

Fayetteville Public Schools Strategies for Funding Technology

Lisa Morstad, Chief Financial Officer, and Susan Norton, Chief Information Officer, discussed a variety of ways for getting the best bang for the buck in financing technologies. The district has enjoyed both community support (a dedicated mill was approved by voters in the mid-1990's) and the unanimous agreement of the school board and superintendent to continue to fund appropriate technologies and support for integration and 21st century skills in the classroom.

Dr. Morstad went over a chart that showed the pros and cons of various funding strategies used by the district and Ms. Norton described the 10 year history of major projects and the funding sources used for each. The attached spreadsheet shows the bottom line for expenditures by project/building. It should be noted this budget reflects capital expenditures only. The district uses this to forecast annual equipment replacement needs based on the inventory currently maintained, and makes every effort to "e-cycle" by using machines and their parts at least on a 6 year rotation. The operational budget for technology software licensing and miscellaneous expenses is approximately \$400,000 annually. Staffing is not budgeted separately and is a part of the overall district personnel budget.

STRATEGY	PROS	CONS
Dedicated Millage (or sales tax)	-Recurring fund sources -Increases in value -"guaranteed" funds -Voted or internally restricted	
Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (QZABs)	-No/low interest -Shortened payback compared to traditional -Endorsed use	-Not recurring
Traditional Bonds (FPS includes in construction projects)	-Lower cost than leasing -Spreads cost over years -Pay off in first few years of bond payment schedule	-Not recurring
Capital Funds (one time funds) Arkansas example is Enhanced Learning Funds	-Good use of one-time funds -No financing cost	-Not recurring
Carry-forward balances (one-time funds)	-Good use of one-time funds -No financing cost	-Not recurring
E-rate	-Rebate on approved expenditures	-Longevity of program unknown
Grants	-Provides funds for specific project	-Some require district match with increasing participation -Variable length of funding stream
Partnerships	-Share costs & resources -Learning opportunity	-Not autonomous
E-Cycle	Utilize old technology components -Increase lifecycle of equipment -"Green" strategy	-Can be a short term fix

Fayetteville Public Schools Strategies for Funding Technology

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
Fayetteville Public Schools														
Technology Expenditures														
													Effect 3/8/10	
Project Description	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	13 year Total
Technology Expenditures					(387,216.29)	(588,599.59)	(648,254.67)	(576,229.02)	(481,863.33)	(\$338,655.60)	(317,169.68)	(398,812.91)	(149,386.09)	(3,886,187.18)
Capital Bond Expenditures					(125,507.12)			(1,261,050.50)	(596,299.38)	(1,625,641.69)	(1,446,297.06)	(512,013.33)	(967,768.34)	(6,534,577.42)
21st Century												(32,296.12)	(876,685.67)	(908,981.79)
ARRA FUNDS													(509,218.67)	
QZAB-HOLT									(466,809.52)	(216,430.37)	(19,222.00)			(702,461.89)
QZAB-ASBELL							(33,850.44)	(866,808.49)	(7,722.99)	(73,409.62)				(981,791.54)
QZAB-JEFFERSON						(494,973.71)	(15,182.04)	(38,617.71)	(2,178.32)					(550,951.78)
QZAB-OWL CREEK											(68,874.99)	(85,583.79)	(11,891.72)	(166,350.50)
QZAB-RAMAY											(469,067.60)	(214,942.24)	(31,496.66)	(715,506.50)
QZAB-HAPPY HOLLOW										(102,819.07)				(102,819.07)
QZAB-HOLCOMB										(173,112.38)				(173,112.38)
QZAB-LEVERETT										(98,640.43)				(98,640.43)
QZAB-WASHINGTON										(97,663.08)				(97,663.08)
BUTTERFIELD PROJECT												(72,238.14)	(4,883.71)	(77,121.85)
WOODLAND PROJECT												(80,000.00)		(80,000.00)
Project Lead Way-RJH&WJH													(180,396.94)	(180,396.94)
Title II-D						(17,950.60)	(40,710.39)	(56,677.89)	(31,490.88)	(8,579.87)				(155,409.63)
Technology Direct Sch. Exp					(153,878.20)	(325,641.80)	(287,579.38)	(280,694.67)	(115,697.76)	(892,105.42)	(140,225.25)	(103,483.83)	(14,171.70)	(2,313,478.01)
Carl Perkins Funds													(53,316.51)	
Virtual Reality Grant						(15,875.00)	(10,125.00)							(26,000.00)
Walton Grant									(70,000.00)					(70,000.00)
Walker Grant									(123,594.43)	(9,931.53)				(133,525.96)
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(666,601.61)	(1,443,040.70)	(1,035,701.92)	(3,080,078.28)	(1,895,656.61)	(3,636,989.06)	(2,460,856.58)	(1,499,370.36)	(\$2,799,216.01)	(17,954,975.95)
														(2,057,501.24)
														9 Year Avg