



**FAIRFAX-FALLS CHURCH CHILDREN'S SERVICES for
AT-RISK CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES**



June 24, 2022

Community Policy and Management Team (CPMT)

Agenda

1:00 p.m. -- Convene meeting ~

1. **MINUTES:** Approve minutes of May 20, 2022 meeting
2. **ITEMS:**
 - **Administrative Items**
Item A – 1: Approve Mental Health Initiative Funding Plan and Protocol
 - **CSA Contract Items**
Item C – 1: Monthly Out-of-State Placement Approvals
 - **CSA Information Items**
Item I – 1: Budget Report
Item I – 2: Methodology for Budgetary Projections
Item I – 3: Update on Private Day Rate Setting
 - **NOVACO – Private Provider Items**
 - **CPMT Parent Representative Items**
 - **Cities of Fairfax and Falls Church Items**
 - **Public Comment**

3:00 p.m. – Adjourn



**FAIRFAX-FALLS CHURCH CHILDREN'S SERVICES for
AT-RISK CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES**



May 20, 2022

**Community Policy and Management Team (CPMT)
Virtual Meeting due to COVID-19 Emergency Procedures**

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Lesley Abashian (office -*acting Vice Chair*), Gloria Addo-Ayensu (office), Jacqueline Benson (home), Cristy Gallagher (office), Annie Henderson (office), Joe Klemmer (home), Dana Lewis (office) Richard Leichtweis (home – *acting Chair*) Dawn Schaefer (office), Matt Thompson (office), Lloyd Tucker (office)

Attended but not heard during roll call: Lyn Thomlinson – *sitting in for Daryl Washington* (office), Michelle Boyd

Absent: Lloyd Tucker, Staci Alexander, Michael Becketts, Deb Evans, Deborah Scott, Chris Leonard, Rebecca Sharp

HMF Attendees: Peter Steinberg, Jim Gillespie, Tracy Davis, Hilda Calvo Perez, Philethea Duckett

CSA Management Team Attendees: Kelly Conn-Reda, Xu Han, Barbara Martinez, Jessica Jackson, Tim Elcesser, Kamonya Omatete, Muhammad “Usman” Saeed, Andrew Janos, Terry Byers, Mary Jo Davis, Jesse Ellis, Julie Bowman

Stakeholders and CSA Program Staff Present: Janet Bessmer, Kristina Kallini, Shana Martins, Kendra Rascoe, Tiffany Robinson, Jeanne Veraska, Chris Metzbower, Jesse Ellis

FOIA Related Motions:

I move that each member's voice may be adequately heard by each other member of this CPMT.
Motion made by Rick Leichtweis; second by Matt Thompson; all members agree, motion carries.

Second, having established that each member's voice may be heard by every other member, we must next establish the nature of the emergency that compels these emergency procedures, the fact that we are meeting electronically, what type of electronic communication is being used, and how we have arranged for public access to this meeting.

State of Emergency caused by the COVID-19 pandemic makes it unsafe for this CPMT to physically assemble and unsafe for the public to physically attend any such meeting, and that as such, FOIA's usual procedures, which require the physical assembly of this CPMT and the physical presence of the public, cannot be implemented safely or practically. I further move that this CPMT may conduct this meeting electronically through a dedicated auto conferencing line, and that the public may access this meeting by calling: 571-429-5982; participant access code: 341 991 249#. It is so moved.

Motion made by Rick Leichtweis; seconded by Jackie Benson; all members agree, motion carries.

Finally, it is next required that all the matters addressed on today's are statutorily required or necessary to continue operations and the discharge of the CPMT's lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities.

Motion made by Rick Leichtweis; seconded by Jackie Benson; all members agree, motion carries.

Approved:

1. **MINUTES:** Approve minutes of April 29, 2022. *Motion made by Matt Thompson; seconded by Dawn Schaefer; all members agree, motion carries.*

2. **ITEMS:**

• **Administrative Items:**

Item A – 1: FY23 CPMT Meeting Schedule – presented by Janet Bessmer. Request for approval for the proposed FY23 CPMT meeting schedule. Joe Klemmer asked when CPMT will begin in person. Janet Bessmer responded that we may reconvene in person either in June or July (but we are still unsure of the exact time) unless the county adopts the practice of keeping the meetings virtual. *Motion made by Cristy Gallagher; seconded by Matt Thompson; all members agree, motion carries.*

Item A – 2: OCS Annual Risk Assessment Survey for Localities– Presented by Janet Bessmer. The state sends a required survey each year to ask about a variety of issues regarding the functioning of CSA program. The survey was completed using the information from the CSA program (full survey responses can be found the meeting materials packet). Request that CPMT approve submission of this survey to the state. *Motion made by Joe Klemmer; seconded by Matt Thompson; all members agree, motion carries.*

• **CSA CONTRACT ITEMS:**

Item C – 1: Monthly Out-of-State Placement Approvals – CSA Management Team approved a child-specific contract with Sandy Pines Residential Treatment facility in FL.

