Colorado Costing Out of P-12 Education

Costing Out

• Undertaken for Children’s Voices as part of the Lobato case.
• APA worked with Tracie Rainey, she was not representing CSFP
• Work was done from September of 2010 through February 2011

Overview

• Focused on identifying the resources needed for school districts to fulfill state standards and requirements
  – Results are a handful of numbers that can estimate the needed resources for every district in the state
Overview

• The standard and requirements “costed” out include all expectations for districts, today and in the near future
  – Districts are not yet being held accountable or fully implementing all of the standards and requirements
    • Examples are CAP4K, Senate Bill 191, and Yearly Growth
  – Focused on the ongoing costs of the standards and requirements not implementation costs

Overview

• Using most current data on expenditures, 2008-09, and performance, 2009-10
• Study does not include transportation, food service, adult education or capital construction

Successful School Districts

• SSD only used to identify a base cost figure
• Examined expenditures of the 13 districts identified as “Accredited with Distinction”
• Looked at instruction, administration and plant m & o categories separately
  – Put all current expenditures, less food service and transportation, into one of these three categories
  – Excluded spending for SpEd, at-risk, and ELL
Successful School Districts

- Ran efficiency screens for each of the three spending areas
  - Based on personnel for instruction and administration
  - Based on actual spending for plant m & o
- Reduced expenditure figures for COL and size adjustments from the formula to get an unadjusted base
  - SSD base is - $6,051

Professional Judgment

- PJ can identify the base cost figure and adjustments for special needs
- Held 18 panels with 81 participants
- Panels for many levels – school, special needs, CFO, Ascent/concurrent enrollment, technology, district, statewide
  - Every panel’s work was reviewed other than statewide panel
  - Panels did not know dollar amounts, just resource levels

- Panels began work with some resources identified as a starting point, the resource levels came from the Evidence Based approach work
  - Panels could adjust as they saw fit
- Panels started by identifying the costs for a base education and then identifying additional resources for special needs populations
Professional Judgment

• Applied statewide average salaries, adjusted up 10% to make competitive and a 34% benefit rate
  — Salary adjustment based on an inter-state competitiveness analysis
• Base cost from PJ is $9,146
• Weights for special needs also generated, will be shown below

Professional Judgment

• Key Assumptions
  — Full Day Kindergarten
  — Extended time for at-risk students
  — Extended year, 10 days for most students
  — Additional 5 days of PD for teachers, plus $100 per student

Professional Judgment

— Four year tech. replacement within a 21st century tech environment
  • Netbooks for 4th grade and above
  • Support for the 21st century environment
  — Includes alternative education
  — Emphasis on concurrent enrollment and Ascent
• Additional costs identified for pre-school for 3 at-risk 3 and 4 year olds
Reconciling Bases and Applying Weights

• Since the PJ base cost figure is “costed” using statewide averages, it needs to be adjusted down to create an unadjusted base similar to the SSD base
  – Reduced the PJ base by 1.182 for a base cost of $7,738
  • 1.182 is the weighted average COL adjustment in the state formula when the Personnel Cost Factor is applied

Reconciling Bases and Applying Weights

• The PJ base cost figure, $7,738, represents what is needed to meet all the standards and requirements going forward
• The SSD figure, $6,051, represents what was spent for by the “successful” districts in 2008-09.
  – Does not include all students meeting standards
  – Does not include CAP4K, Senate Bills 191, 163, and other requirements
• Following Table shows base costs and weights by size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Size Adjustment</th>
<th>At-Risk Weight</th>
<th>ESL Weight</th>
<th>GT Weight</th>
<th>SpEd Mild Weight</th>
<th>SpEd Moderate Weight</th>
<th>SpEd Severe Weight</th>
<th>Total Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,275</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,865</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modeling

- Tried to utilize as much of the current formula as possible
- Funded SpEd, G/T, and ELL through weights
  - Currently funded through categoricals
- Total difference from 2008-09 expenditures
  - PJ - $3.7 billion with overrides in, $4.3 billion excluding overrides
  - SSD - $1.5 billion with override in, $2.1 excluding overrides
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Modeling

- Does not specify where money comes from, includes state, local and federal sources
- Does not include funding for transportation, food service and capital construction