History of School Transportation Funding

1. Act 84 of 1947 - allowed school districts to incur bonded indebtedness for school buildings and equipment, including buses.

2. Act 242 of 1961 - Established the State Transportation Aid Fund thru the State Board of Education for distribution of funds to public schools. \$20min/\$42max per average daily student transported.

3. Act 648 of 1975 - Amended Act 242 of 1961 by increasing to \$20min/\$90max per child transported.

4. Act 196 of 1979 - Amended Act 242 of 1961 by increasing to \$40min/\$120max per average child transported - specified K-12 included.

History of School Transportation Funding continued...

5. Act 83 Of 1983 - Amended Act 242 of 1961 by increasing to \$70min/\$280max per average child transported.

6. Act 840 of 1991 - Required any remaining balance in a school district's state transportation funds balance not used by the end of the biennium to be returned to the ADE for deposit into the fund and redistributed.

7. Act 1133 of 1997 - Repeal of A.C.A. 6-20-219 (Act 242 of 1961) and replaced with High Cost Transportation Funding Formula.

8. Act 373 Of 1999 - Modification of A.C.A. 6-20-1703 (Act 1133 of 1997) for clarification and increased allowances.

9. Act 2138 of 2005 - Repealed A.C.A. 6-60-1701 et seq. (Act 1133 of 1997), and replaced with current formula.

in din de la contra de la Plous

 Page 80: ... we recommend a transportation categorical program which would average \$286 per pupil in 2007-08, but based on district's actual transportation expenditures in 2004-05 inflated up to a 2007-08 base, AND to be replaced by a standards-based formula in the future.

4.21.014.012.007

 A.C.A. § 10-3-317 (a) (1) The Department of Education shall provide the Bureau of Legislative Research with direct read and report only access to the department's data warehouse concerning school districts and related records.

Transportation Variables

- Cost
- ADM
- District Area (square miles)
- Number of Students Transported
- Daily Linear Route Miles
- Number of Buses
- Ratios:
 - ADM / District Area
 - Number Transported / District Area
 - ADM / Miles

l.	FY08	EY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 FY13		
	Receiver						
Native Columbiants		500	500),	500	500 500		
	40	40		40	40 8 40		
Grades 1-3 = 23% of students Grades 4-12 = 63% of students	345	345	345	115 mil) 345 mil	115 (115) 345 (115) 345		Matrix
K P:T ratio = 20:1	2.0	2.0	20	2.0	2.0 2.0	U U	
Grades 1-3 P.T ratio = 23:1	2.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	5.0 5.0		
Grades 4-12 P.T ratio = 25:1 PAM = 20% of classroom	13.6	13.8 4.14	13.8 4.14	13.8	13.8 13.8 4.14 4.14		
Total Classroom Teachers	24.94	24,94	24.94	24.94	24.94 24.94	//	FY2013
Special Ed Teachers	2.9	2.9	29	2.9	2.9 2.9		P \$7 ////// 55
Instructional Facilitators	2.5	2.5 2.5 0.825	29 25	2.9 2.5	2.5 2.5		
Librarian / Media Specialist Guidance Counselor & Nurse	0.825	0.625	0.825	0.825	0.625 0.825		
Total Pupil Support Personnel	8.725	8.725	8.725	8.725	8.725 8.725		
SUBACTAL: Strength and strength							
Secretary	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	<u>1.0 1.0</u> 1.0 1.0		
Total School-Level Personnet	35.666	35.545	36.886	35.065	36.665 35.865		
Real Contraction of The Contraction	and the state	Here a.	3 - D - B	ំ រោះ	et en la concentra ensita		
		die obs	in and				
Teacher Salary + Benefits Per Student Matrix Expenditure	54,888 3,695.6	55,954 3,767.4	57,073	58,214 3,919,6	59,378 60,566 3,998.0 4,077.9		
Principal Salary + Benefits Per Student Matrix Expenditure	85,168	87,860 175.7	89,617 179.2	91,409 182.6	93,237 95,102 186.5 190.2		- CV/3
		6		飄			FY13
School-level secretary Per Student Matrix Expenditure	34,751	35,415 70,8	36,123	36,845	37,582 38,334 75.2 76.7		
Per Stoent Matrix Expenditore	09.5 8 9 9 8 9 7 4	70.8	72.3	4517051	15.2 10.7 10.7		
			98				
Linetherrowing and the second					r	4 4 1	
Technology	220	201	205		rono	portatio	n 309.9
Instructional Materials Extra Duty Funds	160	163.2	166.5 52.0		IZUS		
Supervisory Aides	49,35	50.35	51.4			por la lo	
Substitutes	59	59	60.2	—I			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Report March Report Cost Resources (Cost			1286.6984	B 5.53	2010 655 9 (21) 100 100 59 22		
والمراجع والمحاج والمحاج والمحاج والمحاج والمحاج							
A CARLES AND A CARLES AND A CARLES AND A							
Operations & Maintenance Central Office	581	581 383.5	592.6 391.2	604.5 399.0	616.6 629.0 407.0 415.1		
Transportation*	286	286	291.7	297.5	303.8 309.9		
Conversion of Calcon Conversion Statement	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100		1474.6				
			ری د کی مقدر کار ا	ز بابند : ریخت مند دهنداند			
RANGER CHARGE CONTRACT OF STATE	CTAC	(d) (d) (d)	Correct of the second s	0.000	Care		
Retirement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0		
		1.	10 65 C 10 10				
Matrix Foundation Per Student	5,719	5,789	6,905	6,023	6,144 6,267		
	57	70	116	118	121 123		
Increase per ADM		4				\$	
	1.0%	1.2%	2.0%	2.0%	2.01% 2.0%		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	العتقيات	<u></u>	<u></u>		
	Crec	िजर	ccc	0000	ager com		
				Income	Contract Contract Sector Sector Sector		
Categorical Program Funding							
enegenean riedian rananit	FY08809 ADJ	New Cost	FY10 ADJ	FY11 ADJ	FY12 Cost FY13 Cost		
				2			
EL	0.4/1 to 0.6/1	293			299 305		
ALE	15/1 to 12/1	4,063	-		4,145 4,228		
NSLA	1.0328	496	0	0	506 517		
	1.0328	496 902 1,488	0	0	1,012 1,033 1,518 1,549		
PD	이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이	50	0	<u>0</u>	<u>51 52</u>		

Costs as a Function of ADM



.

Total transportation expenditures by all school districts in FY13	\$184,110,997
Total amount of required expenditures from best funding model	\$176,191,232
Total amount received by school districts from Matrix line-item	\$142,895,770
Differences	\$ 33,295,462 to \$ 41,215,227
Magnet & M-to-M Funding utilized for transportation Isolated and Isolated Special Needs Funding utilized for transportation Growth or Declining Funding utilized for transportation Federal Funds utilized for transportation All Other Sources of Funds utilized for transportation Total Non-Matrix	<pre>\$ 15,332,499 \$ 3,706,710 \$ 3,864,372 \$ 6,571,398 \$ 7,563,892 \$ 37,038,871</pre>
Arguable Net Funding Shortage	\$ -3,743,409 to \$ 4,176,356
TransCost = f (ADM) R ² = .79	
TransCost = f (ADM, Riders, Miles) R ² = .98	
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	~~~~~
FY13 population = 239 school districts	
Eligible for Supplemental Funding = 145 Not El	igible = 94
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	~~~~~

The model results can be used to accurately distribute supplemental transportation funding to the eligible school districts; that pot of money could be any size chosen by the Committee.