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The State of Education report is a cooperative effort between the following organizations:
The organizations partnering on this report agree that students enrolled in Pennsylvania’s public schools represent the future of this commonwealth. As such, public education is the best investment Pennsylvania can make in its future. Yet our public schools face ever mounting pressure from mandated costs like pensions and charter school tuition, uncertainty surrounding the future of state assessments and accountability, and ensuring every student can reach their full potential while being accountable to policymakers and taxpayers.

The State of Education report is intended to be a barometer of not only the key indicators of public school performance, such as standardized test scores and school finances, but also the timely challenges that public schools are facing and how they are coping with them.

Data for this year’s report was obtained through surveys of chief school administrators (CSAs) from school districts (SDs), career and technical centers (CTCs) and intermediate units (IUs); surveys of school principals; and information from publicly available data sources such as the Pennsylvania Department of Education and National Center for Education Statistics.

The goal of this report is to provide a high-level overview of some of the key indicators and challenges facing public education on a statewide basis. When relevant and possible, data are also examined for differences based on community type.

Some key findings from this year’s report include:
- The overwhelming challenge facing public education according to CSAs once again this year is funding. Nearly 75% of all school district superintendents recognized budget pressures as one of their biggest challenges in the coming year.
- Pension costs were still the biggest reported source of budget pressure for school districts and CTCs, but the percentage of CSAs selecting pension costs as one of their biggest budget pressures dropped roughly 20% from last year. Inadequate state funding was selected as the top source of budget pressure among IU executive directors.
- In last year’s survey, less than 9% of principals expected school safety and security to be one of their biggest challenges in the coming year. But this year, more than 31% of principals selected school safety and security as one of the biggest challenges they faced.
- As schools continue to implement Pennsylvania core academic standards, PSSA and Keystone Exam results were a mix of improvements and declines from their 2015 levels.
- The four-year graduation rate at traditional public schools was 88.5% in 2016-17, which is a 3.8% increase from 2010-11.

The data in this report is meant to be representational of the school entities within each group and Pennsylvania as a whole. However, due to the diversity and differences between school entities around the state, specific data points may not apply to all schools within a given group. Comparisons based on survey data year-over-year may not be statistically significant due to the relatively small sample sizes involved.
Pennsylvania’s Public Education Landscape
A big picture look at the composition of Pennsylvania’s public education system and its students.
Pennsylvania’s 778 public local education agencies (LEAs) educated more than 1.7 million students in 2017-18.  

- **1,570,000** Students
- **103,000** Students
- **47,300** Students
- **11,200** Students
- **500** School districts
- **164** Brick-and-mortar charter schools
- **103,000** Students
- **70** CTCs
- **29** IUs
- **15** Cyber charter schools
- **34,500** Students

Find further information at www.psba.org
Community type map

50.7% of rural SDs 60.7% of urban SDs
Community type classification of school districts in this report
Schools in different communities face different challenges. This report organizes school districts into either rural, urban or suburban community types to aid in the broad comparison of the issues facing public schools at the community type level.

How many school districts and students are in each community type?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Average Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>245 (49.0%)</td>
<td>410,455</td>
<td>1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>28 (5.6%)</td>
<td>322,478</td>
<td>11,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>227 (45.4%)</td>
<td>837,128</td>
<td>3,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of enrollment, urban school districts tend to be larger and rural districts tend to be smaller. Nonetheless, even within each community type, the number of students served can vary greatly.
Intermediate Units (IUs)
Pennsylvania’s 29 intermediate units are highly skilled providers of cost-effective, instructional, and operational services and programs to participating schools. Some of these services and programs include:

- Special education
- Extended school year (ESY) services
- Comprehensive planning assistance
- Data collection and reporting
- Professional development
- Early intervention program(s)
- Information technology support
- Curriculum development services
- Emergency/Safety planning or preparedness
- Joint/Cooperative purchasing
- Health insurance consortium
- School-based ACCESS program administration
- Human resource services
- Translation/Interpreter services
- School-to-work transition programs
- Educator evaluation
- Intermediate unit operated cyber program(s)
- English as a second language program(s)
- Head Start or other pre-K program(s)
- Adult education program(s)
- Pregnant/Parenting student educational program(s)
- Gifted education program(s)
- Alternative/Disruptive youth program(s)
- Career and technical education programs
- Grant writing services
- Mental health services
- STEM programs and support
- Financial/Accounting services
Career and Technical Education (CTE)

