## Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

## Report to the Joint Task Force on School Construction Funding Analysis of the School Construction Assistance Program Formula Allocations

## 1. Assignment

The Legislature requested that OSPI report to the Joint Legislative Task Force on School Construction Funding on the appropriate levels of the Student Space Allocation and the Construction Cost Allocation and make recommendations.

- Student Space Allocation is the formula allocation that is used to determine eligible area recognized for state funding assistance in the School Construction Assistance Program.
- Construction Cost Allocation (formerly known as Area Cost Allowance) is the formula allocation that is used to set a construction cost per square foot in the School Construction Assistance Program.


## 2. Response

The report finds that increases in both allocations would be justified to the following levels:

- Student Space Allocation by approximately 20 square feet per grade span.
- Construction Cost Allowance according to a 3-year rolling average of actual school bid data.

That response is based on analysis which:

- Summarized, compiled and compared data and information relevant to determining the appropriate levels of the allocations.
- Reviewed the past recommendations of the State Board of Education, of previous task forces and of multiple State Board of Education and OSPI budget submittals.
- Highlighted educational program changes which have contributed to larger school facility space needs and higher school facility construction costs - class size reduction measures, high performance school buildings, CORE 24's change in graduation requirements with consideration of added lab requirements, and others.


## 3. Recommendations

While OSPI continues to believe and recommend increases are justified, there was not time or resources to complete a comprehensive analysis of the allocations.

- First provide focus or direction to a review of the allocations.


## Review and confirm the existing policy goals or adopt new ones for the SCAP.

A work group should review and make recommendations on SCAP policy issues prior to proceeding with the secondary recommendations below. Key questions should be considered that will guide and will provide context for establishing the appropriate levels of the Student Space Allocation and the Construction Cost Allocation.

- Should raising the formula allocations be a priority to achieve transparency?
- Should raising one allocation be a priority over the other?
- Others - new construction versus modernization; etc.
- Then, adopt a new direction or continue to follow the same recommendations made last year by the 2008 funding formula transparency Work Group.


## Increase the allowable square footage per student based on actual educational needs.

OSPI should commission a study to determine the average square foot space needs for all spaces by grade span which would define the student square foot space allocation. This base standard should include recent policy and educational requirements (e.g., all-day Kindergarten, expanded science labs).

Increase the Construction Cost Allocation to be based on the true costs of construction.

OSPI should commission a study to determine the appropriate level of the construction cost allocation and to establish an appropriate methodology for adjusting the construction cost allocation over time. Specific methodologies to be studied include:

- Use of a 3-year rolling average to determine the appropriate construction cost allocation.
- Base the 3-year rolling average on actual bid data for schools obtained statewide.

Source: Berk \& Associates and OSPI, 2008

## Student Space Allocation Compared to Actual Square Feet Per Student



## Construction Cost Allocation

Compared to Actual Bids for New and Modernization Construction


## Overview of Allocation Changes

| Student Space Allocation |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Allocation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pre - } \\ & \text { FY } 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 80- \\ \text { FY } 01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 02- \\ \text { FY } 06 \end{gathered}$ | FY 07 - <br> Present |  | Prior Year CCA | Inflationary Increases | Enhance | Leg. Approved CCA |
| K | $45 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $40 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $80 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $90 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | FY 02 | \$103.64 | \$3.08 | \$0.00 | \$106.72 |
| 1-6 | $90 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $80 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $80 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $90 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | FY 03 | \$106.72 | \$3.60 | \$0.00 | \$110.32 |
|  |  |  |  |  | FY 04 | \$110.32 | \$4.56 | \$10.44 | \$125.32 |
| 7 \& 8 | $130 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $110 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $110 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $117 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | FY 05 | \$125.32 | \$4.11 | \$0.38 | \$129.81 |
| 9-12 | $130 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $120 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $120 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $130 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | FY 06 | \$129.81 | \$3.70 | \$8.44 | \$141.95 |
| Disabled | $150 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $140 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |  |  | FY 07 | \$141.95 | \$3.40 | \$8.87 | \$154.22 |
| Disabled | $150 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $140 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $140 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $144 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | FY 08 | \$154.22 | \$6.38 | \$1.83 | \$162.43 |
|  |  |  |  |  | FY 09 | \$162.43 | \$6.11 | \$0.25 | \$168.79 |
|  |  |  |  |  | FY 10 | \$168.79 | \$5.47 | \$0.00 | \$174.26 |
|  |  |  |  |  | FY 11 | \$174.26 | \$5.91 | \$0.00 | \$180.17 |

## Decades of Change for K-12 School Facility Requirements \& Expectations

- Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act and Americans with Disabilities Act (1975 and 1990)
- Class Size Reduction (1990s staff ratio, targeted KGrade 4; 2000 I-728; 2009 ESHB 2261)
- Technology (2003 basic education; 2007 Essential Academic Learning Requirement)
- High-Performance School Buildings (2005)
- Full Day Kindergarten (2007 and 2009 ESHB 2261)
- Core 24 / SBE Graduation Requirements (2008)

