

S B

4 4 6

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1992 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. SB 446

Revision Date: _____

Department Affected: Education

Title: An Act amending the formula providing state aid for education.

BRU: K-12

Sponsor: (S) HESS

Component: Foundation

Requestor: (S) HESS

COMPONENT SERIAL NO.

	1	4	1
--	---	---	---

Expenditures/Revenues: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE FUND SOURCE:						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER FUND SOURCE:						
TOTAL	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4	3,374.4

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of current year impact: _____

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)

The increased cost is projected over the FY93 full entitlement projection of \$574,938,100. The foundation program is currently under funded in the Governor's budget by \$22,357,600. An FY93 budget amendment is being submitted to OMB for this amount. Analysis is based on \$60,000 unit value.

See attached

Prepared by: Eddy Jeans/Bill Wright

Phone: 465-2865

Division: Educational Finance and Support Services

Date: 2-27-92

Approved by Commissioner: *Jerry Covey*

Date: 2-28-92

Agency: Education

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 FY93 PROJECTED FOUNDATION ENTITLEMENTS AS AMENDED BY SB446.

UNIT AT \$60,000 SINGLE SITE UNITS UNDER 800 ADM

ADAK	\$237,000
ALASKA GATEWAY	0
ALEUTIAN REGION	58,800
ALEUTIANS EAST	0
ANCHORAGE	0
ANNETTE ISLANDS	168,000
BERING STRAIT	0
BRISTOL BAY	0
CHATHAM	0
CHUGACH	0
COPPER RIVER	0
CORDOVA	198,600
CRAIG	158,400
DELTA/GREELY	0
DILLINGHAM	195,600
FAIRBANKS	0
GALENA	156,000
HAINES	0
HCONAH	163,200
HYDABURG	103,800
IDITAROD	0
JUNEAU	0
KAKE	132,000
KASHUNAMIUT	190,200
KENAI	0
KETCHIKAN	0
KLAWOCK	150,600
KODIAK	0
KUSPUK	0
LAKE AND PENINSULA	0
LOWER KUSKOKWIM	0
LOWER YUKON	0
MAT-SU	0
NENANA	158,400
NOME	274,200
NORTH SLOPE	0
NORTHWEST ARCTIC	0
PELICAN	58,200
PETERSBURG	193,200
PRIBILOF	0
RAILBELT	0
SITKA	0
SKAGWAY	113,400
SOUTHEAST	0
SOUTHWEST	0
ST. MARY'S	119,400
TANANA	115,200
UNALASKA	171,600
VALDEZ	0
WRANGELL	145,800
YAKUTAT	112,800
YUKON FLATS	0
YUKON KOYUKUK	0
YUPIIT	0
SUB - TOTALS	3,374,400
STATE CORR STUDY	0
MT. EDGE CUMBE SCHOOL	0
VALDEZ CONTRACT	0
4 MILL PHASE-IN (SUBSIDY)	0
PL81-874 PASS THRU	0
EST. PRIOR YEAR ADJ	0
FY93 EST. INCREASES	\$3,374,400

Adds a single site district table to increase K-12 units by the following formula: 1-250 ADM = 12%, 251-525 ADM = 8%, 526-800 = 6%.

Small Single Site School District Funding

Issue

To revise Title 13, Chapter 17 Public School Foundation Program to include an increase for schools with one funding community (site) and 1,000 or fewer average daily membership (ADM).

Background

The present public funding act was passed in the 1987 Legislative Session. During the Legislative hearings there was much discussion concerning the adequacy of the funding formula for small single site school districts i.e. districts of up to 1,000 (750, 525, 100-525) in enrollment that were a single funding community. No one was sure of the impact of the new formula on these districts and an appropriation of two million dollars was made to the State Department of Education to address unique and emergency circumstances substantiated by school districts to the Department. Subsequent fiscal year appropriations were made to the Department for specific school districts, the majority of which were single site school districts.

A review of testimony on HB 126, and the discussions in subsequent years on supplemental appropriations for single site school districts, shows that the Legislature believes there is a need for some adjustment in the foundation program for single site school districts. Certainly the passage of supplementals for FY90, 91 and 92 shows there is a continuing need for additional support to single site districts. The major questions concerning the issue are: what size districts should receive additional support, how much support, and how to incorporate the adjustments into the foundation program?