• **CSA INFORMATION ITEMS:**

Item I – 1: Budget Report – Presented by Usman Saeed. Refer to packet for information regarding the budget report.

Item I – 2: Mental Health Initiative Local Funding for FY23 – Presented by Jessica Jackson. Refer to packet for more information.

Item I – 3: Mental Health Initiative State Revisions – Presented by Jessica Jackson. Refer to packet for more information.

• **NOVACO – Private Provider Items** – Quarterly meeting with CSA managers. Regional discussion on opioid crisis and provider capacity issues. Also discussed CSA symposium which will be held June 8 8am-1pm at NOVA Community College. This is a free event for CPMT members and there will be a CPMT round table discussion (more details to come).

• **CPMT Parent Representative Items** – none

• **Cities of Fairfax and Falls Church Items** – none

• **Public Comment** – none

• **Staff Comment** – Jim Gillespie announced that he will be retiring in August.

Next Meeting: June 24, 2022, 1:00 – 3:00pm (location TBD)

Adjourn 1:40pm: *Motion to adjourn made by Lesley Abashian; seconded by Joe Klemmer; all members agree, motion carries.*

Approved:

MEMO TO THE CPMT
June 24, 2022

Administrative Item A – 1: Approve Mental Health Initiative Funding Plan and Protocol

ISSUE:

It is requested that the CPMT approve a funding plan for DBHDS Mental Health Initiative funds allocated to the Community Services Board. The plan and protocol include the annual allocation of \$515,529 and approximately \$1 million in unspent prior year state Mental Health Initiative funds. On June the CSA Management Team reviewed and endorsed this request.

RECOMMENDATION:

that the CPMT approve a funding plan for DBHDS Mental Health Initiative funds allocated to the Community Services Board. The plan and protocol include the annual allocation of \$515,529 and approximately \$1 million in unspent prior year state Mental Health Initiative funds.

BACKGROUND:

The Mental Health Children and Adolescent Initiative (MHI) is a Virginia Department of Behavioral and Developmental Health (DBHDS) funding allocation to CSBs dedicated to serving children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbance and other disorders who are not mandated to receive services under the Children’s Services Act (CSA). The annual MHI allocation to the Fairfax-Falls Church CSB is \$515,529. For the past several years the state MHI allocation has been under-spent, resulting in a current unspent balance of approximately \$1 million. DBHS requires that be spent for the intended purpose.

The current annual MHI allocation is used to support four Youth and Family Behavioral Health Specialist II positions and to purchase intensive behavioral health treatment for children and youth with more complex needs than can be met through outpatient services. In addition, in order to spend down the accumulated balance, in January 2020 CPMT endorsed and DBHDS approved also funding three Senior Clinician positions to begin spending down the accumulated balance. After the onset of COVID that number was reduced to two, with DBHDS concurrence. In January 2021 the CPMT endorsed and DBHDS approved spending \$300,000 annually in purchased services for MHI-eligible youth, to further reduce the accumulated balance. The unspent balance was accumulated through periodic vacancies in the MHI-funded positions, which had the added effect of reducing the case management capacity to assist families in accessing MHI-funded intensive behavioral health treatment.

DBHDS MHI Administrative Requirements:

- MHI funds must be used exclusively to serve currently unserved children and adolescents or provide additional services to underserved children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbances, at risk for serious emotional disturbance, and/or with co-occurring disorders with priority placed on those children who, absent services, are at-risk for removal from the home due to placement by a local department of social services, admission to a congregate care facility or acute care psychiatric hospital or crisis

stabilization facility, commitment to the Department of Juvenile Justice, or parental custody relinquishment.

