	Approved	January 30,	1984
	* *	Date	
MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON	EDUCATION		
The meeting was called to order byRepresenta	Chairperson		at
3:30 森森/p.m. on	, 19 <u>84</u> in	room <u>313-S</u>	_ of the Capitol.
All members were present excepts			
Committee staff present:			
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes' Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research	Office		

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Ben Barrett, Legislative Research, reviewed the interim Proposal No. 45 from which $\underline{\text{HB 2633}}$ reflects. He distributed a memorandum dated January 24, 1984 to the committee, (ATTACHMENT I), which addressed the provisions in this bill. In addition, the memorandum outlines special education excess cost funding.

During committee discussion, it was pointed out the matter of appropriations were not contained in the bill. Mr. Barrett further explained that past policy was that used for the assumption in compiling the figures and information provided in the memorandum.

Meeting was adjourned by the Chairman at 4:38 p.m.

Judy Crapser, Secretary to the Committee

The next meeting of the Committee will be on January 26, 1984 at 3:30~p.m.

DATE Jan. 25, 1984

GUEST REGISTER

HOUSE

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS
Ettel May Miller	Ks, ash a Retardal alegen	2000 W. 59 th Jew. 80203
Bill flirks	4512.259	Wichila
Don Kerbel	USD #497	Lamence
Month Carles	USO I 453	Leavenwarch
Ellew Opembrano	Kansas action for Children	Irpeku
Bill Curtus	KASB	Joseka
Reglered Funk	KASB	Topeka
Charles W. Sohn	KNEA	5M
merle Hill	Kacc	Topoka
Jan Hays	Division of Budget	Topelon
Ganet Blume	K-NEA	1313 Delaware
Goi Miller	(USD 453) K-NEA	325 Pottawatomie Leav., Co. 66048
Lucy Withmeyer	USD 453	Platte City no.
N. Zogleman	Speaker's Office	Topeka
Claime Kellogg	Panaprofessial	Sepeka
Ed Walhourn	Warhaun U	Tapeline
Sully Gener	KCEn	18 peles
Welliam Chice	Free Thinkas	1020 W. 11 Th
Jim Varally	USD# 512	Shawnee Mission

MEMORANDUM

January 24, 1984

TO: House Committee on Education

FROM: Kansas Legislative Research Department

RE: 1984 House Bill No. 2633 and Special Education Excess Cost Funding

Introduction

H.B. 2633 was recommended by the 1983 interim Special Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to Proposal No. 45 — State Aid for Special Education Services. The Committee was directed to evaluate methods used to compute and distribute State General Fund appropriations for special education services, the statutory basis for such appropriations, and the adequacy of data upon which appropriation decisions regarding such aid depend. Pursuant to its charge, the Committee conducted an extensive study of these and related issues.

As a result of its study, the Committee agreed upon several conclusions and recommendations. Two of the recommendations required amendment of the Special Education for Exceptional Children Act. They are contained in H.B. 2633. The Committee also made a major statement regarding state funding of special education services. This memorandum addresses the provisions of H.B. 2633 and the recommendation regarding state funding of special education services.

I. 1984 HOUSE BILL NO. 2633

The Special Committee on Ways and Means proposed H.B. 2633 to accomplish the following:

- amend K.S.A. 72-971 to require the State Department of Education to expand its annual survey of special education to include a count of the full-time equivalent pupils receiving special education services within each category of exceptionality; and
- 2. amend K.S.A. 72-978 to provide that each paraprofessional special education teacher shall be counted as one-fourth (rather than one-half) of a full-time equivalent special teacher.

Considerable confusion has resulted in connection with the purpose and effect of this latter recommendation. The following discussion is designed to clarify the matter.

In 1974, the state's special education laws underwent a major revision, which included the provision of a new categorical state aid program to assist school districts in paying the cost of mandated special education services.

While there have been some changes in this formula, it has remained the same in principle as when it was enacted.

The statute provides for distribution of any amount appropriated for special education services as follows:

- 1. reimbursement of 80 percent of costs incurred in providing transportation for children to special education services;
- 2. reimbursement for 80 percent of the cost of actual travel allowances paid special teachers;
- 3. reimbursement of 80 percent of actual costs incurred in providing maintenance of a child away from the child's residence, not to exceed \$600 per child per school year; and
- 4. from the total funds appropriated for special education services, which remain after payment of reimbursements for (1), (2), and (3), an amount which is based on each district's number of full-time equivalent special teachers in proportion to the state total of such teachers.

The formula in the substantive law has been modified in two ways by appropriation action. First, beginning in FY 1976 and each year since, the Legislature has placed in the line item appropriation for special education services aid a limitation on the maximum amount that could be distributed during the year as aid per teaching unit. Second, for FY 1984, the appropriation for special education services aid was separated into two line items — one for special education services aid and one for special education transportation aid.