Analysis

There has been general agreement that single site districts as large as the Nome School District need some adjustment. For purposes of analysis single site school districts of 1000 or fewer in ADM will be divided into three groups, i.e. districts of 1-250 ADM, 251-525 ADM and 526-1,000 ADM. These groups are selected for analysis because they generally follow breakpoints in the present formula for K-12 instructional units. These districts were analyzed on a per ADM basis for changes that have occurred in state funding, local effort, P.L. 81-874 funds, fund balances, property values, supplemental support and pupil teacher ratios (PTR) since FY86. FY86 was selected as the base year because it had the highest state support for public education in the history of the State. The Aleutian Region REAA and the schools in the Aleutian East Borough were excluded from the analysis because of a lack of comparable data, and the North Slope Borough and Valdez City districts were excluded because of extremely high local property values.

Analysis (continued)

The procedure that was used for analysis purposes was to:

- accumulate the changes in each area listed above incorporating the changes required by the FY88 Foundation Act, and
- dividing the cumulative changes per ADM by the K-12 instructional unit basic need for FY91.

This determined the percentage of gain or loss by group as if there had been no supplemental support, allowing a comparison between what has been appropriated for supplementals and what the analysis shows as needed.

Findings

1. Single site school districts of 1-250 had a loss of 19.96%.
2. Single site districts of 251-525 had a loss of 10.00%.
3. Single site districts of 526-1000 had a loss of 5.06%.
4. The rest of the school districts as a group had a loss of 1.87%.
5. The data would suggest that single site school districts of 1-250 should receive an additional 18.09% (19.96% - 1.87%) of K-12 units, single site districts of 251-525 an addition of 8.13%, and single site districts of 526-1,000 an addition of 3.19%.
6. However, the 1-250 group of single site school districts received about a 4.50% more in supplemental support and exceeded the required 4 mill local effort by about 1 mill more than the other two groups, yielding about another 1.5% advantage, leaving that group at about a 12% adjusted loss. The 526-1,000 group of single site school districts started with a significantly higher pupil teacher ratio and increased it by almost one-fifth, which means that the group cut their programs beyond what the other groups did, reflecting about a 3% lower loss than they should have, had they received a higher level of supplemental support.

Recommendation

The above analysis and findings support the following recommendation for increased support to single site school districts of 1,000 or fewer in ADM except Valdez, which receives a considerable state support break because of the 35% rule.

ADM	Percent of K-12 Units
1-250	12
251-525	8
526-1000	6

REVISED 2/6/92

Small Single Site School District Funding Proposal

Fiscal Note*

SCHOOL DISTRICT	PROJECTED FY 93 ADM	PROJECTED FY93 K-12 UNITS	ADJUSTMENT FACTOR	INCREASED UNITS	AREA DIFFERENTIAL	SMALL SINGLE SITE PROPOSAL
Galena	160	16.67	12.00%	2.00	1.30	\$156,031
Hoonah	225	21.00	12.00%	2.52	1.08	\$163,296
Hydaburg	120	14.00	12.00%	1.68	1.03	\$103,824
Kake	178	17.87	12.00%	2.14	1.03	\$132,524
Kashunamiut	208	19.87	12.00%	2.38	1.33	\$190,275
Klawock	215	20.33	12.00%	2.44	1.03	\$150,767
Nenana	185	18.33	12.00%	2.20	1.20	\$158,371
Pelican	48.2	7.53	12.00%	0.90	1.08	\$58,553
Skagway	135	15.00	12.00%	1.80	1.05	\$113,400
St. Mary's	105.5	12.79	12.00%	1.38	1.30	\$107,640
Tanana	100	12.33	12.00%	1.48	1.30	\$115,409
Yakutat	127	14.47	12.00%	1.74	1.08	\$112,519
Annette Island	420	34.00	8.00%	2.72	1.03	\$168,096
Cordova	478.75	37.22	8.00%	2.98	1.11	\$198,308
Craig	390	32.00	8.00%	2.56	1.03	\$158,208
Unalaska	332	28.13	8.00%	2.25	1.27	\$171,480
Adak	718	51.91	6.00%	3.11	1.27	\$237,333
Dillingham	553	42.91	6.00%	2.57	1.27	\$195,834
Nome	773	56.88	6.00%	3.41	1.34	\$274,389
Petersburg	722	53.70	6.00%	3.22	1.00	\$193,320
Wrangell	527	40.55	6.00%	2.43	1.00	\$145,800
TOTAL	6720.48	567.49		49.60		\$3,305,377

