INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE

TO: Honorable Members of the Basic Education Funding Commission

FROM: Matthew Knittel, Director
Independent Fiscal Office

DATE: December 14, 2023

RE: Results from the 2023 Basic Education Funding Commission Survey

---

This document provides summary tabulations for the Basic Education Funding Commission (BEFC) survey sent by the Pennsylvania Department of Education to 100 school districts and 25 charter schools in October 2023. The data reflect all responses submitted by survey recipients. The school districts and charter schools surveyed represent the same sample used in the April 2015 BEFC survey to facilitate a comparison between the two surveys. All survey questions are the same as the April 2015 survey except for four new questions that pertain to facility assessments. Results from the prior survey can be found in the "*Basic Education Funding Commission Report and Recommendations*" (June 18, 2015).

The BEFC received 84 completed school district surveys (84% response rate) and 11 charter school surveys (44%). Because large districts and charters submitted surveys, response rates weighted by the share of the student population surveyed are higher: 93% for school districts and 72% for charters. For the 2015 survey, the comparable weighted response rates were 89% (school districts) and 77% (charters).

The office would like to thank all survey respondents, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE), the Pennsylvania Association of School Business Officials (PASBO) and BEFC staff for their assistance with the administration of this survey.

- This page intentionally left blank. -

Introduction

This document provides summary data from the Basic Education Funding Commission (BEFC) survey sent to 100 school districts and 25 charter schools in October 2023. The statistics reflect all responses submitted by survey recipients. Relevant comments or clarifications are included in the notes to tables.

The school districts and charter schools surveyed in October 2023 use the same sample and data groups as the April 2015 BEFC survey to facilitate a comparison between the two surveys. The sample selection process used data from school year (SY) 2012-13 and separated districts into four groups based on their SY 2012-13 school performance profile (SPP) score: (1) high performance (SPP 90.0%+), (2) good (80.0-89.9%), (3) proficient (70.0-79.9%) and (4) low performance (<70.0%) schools.[1] It is noted that the computation of district SPP scores was discontinued shortly after the 2015 survey. However, based on other performance metrics computed for SY 2021-22, most districts maintained their relative performance level compared to other districts included in the sample. Therefore, the same relative groupings still generally apply for SY 2021-22 (i.e., high performers in SY 2012-13 remain high performers now).

The two tables that follow provide cross tabulations for 499 school districts across the four SPP groups based on four metrics: (1) share of economically disadvantaged (ED) students, (2) share of English learners (ELs), (3) taxable income per average daily membership (ADM) and (4) regular instruction costs per ADM. While the SPP groups use scores from SY 2012-13, all other data are from SY 2021-22, the data year used by 2023 survey respondents. All tabulations are weighted by the number of ADM.

The top half of the table below displays the number and share of school districts and ADM across the four SPP groups. The data show that 83 high-performing districts comprised 24.4% of total ADM for SY 2021-22, while 91 low-performing districts comprised 29.3% of total ADM. The bottom half displays average values for the four metrics across the groups, weighted by the number of ADM. The data reveal that SPP scores have (1) a negative relation with ED and EL concentration, (2) a positive relation with taxable income per ADM and (3) no clear relation with regular instruction cost per ADM.

School District Characteristics by SPP Score

	School Performance Profile (SPP) Score				
	90.0%+	80.0-89.9%	70.0-79.9%	<70.0%	Total
Number of School Districts	**83**	**151**	**174**	**91**	**499**
Share of Total	16.6%	30.3%	34.9%	18.2%	**100.0%**
Total ADM (000s)	**412,577**	**432,837**	**347,917**	**494,171**	**1,687,503**
Share of Total	24.4%	25.6%	20.6%	29.3%	**100.0%**
Weighted Avg. (by ADM)					
ED Student Concentration	21.8%	38.0%	47.6%	71.4%	**45.8%**
EL Student Concentration	2.7%	2.7%	2.4%	11.4%	**5.2%**
Taxable Income per ADM	$425,169	$266,764	$205,081	$174,349	**$265,712**
Reg. Instruction Costs per ADM	$8,830	$8,029	$8,197	$8,729	**$8,464**

[1] For a complete description of the selection of school districts and charter schools, see page 99 to 105 in the "*Basic Education Funding Commission Report and Recommendations*" dated June 18, 2015.

The table on the next page provides greater detail and shows how students are dispersed across the four groups and four metrics. All percentages in the table are weighted by ADM, and the individual cells sum to 100%. For example, the table shows that 19.2% of total ADM (third data row, first data column) were in a district with an SPP score higher than 90% and an ED concentration below 30%. School districts with an SPP score below 70% and an ED concentration higher than 70% (sixth data row, fourth data column) reported 20.7% of total ADM. This presentation is repeated for the four metrics.

The data for all districts reveal the following trends across the four SPP groups:

ED Student Concentration The high-performance group (SPP 90%+) has a much lower concentration of ED students. For that group, 79% (19.2 / 24.4) of students attended a school district where less than 30% of students were ED. By contrast, no students in the low-performance group (SPP < 70.0%) attended a school district where less than 30% of students were ED. Rather, the majority (71% or 20.7 / 29.3) attended a district where more than 70% of students were ED.

EL Student Concentration Similar results hold for the concentration of EL students. The top three groups have much lower concentrations of EL students than the low-performance group.

Taxable Income per ADM This metric may capture intangibles outside of school that are positively related to SPP scores. The high-performance group has a much higher taxable income per ADM compared to the low-performance group.

Regular Instruction Costs per ADM This metric generally reflects classroom costs only and excludes expenses related to debt, special education and administrative costs. Compared to other metrics, the data are less clear regarding the relation between regular instruction spending per ADM and SPP scores. For example, roughly 12% (2.9 / 24.4) of students in the high-performance group attended a school district where this metric fell below $7,500. For the low-performance group, the comparable figure is 18% (5.2 / 29.3).

Detailed School District Characteristics by SPP Score

	School Performance Profile (SPP) Score				
	90.0%+	**80.0-89.9%**	**70.0-79.9%**	**<70.0%**	**Total**
Number of School Districts	83	151	174	91	499
Share of All Students (ADM)	24.4%	25.6%	20.6%	29.3%	100.0%
ED Student Concentration					
<30.0%	19.2%	7.4%	0.8%	0.0%	27.4%
30.0 - 49.9%	5.2%	13.9%	10.7%	1.4%	31.2%
50.0 - 69.9%	0.1%	4.4%	8.4%	7.1%	20.0%
70.0%+	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	20.7%	21.4%
Total	**24.4%**	**25.6%**	**20.6%**	**29.3%**	**100.0%**
EL Student Concentration					
<1.0%	3.1%	10.1%	10.4%	4.3%	27.8%
1.0% - 4.99%	18.6%	11.3%	6.8%	3.5%	40.2%
5.0%+	2.8%	4.2%	3.4%	21.5%	31.9%
Total	**24.4%**	**25.6%**	**20.6%**	**29.3%**	**100.0%**
Taxable Income per ADM					
<$125,000	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	6.9%	7.5%
$125,000 - $199,999	0.1%	6.3%	9.8%	18.0%	34.2%
$200,000 - $249,999	1.5%	8.5%	6.9%	2.4%	19.3%
$250,000+	22.9%	10.8%	3.4%	1.9%	39.0%
Total	**24.4%**	**25.6%**	**20.6%**	**29.3%**	**100.0%**
Reg. Instruct. Costs per ADM					
<$7,500	2.9%	10.0%	6.9%	5.2%	25.0%
$7,500 - $9,999	18.4%	13.0%	12.6%	22.2%	66.1%
$10,000+	3.2%	2.7%	1.1%	1.9%	8.8%
Total	**24.4%**	**25.6%**	**20.6%**	**29.3%**	**100.0%**

Note: All tabulations are weighted by the school district's share of total Average Daily Membership (ADM). Excludes Bryn Athyn SD because there are less than 10 students. Regular Instruction Costs is 1100 Regular Programs - Elementary/Secondary.

