

Business manager responses to question of delaying Act 173

Support delay	CBG will adequately fund costs	Ready financially?	Ready programatically?
Delay - 11 Implement - 25 Not sure - 1	Yes - 13 No - 21 Not sure - 2	Yes - 23 No - 13 Not sure - 0	Yes - 15 No - 18 Not sure - 3
No - Fortunately our district won't see a substantial loss (about \$15,000). With that being said, I do worry that we won't have the buffer of intensive reimb for any unanticipated special ed students who may move into district. Our costs in FY 23 are much higher than past years with 2 residential placements and additional out of district placements. We do appreciate the additional extraordinary reimb in ACT 173.	Yes	Yes, financially we are still going to code everything separately (sped, non sped costs). Our leadership is looking to enhancing MTSS which will be a positive change as well and pushed more by ACT 173 implementation.	Yes
No, the positive effects we hope Act 173 will achieve outweigh the imperfect funding mechanism.	No, we stand to lose about \$450K in revenue. However the unprecedented announced yield covers this, eliminating all tax increases based on this loss. I do not expect to see a yield increase to this extent again and think this alignment of a funding change is miraculous - let's not lose this opportunity to capture this change.	Yes - "adequately prepared" to an educator means perfectly prepared with no doubt, confusion, or uncertainty - they are perfectionist (thankfully) but the reality is we will never be perfectly prepared. The changes in Act 173 are not new, they have been required in multiple manners over the last 3-5 years - we are as prepared as ever and another year of delay will not make us more prepared.	Yes
No, we do not support a delay in implementation IF implementation of Act 173 AND the weighting study are done at the same time. For us, the losses from Act 173 will be offset by the weighting study so we will not be forced to reduce services to students.	Yes	Yes	Yes
No	Yes, we believe it will because we created our budget with the block grant incorporated on the revenue side. It is less money for our district than the formula would generate, but what we lose there, we gain back in the extraordinary student cost calculations.	Yes	Yes
No	No, it will not adequately cover our projected SpEd costs. We're anticipating a \$750K shortfall with the census block grant.	No - Currently we are not prepared in either the financial or programmatic sides, but we have 5 more months to figure it out!	No
No	No - We've already completed the budget which includes partially compensating for a huge drop in special ed revenue. Because of the increase in the yield, from a tax rate perspective, the impact isn't as bad as it could have been.	Yes	Yes
NO	Yes - The census block grant is projected to decrease available revenue, but by a relatively small amount. So the simple answer is "no" the block grant will not adequately cover our costs. However, the change is small enough that we believe we can absorb it, particularly when combined with the fact that the Extraordinary reimbursement revenue projection is much higher.	Yes	Maybe
Yes	No. According to preliminary information, our SD is one of the districts who will not receive as much as we previously have.	No	No. At this time, there are some issues that haven't been resolved, including what the time study requirements will be.
Yes	No. Our SPED costs have significantly increased over the past two years. Expected shortfall \$750K to \$1M.	No - We have had discussions regarding the change. It will be a heavy lift to get ready for July 1, 2022.	No
Yes	No - Until some type of weighting study determines categorical aid, or some supplemental funds, we are losing substantial funding in our district.	No	No
No	No, but the extraordinary cost formula change makes up for it so the total change has a slightly positive impact on my district (almost no impact).	Yes - I think the financial side will be the easier side of it, but will also require some education. Like with any change of this type, it will be important to stay educated. Is the AOE prepared? Successful implementation will likely depend on that as well.	Yes - Ready as we can be, I think. Teachers are nervous about it. Administration is not as nervous, but recognizes the work ahead. The Board has had a lot of questions, and we are working to educate everyone. There is some excitement about how services will be provided in the future and about the positive impact that will be made on children. IEPs in place at the beginning of the year will have been implemented with the old model, so looking at them next year with the new lens will be important. Continuous education for parents, teachers, special educators, eval teams, administration and board members will be important going forward.

Business manager responses to question of delaying Act 173

Support delay	CBG will adequately fund costs	Ready financially?	Ready programatically?
No	No, not really, we lost money in the block grant but gain some on the extraordinary so the total overall loss was bearable	Yes	Yes
No	No - We have a decline in revenue of about \$167,000 from what we would have received under the current reimbursement model.	Yes	Maybe
No	Yes - But CBG should be weighted	No - I don't think programatically or financially the law has been researched and developed thoroughly enough. I believe this is due to lack of staffing and COVID.	No
Yes	No - Probably not, especially given the changes in eligibility and associated costs.	No	No, especially programatically. The massive PD required for our staff has only been dribbled out to SpEd Directors this year with no time to train our staff.
No	No - ACT 173 does negatively impact our SU by approx. 200K.	Yes - Our SU is prepared financially.	No - our SU does not feel that we have the proper operational guidance and are not prepared on that front.
No	Yes	Yes - We have been lining up for this the past 2 budget cycles. Both financially and programmatic.	Yes
No	No - but neither did the old funding method	No - we do not have information yet about Maintenance of Effort and what we will and will not need to track. I find it hard to believe that we are just trying to figure this out now, considering we have known that it was coming. Despite this, I think we should move forward with implementation.	Maybe - I am not sure they are prepared programatically, but I think we should move forward. Again it does not make sense that we have known this was coming for so long and we are not prepared. I'm really not sure delaying will help.
No	Yes	Yes - As much as we can be. We've known this was in the works for years now, and we will be no more prepared next year than we are this year. To change the financial picture now when we have taken the time to educate our boards and constituents on the funding change means more confusion next year when we try to implement again, and have an SU deficit on top of it.	Yes
Yes	No	No - Financially - NO!!!!	No - programatically - Absolutely Not!!!!!!!!! our Director of Students services wanted me to stress the Absolutely Not
Yes	No	No, We Are Negatively Impacted By A Lack Of Local Reimbursement, We Need Some Type Of Transitional Support For 2023.	No
Yes	No	No. Our increase in education spending for FY23 is due to the loss of revenue from special ed. I feel we could use FY23 as a transition year to be properly prepared both financially and programatically for FY24.	No
No	Maybe	Yes - My SU is as prepared as possible. There will not be a good time to implement this change. We need to implement and move on.	Yes
No	No	Yes - Money wise, yes. The Property Yield helped a lot and I'd just as soon deal with it in FY23.	No - Program wise - no. My SpEd Director has been compalining for weeks -
Yes	No	Yes - I'm not sure the block grant will adequately cover SpEd costs, but we've got our costs in the budget and the high yield has kept our tax rates relatively low.	Yes

The questions you did not ask: "Where do we go from here?" I would recommend we implement Act 173. We complete our review & analysis on the weighting study and if/when that process is completed, and we define a new weighted student count, we should amend Act 173 to apply the census block grant to that new weighted pupil count.....