math Inflation
3 rd	0%	47%	100%
4 th	0%	63%	93%
5 th	0%	88%	100%
6 th	0%	58%	88%
7 th	0%	0%	100%
8 th	35%	65%	79%

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

Kemper County School District



Transportation Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Transportation	Annual transportation operational costs	\$ 927,559.68	\$ 899,014.11
Transportation	Average number of students transported daily	517	525
Transportation	Average number of miles driven daily	2056	2077
Transportation	Regular education route buses in operation	21	22
Transportation	Special Education route buses in operation	2	2
Transportation	Spare route buses	5	6
Transportation	Number of bus mechanics	2	2
General District	Total number of schools within system	5	5
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 11,367,263.17	\$ 11,341,733.90
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	\$ 219,936.10	\$ 214,623.59
Operations	Annual custodial costs overall	\$ 223,249.14	\$ 227,231.07
Operations	Annual custodial supply costs	\$ 64,437.07	\$ 73,784.34
Operations	Total square feet maintained by district	Not Provided	Not Provided
Operations	Number of maintenance technicians/tradesmen employed by district (FTE)	4	4
Operations	Square acre per landscape technician**	42.60	42.60
Operations	Number of custodians employed by district (FTE)	7	7
Operations	Operations as a percentage of overall district expense	5%	5%
Operations	Average number of days to complete a maintenance work order	2	2
Operations	Total utility costs (including electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer)	\$ 258,126.32	\$ 279,627.98
General District	Total number of students enrolled	947	930
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 11,367,263.17	\$ 11,341,733.90

Provided Performance Data



Nutrition Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Child Nutrition	Total meal equivalents served annually	223,138	161,805
Child Nutrition	Total annual labor hours	20,086	16,558
Child Nutrition	Total annual revenue	\$ 1,309,679.50	\$ 1,153,190.65
Child Nutrition	Annual fund balance	\$ 466,559.20	\$ 472,529.01
Child Nutrition	Total value of USDA Commodities	\$ 54,254.58	
Child Nutrition	Total annual food costs	\$ 293,128.75	\$ 241,674.04
Child Nutrition	Total annual labor costs	\$ 240,574.19	\$ 280,450.88
Child Nutrition	Total annual direct costs	\$ 81,653.99	\$ 114,986.99
Child Nutrition	Total annual indirect costs	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 45,000.00
Child Nutrition	Breakfast participation rates	54%	47%
Child Nutrition	Lunch participation rates	77%	49%
General District	Total number of students enrolled	947	930
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	600	1800
Information Technology	Total employee devices	75	130
Information Technology	Total advanced-presentation devices	61	74
Information Technology	Total IT staffing costs	\$ 159,736.78	\$ 97,500.53
Information Technology	Total IT hardware, systems and service costs	\$ 116,118.87	\$ 114,346.67
Information Technology	Business systems costs	\$ 64,368.00	\$ 43,470.00
Information Technology	Instructional systems cost	0	0
Information Technology	IT spending-capital investment	\$ 133,115.06	\$ 114,346.67
Information Technology	Total annual support/incident tickets	300	180
Information Technology	Average number of days support/incident tickets remain open	5	5
Information Technology	Total available bandwidth (in Mbit/s)	4000	8000
Information Technology	Average age of computers	9	7
Information Technology	Network days usage exceeded 75% of capacity	30	45
General District	Total number of students enrolled	947	930
General District	Total number of school personnel (FTE)	306	282
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 11,367,263.17	\$ 11,341,733.90
General District	Total number of teachers (FTE)	133	128

Provided Performance Data



Human Resources

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Human Resources	Annual human resource costs overall	\$ 11,514.94	\$ 8,304.74
Human Resources	Number of HR department staff	0.25	0.25
Human Resources	Total number of overall staff separations (FTE)	44	32
Human Resources	Total number of teacher separations (FTE)	38	23
Human Resources	Total number of employee discrimination complaints	1	1
Human Resources	Total number of employee misconduct investigations	1	1
Human Resources	Human resources as a percentage of overall district expense	69.0%	68.0%
General District	Total number of school personnel (FTE)	306	282
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 13,951,032.56	\$ 12,415,624.12
General District	Total number of teachers (FTE)	133	128