The 67,300 students enrolled in a CTE program are being provided with the skills and education that will prepare them to begin a career and/or pursue postsecondary education. In 2016-17, the CTE programs with the largest number of students were as follows:

1. Institutional food worker
   5,130 students

2. Cosmetology
   4,960

3. Automotive mechanical
   4,390

4. Medical assistant
   3,760

5. Health care technology
   2,850

6. Welding
   2,730

7. Agricultural production
   2,510

8. Carpentry
   2,410

9. Autobody repair
   2,380

10. Electrical installation
    1,900
Student demographics – race/ethnicity

Schools in the different community types across Pennsylvania vary significantly in terms of their student populations. The same is also true for the various types of public schools.4

![PA School Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity](image-url)
Student demographics – gender
Although Pennsylvania’s student population is split fairly even between males and females, there are some variations among the different types of public schools.

Student Characteristics
Certain student characteristics can present challenges for students and schools in providing an educational program which ensures all students can reach their full potential.

Acute Poverty – 6 out of 33 students live below federal poverty limits

English Learners (ELs) – 1 out of 33 is not a native English speaker

In urban districts, 7 out of 20 students are in poverty

In urban districts, nearly 1 out of 10 students are ELs
Special Education
4 out of 25 students between ages 6-21 received special education programs and services.\(^8\)

% of Students by Disability

- Specific Learning Disability: 42.7%
- Other Health Impairment: 15.0%
- Speech/Language Impairment: 13.6%
- Autism: 10.5%
- Emotional Disturbance: 8.7%
- Intellectual Disability: 6.5%
- Multiple Disabilities: 1.1%
- Hearing Impairment: 1.0%
- Other Disabilities: 0.09%

Find further information at [www.psba.org](http://www.psba.org)
Student Achievement

The achievement of public school students cannot be measured by standardized test scores and graduation rates alone. The opportunities for students to learn and grow outside of the standard curriculum provide a well-rounded education and help them prepare for life after school.
**Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten**

Student achievement starts with a strong early childhood education. Every school district offers access to either full-day or half-day kindergarten programs for 5-year-olds. However, pre-kindergarten and kindergarten programs for 4-year-olds are provided by school districts much less frequently.⁹

![Bar chart showing the percentage of school districts offering kindergarten programs, broken down by type of program and urban/rural status.](chart.png)
Compared to 2007-08, 224 school districts made changes to their kindergarten programs. Most of the changes to pre-kindergarten programs were to add or expand programming while most changes to kindergarten programs for 4- and 5-year-olds were to reduce offerings.¹⁰

Changes to School District Kindergarten Offerings 2007-08 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of School Districts</th>
<th>Rural Pre-K</th>
<th>Urban Pre-K</th>
<th>Suburban Pre-K</th>
<th>Rural K4</th>
<th>Urban K4</th>
<th>Suburban K4</th>
<th>Rural K5</th>
<th>Urban K5</th>
<th>Suburban K5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁰ Find further information at www.psba.org
PSSA and Keystone Exam results

The annual Pennsylvania System of School Assessments (PSSA) and Keystone Exams are standards-based assessments in the subjects of English, math and science which are intended to measure a student’s proficiency in the subject area. Results on 2018 assessments show a mix of improvements and declines from 2015 levels, which was the first year the Pennsylvania Core Standards were assessed.

Grade 4 PSSA % Advanced/Proficient - All School Districts

- English Language Arts
  - 2015: 46.8%
  - 2016: 48.9%
  - 2017: 48.9%
  - 2018: 45.9%

- Math
  - 2015: 60.6%
  - 2016: 60.6%
  - 2017: 62.8%
  - 2018: 61.9%

- Science
  - 2015: 79.1%
  - 2016: 78.1%
  - 2017: 76.6%
  - 2018: 77.6%
Grade 8

Grade 8 PSSA % Advanced/Proficient - All School Districts

32.2% 61.8% 61.1% 61.6% 64.1%
30% 2015 2016 2017 2018
35% 40% ELA Math Science

PSSA Testing Fact

PSSA Exams in 2018 contained fewer questions and took less time to complete than previous versions. Starting in 2019, the PSSA testing window will also be shifted to later in the school year, giving students more time to learn.
Keystone Exams

