

H.P. 1335 - L.D. 1850

Resolve, To Establish the Commission To Strengthen the Adequacy and Equity of Certain Cost Components of the School Funding Formula

Sec. 5. Duties. Resolved: That the commission shall examine the reports and related work products presented to the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs during the 126th Legislature as part of the independent review of the Essential Programs and Services Funding Act conducted pursuant to Resolve 2011, chapter 166 and shall develop a plan to strengthen the adequacy and equity of the following cost components included in the Essential Programs and Services Funding Act and other related education statutes.

2. Support for economically disadvantaged students; Title I funds. As part of the review and analysis of the cost components related to strengthening support for economically disadvantaged students, including the provision of funding under Title I of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 20 United States Code, Section 6301 et seq., referred to in this resolve as "Title I," and resources to provide extra help for struggling students, such as extended school days and summer school programs, the commission shall:

- A. Collect school administrative unit spending data on the number of Title I teachers and education technicians in order to update the staffing ratios in the essential programs and services funding formula;
- B. Conduct an analysis of the updated data collected on student-teacher and student-education technician staffing ratios in the essential programs and services funding formula in order to separate the groups of teachers into the following categories: classroom teachers, Title I teachers and teacher leaders or instructional coaches;
- C. Develop a plan for adjusting the costs of the essential programs and services funding formula to account for the separate costs of classroom teachers, Title I teachers, education technicians and teacher leaders or instructional coaches;
- D. Conduct research and analysis of the structures, programs, costs and achievement impacts of evidence-based practices in other states related to extended school day and summer school programs and also analyze examples of extended school day and summer school programs provided by school administrative units in the State;
- E. Develop 2 or more models for funding and evaluating extended school day and summer school programs for inclusion in the essential programs and services funding formula; and**
- F. Project the financial impact of the adjustments under this subsection to the essential programs and services funding formula.

Preliminary Cost Estimates and Models for Summer School Programming

Part I. Estimated Summer Program Costs

Average costs per student were calculated using three different sources of data. The Picus & Associates EB model method uses the number of students who are eligible for free or reduced price lunch (FRPL) to estimate the total number of students likely to need academic support (namely, 50% of all FRPL eligible students). This estimate of student participants is carried through the initial cost estimates for comparability. Appendix A provides the technical details for how each cost estimate was calculated.

Table 1: Summary of Summer Program Costs Estimates using Picus EB, National, and Maine Data

Model:	Picus EB	National Research	Maine-Based		
			District 7	District 1	District 5
Program Intensity	180 to 240 hours	80 hours	80 hours	90-100 hours	95-125 hours
Participation Estimate	43,433	43,433 ($\frac{2}{3}$ K-8, $\frac{1}{3}$ Teens)	43,433	43,433	43,433
Cost Basis	1 teacher per 120 FRPL eligible students (60 participants)	\$4/hr per K-8, \$8/hr per Teen	\$13,000 for 50 elementary students	\$500,000 for 1,100 students, all grades	\$34,000 for 35 middle school students
Cost Per Participating Student	\$997	\$320 per K-8, \$640 per Teen	\$260	\$450	\$980
Total Cost	\$43.29M	\$18.54M	\$11.3M	\$19.54M	\$42.57M

In reviewing the various estimates, it is clear that costs vary by grade level, and high school student programs are more expensive than elementary programs. The costs of the three exemplar Maine programs with a minimum intensity of 80 hours and exhibiting other research-based characteristics are similar to, or slightly below, national average costs per student. For further discussion, a sample cost model was developed using Maine and national data to estimate minimum per student costs of summer programs at each grade level (elementary, middle, and high school). The elementary per-student cost estimate is below the national average, but greater than the lowest-cost Maine program. The middle

school estimate of \$5 per hour per student is in the cost range for a Maine-based multi-age program, and reflects the higher cost of older students. The high school estimate is at the national average, and in-between the two Maine programs serving secondary students.

