FIXING THE FLAWS
IN PA'S SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING SYSTEM
FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS:
HOW AN OUTDATED LAW
WASTES PUBLIC MONEY,
ENCOURAGES GAMING THE SYSTEM,
AND LIMITS SCHOOL CHOICE
Education Voters of PA

Our mission is to ensure elected officials adopt and implement a pro public education agenda. To that end we advocate for sound education policy and build and mobilize the public will to ensure that support for quality public education and an opportunity to learn for all children is a top priority for key decision makers.

Education Voters of PA is a nonprofit, nonpartisan project of the Keystone Research Center.
## Different Funding Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding is based on the Special Education Funding Formula that differentiates students into three cost tiers according to their level of educational need.</td>
<td>Funding is based on a “one-size-fits-all” calculation that assumes 16% each school district’s students receive special education services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014, the Special Education Funding Commission recommended applying the same formula to charters and districts. Charter schools successfully lobbied to be exempted.
Critics of the current “one-size-fits-all” charter school special education funding formula argue that it creates incentives for charter schools to enroll students whose services cost less than the per student tuition they receive from districts and to deny access to students whose disability requires greater intervention and higher costs.
The Special Education Funding Formula

SEFF CATEGORIZES SPECIAL EDUCATION INTO THREE COST CATEGORIES

1. MINIMAL INTERVENTIONS
   eg. weekly speech therapy sessions

2. MORE SIGNIFICANT INTERVENTIONS
   eg. one-on-one help during the school day, a self-contained classroom, physical or occupational therapy, etc.

3. MOST EXTENSIVE & COSTLY INTERVENTIONS
   eg. full-time nurse or specialized out-of-district placement
Under current state law, special education funding for charter schools has NO RELATIONSHIP to actual cost of educating and providing services to students with disabilities.
For charter schools

Students whose services cost LESS than the tuition rate = FINANCIAL GAIN

Students whose services exceed the tuition rate = FINANCIAL LOSS
Charters are overpaid for the cost of educating students who require fewer services and underpaid for the cost of students who need more services.

**STUDENT A**

Actual Cost for Student A: $15,000
Payment to Charter: $27,000

**STUDENT B**

Actual Cost for Student B: $35,000
Payment to Charter: $27,000

#FixSpecialEdFunding
The charter tuition calculation

\[
\left( \text{School District BUDGETED Total Special Education Expenditures (deducted from regular ed tuition)} \right) + \left( \times 16\% \right) + \left( \text{School District Regular Education Charter School Tuition Rate} \right) = \left( \text{School District Special Education Charter School Tuition Rate} \right)
\]

Source: [https://www.pasbo.org/dailydata-april3](https://www.pasbo.org/dailydata-april3)
The 16% problem

Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education in PA School Districts, 2017-18
The 16% problem

Deer Run School District

Average Daily Membership = 4853
Special Education Students = 965
Percentage of Special Ed Students = 19.88%
Total Special Ed Spending = $14,217,761

COST PER SPECIAL ED DISTRICT STUDENT
ACTUAL AVERAGE AMOUNT SPENT
$14,217,761 ÷ 965 Students
= $14,733 Per Student

VS

TUITION PER SPECIAL ED CHARTER STUDENT
USING 16% CURRENT LAW CALCULATION
$14,217,761 ÷ 776.5 Students
= $18,310 Per Student

Deer Run School District paid $3,577 MORE in special education funding per charter school student than it spends on students who remain in district schools.
The 16% problem

Typical school districts are paying charter schools nearly 25% more per special education student, on average, than they spend on students who remain in their own district schools.

Simply using districts’ actual percentage would save $65 million annually.
Why the Funding Matters

In Pennsylvania, State Funding for Students with Disabilities Flatlined as Special Education Expenditures Grew by $2 Billion Over a Decade

- State Funding Rose $110 Million
- Locally Designated Funding Rose $1.8 Billion
- Expenditures Rose $2.0 Billion

The Data

2017-2018 Act 16 report—Students in Tiers 2 and 3

PDE dataset total number of students receiving special education and the numbers of students in each tier, for 2017-18.