Keystone Exam % Advanced/Proficient - All School Districts

Keystone Exam Fact
Act 158 of 2018 drastically changed the use of Keystone Exams as a graduation requirement. Students who do not achieve proficiency in each Keystone Exam would have alternate pathways to graduation.
National Assessments
Every two years, the U.S. Department of Education administers the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in math and reading to a sampling of public school students in grades 4 and 8 in each state. Pennsylvania’s students consistently out-performed the national averages in each 2017 assessment.¹²

2017 NAEP % Proficient or Above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 4 Math</th>
<th>Grade 4 Reading</th>
<th>Grade 8 Math</th>
<th>Grade 8 Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>16th</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA National Rank</td>
<td>National Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rigorous Courses
As part of the new Future Ready PA Index developed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, information on the number of unique Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual credit courses in each school is now available. 580 traditional public schools offered at least one rigorous course in 2017-18 with nearly 12 courses offered per school.

Courses per school

- **11.7** All SDs
- **8.8** Rural
- **10.3** Urban
- **15.2** Suburban

Find further information at [www.psba.org](http://www.psba.org)
Participation in CTE
While some school districts offer their own career and technical education programming, most participate in a regional career and technical center or area vocational technical school. Despite the increased awareness of the value of CTE, there remains a need and capacity to enroll more students in CTE.

In the current school year, what percentage of seats/spots for grades 9/10 to 12 are being utilized?

![Percentage Utilization](chart)

What is the biggest challenge in attracting students to attend a CTC?

- The perception of CTE schools: 40.0%
- Students/parents aren’t aware of the opportunities provided: 23.3%
- Lack of publicity/cooperation at participating schools: 10.0%
- Home school districts providing CTE courses: 16.7%
- Other: 0.0%

![Challenge Distribution](chart)

Does your school advertise any of its programs on radio, TV, print, online, etc.? Not including promotional material or activities in participating school districts.

- Yes: 73.3%
- No: 26.7%
CTE achievement

Students enrolled in CTE programs are engaged in a career-focused curriculum that usually culminates with an industry-specific assessment. On average, nine out of 10 students in the most common CTE programs are achieving competency on the performance component of their industry-specific assessments.  

Institutional food worker: 87.9%
Automotive mechanical: 93.2%
Welding: 86.2%
Carpentry: 87.8%
Cosmetology: 93.0%
Medical assistant: 96.8%
Health care technology: 96.8%
Electrical installation: 92.6%
Agricultural mechanics: 87.0%
Autobody repair: 92.0%
Readiness for life after school – CTE
Students in CTE programs are also in the unique position of preparing to start their careers or continue on to postsecondary education after completing their studies. On average, CTC directors believed that more than 80% of their graduates were ready for the next steps in their educational or professional lives.

In your opinion, what percentage of graduates from your school are ready for life after graduation?

82.6%

Educational outcomes – special education
In terms of educational outcomes for students in special education, more than 73% of students with disabilities graduated from high school with a diploma.\(^{15}\)

Students Exiting Special Education

- 73.3% Graduated with HS diploma
- 9.2% Moved
- 7.1% Transferred to regular education
- 0.1% Reached maximum age
- 0.2% Passed away
With many students with disabilities enrolled in and receiving intermediate unit programs and services, nearly 90% of IUs offer coursework intended to teach basic life skills which will prepare students for life after school, yet many of those students could still benefit from continuing services after turning 21.\textsuperscript{16}

Does your intermediate unit have a program or courses to teach students life skills needed for independent living?

In your opinion, what percentage of students that reach the age of 21 are in need of continuing programs and services?

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{86.7%}
\item \textbf{64.6%}
\end{itemize}
Graduation rates
Graduation rates have risen in Pennsylvania’s traditional public high schools in five of the last six years, with more than 88.5% of students graduating in four years in 2016-17, which is also well above the national average. 

Four-Year Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges
What chief school administrators and building principals had to say about the biggest challenges facing public education.
**Current challenges**

When asked which of the following areas were most difficult to manage over the last year, for the third year in a row, the top response among CSAs was budget pressures/lack of funding. The most identified challenge among building principals was social media issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>CSAs</th>
<th>IUs</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget pressures/lack of funding</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee training requirements</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining issues</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting/Retaining teachers</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School construction/maintenance</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with participating SDs</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>CTCs</th>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget pressures/lack of funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School safety/security</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Administrator workload</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting/Retaining teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School construction/maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Find further information at [www.psba.org](http://www.psba.org)
**Future Challenges**
Looking ahead to the biggest expected challenges in the upcoming year, CSAs also selected budget pressures/lack of funding for the third consecutive year. Building principals expect school safety and security issues to be their biggest challenge in the coming year.
Of the biggest challenges facing public schools, chief school administrators said:

There is just too much to do in terms of reporting and unfunded mandates. Administrators can’t keep up with them especially in small districts which are short staffed.

