

Non-Instructional Performance Review

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

This report is solely intended to be a resource guide for South Pike 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.

South Pike Leadership Positions and Salary				
Position	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
Superintendent	\$127,000	\$129,600	\$129,600	\$129,600
Assistant Superintendent (Trans/Sped)	89,885.61 (excl Asst Sup)	\$89,885	\$96,385	\$96,385
CFO	\$70,778.98	\$70,778	\$70,778	\$70,778
Curriculum & Assessment Coordinator	NA	\$60,825	\$80,042	\$80,042
HR Director	\$44,461.50	\$44,461	\$44,461	\$44,461
Director of Information Systems	\$44,461.50	\$44,461	\$44,461	\$44,461
Child Nutrition Director	\$67,886.10	\$33,435	\$46,220	\$46,220
Assistant SpEd Director	Included above	Included above	Included above	Included above
Transportation Director	Included above	Included above	Included above	Included above

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	5.41%	6.23%	↗	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	\$28,581.65	\$31,889.35	↗	\$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	\$598.27	\$723.70	↗	\$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	\$2.20	\$2.42	↗	\$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	11%	11%	→	9%-15%	18.07%	Total spare buses divided by total scheduled for daily routes
Ratio of Active Route Buses per School	5.16	5.16	→	4-7	6.89	Total number of buses divided by total number of schools within the district
Ratio of Buses per Mechanic	17.50***	17.50***	→		31.36	Total number of maintenance staff divided by the total number of buses

*** This is based on two maintenance technicians, at time of review one of these positions was vacant. Also, these technicians maintain the School District's white fleet (with the exception being tires).

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

South Pike School District's Transportation department was meeting average performance or performing better than average in most of the reviewed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). One potential flag was that the overall transportation expenditures as a percentage of overall district expenditures increased in the 2020-21 School Year to a level (6.23%) higher than both regional (4-6%) and national peers (5.84%). Transportation expenditures rose 11.57% (\$102,538.82) in 2020-21 while overall School District expenditures dropped by 3.15% (\$516,181.33). The overall number of transported students dropped by 7.76% (115) during the same period. Overall average daily miles driven rose from 2,157 to 2,183.

South Pike School District currently staggers bell time to allow for "Domino" routing. This type of routing refers to the practice of in the morning picking up students for multiple schools during one route and then going to each school to deposit students. In the afternoon, the process is reversed. On average during the 2020-21 school year, buses ran between 60-80% capacity. If there was a driver vacancy and no substitute driver available, routes were consolidated to meet student needs.

A detailed review of existing bus routes should take place to evaluate the possibility to reduce the number of buses needed daily, in order to reduce costs. Since a significant number of the routes are in rural distanced areas, "Domino" routing may be the most efficient practice for many routes. The district should explore using some tiered routes, especially in less rural areas to improve route efficiency. This could result in bringing financial performance in line with peers resulting in a \$36,000 to \$62,000 annual savings for the district.

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.

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
Maintenance and Operations as a Percentage of overall District Expense	13.3%	15.2%	↗	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	\$1,170.69	\$1,344.48	↗	\$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	\$8.66	\$48.81	↗	\$245-\$430	\$210.65	Total custodial work costs (contractor and district operated), divided by total student enrollment.
Maintenance Cost per Sq Ft	\$5.14	\$5.60	↗	\$0.91-\$1.52	\$2.34	Cost of maintenance work divided by total square footage of all buildings.
Custodial Cost per Sq Ft	\$1.27	\$1.52	↗	\$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	\$0.05	\$0.26	↗	\$0.09-\$0.18	\$0.17	Total custodial supply cost divided by total square footage of all buildings.
Utility Costs per Square Foot	\$1.53	\$1.61	↗	\$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	1***	1***	→	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)	113,014	113,014	→		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)	19,944	21,190	↗	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	50 acres maintained. Vacant positions for 2 techs, currently subcontracted		↘		154.51	Total acreage of maintained property divided by total number of Landscape Technicians

*** The district does not have a formal workorder management system. Request for work are generated through email. Detail data supporting this number was not available.

Operations

Overall Maintenance and Operations costs are significantly higher than both regional and national peers when comparing as a percentage overall district expenditures and cost per student. Maintenance and Operations costs rose by 11.13% over the two-year review period while student enrollment dropped by 3.23%.