Survey Sample and Response Rate

In October 2023, the BEFC survey was sent to 100 school districts and 25 charter schools. Through December 1, 2023, the BEFC received 84 completed school district surveys (84% response rate) and 11 charter school surveys (44%). Because large districts and charters had higher response rates, responding school districts comprise 93% of students for those surveyed, and responding charters comprise 72% of students for those surveyed.

Per instructions from the BEFC, the survey sample is representative of school districts across the four SPP groups and is geographically diverse. The sample was constructed to oversample "good school districts" with an SPP score between 80.0% and 89.9% that also had ED, EL, taxable income per ADM and instructional cost per ADM characteristics that were representative of statewide median values. (For a complete description of the sample selection methodology, see page 99 of the "*Basic Education Funding Commission Report and Recommendations,*" June 18, 2015.) As shown in the table, the survey sample also includes a disproportionate number of districts with high ED concentrations.

Surveyed and Responding School Districts and Charter Schools

	School Performance Profile (SPP) Score				
	90.0%+	**80.0-89.9%**	**70.0-79.9%**	**<70.0%**	**Total**
All School Districts	83	151	174	91	**499**
Surveyed Districts	13	58	19	10	**100**
Sample Rate	15.7%	38.4%	10.9%	11.0%	**20.0%**
Responding Districts	10	48	16	10	**84**
Response Rate	76.9%	82.8%	84.2%	100.0%	**84.0%**

	School District ED Concentration				
	<30.0%	**30.0-49.9%**	**50.0-69.9%**	**70%+**	**Total**
All School Districts	106	227	131	35	**499**
Surveyed Districts	11	40	37	12	**100**
Sample Rate	10.4%	17.6%	28.2%	34.3%	**20.0%**
Responding Districts	9	34	29	12	**84**
Response Rate	81.8%	85.0%	78.4%	100.0%	**84.0%**

Charter Schools	
All Charter Schools	**180**
Surveyed Charter Schools	**25**
Sample Rate	**13.9%**
Responding Charter Schools	**11**
Response Rate	**44.0%**

Note: ED represents economically disadvantaged students.

Part II – Cost Multiplier Estimates

The tables that follow tabulate all survey responses across the four SPP groups. The first four questions that seek information regarding cost multipliers also provide separate tabulations based on ED or EL student concentration. Other questions in the section request information that pertain to gifted, charter school and transitioning students.

Question 1(a): If your average base cost equals 1.0, provide your best estimate of the cost multiplier for a typical ED student who is not also an EL. (Respondents used a drop-down menu of options that include: 1.00 – 1.19, 1.20 – 1.39, 1.40 – 1.59, 1.60 – 1.79 and 1.80 – 2.00.)

Economically Disadvantaged (ED) Multiplier

	1.00-1.19	1.20-1.39	1.40-1.59	1.60-1.79	1.80-2.00	No Response
School Districts (SDs)						
90.0%+	8	1	1	0	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	20	10	8	2	7	1
70.0% - 79.9%	6	2	6	2	0	0
<70.0%	4	1	2	1	2	0
All SDs	**38**	**14**	**17**	**5**	**9**	**1**
Charter Schools	**6**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg.[2]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	1.10	1.16	1.18
80.0% - 89.9%	1.30	1.36	1.39
70.0% - 79.9%	1.40	1.35	1.39
<70.0%	1.40	1.42	1.44
All SDs	**1.30**	**1.34**	**1.42**
SD ED Concentration			
<30.0%	1.10	1.12	1.10
30.0 - 49.9%	1.30	1.32	1.34
50.0 - 69.9%	1.40	1.40	1.42
70.0%+	1.50	1.41	1.45
All SDs	**1.30**	**1.34**	**1.42**
Charter Schools	**1.10**	**1.35**	**1.19**

1 Calculated using the midpoint of the ED multiplier range.

2 Calculated using number of ED students as the weight and the midpoint of the ED multiplier range.

Question 1(b): If the funding level indicated in 1(a) was impacted by the reallocation of state and federal funds, what weight was represented prior to the reallocation? (Respondents used a drop-down menu of options that include: 1.00 – 1.19, 1.20 – 1.39, 1.40 – 1.59, 1.60 – 1.79 and 1.80 – 2.00.)

Economically Disadvantaged (ED) Alternate Multiplier[1]

	1.00-1.19	1.20-1.39	1.40-1.59	1.60-1.79	1.80-2.00	No Response
School Districts (SDs)						
90.0%+	8	2	0	0	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	22	8	11	1	5	1
70.0% - 79.9%	7	3	4	2	0	0
<70.0%	5	1	1	2	1	0
All SDs	**42**	**14**	**16**	**5**	**6**	**1**
Charter Schools	**6**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**

	Median[2]	Average[2]	Wght. Avg.[2,3]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	1.10	1.14	1.15
80.0% - 89.9%	1.30	1.33	1.32
70.0% - 79.9%	1.30	1.31	1.32
<70.0%	1.20	1.36	1.41
All SDs	**1.10**	**1.30**	**1.38**
SD ED Concentration			
<30.0%	1.10	1.10	1.10
30.0 - 49.9%	1.30	1.31	1.30
50.0 - 69.9%	1.30	1.34	1.34
70.0%+	1.30	1.36	1.42
All SDs	**1.10**	**1.30**	**1.38**
Charter Schools	**1.10**	**1.39**	**1.20**

1 For respondents that did not answer this question, it is assumed the multiplier is the same as question 1(a).

2 Calculated using the midpoint of the alternate ED multiplier range.

3 Calculated using number of ED students as the weight.

Question 2: If your average base cost equals 1.0, provide your best estimate of the cost multiplier for a typical EL student who is not also ED. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options.)

English Learner (EL) Multiplier

	1.00-1.19	1.20-1.39	1.40-1.59	1.60-1.79	1.80-1.99	2.00+	No Response[1]
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	2	0	3	1	0	0	4
80.0% - 89.9%	4	7	8	5	0	3	21
70.0% - 79.9%	3	5	2	2	0	0	4
<70.0%	1	2	1	3	1	1	1
All SDs	**10**	**14**	**14**	**11**	**1**	**4**	**30**
Charter Schools	**1**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**4**

	Median[2]	Average[2]	Wght. Avg.[2,3]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	1.49	1.38	1.41
80.0% - 89.9%	1.50	1.46	1.41
70.0% - 79.9%	1.28	1.31	1.47
<70.0%	1.62	1.72	1.58
All SDs	**1.48**	**1.46**	**1.56**
SD EL Concentration			
<1.0%	1.32	1.39	1.39
1.0% - 4.99%	1.40	1.41	1.31
5.0%+[4]	1.50	1.46	1.47
All SDs	**1.48**	**1.46**	**1.48**
Charter Schools	**1.49**	**1.47**	**1.37**

1 All responses of 1.00 (default response on the survey) and districts/schools without any EL students were considered to be a "No Response."

2 Excludes respondents designated as no response.

3 Calculated using number of EL students as the weight.

4 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Question 3: If your average base cost equals 1.0, provide your best estimate of the cost multiplier for a typical ED student who is also homeless. Your answer may be the same as question 1, or somewhat higher. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options, but a few districts used the ranges provided in questions 1a and 1b. In those cases, the midpoint of the range was used.)