State mandates continue to be approved and handed down to districts for implementation without any regard for money, other resources, and how much time this takes away from what educators are trained to do...teach and educate children.

Supporting the mental health of students is a major concern in our district as well as many others throughout the state and country. We need to do a better job in teaching coping skills as well as letting students know it’s ok to seek out help.

Accessing quality mental health services is by far the clearest threat to learning and to the school environment for all.

We developed a safety day initiative earlier in the year and devoted an entire school day to the many aspects of safety that may impact us on any given school day.

Additional state funding is desperately needed. The school security needs are overwhelming without financial support.

The bottom line is that there is a lack of funding for schools to keep up with the growing needs that we are dealing with on a regular basis — special education/mental health/safety and security upgrades. We need help from the state.

We need adequate state funding.

If the state would increase funding for special education and establish a realistic standard cost for cyber charter tuition, it would free up money for all districts to implement many other programs to support all students.

Restoring PlanCon and allowing districts that have met the necessary requirements to apply for this funding is crucial for districts that don’t have a fund balance to pull from nor a tax base to support the needed renovations.
School Finances
A closer look at where education revenue comes from, how education dollars are being spent, and the financial challenges facing our public schools.
Budget pressures
When asked to select the biggest sources of budget pressure facing their schools, the most common answer among CSAs once again was pension costs. However, the percentage of CSAs identifying pension costs as one of their biggest sources of budget pressures decreased by as much as 22% from last year.
Public schools encountering budget pressures can be forced to take steps which could significantly impact their educational programs and future financial health. In the upcoming fiscal year, CSAs reported taking, or anticipated taking, the following actions because of budget pressures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SDs</th>
<th>CTCs</th>
<th>IU5s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising local property taxes</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>Drawing from fund balances</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing from fund balances</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>Reducing equipment/supplies provided to students/faculty</td>
<td>Putting a greater focus on revenue generating programs and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing staffing/furloughing employees/eliminating positions</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>Requiring student activity fees for extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>Reducing staffing/furloughing employees/eliminating positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing class sizes</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>Increasing class sizes</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing programs or services</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>Reducing programs or services</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining or sharing programs or services with another school district to split costs</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>Reducing staffing/furloughing employees/eliminating positions</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminating individual course offerings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Find further information at [www.psba.org](http://www.psba.org)
CSAs were also asked if they anticipated cutting and/or postponing any of the following programs, services or activities in the upcoming fiscal year.

- **SDs**
  - 24.3% Curriculum materials/books/supplies
  - 27.1% Technology/Equipment upgrades
  - 35.5% Prof. dev. opportunities for teachers/admins.
  - 46.6% Building maintenance/upgrades

- **CTCs**
  - 45.5% Building maintenance/upgrades
  - 36.4% Field trips
  - 36.4% Technology/Equipment upgrades

- **IUs**
  - 75.0% Building maintenance/upgrades
  - 41.7% Staffing levels
  - 41.7% Technology/Equipment upgrades

- **IUs**
  - 75.0% Building maintenance/upgrades
  - 41.7% Staffing levels
  - 41.7% Technology/Equipment upgrades

- **IUs**
  - 75.0% Building maintenance/upgrades
  - 41.7% Staffing levels
  - 41.7% Technology/Equipment upgrades

- **IUs**
  - 75.0% Building maintenance/upgrades
  - 41.7% Staffing levels
  - 41.7% Technology/Equipment upgrades

- **Field trips**
  - 33.3% Field trips
  - 18.2% Prof. dev. opportunities for teachers/admins.