A deeper review of costs by function highlighted that all functions (i.e. Maintenance, Custodial Services, and Landscaping) were running at higher cost levels than both regional and national peers. Costs across all functions increased over the two-year review period. Only utility costs remain in alignment with peer districts.

The district has taken some action to address custodial cost through outsourcing custodial services for the upcoming 2022-23 school year. Also, landscaping for approximately 50 acres is currently outsourced due to two vacant landscape technician positions. Once/when these positions are filled landscape sub-contracting will cease.

A deeper review should take place to better understand the current challenges and opportunities that exist to improve efficiency and reduce overall Maintenance and Operations costs. The review needs to take into account the condition of current facilities as well as observe detailed processes associated with work management and procurement. Most of these processes are manual and prone to drive some efficiency loss. If the district was able to bring Maintenance and Operations costs into peer ranges, this could free up between \$200,000 to \$980,000 annually to invest in student outcomes.

Potential Improvement Opportunities



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	97.50%	96.50%	↘	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	98.1%	99.2%	↗	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	\$5.47	\$7.32	↗	\$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	\$2.06	\$2.65	↗	\$1.56-\$2.10	\$1.52	Total food costs, divided by the total meals equivalent served annually.
Fund Balance as Percent of Revenue	44.0%	47.6%	↗	6.5%-36.0%	39.00%	Fund balance divided by total revenue
Food costs as a Percent of Revenue	18.1%	14.5%	↘	38.1%-47.9%	37.08%	Total food costs divided by total revenue
Labor Costs as Percent of Revenue	26.9%	20.9%	↘	42.7%-58.6%	47%	Total labor costs divided by total revenue
USDA Commodities Percent of Total Revenue	0.6%	3.9%	↗	6.1%-8.1%	5.72%	Total value of commodities received divided by total revenue
Meals Per Labor Hour	22.7	11.5	↘	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 provided data points appear to be contradictory.

Both breakfast and lunch participation levels for both reviewed school years were significantly above both regional and national peers. Over the review period, breakfast participation dropped by 1%, and lunch participation increased by 1%. Oddly, meal equivalents served dropped significantly (80,193 MEQs) over the same period while overall enrollment dropped by only 60 students.

Overall meal costs and food costs rose over the review period and were significantly higher than both regional and national peers. Labor cost as a percentage of revenue dropped over the reviewed period from 26.9% to 20.9%. Both year's labor cost was significantly lower than peers. Overall labor hours over the same period increased by 1,364 hours. This increase in hours and the reduction in overall meal equivalents served resulted in a 49.3% drop in Meals per Labor Hour from 22.7 to 11.5. At the provided participation percentages, this metric would imply that Nutrition Services are considerably over staffed.

Before any action is taken, the district should review provided data for accuracy. If data points are correct, then a deeper review should be conducted to identify drivers of food cost and labor hours. Once 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 bases.

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	1.2%	1.5%	↗	1.85%-3.71%	1.9%	Total IT staffing, hardware, systems and service costs divided by total district operating budget.
IT Spending per student	\$109.41	\$134.12	↗	\$243-\$518	\$192.35	Total IT staffing, hardware, systems and service costs divided by total student enrollment
Network-Bandwidth per Student	Varies	Varies***	↗	125.4-381.6	271	Total standard available bandwidth divided by total student enrollment
Network days usage exceeded 75% of capacity	90.00	110.00	↗	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	5.00	2.29	↘	2.98-3.56	3.98	Total age of computers, divided by the number of district-owned computers

*** In response to this question, the assessment team was told that hotspots are setup in certain areas for certain hours per day. Initially these Hotspots were at 250 Mbit/s. Now they have been expanded to 1 Gbit/s. The number of students using each hotspot varies.

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	1.34	1.87	↗	0.96-1.65	1.18	Total number of employee laptops and desktops divided by the total number of district employees
Devices per student	0.31	1.30	↗	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	0.85	0.86	↗	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	298	918	↗		772.17	Total student and employee devices (excluding presentation devices) divided by total number of IT staff FTEs.

Technology

Technology spending has increased across the two-year span reviewed, rising from 1.2% of the district's overall budget to 1.5% in the 2020-2021 School Year. The district did make significant Capital Investments in November of 2020, purchasing Chrome Books for all students and another 110 HP computers for staff members. This increased student computers from 584 to 2,334. Yet, technology spending as measured per student and as an overall percentage of district budget remained significantly below national and regional peers.