PDE dataset showing total number of special education students for charter schools
Student Enrollment Statewide

66 brick-and-mortar charter schools, 41% of the state’s total charters, enroll NO STUDENTS IN TIERS 2 OR 3.

PERCENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS IN EACH TIER
BY SCHOOL TYPE, PENNSYLVANIA 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTERS</th>
<th>DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cyber Charter Enrollment

PERCENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS IN EACH TIER
CYBER VS. NON-CYBER CHARTERS 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Cyber Charter</th>
<th>Non-Cyber Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICTS</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CYBERS</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 CYBERS</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYBERS-S4</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“S4 Cybers” are Agora Cyber CS, Commonwealth Charter Academy CS, Pennsylvania Cyber CS, Pennsylvania Leadership CS
41% of charters enroll NO Tier 2 or 3 students

In Philadelphia, some schools that operate as catchment-based Renaissance schools have higher shares of students with disabilities in Tier 2 and 3, but still enroll a smaller share of high-need students than district schools. Enrollment differs among operators, with Mastery serving more students with disabilities in Tier 2 & 3 than KIPP or Universal. 24 charter schools in Philly (29%) enroll no Tier 2 or Tier 3 students.

Environmental Charter School at Frick Park and City High Charter in Pittsburgh enroll expected numbers of students in each tier. Eight of Allegheny County’s 22 charter schools (36%) enroll no students in Tiers 2 or 3.
41% of charters enroll NO Tier 2 or 3 students

**Lehigh**
Lehigh County’s 6 of eight charter schools (75%) enroll no students in Tiers 2 or 3.

**Dauphin**
Dauphin County’s 3 of four charter schools (75%) enroll no students in Tiers 2 or 3.

**Erie**
Erie County’s 4 charter schools (100%) enroll no students in Tiers 2 or 3.

**9 Counties**
All charter schools in Adams, Bedford, Berks, Clinton, Huntingdon, Lancaster, Luzerne, Mercer, and Westmoreland Counties – **ALL (100%) ENROLL NO STUDENTS IN TIERS 2 OR 3.**
## APPENDIX II: SPECIAL EDUCATION TIERS IN CHARTER SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Tier 1 (%)</th>
<th>Tier 2 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERIE</td>
<td>Erie Rise Leadership Academy CS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montessori Regional CS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perseus House CS of Excellence</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Benjamin Wiley Community CS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGDON</td>
<td>New Day CS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone Valley Community CS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACKAWANNA</td>
<td>Fell CS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Gardner Multiple Intelligence CS</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANCASTER</td>
<td>La Academia: The Partnership CS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Charter school enrollment patterns are consistent with the likelihood that many charter schools are gaming the funding system by cherry picking students with low-cost special education needs and discriminating against students with high-cost needs.
School districts must **raise taxes** and/or **cut teachers and programs** for students in district schools in order to send excess special education payments to charter schools, which are wasted on things other than providing services to students with disabilities.

Meanwhile charters can spend excess special education funding on whatever they want—advertising, CEO salaries, anything.
In Pittsburgh Public Schools, the 2020-2021 estimated charter school tuition rates are:

Regular education: $18,050
Special education: $42,000
The Pennsylvania legislature should apply the Special Education Funding Formula to school districts and charter schools alike.

- **Save more than $100 million.**
- More closely tie funding to actual costs, substantially reducing the incentive for charter schools to cherry pick students.
- Improve opportunities for school choice for students with disabilities.
The Second Best Solution

Allow each school district to use its actual percentage of students who receive special education as the divisor in the charter tuition calculation.

• Equalize average funding for district and charter special education students from the same district.

• **Save around $65 million.**
Profits should be returned to districts

The General Assembly should enact a law requiring charter schools to return special education funding that is not used to provide services for students with disabilities.
Thank you!

Contact Susan Spicka

sspicka@educationvoterspa.org