Homeless Student Multiplier

	1.00-1.19	1.20-1.39	1.40-1.59	1.60-1.79	1.80-1.99	2.00+	No Response
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	7	2	0	1	0	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	18	7	10	4	0	8	1
70.0% - 79.9%	6	3	3	2	1	1	0
<70.0%	3	1	2	1	2	1	0
All SDs	**34**	**13**	**15**	**8**	**3**	**10**	**1**
Charter Schools	**6**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg.[1,2]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	1.05	1.18	1.19
80.0% - 89.9%[3]	1.24	1.40	1.41
70.0% - 79.9%	1.25	1.38	1.46
<70.0%	1.50	1.50	1.56
All SDs	**1.25**	**1.38**	**1.51**
SD ED Concentration			
<30.0%	1.05	1.21	1.19
30.0 - 49.9%[3]	1.23	1.37	1.38
50.0 - 69.9%	1.25	1.40	1.44
70.0%+	1.50	1.48	1.57
All SDs	**1.25**	**1.38**	**1.51**
Charter Schools	**1.10**	**1.35**	**1.18**

1 Excludes respondents who did not answer question.

2 Calculated using number of ED students as the weight.

3 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Question 4: If your average base cost equals 1.0, provide your best estimate of the cost multiplier for a typical ED student who is also in foster care. Your answer may be the same as question 1, or somewhat higher. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options, but a few districts used the ranges provided in questions 1a and 1b. In those cases, the midpoint of the range was used.)

Students in Foster Care Multiplier

	1.00-1.19	1.20-1.39	1.40-1.59	1.60-1.79	1.80-1.99	2.00+	No Response
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	7	1	2	0	0	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	20	6	8	4	1	8	1
70.0% - 79.9%	5	3	3	2	1	2	0
<70.0%	3	1	2	2	1	1	0
All SDs	**35**	**11**	**15**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**1**
Charter Schools	**7**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**0**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg.[1,2]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	1.05	1.17	1.16
80.0% - 89.9%[3]	1.20	1.40	1.43
70.0% - 79.9%	1.43	1.44	1.53
<70.0%	1.50	1.49	1.56
All SDs	**1.25**	**1.39**	**1.52**
SD ED Concentration			
<30.0%	1.05	1.12	1.08
30.0 - 49.9%[3]	1.20	1.38	1.37
50.0 - 69.9%	1.30	1.43	1.49
70.0%+	1.50	1.51	1.57
All SDs	**1.25**	**1.39**	**1.52**
Charter Schools	**1.10**	**1.35**	**1.20**

1 Excludes respondents who did not answer question.

2 Calculated using number of ED students as the weight.

3 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Question 5: If your average base cost equals 1.0, provide your best estimate of the cost multiplier for a typical student who is gifted. Expenses for gifted students include those listed under Accounting Code 1243, but could include other expenses as well. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options, but a few districts used the ranges provided in questions 1a and 1b. In those cases, the midpoint of the range was used.)

Gifted Student Multiplier

	1.00-1.19	1.20-1.39	1.40-1.59	1.60-1.79	1.80-1.99	2.00+	No Response
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	7	1	1	0	1	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	23	16	4	0	1	3	1
70.0% - 79.9%	7	6	3	0	0	0	0
<70.0%	5	2	2	0	0	1	0
All SDs	**42**	**25**	**10**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**1**
Charter Schools	**6**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**4**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg.[1,2]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	1.03	1.16	1.09
80.0% - 89.9%[3]	1.20	1.24	1.25
70.0% - 79.9%	1.20	1.21	1.24
<70.0%	1.20	1.31	1.24
All SDs	**1.19**	**1.23**	**1.22**
SD ED Concentration			
<30.0%	1.02	1.10	1.05
30.0 - 49.9%[3]	1.20	1.23	1.21
50.0 - 69.9%[3]	1.20	1.29	1.51
70.0%+	1.15	1.20	1.14
All SDs	**1.19**	**1.23**	**1.22**
Charter Schools	**1.00**	**1.11**	**1.12**

1 Excludes respondents who did not answer question.

2 Calculated using number of ADM students as the weight.

3 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Question 6 (school districts only): Student departures to charter schools may imply additional costs or savings for certain school districts. For example, if 10% of your student base departs to a charter school, then the average cost to educate students that remain might increase by a small percentage due to smaller class size or other technical factors. If your average base cost equals 1.0, provide a rough approximation of the cost multiplier to apply to the average student cost if such a hypothetical scenario occurred proportionally across all grades. Be sure to factor in the additional charter school tuition cost. For example, a response of 1.02 would imply that the average cost to educate remaining students would increase by 2%. It is also possible that the cost multiplier could be 1.0, or possibly less than 1.0. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options, but a few districts used the ranges provided in questions 1a and 1b. In those cases, the midpoint of the range was used.)

Note: This question attempts to quantify the increase in the base cost to educate remaining students due to students who depart for charter schools. The base cost may increase due to (1) stranded costs (e.g., the same number of teachers are needed and class sizes are reduced, hence the cost is spread over fewer students) and (2) charter school tuition costs for students who leave the district (increases the instructional costs to be spread over the same number of students).

Student Departure Multiplier

	1.00-1.04	1.05-1.09	1.10-1.19	1.20-1.29	1.30-1.39	1.40+	No Response
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	5	1	2	2	0	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	9	7	9	3	4	15	1
70.0% - 79.9%	1	4	4	2	2	3	0
<70.0%	1	1	3	0	1	4	0
All SDs	**16**	**13**	**18**	**7**	**7**	**22**	**1**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg.[1,2]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	1.06	1.08	1.07
80.0% - 89.9%[3]	1.14	1.28	1.28
70.0% - 79.9%[3]	1.15	1.20	1.17
<70.0%	1.26	1.41	1.27
All SDs	**1.11**	**1.26**	**1.24**

1 Excludes respondents who did not answer question.

2 Calculated using number of ADM students as the weight.

3 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Question 7 (Question 6 for charter schools): Student transition and unexpected enrollments may imply additional costs related to assessment testing, remediation and other factors. Provide your best dollar estimate of the additional costs for a new student who enrolls mid-year (e.g., $300 per new student). If possible, provide your best estimate for the share of new students that enroll during the school year, relative to those present to start the school year. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options.)

Transition Costs per New Student

	$0	$1-$249	$250-$499	$500-$999	$1,000-$1,999	$2,000+	No Response
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	2	3	2	2	0	0	1
80.0% - 89.9%	1	6	16	14	5	1	5
70.0% - 79.9%	1	3	3	3	3	2	1
<70.0%	0	1	0	4	2	3	0
All SDs	**4**	**13**	**21**	**23**	**10**	**6**	**7**
Charter Schools	**3**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**2**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg. (New Students)[1,2]	Wght. Avg. (ADM)[1,3]
SD SPP Scores				
90.0%+	$200	$222	$269	$209
80.0% - 89.9%[4]	$429	$508	$724	$618
70.0% - 79.9%[4]	$450	$651	$849	$812
<70.0%	$875	$1,819	$1,235	$867
All SDs	**$500**	**$680**	**$1,052**	**$741**
Charter Schools[4]	**$438**	**$409**	**$780**	**$362**

1 Excludes respondents who did not answer question or indicated they had no student enrollments during the year.

2 Calculated using number of new students during the year as the weight.

3 Calculated using ADM as the weight.

4 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Share of New Students Arriving During School Year

	<5.0%	5.0% - 7.4%	7.5%- 9.9%	10.0%- 19.9%	20.0%- 29.9%	30.0%+	No Response
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	7	1	1	1	0	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	20	11	4	7	1	1	4
70.0% - 79.9%	3	5	2	4	1	1	0
<70.0%	1	1	4	3	1	0	0
All SDs	**31**	**18**	**11**	**15**	**3**	**2**	**4**
Charter Schools	**6**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg.[1,2]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	2.4%	4.3%	4.8%
80.0% - 89.9%[3]	5.0%	5.3%	5.7%
70.0% - 79.9%	7.5%	9.3%	9.2%
<70.0%	8.0%	10.7%	7.5%
All SDs	**5.0%**	**6.7%**	**6.9%**
Charter Schools	**2.5%**	**6.0%**	**18.2%**

1 Excludes respondents who did not answer question.

2 Calculated using ADM as the weight.

3 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Part III – Best Practices

Please attempt to quantify how intensively the following practices, programs or activities were used by your school district/charter school for the 2021-22 school year and the approximate share of students that participated in the programs or activities (if applicable). Use a scale that ranges from 0-3 (0 denotes N/A; 1 denotes minimal use; 2 denotes moderate use; and 3 denotes extensive use).