The number of days that peak daily internet usage reached more than 75% of standard available bandwidth for 5 minutes or longer was 110 days out of 187 school days in the 2020-21 school year. This was up from 90 days in the prior year. This is significantly higher than both regional and national peers. Also, when asked about the Network-Bandwidth available per Student, the team was told that hotspots are setup in certain areas for certain hours per day. Initially, these Hotspots were at 250 Mbit/s. Now they have been expanded to 1 Gbit/s. The number of students using each hotspot varies. These two factors are an indication that the district may need to further invest in network/bandwidth infrastructure over the next few years.

Lastly, when asked how traditional information technologies are blended with education technology functions, the assessment team was told that Principals set up training on technology devices directly with the software vendors. There did not appear to be any district-wide push to integrate technology beyond substitution and augmentation. The district might benefit from a SAMR* model integration plan to drive technology use to modify and redefine traditional learning.

*The SAMR Model is a framework created by Dr. Ruben Puentedura that categorizes four different degrees of classroom technology integration. The letters "SAMR" stand for Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, and Redefinition. The SAMR model was created to share a common language across disciplines as teachers strive to personalize learning and help students visualize complex concepts. The SAMR Model can be especially powerful during remote and blended learning when integrated classroom technology makes teaching and learning a more seamless experience for educators and students.

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	\$500.40	\$429.38	↘	\$408-\$792	\$288.41	Total HR department costs, divided by total district operating revenue over \$100,000
HR Cost per District Staff Member	\$308.15	\$287.98	↘	\$417-\$1,047	\$237.95	HR Department costs divided by total number of District Staff (FTEs)
Number of Employees per HR Staff Member	231	225	↘		371.36	Total number of district staff (FTEs) divided by total number of HR staff.
Overall Employee Separation Rate	9%	12%	↗	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	13%	16%	↗	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	12.99	13.33	↗	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

South Pike School District is small with only 1,796 students and 225 staff members of which 135 are teachers. As a small school district, South Pike only has one staff member supporting Human Resource needs for the district. While cost associated Key Performance Indicators reflect higher than regional peers, cost comparatives are in line with national peers. Actual department expenditures reduced over the reviewed period by 8.79% from \$71,182.72 to \$64,795.50.

While both overall employee and specific teacher separation rates increased over the review period, they were both below regional averages. In functional department interviews, there were several vacant positions noted. Also, several functional department leaders spoke of the issues with compensation being competitive enough to attract and retain staff. This may partially be a result of the district's location near the Louisiana state border and the pay differential that exists between Mississippi and Louisiana school systems. The district may benefit from an overall compensation review.

The only Key Performance Indicator appearing to be notably outside of both national and regional peer performance was the number of Employee Misconduct Investigations per 1000 Employees. While the normalized number is significantly higher than peers, it should be noted that this represents only 3 investigations per year.

Lastly, the department is actively tracking separations and terminations along with the reason. The department is also tracking misconduct cases.

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	\$302.20	\$289.29	↘	\$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	\$11.70	\$12.76	↗	\$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	30	→	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	306.2	285.2	↘	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	0.00%	0.00%	→	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	2.31%	1.78%	↘	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	\$378.61	\$360.95	↘	\$70-\$133	\$80.52	Total Procurement department costs, divided by total district revenue over \$100,000
Costs per PO	\$65.52	\$52.17	↘	\$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 Applicable</i>	<i>Not Applicable</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

As a small school district, South Pike only has one accounts payable staff member and one procurement staff member. Annual expenditures associated with both of these departments has risen by less than 2% over the two years reviewed. The district has recently implemented a new ERP system (Marathon).

Currently the accounts payable processes are highly manual. The new ERP system has the capability to do electronic processing. The district should consider implementing this functionality. While there may be a slight learning curve and an initial increase in errors, this should correct as employees become more familiar with the new process. The new process should eventually lead to a reduction in processing errors and labor efficiencies.

Few formal requests for quote or requests for proposals are sent out each year - only for purchases over \$50,000. For all purchases below that amount, requestors simply provide a minimum of two quotes. Often these quotes are provided by vendors on the state vendor list. The district does not formally track procurement performance indicators such as Procurement Savings Ratio or Competitive Procurement Ratio. The district should look to find opportunities to increase formal competitive bidding. Historically, districts have seen a 5 - 20% reduction in overall cost of goods and services when formal competitive procurement practices are deployed. It should be noted that the district was unable to provide the total amount of procurement outlay annually. Assuming that a district this size purchases approximately \$4 to \$5 Million annually and that due to limited staff and experience the district may only be able to formally bid up to 25% of current item and service expenditures, the district potentially could see a cost savings of \$50,000 to \$250,000 on purchased goods and services annually.