Table 2: Example Model for Consideration

Level	K-5	6-8	High School
Duration	80 Hours	80 Hours	80 Hours
Cost per Student	\$3.75/hr, \$300/student	\$5/hr, \$400/student	\$8/hr, \$640/student
Total Students 2013-14	80,993	41,320	57,266
Estimated Participating Students @ 48.4% FRPL, ½ participating	19,600	10,000	13,858
Costs	\$ 5.9 M	\$ 4.0 M	\$ 8.9 M
Total Cost:	\$18.8 M		

Part II. Additional Considerations: Decision Points for District Cost Estimates

A. Who should pay for summer programs?

Table 3. Selected Cost Sharing Scenarios for \$16.99M Base Model

		State Share %	State Share \$	Local Share	Total Costs
A	State pays 100%	100%	\$ 18.8 M	\$ 0 M	\$ 18.8 M
B	State pays 45%	45%	\$ 8.5 M	\$ 10.3 M	\$ 18.8 M
C	State pays 55%	55%	\$ 10.3 M	\$ 8.5 M	\$ 18.8 M

B. How should state funds be distributed to schools/districts?

- a. Ability to pay, based on property valuation;
- b. Ability to pay, based on poverty levels (e.g. percent of students eligible for FRPL or median household income);
- c. Schools meeting certain thresholds of student need (based on % not meeting proficiency and/or % economically disadvantaged) qualify for state funding;
- d. Other?

- C. How should funds be received by school districts?
 - a. Block grant: funds are allocated on a per student basis with no additional qualifying or reporting criteria
 - b. Targeted funds: funds are directed specifically for summer programs, and must comply with reporting requirements

- D. For what duration should districts receive funds?
 - a. Continuous
 - b. Continuous, contingent on evaluation results / outcomes
 - c. 3-5 years (i.e. transition period)

- E. Who should be targeted for participation?

The Picus method of basing participation numbers on the proportion of FRPL eligible students is a proxy for those in need of academic support. Not all low-income students are struggling, and sizeable numbers of those not meeting proficiency on NECAPs are not low-income:

Table 4: Grades 3-8 Mathematics NECAP performance, Fall 2013

	Not Proficient (Level 1 or 2)		Proficient (Level 3 or 4)	
Economically Disadvantaged	50.9%	20,244	49.1%	19,533
Not Economically Disadvantaged	25.1%	10,134	74.9%	30,222

If targets were set based on NECAP and MHSAs proficiency levels rather than FRPL status, the student estimates would more closely approximate the number of students in need of academic support:

Table 5. Alternate Student Participation Models:

Level	K-5	6-8	High School	Total Costs
Total Enrollment	80,993	41,320	57,266	
Base model: 50% FRPL	19,600 \$300 ea	10,000 \$400 ea	13,858 \$640 ea	\$18.8 M
Level 1* Proficiency (at 100% of eligible attending)	12,473 (15.4%) 3.7M	8,347 (20.2%) 3.3M	13,973 (24.4%) 8.9M	\$15.9 M
Level 2* Proficiency (at 100% of eligible attending)	18,547 (22.9%) 5.6M	8,719 (21.1%) 3.5M	16,664 (29.1%) 10.7M	\$19.8 M

* Proficiency estimates based on grade 3 math proficiency rates for K-5, Grade 7 rates for 6-8, and Grade 11 rates for 9-12

Appendix A: Development of Program Cost Estimates

Table A1: Picus Evidence-Based (EB) Model Cost Estimates

Program Description	6 to 8 weeks, 6 hours per day with 4 hours academic and 2 hours other programming (180 to 240 hours); includes planning days
Participation Estimate	50% of the 86,865 FRPL eligible students will participate (43,433)
Cost Basis	1 teacher per class of 15 participants, working at 25% of full year = 1 FTE teacher for 60 participating students and per 120 total FRPL eligible students
Cost Per Student	\$997 per participant
Total Cost	86,865 FRPL / 120 = 724 teachers needed 724 @ \$50,243 ^a mean FT salary + 19% benefit rate = \$43.29M

^a \$50,243 was the mean base salary of full-time regular education Maine teachers in FY2014

Table A2: National Summer Program Cost Estimates (based on published research)

Summer Program Description	80 hour duration, in half or full day format	
	K-8	High School
Participation: 50% of FRPL eligible students	28,957	10,476
Cost Basis	\$4 per hour per student	\$8 per hour per student
Cost Per Participating Student	\$320 per K-8 student = \$9.27M total	\$640 per H.S. student = \$9.27M total
Total Cost	\$18.54M total	

Table A3: Costs for Maine-Based Programs Using Quality Program Elements

	Program 7	Program 1	Program 5
Brief Description	Elementary ½ day, 5 weeks 80 hours	All grades 18-20 hr/wk, 5 wks 90-100 hours	Middle school 4 Full days, 3 weeks 95-125 hours
Reported Costs	\$13,000 for 50 students	\$500,000 for 1,100 students	\$34,000 for 35 students
Cost per Student	\$260 (\$3.25/hr)	\$450 (\$4.50-\$5/hr)	\$980 (\$7.50-\$10/hr)
Total Statewide cost, 43,433 participants	\$11.30M	\$19.54M	\$42.57M