Note: While many districts were able to provide the percentage of students participating, some districts noted that they were rough approximations. The percentage of students participating is not included in these results but can be provided upon request.

Q1: Pre-School and/or K4 Programs for Students Without a Known Disability

	Intensity of Use				Value		
	NA	Minimal	Moderate	Extensive	Median	Avg.	Wght. Avg.
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	5	1	0	3	0.00	1.11	0.89
80.0% - 89.9%	26	5	8	7	0.00	0.91	0.86
70.0% - 79.9%	7	1	2	5	1.00	1.33	0.70
<70.0%	3	0	2	5	2.50	1.90	1.98
All SDs	**41**	**7**	**12**	**20**	**0.00**	**1.14**	**1.50**
Charter Schools	**9**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0.00**	**0.55**	**0.13**

Notes: For median, average and weighted average values, 0 = NA, 1 = minimal, 2 = moderate and 3 = extensive intensity of use. Weighted average uses ADM as weight. Data groups exclude some school districts due to no response: 90.0% (1 district), 80.0% - 89.9% (2 districts), 70.0% - 79.9% (1 district).

Q2: Monitoring of Individual Student Achievement

	Intensity of Use				Value		
	NA	Minimal	Moderate	Extensive	Median	Avg.	Wght. Avg.
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	0	0	1	9	3.00	2.90	2.89
80.0% - 89.9%	0	3	9	35	3.00	2.68	2.81
70.0% - 79.9%	0	1	1	13	3.00	2.80	2.88
<70.0%	0	0	1	9	3.00	2.90	2.96
All SDs	**0**	**4**	**12**	**66**	**3.00**	**2.76**	**2.91**
Charter Schools	**0**	**1**	**1**	**9**	**3.00**	**2.73**	**2.94**

Notes: For median, average and weighted average values, 0 = NA, 1 = minimal, 2 = moderate and 3 = extensive intensity of use. Weighted average uses ADM as weight. Data groups exclude some school districts due to no response: 80.0% - 89.9% (1 district), 70.0% - 79.9% (1 district).

Q3: Parent and Community Involvement

	Intensity of Use				Value		
	NA	Minimal	Moderate	Extensive	Median	Avg.	Wght. Avg.
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	0	2	5	3	2.00	2.10	2.13
80.0% - 89.9%	0	14	23	10	2.00	1.91	2.06
70.0% - 79.9%	0	3	8	4	2.00	2.07	2.21
<70.0%	0	1	7	2	2.00	2.10	1.48
All SDs	**0**	**20**	**43**	**19**	**2.00**	**1.99**	**1.75**
Charter Schools	**0**	**5**	**5**	**1**	**2.00**	**1.64**	**2.47**

Notes: For median, average and weighted average values, 0 = NA, 1 = minimal, 2 = moderate and 3 = extensive intensity of use. Weighted average uses ADM as weight. Data groups exclude some school districts due to no response: 80.0% - 89.9% (1 district), 70.0% - 79.9% (1 district).

Q4: Student Participation in After-School Activities

	Intensity of Use				Value		
	NA	Minimal	Moderate	Extensive	Median	Avg.	Wght. Avg.
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	0	0	7	3	2.00	2.30	2.41
80.0% - 89.9%	0	3	22	22	2.00	2.40	2.49
70.0% - 79.9%	0	2	6	8	2.50	2.38	2.21
<70.0%	0	0	5	5	2.50	2.50	2.19
All SDs	**0**	**5**	**40**	**38**	**2.00**	**2.40**	**2.29**
Charter Schools	**2**	**2**	**6**	**1**	**2.00**	**1.55**	**1.90**

Notes: For median, average and weighted average values, 0 = NA, 1 = minimal, 2 = moderate and 3 = extensive intensity of use. Weighted average uses ADM as weight. Data groups exclude some school districts due to no response: 80.0% - 89.9% (1 district).

Q5: Student Participation in School-Sponsored Tutoring

	Intensity of Use				Value		
	NA	Minimal	Moderate	Extensive	Median	Avg.	Wght. Avg.
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	0	3	6	1	2.00	1.80	1.71
80.0% - 89.9%	2	17	21	7	2.00	1.70	1.80
70.0% - 79.9%	0	8	2	5	1.00	1.80	1.39
<70.0%	0	4	2	4	2.00	2.00	1.39
All SDs	**2**	**32**	**31**	**17**	**2.00**	**1.77**	**1.53**
Charter Schools	**4**	**2**	**3**	**2**	**1.00**	**1.27**	**2.32**

Notes: For median, average and weighted average values, 0 = NA, 1 = minimal, 2 = moderate and 3 = extensive intensity of use. Weighted average uses ADM as weight. Data groups exclude some school districts due to no response: 80.0% - 89.9% (1 district) and 70.0% - 79.9% (1 district).

Q6: Aide/Para-Professional Work in the Classroom to Assist Teachers

	Intensity of Use				Value		
	NA	Minimal	Moderate	Extensive	Median	Avg.	Wght. Avg.
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	1	1	3	5	2.50	2.20	2.32
80.0% - 89.9%	0	2	13	32	3.00	2.64	2.58
70.0% - 79.9%	1	1	3	11	3.00	2.50	1.88
<70.0%	0	3	3	4	2.00	2.10	1.43
All SDs	**2**	**7**	**22**	**52**	**3.00**	**2.49**	**1.84**
Charter Schools	**2**	**3**	**2**	**4**	**2.00**	**1.73**	**0.64**

Notes: For median, average and weighted average values, 0 = NA, 1 = minimal, 2 = moderate and 3 = extensive intensity of use. Weighted average uses ADM as weight. Data groups exclude some school districts due to no response: 80.0% - 89.9% (1 district).

Q7: Other best practices your district uses to assist ED or EL students.

Many districts and charter schools listed different items for this question. The table below contains a list of practices noted by districts and charter schools on best practices they use to assist ED or EL students.

