

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 23, 2000 LB 715

each student you bring into the school. So adding a cost per system accounts for that factor. The scale factor simply addresses the idea that once you get so big costs per student don't keep going down, but eventually level off and, after some point, may start to go up slightly. So another way to put this is that we are incorporating economies of size in school systems into the cost calculations for schools. A couple other points on costs, in this bill I have defined these cost components to achieve cost neutrality. That is the total aid under this bill would be exactly, well, not to the penny, but nearly exactly the same as it would be under the current statute. The other thing is that, and this I think also is an important point, the way we currently assess cost per student, and thereby needs, is we look backwards two years to see what schools spent two years ago, and then we apply a growth factor to bring that up to the current year and project it into the future. If you will, in effect, we're trying to back into the future. We're looking at what happened in the past and using that as a guide, or really as our predictor for what's going to happen in the future. In this bill, what I propose is getting away from that. We are going to establish the values of cost parameters in the first year and then we will apply a growth rate from thence forward. There are advantages and disadvantages of that, but certainly one advantage is it's much, more predictable and stable than the current system. The current system you have to try to guess, if you're a school financial manager, what other schools similar to you spent two years ago in trying to plan your budget for the coming year. Okay, so cost components is one main factor. A second one is a mechanism for adjusting for small school costs. Basically, what we do in the current formula is pretend that size of school has nothing to do with what it costs to operate a school. If you're in the same category, for example, if you're a school with 200 students that is in the same category cost group as Omaha, you are assumed to be able to achieve the same cost per student as Omaha or whatever the largest group might be in your system, the largest system...or the largest system might be in your cost group. What I've done in this bill instead is to, for each sparsity group, define what is a minimum efficient size of school. For example, for standard sparsity you might argue that minimum efficient size is 1,250 students; for a sparse it might be 700 students. But I would point out that I have tried to make these policy choices explicit in this bill