



Preliminary Data from FY2016 Review of Selected EPS Components

June 28, 2016

Amy Johnson

amyj@maine.edu

Jim Sloan

james.sloan@maine.edu

Overview

Review Cycle of EPS Components

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Professional development• Student assessment• Technology• Leadership support• Co-curricular & extra-curricular activities• Supplies & equipment• Charter schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student-to-staff ratios• Salary and benefit matrixes• Transportation• Small school adjustments• Labor markets (regional index)• Gifted & talented	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CTE - career & tech. education• Special education• Specialized student populations• System administration• Operations & maintenance of plant

Overview

FY 2016 EPS Discussion Items:

- Special Education
- CTE
- pK-2

Special Education

What's going on with increases in per pupil spending?

Methods:

- Analysis of expenditure data
- Analysis of student-level data
- Conversation with MADSEC
- Interview with one large urban district

Special Education

Special Education Prevalence Rates, 2011-12 to 2015-16

Year	Number of Special Education Students*	Number of Maine Resident Students	Sp. Ed. Prevalence
2011-2012	29,475	188,686	15.6%
2012-2013	29,646	186,178	15.9%
2013-2014	29,810	182,101	16.4%
2014-2015	29,919	183,460	16.3%
2015-2016	30,356	181,876	16.7%

* Includes all resident students including state wards and state agency clients

Increases in: Autism (33%), Other Health Impairments (14%), Multiple Disabilities (8%) from 2010 to 2015.

Decreases in: Emotional Disability and Speech/Language (14%)

Special Education

Special Education Expenditures

	Expenditure 2009-2010	Expenditure 2014-2015	Increase FY 2010-2015
Regular Instr.	\$835.3 M	\$923.3 M	10.5%
Special Ed. Instr. (Inc'l Federal)	\$304.6 M	\$351.8 M	15.5%
Regular Educ.* Per Pupil	\$7,694	\$8,684	12.9%
Special Educ. Per Pupil	\$9,839	\$12,795	30.0%
EPS Special Ed. Allocation	\$220.9 M	\$289.2 M	30.9%
Total Ed.	\$2,074.7 M	\$2,260.5 M	9.0%

*Includes regular instruction, student & staff support, school and system admin, and operation and maintenance

Special Education

High-Cost In-District challenges

- Currently based on disability and placement setting
- Adjustment for estimated costs above 3x state average EPS rate
- Estimates based on individual student cost data from 2005; data no longer collected
- Amounts inflated each year

Special Education

Instruction Expenditure by In-District Placement

	FY 2009 and FY 2015 Special Education Program Expenditures for Instruction			
	Fiscal Year	Regular Class Placement	Resource Room	Self-Contained Classroom
Students (Oct. 1 Counts)	FY09	16,474	8,749	3,783
	FY15	17,193	8,550	3,202
General Fund Expense (Instruction & Admin)	FY09	\$47,251,514	\$122,088,134	\$70,156,375
	FY15	\$42,846,792	\$129,571,066	\$88,682,669
Per pupil Expense	FY09	\$2,868	\$13,955	\$18,545
	FY15	\$2,492	\$15,155	\$27,696
Percent Change in Per pupil Expense		-13.1%	8.6%	49.3%

**Excludes students categorized as resident students of the Maine Department of Education*

Special Education Discussion

1. Need: provide quality services and constrain escalating costs.
2. Input on high-cost in-district data?
3. How to incentivize least restrictive environment?
4. How to incentivize inter-district programs for high-cost students?

Special Education

Growth of the Maintenance of Effort Component

Year	Total MOE Component (\$Millions)	# SAUs with Sp. Ed. Allocat.	% SAUs receiving MOE Adjust.	Total EPS Special Ed. Allocation (\$Millions)	MOE as % of Special Education Allocation
2006-07	\$29.8	261	52.9%	\$217.7	13.7%
2008-09	\$35.9	275	54.9%	\$220.9	16.2%
2010-11	\$37.7	196	54.1%	\$239.5	15.7%
2012-13	\$61.7	197	67.0%	\$260.1	23.7%
2014-15	\$81.2	222	71.6%	\$289.2	28.1%
2015-16	\$91.7	227	72.7%	\$313.5	29.2%

Current CTE Funding Challenges

1. Limitations of expenditure based model (2 year lag in state funding)
 - Difficult to start new programs, esp. in low-wealth communities
 - If temporary cuts in economic downturn, automatic cut in subsidy two years later
2. Limited support for equipment purchases; hampers up-to-date industry standards
3. Construction
4. Equitable state subsidy and cost sharing

CTE Discussion

1. Pros and cons: Center vs. Region funding models?
2. What would make it easier for your students to participate in CTE programs?

Pre-K to Grade 2

Issues:

1. Need for quality data to capture early education investments; increasing emphasis on literacy by grade 3.
2. Challenges in isolating/reporting K-2 costs?
3. Challenges in isolating/reporting pre-K costs?

Q & A

Questions?

Amy Johnson

amyj@maine.edu

James Sloan

James.Sloan@maine.edu

Maine Education Policy Research Institute at USM