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	0.854%	0.749%	↘	3.9%-11.2%	3.06%	Total debt servicing costs, divided by total operating revenue
Fund Balance Ratio	60.1%	64.7%	↗	9.7%-20.8%	7.36%	Total fund balance, divided by total district operating expenditures
Expenditure Efficiency - Adopted Budget as a Percent of Actual	124%	136%	↗	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	108%	116%	↗	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	128%	126%	↘	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	638.5***	593.67***	↘	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	\$264.87	\$295.27	↗	\$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	\$9.55	\$10.31	↗	\$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	15.7	44.9	↗	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	100.00%	100.00%	→	94.2%-99.7%	92.00%	Total number of pay checks paid through direct deposit, divided by the total number of pay checks issued

*** South Pike has one staff member that handles payroll as well as benefits and insurance. We assumed 50% of their time was tied to payroll duties for these calculations.

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 Spend	\$1,332.70	\$2,147.20	↗	\$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	\$797.05	\$1,187.01	↗	\$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	29.66%	30.55%	↗	9.2%-13.2%	5.69%	Total grant funds expenditures, divided by total district operating revenue
Grant-Funded Staff as Percent of District FTEs	30.7%	29.8%	↘	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	30	30	→	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

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

- Expenditure Efficiency - Adopted Budget as a percent of actual (136% - 2020-21 SY)
- Expenditures Efficiency - Final Budget as a percent of actual (116% - 2020-21SY)
- Revenues Efficiency - Final Budget as percent of actual (126% - 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, 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.

Payroll efficiency indicators are in line or better than both national and regional peers. The district has achieved 100% of employees' paychecks being directly deposited. This is a commendable feat. The only opportunity identified by payroll indicators was that the number of paycheck errors per \$10K of pay was higher than both national and regional peers for the 2020-21 Fiscal year. It should be noted that during this time the district had implemented a new ERP system (Marathon). Based on interviews, it appears that the rise in errors seem to be due to the learning curve on the new system. Errors should reduce as users mature in their knowledge of the new system.

A deeper review should be conducted of Workers' Compensation cost to determine if there is opportunity to reduce/prevent incidents that cause employee injury. Workers' Compensation grew over the review period and was significantly higher both

years than both national and regional peers.

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. Grant funds composed 30.55% of the 2020-21 school year budget.

Instructional Performance Review

South Pike 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. iReady was evaluated for South Pike 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

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 61.47%. 4th grade had the highest utilization (96.77%) and 6th grade had the lowest utilization (24.24%).

\$77,039.74 was spent on iReady.

Key Takeaways

- Underutilized spending due to lack of usage totaled 38.53% 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 likely contributed to the lower-than-expected utilization rate.

Grade Level	Utilization Rate
K	31.48%
1	70.01%
2	82.61%
3	67.65%
4	96.77%
5	83.08%
6	24.24%
7	44.59%
8	42.11%
Overall	61.47%

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 3.05%. This was significantly lower than the growth rate seen for the User group, 5.00%.

Key Takeaways

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

Grade Level	User Growth	Non-User Growth
K	8.79%	5.06%
1	5.08%	3.44%
2	6.09%	3.73%
3	6.17%	4.8%
4	4.56%	3.81%
5	4.53%	4.66%
6	4.96%	3.02%
7	2.43%	1.88%
8	4.07%	1.28%
Overall	5.00%	3.05%

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. 8.61% of students in the User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests. However, 24.05% 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 3x more than in the User group.
- Increasing the number of students in the User group would likely reduce the amount of Learning Loss in the school district.

Grade Level	% of Users with Learning Loss	% of Non-Users with Learning Loss
K	0%	21.62%
1	9.52%	22.22%
2	7.89%	25%
3	4.35%	4.55%
4	10%	0%
5	3.7%	9.09%
6	12.5%	12%
7	15.15%	36.59%
8	12.5%	45.45%
Overall	8.61%	24.05%

Instruction

iReady Reading Utilization Rate

The overall utilization rate across the district was 70.21%. 6th grade had the highest utilization (95.83%) and 7th grade had the lowest rate (37.80%).