Other Best Practices Used to Assist ED or EL Students Noted by Survey Respondents

School Districts - SPP 90.0%+

- Classroom support
- Cultural navigation, professional development
- ELD assistants and parent workshops
- Interpreting services
- Individualized English Language Learner plans
- Cares closet
- Holiday shop
- MTSS

School Districts - SPP 80.0 - 89.9%

- Summer Programming for ED, EL & base students
- Padres/Latino meetings (100+ participants)
- Title I Services
- Preview grade level content. Reteach prerequisite skills as needed
- Positive Behavioral Intervention Support
- Additional Counseling Services
- Community Eligibility Program (all kids eat free)
- Instructional Shifts
- SAP, Alternative Ed, Summer Lunch Program
- Extended School Year
- Instructional Coaches and MTSS
- Saturday Superstars, Summer Learning Lab
- Strengthening Families
- In-house ELL teachers (2)
- Transportation/counseling for homeless and foster
- Instructional Materials and Digital Platforms
- Summer ESL Program
- Social Work Services
- Summer Food Service Program and Food Service Truck Delivery
- Life Ready Graduate Implementation
- Panther Pantry
- Motherhood Initiatives, Fatherhood Initiatives, Stem & Vine ASP
- Hired 3 social workers
- HOMES program
- Utilize SHINE Program in elementary school
- Food Service Assistance

School Districts - SPP 70.0 - 79.9%

- Schoolwide Title I
- MTSS
- ED Backpack Prog. (food sent home over weekend)
- Student Assistance Program
- EL Summer School Program
- Extended School Year
- EL interpretation services for students & families
- Transition Education

School Districts - SPP <70%

- Interventionist Program
- Small group instruction
- Dual Language Programs
- On-demand translation and transcription services
- Implemented a Welcome Center for New Comers
- Translators, Parent Liaisons, MTSS Positions & Bilingual Psychologists
- Bilingual Paraprofessionals
- Additional Social Workers
- Summer and Extended Day Programming
- Newcomer Learning Academy
- Summer enrichment programming
- Bilingual Office Aides & Welcome Center

Charter Schools

- Collaboration with community services
- Career Readiness
- Saturday School
- El Student best practices
- Progress Monitoring
- Social Work & mental health services
- Push-in by EL teacher and support teachers in EL classrooms
- Certified Instructional Support teacher to provide Tier II support
- Translation services
- Family Services
- Before School Prep
- Safety/Security services

Question 8: If your district/school operates a school-based community center(s) for after school group activities, social support, public information or other purposes, provide your best estimate of the annual cost to operate the center(s) on a per student basis. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options.)

Note: Since few surveyed districts and charters have community centers, only a tabulation of the cost per student for the community centers was completed. Additional detail can be provided upon request.

Community Center Costs per Student

	$1-$99	$100-$199	$200-$299	$300-$999	$1,000-$1,999	$2,000+	$0/ No Response
School Districts (SDs)							
90.0%+	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
80.0% - 89.9%	0	1	1	0	0	2	44
70.0% - 79.9%	0	1	0	0	1	0	14
<70.0%	0	0	1	2	1	2	4
All SDs	**0**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**71**
Charter Schools	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**10**

Question 9: If your school district employs crossing guards to ensure the safe passage of students to and from school, please provide the annual cost to provide those services. If crossing guard services are provided by a municipal government, please provide the municipal government cost, if possible. Do not include any costs related to special events or after school activities. (Respondents were not given a drop-down menu of options.)

Note: In some cases, a district covers all costs, while in other cases a municipality shares costs with the districts. In a few cases, a municipality paid the full cost of crossing guards. Overall, roughly one-third of the cost of crossing guards is paid by a municipality and two-thirds by a district. The table reflects total crossing guard expenses.

Total Crossing Guard Expenses Paid by District/Charter School and Municipality

	$1-$24,999	$25,000-$49,999	$50,000-$99,999	$100,000-$149,999	$150,000+	No Response or $0
School Districts (SDs)						
90.0%+	3	2	0	1	1	3
80.0% - 89.9%	9	3	6	3	1	26
70.0% - 79.9%	5	1	0	1	1	8
<70.0%	0	0	2	0	6	2
All SDs	**17**	**6**	**8**	**5**	**9**	**39**
Charter Schools	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**

Crossing Guard Expenses per ADM (for Districts with Crossing Guards)

	<$5	$5-$9.99	$10-$19.99	$20-$49.99	$50+	$0/No Response
School Districts (SDs)						
90.0%+	3	1	3	0	0	3
80.0% - 89.9%	5	5	4	6	2	26
70.0% - 79.9%	3	1	2	1	1	8
<70.0%	2	0	0	5	1	2
All SDs	**13**	**7**	**9**	**12**	**4**	**39**
Charter Schools	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**

	Median[1]	Average[1]	Wght. Avg.[2]
SD SPP Scores			
90.0%+	$6.67	$7.71	$7.67
80.0% - 89.9%[3]	$10.16	$15.82	$17.35
70.0% - 79.9%	$8.28	$16.49	$21.62
<70.0%	$27.42	$31.44	$9.89
All SDs	**$10.89**	**$17.49**	**$11.65**
Charter Schools	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**

1 Includes only districts and charter schools that reported non-zero crossing guard expenses (paid for by the district, charter school or municipality).

2 Calculated using ADM as the weight.

3 Excludes an outlier response that was more than three standard deviations away from the average/mean response.

Part IV – Facility Assessments

This section contains questions regarding facility assessments that were not included in the 2015 survey.

Question 1: How frequently do you routinely conduct a district-wide/charter school-wide facilities assessment that includes projected district maintenance needs, infrastructure upgrade needs, and other facilities' needs? (Respondents were given a drop-down menu of options that include: annually, alternate years, every 3-5 years, every 5+ years, and every 10+ years.)

Frequency of District/School-Wide Facility Assessments

	Annually	Every Other Year	3-5 Years	5+ Years	10+ Years	Other[1]
School Districts (SDs)						
90.0%+	2	0	4	2	2	0
80.0% - 89.9%	28	3	11	3	3	0
70.0% - 79.9%	8	0	2	2	4	0
<70.0%	5	0	3	2	0	0
All SDs	**43**	**3**	**20**	**9**	**9**	**0**
Charter Schools	**7**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**1**

1 Has not completed a school wide facilities assessment.

Question 2: If yes to question 1, who is involved in this routine assessment? (Respondents were given a drop-down menu of options that include: engineering, architectural, or other professional firm/consultant; district staff/charter school staff; combination of district/charter school staff and engineering/architectural/other professional firm/consultant; answered "no" to question 1.)

Type of District/School-Wide Facility Assessment

	District/School Staff	Professional Firm/Consultant	District/School Staff & Prof. Firm/Consultant	Other[1]
School Districts (SDs)				
90.0%+	1	3	6	0
80.0% - 89.9%	23	3	22	0
70.0% - 79.9%	5	2	8	1
<70.0%	1	0	9	0
All SDs	**30**	**8**	**45**	**1**
Charter Schools	**4**	**0**	**6**	**1**

1 Has not completed a school wide facilities assessment or did not answer the question.

Question 3: In what year did you last conduct a formal (professionally contracted) system wide (all school/LEA buildings) facilities assessment? (Respondents were given a drop-down of years from 1980 through 2023 and prior to 1980.)

Latest Year of a Professionally-Contracted, System Wide (All Buildings) Assessment

	2022 or 2023	2020 or 2021	2015 to 2019	2010 to 2014	Prior to 2010	No Response
School Districts (SDs)						
90.0%+	5	1	3	1	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	11	9	12	6	7	3
70.0% - 79.9%	4	1	4	4	1	2
<70.0%	4	1	4	0	1	0
All SDs	**24**	**12**	**23**	**11**	**9**	**5**
Charter Schools	**5**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**3**

Question 4: In what year did you last conduct a formal (professionally contracted) individual school site or individual building facilities assessment? (Respondents were given a drop-down of years from 1980 through 2023 and prior to 1980.)

Latest Year of a Professionally-Contracted, Individual Building Assessment

	2022 or 2023	2020 or 2021	2015 to 2019	2010 to 2014	Prior to 2010	No Response
School Districts (SDs)						
90.0%+	8	0	1	1	0	0
80.0% - 89.9%	19	11	8	5	4	1
70.0% - 79.9%	6	3	4	2	0	1
<70.0%	7	0	2	0	1	0
All SDs	**40**	**14**	**15**	**8**	**5**	**2**
Charter Schools	**5**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3**

Part V: General Survey Comments

Survey respondents were instructed to provide comments or additional information that may be pertinent to the survey. All responses are shown as submitted.