Find further information at [www.psba.org](http://www.psba.org)
Revenues
School districts received slightly less than $29.0 billion in revenue\textsuperscript{18} in 2016-17, which was a 5.2\% increase over 2015-16. For a majority of school districts, especially those in suburban areas, the largest share of their revenue comes from local sources. In fact, for suburban school districts, local revenues are roughly 2.4 times that of state revenues.
Taking a closer look at the percentage of state and local funding for each school district reveals, in greater detail, the reliance on local revenue for suburban school districts and that many rural and urban school districts are more reliant on the state for funding.\(^9\)

State/Local Revenue Split

![Map showing state/local revenue split in Pennsylvania](image-url)
From a national perspective, only five other states are more reliant on local revenue to fund public education than Pennsylvania.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank/State</th>
<th>% local revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New Hampshire</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nebraska</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Massachusetts</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Connecticut</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. South Dakota</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pennsylvania</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New Jersey</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Illinois</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Total</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From an historical perspective, the percentages of revenue school districts receive from local and state sources are nearly identical to 1993-94 levels. But, in terms of dollars contributed, the difference between state and local shares had grown by nearly $3.4 billion.\(^\text{21}\)

* 2008-09 was the first year for state property tax reduction allocations under Act 1 of 2006.
At slightly more than $6.0 billion in 2018-19, basic education funding (BEF) was the single-largest line item in the state’s annual budget. All BEF funding above 2014-15 levels, an estimated $539 million for 2018-19, is annually divided among school districts according to a formula which takes into account various student and school district factors such as poverty and local taxation.\(^{22}\)

**BEF Increases From 2014-15 Levels**

- **Rural**: 6.0%
- **Urban**: 12.9%
- **Suburban**: 9.8%

Find further information at [www.psba.org](http://www.psba.org)
When asked how their school districts would utilize a sustainable 5% increase in BEF, roughly half of all school districts indicated that mental health services and school safety/security would be their top priorities.
Property taxes are the single largest source of local revenue for school districts. In 2016-17, school districts collected more than $13.0 billion in property taxes, which accounted for 45.0% of revenues.\(^{23}\)

Over the last 10 years...

Property tax revenues increased **24.6%**

The percentage of revenue coming from property taxes decreased by **nearly 1%**

Personal income\(^{24}\) increased **20.8%**, resulting in slight increases in property taxes as a percentage of personal income.

---

Find further information at [www.psba.org](http://www.psba.org)
When further comparing property taxes collected to personal income levels, nearly 60% of school districts have property tax collections that represent between 2% and 4% of personal income. Although, in some areas of the state, that number is much higher.

Property Taxes Collected as a Percent of Personal Income
For many school districts, their 2019-20 budgets will include increases to local property taxes. The vast majority of those increases are anticipated to be at or below the district’s Act 1 Index but in some districts, the increase will likely be higher.

What will be your anticipated property tax increase for 2019-20?

- No increase: 12.1%
- Below the district’s Act 1 index: 30.5%
- At the district’s Act 1 index: 47.9%
- Above the district’s Act 1 index: 9.5%

When asked if their school district’s financial outlook would be better in 2019-20 than it was in 2018-19, less than 7% of superintendents responded in the positive.

Will your school district’s financial outlook be better in 2019-20 than it was in 2018-19?

- Yes: 25.3%
- No: 68.1%
- Not sure: 6.6%
Current Expenditures
School district current expenses in 2016-17 were slightly less than $26.0 billion in 2016-17 which was a 4.7% increase over 2015-16. Specific expenditures will be examined next, but first, a high-level overview of school district spending.

- **Instruction**: 67.1%
- **Debt service and other financing uses**: 9.1%
- **Administrative services**: 8.4%
- **Instructional support services**: 6.6%
- **Student transportation**: 5.6%
- **Student activities**: 1.8%
- **Student health**: 1.2%
- **All other uses**: 0.2%
Pennsylvania ranks ninth nationally in terms of current expenditures per student, with $15,418 being spent on each student. However, $4,631, or 30% of that spending is dedicated to employee benefits, including pension costs. Only two other states have a greater proportion of spending per student dedicated to employee benefits.
Mandated Expenses

The growth in mandated expenses, particularly pension costs and charter school tuition payments over the last several years have drastically outpaced the growth in all other areas of school spending. School districts have responded by reducing salary costs and outsourcing more educational and other services to help control spending.

Growth in Expenses - 2010-11 to 2016-17
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Charter School Tuition
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Pensions

The costliest mandated expense public schools are currently facing is pension costs. As employer contribution rates have increased over the last several years, the percentage of school budgets being consumed by pension costs has grown at a commensurate rate. With employer contribution rates projected to continue rising for at least the next decade and a half, pension costs will continue to drain resources away from classrooms.