Provided Performance Data



Supply Chain

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Supply Chain	Total procurement dept. costs	\$ 56,621.70	\$ 53,274.27
Supply Chain	Total procurement Staff	1	1
Supply Chain	Total procurement staff with professional certification	0	0
Supply Chain	Total # PO's/fiscal year (exclude P-card & construction)	1376	1169
Supply Chain	Total P-card transactions	0	0
Supply Chain	Total construction transactions	0	0
Supply Chain	Total amount of procurement outlay	\$ 5,423,642.46	\$ 6,415,137.33
Supply Chain	Total savings from invitations for bids, request for proposals & informal solicitations	0	0
Supply Chain	Average # days to administer invitations to bid	14	14
Supply Chain	Total purchasing through competitive procurement	0	0
Supply Chain	Total spent under cooperative agreements	0	0
Supply Chain	Total district warehouse operating expenses	0	0
Supply Chain	Total value sales/issues from district warehouse	0	0
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 13,951,032.56	\$ 12,415,624.12

Supply Chain

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Supply Chain	Total accounts payable dept. costs	\$ 48,075.73	\$ 47,474.81
Supply Chain	Total AP staff	1	1
Supply Chain	Total # invoices processed	6129	4387
Supply Chain	Average #days to process invoice	<= 30	11
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments	\$ 5,961,929.66	\$ 7,418,786.09
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments past due	0	0
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments voided	56	40

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	Total # staff in financial dept.	5	4
Finance	Total # directors/managers	1	1
Finance	Total # secretaries/admin assistants	2	1
Finance	Total # staff in payroll dept.	5	4
Finance	Total payroll dept. costs	\$ 72,205.53	\$ 33,218.97
Finance	Total district payroll	\$ 7,636,820.35	\$ 7,880,868.11
Finance	# paychecks processed	2667	2692
Finance	Total # paycheck errors	182	17
Finance	Total # paychecks direct deposit	2673	2666

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	Total debt principal	\$ 1,933,500.00	\$ 1,306,093.00
Finance	Total debt servicing costs	\$ 135,353.74	\$ 53,131.65
Finance	Total fund balance	\$ 15,100,184.81	\$ 18,373,075.40
Finance	Total budgeted expenditures	\$ 19,534,383.34	\$ 17,462,619.70
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 11,367,263.17	\$ 11,341,733.90
Finance	Total budgeted revenue	\$ 18,813,562.83	\$ 18,761,470.27
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 13,951,032.56	\$ 12,415,624.12
Finance	Total budgeted expenditures in final budget	\$ 15,791,578.65	\$ 17,216,112.07
Finance	Total budgeted revenue in final budget	\$ 18,813,562.83	\$ 18,761,470.27
Finance	Total liability premiums, claims & admin costs	\$ 175,884.99	\$ 89,038.00

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	# liability claims filed	12	0
Finance	# liability claims litigated	4	0
Finance	Total workers' comp. premium, claims & admin costs	\$ 55,078.00	\$ 91,087.88
Finance	Total workers' comp claims filed	0	1
Finance	Total lost days for all workers' comp claims	0	160
Finance	Total workplace accidents reported	0	1
Finance	Total grant fund expenditures	\$ -	\$ 9,890.25
Finance	Number of grant funded staff	0	0
Finance	Total grant funds returned	\$ -	\$ 1.74
Finance	Total grant funds expenditures from competitive grants	\$ -	\$ 9,890.25
Finance	Average days to access grant funds		30
Finance	Average days to process grant receivable invoices		<45 days
General District	Total Number of School Personnel (FTE)	306	282

Date	Time	Department	Personnel
21-June-22	10:00 a.m.	Finance/Procurement	Dr. Matilda Miller
21-Jun-22	1:00 p.m.	Human Resources	Tomi Brown
22-Jun-22	10:00 a.m.	Transportation	Douglas Newton
22-Jun-22	1:00 p.m.	Nutrition Services	Stacey Peeler
22-Jun-22	3:00 p.m.	Instructional Technology	Dr. Frederick Hickmon
23-Jun-22	10:00 a.m.	Special Education	Amanda Hailey
23-Jun-22	1:00 a.m.	Operations	Marcus Wilson

Department Interviews Conducted