Allentown City SD

Very hard to assess and estimate numbers in a district like Allentown. Most students are very needy and they have an unusually high % of students that are ELL. In fact Allentown has 2 schools dedicated to students who are severely ELL (barely speak English).

Altoona Area SD

Significant costs related to the support of ED and EL students are found in function codes outside of the 1100 series (but are included in the PDE 363 calculation). The multiplier above incorporates expenditures related to school psychologists, social workers, administrative support, nursing, building security and tuition to career and technology centers. Additionally, in a community with low property values and low average income levels the reducing factor of the Local Effort Capacity Index has negative effect on the distribution of BEF to communities in need.

Avon Grove SD

Part II-First Section-Line 2 Code 1100 costs include ESSR & Title expenses = $2,298,306 - Part II - Item #7, Student Transitions - Additional Cost per student would depend if the newly enrolled required special services. Student Departure to Charter School - If 50 students were to transfer to charter school, the additional expense would be all tuition, and increase of approx. 2% to those students that remained. If 500 students transferred the additional tuition expense would be significant with some reduction in staff costs, estimated increase of approx. 18% to those students that remained.

Blue Ridge SD

The Blue Ridge School District struggles financially in its efforts to fund rising special education costs, charter school funding and aging facilities. Our region is a low-income rural county with limited opportunities for families. We are in need of a greater state investment for our children to learn and thrive.

Bradford Area SD

The Bradford Area School District has not had a Business Manager for the past 60 days. We are uncomfortable estimating the multipliers without extensive analysis. We have given our best estimates.

Chambersburg Area SD

We continue to see an increase in enrollment of high needs students and ELL, requiring additional supports to include one-one PCAs, individualized transportation, OT/PT and Speech. We are experiencing dramatic increases to our special education expense. We currently have 26 Autistic support classrooms. Each classroom can serve a maximum of 8 students. We employee 1 teacher and 2 classroom aides for each classroom. Our ELL population is also growing with an additional 120 students over a 2-year period. The weight of these populations must be addressed in the formula.

Clearfield Area SD

Our multiplier's are lower due to the fact that our ED group is in the range of 60-70% of our student population. As a result our cost per student already reflects what we do for all students regardless of ED status. The programs apply to all students.

Corry Area SD

We are in the midst of a middle high school renovation. This school hadn't been renovated since the 1990's. The renovation includes roof, HVAC, lighting, ceiling tiles, new front office renovation and several bathrooms.

Dubois Area SD

DASD was able to slide into Plan Con during the 2019 lapse in the moratorium. Consequently, we were able to start renovation on two of our elementary schools that we would not have undertaken without the Plan Con reimbursement.

East Stroudsburg Area SD

We have a district hired engineering consultant who consults with us on individual needs but does not do "District wide" facilities assessment. The last one that was done was back in 2010 here.

Erie City SD

The District tries to utilize the best practices listed above for as many students as possible, however, the resources the District has does not allow for extensive use. Our limited resources only permits us to implement many of the best practice, student support services which are greatly needed by our most challenging students. Additional financial support through the Fair Funding formula would allow us to increase student supports, best practices as well as level the play field for all of our students. The influx of Federal COVID relief dollars allowed us to bring in some of those supports, however, with those dollars not being reoccurring and coming to an end very soon, we are fearful that those programs which we implemented will have to be taken away from our high ED population.

Forest City Regional SD

I am a brand new superintendent to the school district. Many of the questions on facilities will be part of my plan to establish. I cannot answer them based on my current knowledge of the district.

Fort LeBoeuf SD

Just to note: in 2021-2022, the Fort LeBoeuf school district used $1,063,794 of ESSER/COVID related funding in the Instructional Costs function (Part II, column a). The District is also currently preparing for a district wide feasibility study. (Part IV Q3)

Girard SD

The district is about 60% ED, tax base is made of mostly residential, and the average assessed value of a home is a little over $100,000. The district is very dependent on state revenue as it makes up about 57% and local being 39%. With our district being very poor it is hard to keep raising the taxes to meet shortfalls and to keep up with all the demands of having such a high economically disadvantaged percentage. With

normal costs going up each year and especially higher after covid, the district faces a battle of keeping classroom size at a level that students will be able to learn and engage while also looking at our facilities on what work needs to be done from roofing to HVAC. The School District has a community school at the elementary that is funded by our local United Way for the director and other resources. This too has been seeing decline in allocation which if it goes away will be difficult to fill due to the resources that the program has brought to the school.

Hazleton Area SD

The Hazleton Area School District, which encompasses 256 square miles, serves students from a cross representation of urban, rural, and suburban communities. The District encompasses 16 municipalities. Most of the District is located in Luzerne County; however, portions of the radius include Carbon and Schuylkill Counties.

The Hazleton Area School District, among the top 10 largest school districts in PA, is comprised of 16 school buildings. The organizational structure includes six (6) K-8 elementary/middle schools, two (2) 3-8 elementary/middle schools, two (2) K-2 elementary schools. The high school students (grades 9-12) are served by four (4) buildings that include the Hazleton Area Academy of Science, the Hazleton Area High School, the Hazleton Area Arts and Humanities Academy, and the Hazleton Area Career Center, which is the District's own Career and Technical Center. The Hazleton Area School District operates a K-12 Cyber Academy that is uniquely designed and housed at our local mall. The Hazleton Area School District operates the Luzerne/Wyoming counties early intervention programs. Hazleton Area School District also educates Pre-Kindergarten students. Our Early Intervention and Pre-K students are located in The Academy near our Arthur Street Elementary School. Hazleton Area also operates a Newcomer Center for our K-6 students. Our Newcomer 7-12 students are serviced in our other schools.

Our student population has grown in both diversity and numbers over the last several years. In 2018-2019, the District's population was approximately 11,500 students with a minority population of 54% Latinx. For the 2023-2024 school year, our student population is in excess of 13,200 students with a minority population is approximately 64% Latinx. In the last year, alone, the District increased its ELL population from 2,600 to 3,400. To meet the needs of our children, we have an ELL staff of 53 certified teachers at a cost of $4.5 million annually. All of our schools have bilingual liaisons and bilingual paraprofessionals to assist our students and parents as well. We continue to enroll new students every day. New enrollments continue throughout the school year. The District employs approximately 1600 people. We are one of the largest employers in the area.

Although Spanish accounts for the largest percentage of languages spoken in the District buildings, there are a total of 22 different languages across our schools. The special education population was approximately 12.8% in 2018-2019 school year. The special education population in 2023-2024 is about 15%. Due to our Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) percentage, all of our students receive free breakfast and lunch.

We have addressed the increasing population through creatively renovating spaces within our existing schools. For example, we closed four (4) pools located in four (4) of our elementary/middle schools to create classroom space. Additionally, we remodeled our existing libraries in most of our schools to provide additional classroom spaces. With those projects, we were able to secure 34 classrooms for $10 million. We purchased and renovated two (2) buildings recently. They now house our Early Intervention students,

Pre-K students, and Arts and Humanities students. By doing so, we were able to provide more space in our High School, Career Center, and Early Learning Center. By redesigning our Cyber Academy and providing a home in our local mall for those who have chosen to learn online, we increased enrollment from 70 students to over 600 students. This increase in enrollment into our Cyber Academy has allowed for additional space in our other buildings. However, with all of these changes, we are still not able to address the large influx of children we are seeing. As we know, educating children in smaller groups is a better learning environment and can positively impact their academic careers. Our regular education classrooms have large numbers of students in them. Our special education population is increasing which reduces the available space considerably due to the limited number of students permitted in a special needs classroom. For example, we are only permitted, by law, to have eight (8) Autistic Support children in a classroom. We have had to add a number of additional classrooms because of our increased Autism Spectrum Disorder population. As mentioned, this reduces the available space for regular education areas greatly.