Pension Expenses and Employer Contribution Rates

- Pensions as % of Current Expenses
- PSERS Employer Contribution Rate

Find further information at www.psba.org
Charter school tuition payments
In 2016-17, school districts spent more than $1.6 billion in mandatory charter school tuition payments for the 133,000 students enrolled in a charter school. Between 2004-05 and 2013-14, enrollment and tuition payment growth were steady, averaging 11.6% and 16.5% per year respectively. But over the last three years, both have slowed.
With roughly 7 out of 10 brick-and-mortar charter schools located in urban areas, urban school districts account for the greatest proportion of charter school tuition payments.\textsuperscript{36} When looking specifically at tuition payments to cyber charter schools, suburban and rural become more impacted.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Brick-and-mortar charter school locations\textsuperscript{*}
  \item Proportion of charter school tuition payments by community type
\end{itemize}

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
School Type & Urban & Suburban & Rural \\
\hline
Cyber Charter Tuition & 29.6\% & 31.2\% & 39.2\% \\
Brick & Mortar Tuition & 3.5\% & 81.1\% & 15.5\% \\
Total Charter School Tuition & 10.8\% & 67.1\% & 22.1\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{*} Regional charter schools may be included in more than one community type.
**Fund balances**

A school district’s reserve funds, or fund balance, can be crucial to helping the school district pay for emergency repairs, keep taxes down or keep school doors open in the event state funding stops. A school district’s unassigned fund balance is money held in reserve that can be used for any reason. Financial industry recommendations are that school districts maintain an unassigned fund balance between 5-10% of expenditures.  

Unassigned Fund Balance as % of Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All SDs</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of school districts with $0 or negative fund balance

- **All SDs**: 28
- **Rural**: 7
- **Urban**: 6
- **Suburban**: 15

Number of school districts with lower unassigned fund balance than 2011-12

- **All SDs**: 197
- **Rural**: 110
- **Urban**: 14
- **Suburban**: 73
School Safety & Security

Ensuring the safety and security of students, staff and visitors is easily among the most important responsibilities of school leaders.
Safety and security challenges
When asked to identify the biggest challenges related to school safety and security, meeting the mental health needs of students was the most common answer among CSAs, with the need for more resources next.
Superintendents were also asked to identify the biggest challenges in meeting the mental health needs of students. The most frequently selected challenge points to a lack of qualified mental health professionals to meet the needs of schools and students.
When asked where their schools would focus their safety and security efforts, CSAs plan on using a variety of solutions to best utilize available resources and meet the needs of their schools, students and communities.

**SDs**
- Improving access to mental health resources: 37.9%
- Safety-based school building improvements: 27.0%
- Purchasing security-related technology: 25.4%
- Positive behavior supports: 24.8%
- School police/resource/security officers: 24.5%
- Conducting drills with first responders: 23.2%

**CTCs**
- Safety-based school building improvements: 37.9%
- Adding security-related technology: 37.9%
- Improving access to mental health resources: 31.0%
- School police/resource/security officers: 20.7%
- Conducting drills with first responders: 20.7%

**IUs**
- Improving access to mental health resources: 85.7%
- Adding security-related technology: 28.6%
- Prof. dev. to identify at-risk students/behaviors: 21.4%
- Safety-based school building improvements: 14.3%
- Positive behavior supports: 14.3%
School police/resource/security officers in schools
A common approach to making schools safer places over the last 12 years has been to add school police, resource and/or security officers. Compared to 2005-06, the number of officers serving in schools has increased 45%.³⁸

2005-06
1,364 officers
One officer for every 1,342 students.

2017-18
1,982 officers
One officer for every 867 students.

Find further information at www.psba.org
Nearly two-thirds of school districts reported having an armed officer in at least one school building for at least part of the school day. Additionally, nearly three-quarters of school districts have reported conducting an active shooter drill in the last year.

Do you currently have an armed security/police/resource officer in any of your school buildings for any part of the school day?

- **64.3%** Yes
- **35.7%** No

Has your school district conducted an active shooter drill in last 12 months?

- **74.5%** Yes
- **25.5%** No
Survey invitations were emailed on Dec. 2018, to 584 chief school administrators (CSAs) and 3,223 school principals. When the survey was closed on Jan 2019, 371 responses were received from CSAs and 155 from school principals. Response rates within each group are as follows: school districts – 328 of 497 (66.0%); intermediate units – 16 of 27 (59.3%); career and technical centers – 30 of 60 (50.0%); school principals 155 of 3,223 (4.8%). Percentages used in this report from survey questions are based on the number of responses to the question and not on the number of school entities in the group.