For the purpose of determining the state aid distributed to a district, a teaching unit is presently defined in statute as one full-time special teacher or two full-time paraprofessionals. The law defines special teacher as a person who is employed by a school district for approved special education services and who is qualified and certified to instruct exceptional children as determined by standards established by the State Board of Education. The definition also includes a qualified paraprofessional.

Thus, since 1974, the state aid teaching unit distribution procedure has treated a paraprofessional at one-half (0.5) the weight of a professional employee.

An issue that the Special Committee on Ways and Means addressed was the relationship between the amount of state aid that is paid for professionals and paraprofessionals and the average compensation level of both types of employees.

The State Department of Education conducted a study of six selected school districts and found:

- 1. for professional employees, the amount of the teaching unit aid, on the average, equated to slightly more than 50 percent of salary, and
- 2. for paraprofessionals (counted at 0.5), the teaching unit aid equated, on the average, to nearly 100 percent of salary.

The Committee took note of the fact that in recent years, the number of paraprofessionals employed by the districts has increased at a much more rapid rate than the number of professionals. After considerable discussion, the Committee determined that it would be more equitable to count paraprofessionals at 0.25 rather than 0.5 so that the relationship between the state aid generated by, and the actual compensation paid, to both professionals and paraprofessionals would be more nearly equal.

It is important to note that this recommendation would have no bearing on the total amount of state special education categorical aid that would be distributed; rather, it would result in a shift in the distribution of such aid so as to increase the amount generated by each special education professional employee and decrease the amount generated by each paraprofessional.

Whether a district would receive more or less state aid as a result of this change would depend on its ratio of paraprofessionals to professional employees. Based on the Special Committee on Ways and Means FY 1985 special education funding proposal (and using 1983-84 employment data) a district generally would receive increased aid if it had about one-half as many (or fewer) paraprofessionals as professionals. Conversely, a district would receive less aid if it had more than half as many paraprofessionals as professionals. (For these calculations the actual break-even point as a ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals was about 53.5 percent.) The following examples illustrate this point:

	Manhattan	Clay Center Cooperative	Shawnee Mission	Wichita	Barton County Cooperative	Russell (USD 407)	Northwest Kansas Educational Service Center	ANW Cooperative (Allen, Neosho, Woodson County)	Rice County Cooperative
FTE Professionals	39.60	30.70	309.60	455.6	39.5	20.0	58.20	59.00	16.9
FTE Paraprofessionals	6.50	9.80	122.00	228.3	20.1	12.7	44.50	51.52	15.0
\$11,434 and Paraprofessionals counted at 0.5 FTE (present law) \$12,781 and Paraprofessionals counted at 0.25 FTE (Ways and Means proposal)	\$ 489,947 \$ 526,833	\$ 407,050 \$ 423,690	\$ 4,237,440 \$ 4,346,818	\$6,514,522 \$6,552,499	\$ 566,555 \$ 569,074	\$ 301,285 \$ 296,200	\$ 919,865 \$ 885,979	\$ 969,146 \$ 918,698	\$ 278,990 \$ 263,928
Exhibit: FTE Paraprofessionals as a Percent of Professional Employees	16.49	6 31.9%	39.4%	50.19	51.0%	63.5%	76.5%	s 87.3%	88.8%

II. EXCESS COST FUNDING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES

In each of the legislative sessions from 1979 through 1983, the Legislature increased the amount of special education categorical aid to a level designed to result in combined state and federal aids approximately equal to the estimated "excess" costs, statewide, of special education services. As a practical matter, it was the maximum amount authorized per teaching unit that was "adjusted" by the Legislature in order to achieve the desired total amount to be distributed. During this period, excess costs were considered to be expenditures attributable to special education above the average amount budgeted per pupil in the districts' general fund, less certain deductions—computed on a statewide basis. This excess cost funding approach has not been incorporated in the substantive law.

The result derived from this calculation represented the estimated excess cost of special education services for the next fiscal year. An amount estimated to represent the transportation and maintenance components of the excess cost figure was subtracted from the excess cost total and the remainder was divided by the estimated number of FTE teaching units to determine the projected amount of aid per teaching unit for the next year.

During the 1983 interim, the Special Committee on Ways and Means reviewed the excess cost funding concept. In the years that the Legislature has been using the excess cost approach for determining the amount to be appropriated for state special education categorical aid (FY 1980 through FY 1984), the Legislature's target has generally been that total state aid should equal the full statewide excess cost amount, i.e., 100 percent of such costs. This policy resulted from a recommendation of the 1978 Special Committee on Education during its study of the School District Equalization Act. The Special Committee on Ways and Means recommended continuing the present method of computing excess costs, but proposed that state reimbursement be targeted at 95 percent (rather than 100 percent) of such costs. The Committee was of the opinion that local funding sources should share in subsidizing the excess costs associated with the provision of special education services. While the Committee's recommendation is a modification of philosophy, it is not so much of a change from what has occurred in actual practice. The Committee noted in its report that in FYs 1981, 1983, and 1984, state appropriations did not, in fact, fully reimburse excess costs.