The District's budget for the 2023-2024 school year is $225,512,780.00, which has drastically increased over the last several years to address the needs of our growing student population. Unfortunately, we are not adequately funded to meet all the needs of our children. We are 497 out of 500 school districts for per pupil spending. We are the lowest or next to the lowest tax base in all three counties our District reaches. We do increase taxes, at least, to the index each year. Many families are on fixed incomes or are renting, which makes it difficult to continue to complete our maintenance of effort with our tax increases.

Districts of similar size and demographics receive millions of dollars more than HASD. For example, Lancaster School District received $77,641,742. They are of similar size and demographic. Reading School District received $201,949,819. Again, similar size and demographics. HASD received $64,505,080, which is $13,136,662 less than Lancaster and $137,444,739 less than Reading.

Although we have our own Cyber Academy we are still forced to pay for students who attend cyber charter schools. We expend approximately $6 million on cyber charter tuition each year for about 400 students. With our own Cyber Academy, we are able to minimize the costs associated with its operation. To educate a student in the HACA is approximately $5,000 per student for roughly 600 students. Basically, we are able to educate more students in our Cyber Academy for much less. We teach students synchronously. We have dedicated special education teachers, psychologist, school counselor, administration, as well as regular education teachers who support all of our students in our Academy.

Jersey Shore Area SD

The provision of services to students who show up with needs at our doors is not only cost prohibitive, but difficult to find outside of our walls. As a district, we are paying for it and putting that burden on the local taxpayer because there is little support in rural communities to get those services from local and county social service organizations.

Jim Thorpe Area SD

Since the Superintendent and Business Manager were not working at JTASD during the 2021-22 school year we used 2022-23 information for the Best Practices section.

Lampeter-Strasburg SD

Our Title I expenses are included in the 1100 total expenditures. This money is used to provide reading and math support.

The "Percentage of Students Participating" in Part III refers to the percentage that participated based on who was able to participate, not on the total student population. For instance, approximately 50% of the students who were offered school-sponsored tutoring participated in tutoring. Likewise, all K4 students without a known disability were included in programs or activities but the K4 students do not make up 100% of our student population.

Lancaster SD

Please publish the results of this survey to ensure transparency and allow for feedback. Many of my colleagues were not certain of how best to complete the information. I am not certain of how much, if any of the information was used back in 2014/15 to create the formula, so confidence is low in how much of this will actually be taken into consideration. I am happy to discuss this with the commission and any other lawmakers as appropriate.

Mahanoy Area SD

In Part II, Line 2, an adjustment was made to reduce Instructional Costs by one time federal funds due to ESSERS/ARP ESSER.

Manheim Township SD

Instructional costs have been reduced by ESSER funds (funding source 990, 994, 996).

Mifflinburg Area SD

COVID funds were utilized in the instructional expenditures (approx.. $2.2 mil). The monitoring individual student achievement basis response was in relation to schoolwide positive behavior.

Milton Area SD

Milton Area School District looks forward to additional state education subsidy payments. Increasing our future revenues and making them more predictable will serve our students and community immensely. We face pressure from drastically increasing cyber charter costs, declining tax base, and reliance on local revenues that puts the financial future of our district at risk. One of our primary goals is to be the center of our community and offer opportunities for students, families, and taxpayers to all benefit from what our district offers but when funding is inadequate, this is often the first priority to get cut as we always place student academic performance first.

North East SD

Cyber charter school enrollments are financially devastating to small enrollment districts. We offer virtual synchronous, asynchronous or on site hybrid learning options at a third of the cost of cyber charter schools. Lack of Plancon funding has forced us to use 100% local taxpayer funds for all current and proposed renovations. Some districts are advocating for BEF to fully apply the new formula to 100% of all BEF. That would be a $1 million swing from state to local funding in one year for NESD. Special education mandates

do not have adequate funding to support costs. Cyber charter schools should use same SEF formula for funding.

North Penn SD

For Part IV, question 3, the district completed a partial formal facilities assessment (4 buildings). To the best of my knowledge the district has not completed a professionally contracted system wide facilities assessment.

North Star SD

Our school facilities are in need of renovation. Funding is needed from the State for aging schools to be able to perform necessary renovations. Aging buildings, utilization, and roofs need attention.

Northern Bedford County SD

$74,974.67 of instructional expenditures (1100) would have been contributed to ESSER money received in 21/22. Question 6 seems irrelevant, with an enrollment of 845, if 10% departed to charter school we would still have the base population to provide educational services to and our charter tuition cost overall would increase by those students $956,262.72. Retained students also have an impact on these costs as an educational years of education are provided depending on when they are retained.

Penncrest SD

We only have one crossing guard through the Boro at one school. The other schools do not need a crossing guard.

Pittsburgh SD

Since 2017-18, we experienced a 33% growth in our English Language Learner population. The cost multiplier for charter school students shows the need for either charter funding formula reform or the reinstitution of the charter reimbursement subsidy.

Scranton SD

Part 3 Section 1 - N/A - no Pre-school or K4 in district. Section 2 - 100% benchmark assessments grades 3-10 adjusted to be 61.5% of all grades. Section 3 - SSD participates in School Wide Title 1 where 13 of 16 buildings receive parent and family engagement funding. Number represented above is the percentage of students eligible for title 1 services vs total enrollment (excluding outside cyber / charter) Section 4 - District had 1452 7-12 grade students participating in after school sponsored activities. Section 5 - District had 644 students participating in school sponsored tutoring after school. Section 6 - District has a teacher aid in every K classroom as well as provides 1 FTE or itinerant aides for special educations. Percentage represented above is the FTE ratio of students with aides vs total district enrollment (excluding cyber and charters) Section 9 - District and Municipality split the cost of crossing guards on an annual basis. Amount show is the wages and FICA costs paid by the SSD in calendar year 2022. Part 4 - SSD engaged a firm to do a feasibility study in 2021 and is in the process of updating by EOY 2023.

Sharon City SD

The ESSER funds provided much needed funding that allowed us to add staff, new curriculum and new technology. The amount of federal assistance in the 1100s increased from $1 million in 2012-13 to almost

$2.7 million in 2021-22. Please note that we answered the questions as best we could based on our interpretation. There are other issues to consider such as unfunded mandates, costs associated with implementing new programs and providing support to meet the needs of students coming to school not prepared and behind in their growth and development. The District sees a high transiency rate, which impacts student skill acquisition. Many of which have presented large gaps in learning and mastery. We have experienced an increase in students enrolling with special needs, and are seeing increased costs from COVID and inflation in general. The ESSER funds helped us, but we have huge concerns in how we will maintain needed programming and supports for students when the ESSER funding goes away.

Shikellamy SD

Part II Question 6 is confusing, so I wanted to explain the basis of our answer. Based on our base cost of $6,787, our costs increase about 48% from the base cost for a regular education student that leaves for a charter school because now we need to pay north of $10,000 for that student to the cyber charter school. When paying that $10k, we aren't reducing or saving $6,787 of cost from our district expense line. The base costs inherently remains in the system and now a new expense is created due to the student going to cyber school. The cost increase is even larger if it is a special education student because then we are paying $26,000 per student that departs for a charter school. There are no cost savings for a student that goes to a charter school. The home district is not able to reduce staffing to offset these cost increases unless a large number of students depart in one single grade level or out of the high school alone. For example, we currently have approx. 160 students that attend cyber charter schools at a cost north of $2 million per year. We could bring all 160 of those students back into our classrooms with minimal cost increase to our current education structure based on the assumption that 160 kids equates to somewhere around 12-15 students per grade level. The state funding cyber charter schools or providing for a greater weight in the formula would provide immediate relief to districts that have larger out of district cyber enrollments.