Enrollments based on Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) Oct. 1, 2017 enrollment snapshot by LEA unless otherwise noted. There may be some overlap between school districts, career and technical centers and intermediate units. Intermediate unit enrollment does not include Philadelphia (IU 26) and Pittsburgh (IU 2) because enrollments in those intermediate units is included with the home school district. Career and technical center enrollment does not include students enrolled in a CTE program provided by their home school district due to unavailability of the data. PDE enrollment snapshots available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Enrollment%20Reports%20and%20Projections.aspx


An estimated 325,061 children ages 6-17 (18.0%) lived in households with income below 100% of federal poverty limits. In urban districts, 35.2%. Acute poverty and child population estimates based on 2016 American Community Survey 5-year estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau Ratio of Income to Poverty by age group available: https://factfinder.census.gov/taces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml

55,863 students (3.2%) were English Learners. In urban districts, 9.2%. 2016-17 English Learner student counts by LEA and school available: https://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/English-as-a-Second-Language.aspx

277,155 students ages 6-21 (16.0%) were enrolled in special education. 2016-17 Special Education Statistical Summaries. Includes only students ages 6-21. Available: https://penndata.hbg.psu.edu/PublicReporting/StatisticalSummary/tabid/2546/Default.aspx

Analysis based on enrollment snapshot for Oct. 1, 2017 – enrollments in Pre-K, K4 and K5. Does not include Bryn Athyn SD because the school district does not operate any schools. School district provided pre-kindergarten or K4 is not indicative of student’s access to pre-kindergarten. Many children have access to pre-kindergarten through independently operated preschools or other programs. Enrollment snapshots available http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Enrollment%20Reports%20and%20Projections.aspx

Analysis based on a comparison of enrollment snapshots for Oct. 1, 2017 and Oct 1, 2007 – enrollments in Pre-K, K4 and K5. For purposes of this analysis, expansion is defined as the school district going from half-day to full-day and/or adding half or full day where none was offered before; and reduction is defined as going from full-day to half-day and/or cutting half- or full-day where one was offered before.

Every Pennsylvania student in grades 3 through 8 is assessed in English Language Arts and Math and every Pennsylvania student in grades 4 and 8 is assessed in science. Keystone Exams are designed to be taken at the end of courses in literature, algebra and biology to measure a student’s proficiency in the subject area. Scores shown are for all students. 2018 PSSA School Level Data available http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/PSSA/Pages/default.aspx. 2018 Keystone Exam School Level Data available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/KeystoneExamsResults.aspx.

Number of Advanced Placement (AP)/ International Baccalaureate (IB), and Dual Enrollment Unique Courses taken from Future Ready PA Index available: https://futurereadypa.org/Home/DataFiles. Only schools which offer a rigorous course were included.

National Occupational Competency Testing Institute (NOCTI) 2017 Pennsylvania state averages. Available http://www.nocti.org/State-Customized-PA.cfm. NOCTI exams also include a written component. Written component scores are generally lower than scores on the performance component. Comparison to national assessment results are not possible in most areas due to assessments being Pennsylvania state-specific in most areas. Agriculture mechanics results substituted for agricultural production due to results for agricultural production being unavailable.

According to Pennsylvania law, free public school attendance privileges end upon graduation or the school year after the student turns 21. See 24 P.S. § 13-1301.

Graduation rates are for all school district students. 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rates available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/CohortGraduationRate.aspx. 2015-16 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (latest available) available: https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/tables/ACGR_RE_and_characteristics_2015-16.asp.

Revenue comes from four primary sources – local sources such as local property taxes; state sources such as state budget line items like basic education funding; federal sources such as federal programs to educate students with disabilities; and other sources such as issuing bonds and fund transfers. Other revenue sources were excluded from this analysis to: 1) avoid skewing the fiscal picture of public schools due to the inconsistency in other revenue sources year-to-year; 2) to more closely reflect actual revenue generated; and 3) to allow general comparisons to other states. 2016-17 Annual Financial Reports for revenues. Available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Finances/AFR%20Data%20Summary/Pages/AFR-Data-Detailed-.aspx.

Excludes other revenue.


Comparing only state and local revenues for school districts.