Key Takeaways

- The implementation fidelity for the district most likely led to lower academic performance and underutilized spending.
- Underutilized spending due to lack of usage totaled 29.79% 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
K	41.79%
1	81.97%
2	78.79%
3	95.38%
4	95.45%
5	39.39%
6	95.83%
7	37.80%
8	66.67%
Overall	70.21%

Instruction

iReady Reading Impact Analysis

The overall academic growth seen in the Non-User group on their Pre to Post formative assessment was 4.71%. This was significantly lower than the growth rate seen for the User group, 5.52%.

Key Takeaways

- Overall the User group outperformed the Non-user group by almost 1%.
- However, 1/3 grade levels in the Non-User group outperformed the User group.
- Given that 30% 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
K	15.86%	13.11%
1	10.55%	14.95%
2	9.27%	5.05%
3	4.12%	-8.26%
4	2.2%	.1%
5	2.28%	3.45%
6	4.67%	4.35%
7	1.19%	2.75%
8	2.1%	-.32%
Overall	5.52%	4.71%

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. 17.97% of students in the User group showed Learning Loss on their formative assessment Pre to Post tests. 23.47% 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 6% higher than in the User group.
- Increasing the number of students in the User group would likely reduce the amount of Learning Loss in the school district.

Grade Level	% of Users with Learning Loss	% of Non-Users with Learning Loss
K	0%	2.56%
1	8%	0%
2	6.41%	23.81%
3	17.74%	66.67%
4	35.71%	50%
5	30.77%	20%
6	15.94%	33.33%
7	41.94%	31.37%
8	27.78%	50%
Overall	17.97%	23.47%

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 underutilized spending from lack of utilization

Impact Analysis

- Conduct a deeper investigation into why certain grade levels did not see greater growth in iReady Reading User group than the Non-User group.
- 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

USA Test Prep Utilization Rate

Utilization rate shows the percentage of students that met the vendor’s recommended threshold. The overall utilization rate varied across USA Test Prep subject.

\$7,676.65 was spent on USA Test Prep for the 21.22 school year.

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 86.40% 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.

Subject Area	Utilization Rate
ACT Science	21.40%
MAAP Alg I	12.60%
MAAP Bio	47%
MAAP US History	14.20%
ACT Math	0%
ACT English	0%
ACT Reading	0%

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 South Pike school district selected iReady for their Math formative assessment.

Key Takeaways:

- iReady Math proficiency had a high correlation to proficiency on MAAP
- iReady Math non-proficiency had an average amount of correlation to non-proficiency on MAAP
- The non-proficiency correlation level indicates that the iReady Math proficiency level is slightly higher compared to MAAP. A deeper dive into the optimal iReady proficiency level is recommended to guide instruction.
- 7th & 8th grades did not have enough proficiency level students for analysis. A deeper dive into 7th and 8th grade Math curriculum alignment is recommended to address this issue.

Grade Level	Proficiency Correlation	Non-Proficiency Correlation
3 rd	100%	67.86%
4 th	100%	65%
5 th	100%	69.2%
6 th	100%	63.21%
7 th	NA*	71.04%
8 th	NA*	76.19

Instruction

Reading

The South Pike school district selected iReady Reading for their Reading formative assessment.

Key Takeaways:

- 3rd-5th grades had high proficiency correlation between iReady and MAAP
- 6th – 8th grades had lower than expected correlation between iReady and MAAP
- 6th-8th grade had the lowest utilization rate which most likely contributed to the low proficiency correlation.
- All grades had average non-proficiency correlation indicating the proficiency level for iReady is a bit higher than MAAP.
- A deeper dive into iReady’s curriculum alignment of 6th-8th grades is recommended.