The following table displays the excess cost calculation and shows the estimates for 1984-85 at both the 95 percent and 100 percent level.

SPECIAL EDUCATION STATE AID

FY 1985 Projection

F	Y	1	9	83	Α	c	tυ	al

Total U.S.D. Special Education Fund E Less: Payments to Special Educatio Participating School Distric Less: Payments for Interlocal Agree School Districts Subtotal - Regular Expense	(9 (13	,605,634 ,189,959) ,559,316) ,856,359			
Total Special Education Cooperative I	Expenditures	for F	Y 1983	\$ 40	,195,462
Total Special Education Interlocal Exp	enditures fo	r FY :	1983	\$ 23	,353,296
Federal Aid - Special Fund Amount Distributed by Department Less: Reported Expenditures of Federal Grant TOTAL FY 1983 EXPENDITURES FO	ieral Aid (inc Expenditures	luded from	Other Funds	<u>(7</u>	,540,102 ,161,319) ,378,783
FY 1984 Estimate				<u> </u>	
FY 1983 Actual Expenditures Percentage Increase of 8.0% (Assumes	s Constant St	affing	g)	9	,783,900 ,502,712 ,286,612
Plus New Teacher Costs (Estimated T \$24,900 Average Operating Cost per x 157 New F.T.E. Teachers					
Estimated FY 1984 Costs					,909,300 ,195,912
FY 1985 Projection					
Estimated FY 1984 Costs Percentage Increase of 8.0% (Assumes Estimated FY 1985 Costs (Assumes Co Plus New Teacher Costs (Estimated To \$26,900 Average Operating Cost per	10	,195,912 ,575,673 ,771,585			
x 47 New F.T.E. Teachers TOTAL PROJECTED FY 1985 EXPEN SPECIAL EDUCATION		R			,264,300 ,035,885
Less: Average Per Pupil Cost of Regular Education times Number of F.T.E. Special Education Pupils (excluding residents of SRS institutions): \$2,895 BPP (based on 8% Increase) x 18,700 F.T.E. Less: Federal Aid Distributed by Department of Education Subtotal					,136,500) 800,000) 099,385
			ess Cost Reimb 95%		nt Level
Subtotal			099,385		099,385
Less: SRS Contributions Excess Cost Projection			675,000) 424,385		475,000) 624,385
State Aid Appropriations for Special E Teaching Unit Distributions Transportation Reimbursements	Education:	9,	173,165 530,000 703,165	9,	094,385 530,000 624,385
Current Statute Distribution Rates: Professionals (1.00 F.T.E.) Paraprofessionals (.50 F.T.E.) TOTAL F.T.E.	4,222 1,128 5,350	.\$	11,434	\$	12,167
Special Ways and Means Committee Rec. Rates: Professionals (1.00 F.T.E.) Paraprofessionals (.25 F.T.E.) TOTAL F.T.E.	4,222 564 4,786	\$	12,781	\$	13,600

Kansas Legislative Research Department January 24, 1984

APPENDIX

History of State Special Education Services Aid and Expenditures

(1974-75 — EST. 1984-85)

(In Thousands)

Maximum Authorized

			FTE		
			Teaching Unit	Total USD	
	Special Ed.	Percent	Entitlement	Special Ed.	Percent
Year	Services Aid	Increase	(Actual Dollar Amounts)	Expenditures	Increase
1974-75	\$ 9,475		\$ 3,793 ⁸	\$ 25,300	
1975-76	12,088	27.6%	4,000	32,700	29.2%
1976-77	14,322	18.5	4,000	44,400	36.0
1977-78	18,402	28.5	4,500	51,900	17.0
1978-79	22,327	21.3	4,815	61,000	17.5
1979-80	32,112	43.8	6,500	75,100	23.2
1980-81	39,415	22.7	7,060 ^b	95,001	26.5
1981-82	46,613	18.3	8,060	107,868	13.5
1982-83	57,440	23.2	9,580	118,784	10.1
Est. 1983-84	62,696 ^C	9.2	10,339	132,196	11.3
Est. 1984-85	*		_	144,036	9.0

- a) Maximum amount was not fixed by an appropriation bill proviso in this year only.
- b) The teacher unit amount was prorated at \$7,025 due to insufficient appropriations.
- c) Consists of \$9,192,800 for transportation of pupils and teachers and for maintenance of pupils away from home and \$53,503,101 for special education services (teaching unit) aid. This is the first year that separate appropriations have been made for these items.