Funding distribution is now governed by Act 35 of 2016. https://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Education%20Budget/Pages/default.aspx

2016-17 Annual Financial Reports for local revenues - current and interim property taxes (revenue codes 6111 and 6112) divided by total state, local and federal revenues. Available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Finances/AFR%20Data%20Summary/Pages/AFR-Data-Detailed-.aspx.

2007-08 and 2016-17 current and interim property taxes (available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Finances/AFR%20Data%20Summary/Pages/AFR-Data-Detailed-.aspx) divided by 2007 and 2016 adjusted personal income (available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/School%20Finances/FinancialDataElements/Pages/default.aspx).

The Act 1 Index is the maximum property tax increase that school districts may levy without voter approval or an approved exemption from the Department of Education. https://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/Property%20Tax%20Relief/Pages/default.aspx.

Current expenditures include all function codes other than 4000 and 5000. 2016-17 Annual Financial Reports for expenditure detail by function. Available: http://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Finances/AFR%20Data%20Summary/Pages/AFR-Data-Detailed-.aspx.

For purposes of this map, the U.S. Census Bureau defines current operation as follows: direct expenditure for salaries, employee benefits, purchased professional and technical services, purchased property and other services, and supplies. It includes gross school system expenditure for instruction, support services, and noninstructional functions. It excludes expenditure for debt service, capital outlay, and reimbursement to other governments (including other school systems). Also excluded are payments made on behalf of the school system by other governments including employee retirement payments made by state governments to state retirement funds and to social security. Employer contributions made by those few school systems that have their own retirement systems (such as the Chicago Board of Education and the Denver Public School System) into their own retirement funds are excluded. Current operation expenditure is a standard classification item used in all Census Bureau government finance reports. 2016 Public Elementary-Secondary Education Finance Data. Summary Tables, Table 8 and Appendix A. Available https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2016/econ/school-finances/secondary-education-finance.html.

Michigan (32.1%) and Illinois (31.8%).

Mandated expenses refer to the costs and expenses which school districts are required to incur in order to provide required programs and services, meet legal or regulatory obligations, or otherwise have no discretion in incurring.

Pension costs – object 230. Charter school tuition payments – object 562. Salaries – object 100. Other purchased services include outside educational services, transportation services, food services, liability insurance, and other tuition payments – object 300 plus object 500 (less object 562). All other expenses – sum of objects 400, 600, 700, and 800. Fund transfers and debt service payments from object 900 were not included. 2016-17 Annual Financial Reports for major object available https://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Finances/AFR%20Data%20Summary/Pages/AFR-Data-Detailed-.aspx. Inflation calculated as percentage change in Consumer Price Index – All Urban Customers, not seasonally adjusted between July 2010 and June 2017. Consumer Price Index data available: https://www.bls.gov/data/.
Public schools are required by law to contribute an actuarially determined percentage of their salary expenses to the Public School Employees’ Retirement System (PSERS) to assist in paying for the retirement benefits its members have earned. This percentage is commonly referred to as the “employer contribution rate.”


Charter school tuition payments represented 6.4% of all current expenditures. 133,000 students enrolled in charter schools represent 7.8% of public school enrollments. Enrollment based on Oct. 1, 2017 snapshot available http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Enrollment%20Reports%20and%20Projections.aspx. Tuition to Pennsylvania charter schools (object code 562) available: https://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20-%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Finances/AFR%20Data%20Summary/Pages/AFR-Data-Detailed.aspx#.

The number of charter schools has also increased from 109 in 2004-05 to 176 in 2013-14. As of 2017-18, there were 179 charter schools in operation. Based on enrollment snapshot data available http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Enrollment%20Reports%20and%20Projections.aspx.

Number and location of charter schools available: https://www.education.pa.gov/K-12/Charter%20Schools/Pages/default.aspx. Tuition to Pennsylvania charter schools (object code 562) available: https://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers%20-%20Administrators/School%20Finances/Finances/AFR%20Data%20Summary/Pages/AFR-Data-Detailed.aspx#.


2005-06 was the first year that the number of school police/security personnel was reported. 2005-06 and 2017-18 PA Office for Safe Schools state reports available: https://www.safeschools.state.pa.us/ (Strzgddlkpm14i1m4dnqvf)/Main.aspx?App=6a935144-7cbf-45e1-850b-e29b2f11f171&Menu=dd39a1f33194a75-8f69-d1166dba5d70&res.