Shippensburg Area SD

1. We continue to experience a substantial increase in our ELL students in 22/23 and 23/24 school years

2. Since COVID, student enrollment in external cyber charter schools has remained high

3. Homeless population in the District continues to grow. One reason is due to a homeless shelter established in our school district about 1-2 years ago

4. Received a letter notifying our District of a proposed Low Income Housing to be constructed in our school district.

5. Multi-County SD's (including SASD) is harmed by the current laws governing the equalization of real estate tax millage rates across multiple counties. We lose out on tax growth/tax revenue. This should be a factor/weight in the BEF formula.

Souderton Area SD

We would respectfully request that the BEFC's funding formula recommendation be based on data that are currently being collected by the Department of Education. Much of the data requested in this survey are not currently being reported. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

Stroudsburg Area SD

We do not employee crossing guards. Our armed security personnel conducts traffic control for the schools.

Uniontown Area SD

Part III, I based % off of total ADM. Part IV, the District does routine examinations of the buildings and inspections from our insurance providers but has been a while since we did a formal assessment. However, we did have formal inspections for safety from the PA State Police on all our buildings in 2023.

Upper Darby SD

Part II: Instructional Costs were reduced by $10,502,911, which was all funded by various COVID relief funding. An additional note to consider, the District's "Share of ED students" is currently at 74%.

Part III. 9: Our costs should be much higher, but we were unable to staff all of our budgeted positions throughout the 21-22 school year due to staffing shortages.

Wayne Highlands SD

It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of the enacted funding formula because of the lack of funding support for the formula. Cyber Charter School tuition is a huge cost driver approaching 5% of our total budget. Spread over 12 grades and 435 square miles our 140 cyber charter school student enrollments does not allow for any reduction in costs. Wayne Highlands is a very rural district that consists of 1 K-2 building, 1 3-5 building, 1 6-8 building, 1 9-12 high school, along with two K-8 buildings in the northern regions of our district that our located at least 25 miles from our main campus. Somehow we do not qualify for the paltry sparsity factor in the current formula! These K-8 Buildings serve students from vast areas but have small enrollments. One building has 145 students and the other has 240 students K-8, on a purely economical basis, because of these small enrollments these buildings should be closed, but we strive to provide the best educational experience (our test scores prove this out) for our students, the bus rides for these students are extreme for any age student but doubly so for elementary students.

West York Area SD

III #3 is for 2 Elementary Title Building wide-Parent & Family Engagement is required.

York City SD

Full funding of Basic Education Funding (BEF) would allow equitable and appropriate levels of funding to meet the individual needs of ED, EL, Special Education and General Education students.

York Suburban SD

Part II adjustments: The district used the October 1 Enrollment PIMS reporting. Total 1100 expenditures do not include COVID dollars.

Yough SD

Part IV - the district is current conducting a contracted district-wide feasibility assessment study with the final report to be released in December 2023. The district, with the assistance of the hired Architect, will begin to prioritize projects based on facility needs and costs.

Commonwealth Charter Academy CS

It's important to note that Basic Education Funding (BEF) is only distributed to school districts as one of many sources of revenue. Due to the way public cyber charter schools are funded pursuant to Section 1725-A of the Public School Code (24 PS § 17-1725-A), their inability to raise revenue through local taxes, and the tuition rates determined through the PDE-363 (Funding for Charter Schools, Calculation of Selected Expenditures Per Average Daily Membership), the BEF formula and its components lack the specificity needed to support the unique academic, financial, technological, and facility operations of public cyber charter schools, nor do they capture the needs and characteristics of public cyber charter schools and their students. While the information provided in this survey may inform the BEF Commission's processes, it's important for the Commission to recognize and understand that any financial considerations for public cyber charter schools included in a revised BEF formula would result in a reduced benefit to public cyber charter students due to the operation of the PDE-363. Furthermore, due to the unique operations of public cyber charter schools, the Charter School Law, 24 P.S. § 17-1701-A et seq., requires cyber charter schools to "(1) provide all instructional materials; (2) provide all equipment, including but not limited to, a computer, computer monitor and printer; and (3) provide or reimburse for all technology and services necessary for the on-line delivery of the curriculum instruction. See 24 P.S. § 17-1743-A(e).

Discovery CS

A full scale assessment and appraisal of the Building was performed as done as part of our Bond renewal in April 2022.

Lincoln Park Performing Arts CS

We rent our buildings from another entity, the Lincoln Park Performing Arts Center.

Mastery CS-Mann Campus

The baseline funding that Charter schools receive per pupil in Philadelphia ($10,786 in SY 2021-22) is not sufficient to meet the needs of students in city, particularly to tackle the challenges noted in this document. With EL needs fully unfunded, all services that are provided for English Language Learners pull funds away from the operating funding of the rest of the school, despite it being a moral and legal necessity. Additionally, substantial facility concerns exist due to the operation of buildings in Philadelphia that are nearly 100 years old and have not been maintained prior to the inception of the charter organization, leading to a position where the school must use significant operation funds to ensure the health and safety of students and staff, beyond that which is feasible. Most challenging, the socioeconomic and environmental factors, such as gun violence and poverty, a tremendous amount of resources have to go towards trauma informed mental health services to support the social and emotional needs of students, well above what standard funding allows. As such, many Philadelphia charters are faced with a challenge to provide the basic levels of service to students, let alone tackle the necessary remediation steps required to catch up with better funded suburban peers.

Souderton CS Collaborative

Our authorizing district and its board have prioritized keeping tax increases below the threshold for the past 5 years, often only raising taxes 1%. This reality impacts our funding. During the pandemic, the extra funding provided by the state and federal governments were necessary for the safe and productive

reopening of schools in the 2020-2021 school year. We proudly share that our school, offered in-person instruction for our families beginning on 9/5/2020. During the summer of 2020, our teachers worked tirelessly, to learn and hone their use of technologies that would provide students with a similar quality education as they had pre-pandemic. We began 2020 with 67% of our students in-person and by the years end 85% of students had returned to in-person. During this year, the teachers had to find the balance between academic and social emotional learning. We leaned into our SEL team to meet the needs of the students. By 2021-2022 SY, we continued with a focus on social emotional learning and basic skills like executive functioning and socialization. Beyond the additional funds that we and other schools used to rebound from COVID, we believe that charter school funding in Pennsylvania continues to be inequitable due to districts abilities to hold back funds for capital programs and debt.

While the BEC is addressing unequal funding between districts, I appreciate your inclusion of charters in the discussion. An impact that charters experience, and we did recently, is contention with our authorizers. Though we are one of the highest performing schools in the state, we had to seek remedy for our last charter through the courts. While we prevailed, the monies that were spent on legal costs versus going to programming for students, was disheartening. Despite this reality, we have been able to regain losses experienced over the past several challenging years. We would ask that authorizers not place undue financial burdens on charters who are performing because they believe that charters are unnecessary. We ask that the 363 funding formula be reviewed so more taxpayer monies flow to charters, if one is available in their district.

Sylvan Heights Science CS

Sylvan Heights Science Charter School contracted with our architects to conduct a complete facilities/feasibility assessment in 2019. The results were released January 2020. The School was not able to move forward with recommendations due to COVID-19 interruptions because the School was required to close March 2020. The School is once again in the process of evaluating our School building and is considering moving to a new location based on the results of the current assessment. Also note, that Sylvan Heights Science Charter School experienced disruptions to the School's learning environment which negatively impacted the school's ability to implement programs involving parent and community engagement.

Staff Acknowledgments

The survey results were compiled by Karen Maynard and Rachel Flaugh. Questions regarding the survey results can be directed to kmaynard@ifo.state.pa.us.