Grade Level	Proficiency Correlation	Non-Proficiency Correlation
3 rd	100%	83.51%
4 th	100%	72.45%
5 th	100%	63.64%
6 th	40%	68.57%
7 th	75%	75.68%
8 th	66.67%	78.22%

Instruction

Math

South Pike’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: weightings, number of graded items, activity types

Grade Level	‘A’ Math Inflation	‘B’ Math Inflation	‘C’ Math Inflation
3 rd	82%	100%	100%
4 th	92%	92%	100%
5 th	85%	97%	97%
6 th	83%	95%	94%
7 th	100%	100%	100%
8 th	100%	100%	95%

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

Instruction

Reading

South Pike'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: weightings, number of graded items, activity types

Grade Level	'A' Math Inflation	'B' Math Inflation	'C' Math Inflation
3 rd	0%	72%	97%
4 th	79%	95%	100%
5 th	70%	94%	93%
6 th	83%	95%	95%
7 th	80%	96%	85%
8 th	84%	95%	88%

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

South Pike School District



Transportation Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Transportation	Annual transportation operational costs	\$ 886,031.26	\$ 988,569.82
Transportation	Average number of students transported daily	1,481	1,366
Transportation	Average number of miles driven daily	2,157	2,183
Transportation	Regular education route buses in operation	30	30
Transportation	Special Education route buses in operation	1	1
Transportation	Spare route buses	4	4
Transportation	Number of bus mechanics	2	2
General District	Total number of schools within system	6	6
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 16,383,786.78	\$ 15,867,605.45
General District	Number of school days annually	187	187

Provided Performance Data



Operations

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Operations	Annual maintenance costs overall	\$1,742,518.99	\$1,899,538.06
Operations	Annual custodial costs overall	\$430,284.06	\$515,139.79
Operations	Annual custodial supply costs	\$16,074.79	\$87,661.91
Operations	Total square feet maintained by district	339,041.00	339,041.00
Operations	Number of maintenance technicians/tradesmen employed by district (FTE)	3	3
Operations	Square acre per landscape technician**	50 acres	51 acres
Operations	Number of custodians employed by district (FTE)	17	16
Operations	Operations as a percentage of overall district expense	11.18%	12.58%
Operations	Average number of days to complete a maintenance work order	1	1
Operations	Total utility costs (including electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer)	\$518,782.06	\$547,319.49
General District	Total number of students enrolled	1,856.00	1,796.00
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$16,383,786.78	\$15,867,605.45

Provided Performance Data



Nutrition Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Child Nutrition	Total meal equivalents served annually	195,001	114,808
Child Nutrition	Total annual labor hours	8,584	9,948
Child Nutrition	Total annual revenue	\$ 2,211,392.38	\$ 2,098,570.24
Child Nutrition	Annual fund balance	\$ 972,033.11	\$ 999,868.40
Child Nutrition	Total value of USDA Commodities	\$ 12,449.78	\$ 82,821.30
Child Nutrition	Total annual food costs	\$ 401,252.13	\$ 304,258.03
Child Nutrition	Total annual labor costs	\$ 594,852.65	\$ 439,481.08
Child Nutrition	Total annual direct costs	\$ 69,629.27	\$ 97,036.08
Child Nutrition	Total annual indirect costs	\$ -	\$ -
Child Nutrition	Breakfast participation rates	97.5%	96.5%
Child Nutrition	Lunch participation rates	98.1%	99.2%
General District	Total number of students enrolled	1,856	1,796
General District	Number of school days annually	187	187

Provided Performance Data



Technology

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Information Technology	Total IT staff	3	3
Information Technology	Total student devices	584	2,334
Information Technology	Total employee devices	310	420
Information Technology	Total advanced-presentation devices	116	116
Information Technology	Total IT staffing costs	\$ 159,084.66	\$ 153,045.55
Information Technology	Total IT hardware, systems and service costs	\$ 43,973.54	\$ 87,829.13
Information Technology	Business systems costs	\$ 24,422.93	\$ 60,097.29
Information Technology	Instructional systems cost	\$ 217,141.00	\$ 195,366.72
Information Technology	IT spending-capital Investment	\$ -	\$ -
Information Technology	Total annual support/incident tickets	1,080	950
Information Technology	Average number of days support/incident tickets remain open	5	2.29
Information Technology	Total available bandwidth (in Mbit/s)	250	250
Information Technology	Average age of computers	5	5
Information Technology	Network days usage exceeded 75% of capacity	90	110
General District	Total number of students enrolled	1,856	1,796
General District	Total number of school personnel (FTE)	231	225
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 16,383,786.78	\$ 15,867,605.45
General District	Total number of teachers (FTE)	136	135

