

Adequacy Testimony

Kathy Smith

Senior Program Officer

The
WALTON FAMILY
FOUNDATION



Trend data shows that inputs, or funding to assure adequate and equitable resources, has been strong

Nominal Net Current Per Pupil Expenditures by State, 2000-2012 (Table 7)

State	2000-01	2005-06	2008-09	2011-12
Arkansas	\$5,615	\$8,143	\$9,006	\$9,618
Louisiana	\$6,188	\$8,115	\$10,744	\$10,741
Mississippi	\$5,046	\$6,999	\$7,867	\$7,790
Missouri	\$6,782	\$8,219	\$9,688	\$9,646
Oklahoma	\$5,929	\$6,786	\$7,771	\$7,565
Tennessee	\$5,698	\$6,754	\$7,836	\$8,447
Texas	\$6,644	\$7,554	\$8,722	\$8,341
Regional Average	\$6,303	\$7,526	\$8,780	\$8,646
National Average	\$7,505	\$9,239	\$10,673	\$10,772
Diff AR-National	-\$1,890	-\$1,096	-\$1,667	-\$1,154
Diff AR-Regional	-\$688	+\$617	+\$226	+\$972

*Adjusted Net Current Per Pupil Expenditures, Arkansas and Neighboring States 2000-12 (Table 8)

State	Cost of Living	2000-01	2005-06	2008-09	2011-12
Arkansas	91.1	\$6,164	\$8,939	\$9,886	\$10,558
Louisiana	93.0	\$6,654	\$8,726	\$11,553	\$11,549
Mississippi	83.4	\$6,050	\$8,392	\$9,433	\$9,341
Missouri	91.2	\$7,436	\$9,012	\$10,623	\$10,577
Oklahoma	89.5	\$6,625	\$7,582	\$8,683	\$8,453
Tennessee	90.1	\$6,324	\$7,496	\$8,697	\$9,375
Texas	91.6	\$7,253	\$8,247	\$9,522	\$9,106
Regional Avg.	89.8	\$7,020	\$8,382	\$9,779	\$9,630
National Avg.	100	\$7,505	\$9,239	\$10,673	\$10,772
Diff AR-National	-0.09	-\$1,341	-\$300	-\$787	-\$214
Diff AR-Regional	0.01	-\$857	+\$556	+\$107	+\$928

*2015 third quarter cost of living index for each state

University of Arkansas Office for Education Policy *Arkansas Education Report*, Volume 12, Issue 3, November 2015

Average Net Current Per Pupil Expenditures by Percent of Poverty, 2000-2014 (Table 3)

Description	2000-01	2010-11	2013-14
Least % FRL	\$5,208	\$8,131	\$8,350
Highest % FRL	\$5,895	\$10,904	\$10,814
State	\$5,531	\$9,292	\$9,429
	+\$687		+\$2,464

Average Net Current Per Pupil Expenditures by Percent of Students of Color 2000-2014 (Table 4)

Description	2000-01	2010-11	2013-14
Least % of Color	\$5,264	\$8,749	\$8,645
Highest % of Color	\$6,037	\$10,571	\$10,426
State	\$5,531	\$9,292	\$9,429
	+\$773		+\$1,781

Average Net Current Per Pupil Expenditures by Math and Literacy Performance 2005-2014 (Summarized)

Math	2005-06	2010-11	2013-14
Least % Proficient or Advanced	\$8,778	\$11,366	\$11,249
Most % Proficient or Advanced	\$7,233	\$8,249	\$8,571
State	\$5,531	\$9,292	\$9,429
Literacy	2005-06	2010-11	2013-14
Least % Proficient or Advanced	\$8,822	\$11,313	\$11,177
Most % Proficient or Advanced	\$7,190	\$8,198	\$8,657
State	\$5,531	\$9,292	\$9,429

Math Difference: +\$1,545
Literacy Difference: +\$1,632

Math Difference: +\$2,678
Literacy Difference: +\$2,520

While inputs have been strong, they have not been matched by academic outcomes in regard to **closing the achievement gap.**

Percent of Arkansas Students Scoring Proficient or Advanced on Benchmark Exams by FRL Eligibility, 2005-2014 (Tables 18 and 19 summarized)

Math	2005-06	2008-09	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Non-FRL	69%	84%	89%	89%	88%	86%
FRL	43%	64%	70%	70%	68%	65%
FRL Gap	26 points	20 points	19 points	19 points	20 points	21 points
Literacy	2005-06	2008-09	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Non-FRL	74%	81%	89%	91%	90%	90%
FRL	46%	58%	68%	74%	72%	70%
FRL Gap	28 points	23 points	21 points	17 points	18 points	20 points

Performance Funding Recommendation

- By 2020-21, make 20% of the poverty funding performance-based*
- For 2016-17, make the performance component equal to the increase from the 2015-16 school year
- For 2017-18, make the performance component 5% of the poverty funding total
- For 2018-19, make it 10%
- For 2019-20, make it 15%
- For 2020-21, make it 20%
- At an annual expenditure of ~\$200 million, \$160 million would still be used up front for inputs and \$40 million for performance outcomes

*Half of the performance funding would be designated for meeting academic goals for the FRL students in Math achievement; the other half would be for meeting these for Literacy, consistent with the state's accountability system.

Rationale

- **Performance Outcomes** (closing the Achievement Gap) should be as important as inputs (investments for interventions)
- **The practice of limiting interventions** is counterintuitive to the state's interest in innovation and customized programming to fit variance in student populations and their specific needs
- **Performance Funding** provides additional incentive to use investments to drive positive academic results
- **Excess funds could be re-invested** to benefit other proven interventions for FRL students, such as more access to high-quality preschool programs.