*The fiscal note is for \$3,305,377. However, when the FY 92 small school supplemental (HB 5: \$2,131,200 and the Petersburg and Wrangell FY91 supplementals HB 15: \$372,600, TOTAL \$2,503,800) are considered, the increase is \$801,577.

Proposed Legislative Wording

* Sec. ____ AS 14.17.041 is amended by adding a new subsection to read: (e) A district with an ADM of 1,000 or less that consists of one funding community and whose property evaluation per ADM is less than \$1,000,000.00 shall increase the elementary and secondary instructional units to which it is entitled under (a) or (b) of this section by a percentage determined under the following table:

District ADM	Percentage
1-250	1.12
251-525	1.08
526-1000	1.06

Small Single Site School Districts

Funding Analysis

TABLE I

Sch Dist. Size in ADM	A ACTUAL FY91 ADM	B AV. SUPP. PER ADM	C FY90 LOCAL EFF ≥ 4 MILLS PER ADM	D ADJ LOC EFF CNG PER ADM	E F90-F86 FND BAL PER ADM	F F88-91 LO EF/ADM CNG @ 4 MIL	G ST FND/ADM F85-F91	H PL874/ADM F88-F91	I C&D PL874 ADJUST/ADM
Total ADM 1-250	2046.1	500	517	-420	-986	-35	-1766	-209	802
Total ADM 251-525	2095.45	142	430	-235	-325	3	-928	532	200
Total ADM 526-1000	2171.15	116	331	-47	-512	-33	-1014	1022	46
Total Other Districts	99321.25		646	-22	-102	-618	123	212	56

TABLE II

Sch Dist. Size in ADM	J CUM CNGS/ADM	K CUM CNGS/ADM PER YEAR	L F91 K-12 BASIC ND PER ADM	M CUM CNG AS % OF F91 BN INC SUPP	N AV SUPP AS % OF F91 BN	O CUM % CNG WITHOUT SUPP	P CNG LOC EFF C&B ≥ 4 MILLS IN F90
Total ADM 1-250	-2613	-523	7226	-7.23%	-6.92%	-14.15%	-5.81%
Total ADM 251-525	-754	-151	5284	-2.85%	-2.69%	-5.55%	-4.45%
Total ADM 526-1000	-537	-107	5343	-2.01%	-2.17%	-4.18%	-0.88%
Total Other Districts	-351	-70	4913	-1.43%	0.00%	-1.43%	-0.44%

TABLE III

Sch Dist. Size in ADM	Q GRAND TOTAL % CNG/ADM	R ONE MILL PER ADM	S LOCAL MILL EFFORT ≥ 4 MILLS	T PTR F86	U PTR F90	V % INC PTR F90VS85
Total ADM 1-250	-19.96%	151	3.43	7.13	8.96	25.66%
Total ADM 251-525	-10.00%	187	2.30	9.59	10.92	13.83%
Total ADM 526-1000	-5.06%	138	2.39	11.62	13.82	18.90%
Total Other Districts	-1.87%	219	2.94	13.05	13.73	5.25%

Column Explanation Tables I-III

School District Size In ADM:

Total ADM 1-250 : Is single site school districts with average daily memberships (ADM) of 1-250.

Total ADM 251-525: Is single site school districts of 251-525 ADM.

Total ADM 526-1000: Is single site school districts of 526-1000 ADM.

Total Other Districts: Is all other school districts except Valdez, North Slope , Aleutian East and Aleutian Region as noted in the analysis section of the report.

Column A: Actual FY 91 ADM: Foundation ADM for fiscal year 1991

Column B: Average Supplementals Per ADM: Total supplemental support FY 86-91 divided by the number of supplementals received divided the FY 91 ADM.

Column C: F 90 Local Effort Greater Than 4 Mills Per ADM: Shows the per ADM local effort of school districts greater than the 4 mills required by the foundation act in effect in FY 88.