Provided Performance Data



Human Resources

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Human Resources	Annual human resource costs overall	\$ 71,182.72	\$ 64,795.50
Human Resources	Number of HR department staff	1	1
Human Resources	Total number of overall staff separations (FTE)	21	28
Human Resources	Total number of teacher separations (FTE)	17	21
Human Resources	Total number of employee discrimination complaints	0	0
Human Resources	Total number of employee misconduct investigations	3	3
Human Resources	Human resources as a percentage of overall district expense	0.35%	0.31%
General District	Total number of school personnel (FTE)	231	225
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 14,225,292.14	\$ 15,090,440.39
General District	Total number of teachers (FTE)	136	135

Provided Performance Data



Supply Chain

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Supply Chain	Total procurement dept. costs	\$ 53,858.76	\$ 54,469.52
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)	822	1,044
Supply Chain	Total P-card transactions	0	0
Supply Chain	Total construction transactions	1	0
Supply Chain	Total amount of procurement outlay	\$ -	\$ -
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	\$ -	\$ -
Supply Chain	Total spent under cooperative agreements	\$ -	\$ -
Supply Chain	Total district warehouse operating expenses	\$ -	\$ -
Supply Chain	Total value sales/issues from district warehouse	\$ -	\$ -
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 14,225,292.14	\$ 15,090,440.39

Supply Chain

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Supply Chain	Total accounts payable dept. costs	\$ 42,988.62	\$ 43,655.20
Supply Chain	Total AP staff	1	1
Supply Chain	Total # invoices processed	3,674	3,422
Supply Chain	Average #days to process invoice	30	30
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments	3,674	3,422
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments past due	0	0
Supply Chain	Total # AP payments voided	85	61

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	Total # staff in financial dept.	4	4
Finance	Total # directors/managers	1	1
Finance	Total # secretaries/admin assistants	0	0
Finance	Total # staff in payroll dept.	0.5	0.5
Finance	Total payroll dept. costs	\$ 73,187.10	\$ 73,452.74
Finance	Total district payroll	\$ 13,815,429.08	\$ 12,438,364.35
Finance	# paychecks processed	3,831	3,562
Finance	Total # paycheck errors	6	16
Finance	Total # paychecks direct deposit	3,831	3,562

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	Total debt principal	\$ 225,000.00	\$ 230,000.00
Finance	Total debt servicing costs	\$ 121,455.88	\$ 113,049.75
Finance	Total fund balance	\$ 9,841,737.71	\$ 10,269,633.77
Finance	Total budgeted expenditures	\$ 20,340,420.13	\$ 21,528,670.42
Finance	Total district operating expenditures	\$ 16,383,786.78	\$ 15,867,605.45
Finance	Total budgeted revenue	\$ 18,944,220.27	\$ 20,465,719.22
Finance	Total district operating revenue	\$ 14,225,292.14	\$ 15,090,440.39
Finance	Total budgeted expenditures in final budget	\$ 17,728,264.14	\$ 18,405,453.46
Finance	Total budgeted revenue in final budget	\$ 18,161,782.12	\$ 18,972,144.37
Finance	Total liability premiums, claims & admin costs	\$ 236,475.32	\$ 267,076.68

Financial Services

Source	Requested Data	2019-2020	2020-2021
Finance	# liability claims filed	3	2
Finance	# liability claims litigated	0	0
Finance	Total workers' comp premium, claims & admin costs	\$ 184,118.32	\$ 267,076.68
Finance	Total workers' comp claims filed	11	8
Finance	Total lost days for all workers' comp claims	0	0
Finance	Total workplace accidents reported	11	8
Finance	Total grant fund expenditures	4,219,319	4,610,798
Finance	Number of grant funded staff	71	67
Finance	Total grant funds returned	0	0
Finance	Total grant funds expenditures from competitive grants	\$ -	\$ -
Finance	Average days to access grant funds	30	30
Finance	Average days to process grant receivable invoices	30	30
General District	Total number of school personnel (FTE)	231	225

Date	Time	Department	Personnel
7-Jun-22	10:00 a.m.	Operations	Mike Scott
7-Jun-22	1:00 p.m.	Finance/Procurement	DeLorean Hall
8-Jun-22	10:00 a.m.	Transportation/Special Education	Warren Banks
8-Jun-22	1:00 p.m.	Nutrition Services	Charleen Hackett
8-Jun-22	3:00 p.m.	Human Resources	Maria Felder
9-Jun-22	10:00 a.m.	Instructional Technology	Andrei Jennings

Department Interviews Conducted