Column D: Adjusted Local Effort Change Per ADM: Shows the difference in local effort per ADM in FY 86 minus FY 90. This represents the local effort change made by school districts over the 5 year period FY 86- FY90. Negative represents more local effort and positive less local effort.

Column E: F 90- F 86 Fund Balance Per ADM: Shows the loss(-) or gain (+) in fund balance per ADM between FY 86 and FY 90.

Column F: FY 88_FY91 Local Effort Per ADM change at 4 Mills: Shows the increase (-) or decrease (+) in required local effort resulting from the change in local property valuations per ADM between FY 88 and FY 90. That is the change in state foundation funding (Column G) would have been greater or lesser had the property values remained the same.

Column G: State Foundation Per ADM FY 86 less FY 91: Shows the loss (-) or gain (+) in state foundation payments per ADM between FY 86 and FY 91. Columns F, H and I are adjustments to this number for required local effort (F) and P. L. 874 (H,I).

Column H: P. L. 874 per ADM FY 88 less FY 91: Shows the gain (-) or loss (+) in P. L. 874 from FY 88 to FY 91. A gain reduced state aid and a loss increased state aid compared to no change.

Column I: City and Borough P. L. 874 payments that were first taken into consideration in FY 88 and which adjusts positively to the foundation change (Column G). That is the loss in state funds for city and borough school districts due to the 874 payments was an intentional adjustment and should show as a reduction in the change in Column G.

Column J: Cumulative Changes Per ADM: Shows the net result of the changes in Columns D through I.

Column K: Cumulative Changes Per ADM Per Year: Column J divided by the five years FY 86 through FY 90 to get the average change to apply to FY 91 K-12 Basic Need.

Column L: FY 91 K-12 Basic Need Per ADM: Shows the FY 91 dollars per ADM that represents the amount of K-12 Basic Need. This is the number that the changes from FY 86 to FY 91 are compared to determine the needed percent change in the K-12 Instructional Units for the single site school districts.

Column M: Cumulative Changes AS A Percent Of FY 91 Basic Need Including Supplementals: Shows the average adjusted changes per year brought about by changes in local effort up to 4 mills, change in fund balance, change in P. L. 874 and state foundation change. It also includes the supplemental support shown in Column B which when relating to foundation payments must be adjusted out to show how districts foundation payments are affected without the supplementals.

Column N: Average Supplemental AS A Percent Of FY 91 Basic Need: Shows the effects of not having the supplementals in Column B.

Column O: Cumulative Percent Change Without The Supplemental: Shows the sum of Columns M and O.

Column P: Change In Local Effort With City And Borough's Local Effort Greater Than 4 Mills In FY 90 FY86 Less FY 90: Shows the local effort increase (-) above 4 mills in FY 90.

Column Q: Grand Total Percent Change Per ADM: Shows the total changes as a percent of FY 91 K-12 Basic Need.

Column R: One Mill Per ADM: Shows the dollars per ADM generated by one mill.

Column S: Local Mill Effort Greater Than 4 Mills.

Column T: PTR FY 86: Shows the pupil teacher ratio for FY 86.

Column U: PTR FY 90: Shows the pupil teacher ratio for FY 90.

Column V: Percent Increase In PTR FY 90 Verses FY 86.



ALASKA ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
ALASKA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
ALASKA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

• ALASKA COUNCIL OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS •
326 Fourth St., Suite 408, Juneau, AK 99801-1101 (907) 586-9702 FAX (907) 586-5879

POSITION STATEMENT

SENATE BILL NO. 446

"An Act amending the formula providing state aid for education; and providing for an effective date."

The Alaska Council of School Administrators is in support of SB 446 providing that the proper appropriation be made to fund the single funding community formula changes.

The single site issue has been before the legislature for the past five years with proposed fixes and justification for the need to adjust the formula each year. The legislature has continued to provide annual adjustments which is evidence of an admission of the fact that there is a recognition of the need to make a permanent foundation formula change.

It is our belief that this issue must be resolved now. To wait for a recommendation for an over haul of the foundation formula program could mean continuing to meet the needs of the single sites on a year by year process which we find to be unacceptable. We strongly recommend this issue be resolved with the adequate appropriation to fund the formula.