- Services must be based on the individual needs of the child or adolescent and must be included in an individualized services plan. Services must be child-centered, family focused, and community-based. The participation of families is integral in the planning of these services.
- MHI funds must be used to purchase services which will be used to keep the child or adolescent in the least restrictive environment and living in the community.
- These funds shall be used exclusively for children and adolescents, not mandated for services under the Children’s Services Act.
- The CSB shall develop a Mental Health Initiative funding plan in collaboration with the local Family and Assessment Planning Team and/or Community Policy and Management Team. The funding plan shall be approved by the Community Policy and Management Teams of the locality. The CSB should seek input and guidance in the formulation of the protocol from other FAPT and CPMT member agencies.
- MHI funds may not be used for residential care services, partial or full hospitalizations, or for CSA sum sufficient populations. MHI funding may not be used to purchase vehicles, furniture, computers, or to provide training.

The new language is much clearer about the role of FAPTs and CPMTs in planning for use of MHI funds. Currently DBHDS requires that CSBs work collaboratively with local Community Policy Management Teams (CPMTs) to establish a MHI Fund Protocol for how the CSB will expend the MHI funds for the target population. The new budget amendment establishes a requirement that the CPMT approve a MHI funding plan.

The new priority for serving “children who, absent services, are at-risk for removal from the home due to placement by a local department of social services” sews confusion about whether to serve them through CSA or MHI. Those children would appear to be mandated under CSA, which would make them ineligible for MHI funding. CSB MHI procedures will specify that MHI funds not be used for CSA sum sufficient populations.

PROPOSED PROTOCOL:

It is proposed that the annual MHI allocation and unspent balance be spent to:

1. Continue funding four Youth and Family Behavioral Health Specialist II positions to provide case management for children and youth requiring more intensive services than outpatient.
2. Continue funding two CSB Youth and Family Senior Clinician positions. These clinicians are trained in and provide evidence-based treatments for children and youth with SED.
3. Budget \$300,000 annually to purchase services for MHI-eligible youth. Types of services that these funds may be used for include, but are not limited to: crisis intervention and stabilization, outpatient, intensive in-home, intensive care coordination, case management,

Family Support Partners, evidence-based practices, therapeutic day treatment, alternative day support (including specialized after school and summer camp, behavior aide, or other wrap-around services), and, supervised family support services.

These proposed uses will meet all Appropriations Act and DBHDS State Performance Contract requirements.

Target Population:

MHI funding is targeted to unserved or under-served children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbances, at risk for serious emotional disturbance, and/or with co-occurring disorders with priority placed on those children who, absent services, are at-risk for removal from the home due to placement by a local department of social services, admission to a congregate care facility or acute care psychiatric hospital or crisis stabilization facility, commitment to the Department of Juvenile Justice, or parental custody relinquishment.

Access to Services:

Children and youth identified at inter-agency family assessment and planning team meetings, family resource meetings, family partnership meetings or ICC youth and family team meetings as meeting MHI eligibility criteria will be considered for MHI-funded treatment services. In addition, children and youth entering services through the CSB Entry and Referral process will be assessed for MHI eligibility.

Individualized Service Planning:

All youth served will have an individualized plan of care compliant with the requirements in the CSA Code, developed through a multi-disciplinary team process.

Services to be Provided:

Types of services that these funds may be used for include, but are not limited to: crisis intervention and stabilization, outpatient, intensive in-home, intensive care coordination, case management, Family Support Partners, evidence-based practices, therapeutic day treatment, alternative day support (including specialized after school and summer camp, behavior aide, or other wrap-around services), and, supervised family support services.

Review and Reporting:

A report of MHI services and expenditures will be presented to the CPMT on an annual basis.

ATTACHMENT: None

INTERNAL CONTROL IMPACT: None

FISCAL IMPACT:

The unspent MHI balance is sufficient to fund two Senior Clinician positions and \$300,000 annually in purchase of services through at least FY 2023.

STAFF:

Jim Gillespie, CSB Youth and Family Services Director

MEMO TO THE CPMT
June 24, 2022

CPMT Contract Information Item C-1: Out of State Residential Child Specific Contract Activity

ISSUE: That the CPMT receive regular reports on the CSA Management Team approvals of placements in out of state residential facilities. Since the last CPMT meeting, DPMM processed one (1) Child Specific Contract Request for out of state residential facilities.

Date Received by DPMM	Provider	Location	Medicaid Participating/ Single Case Agreement	Requesting Department	Barrier to Contract Pool of Providers	CSA MT Approval Date
6/6/2022	Millcreek of Pontotoc Treatment Center	Pontotoc, MS	No but considering Single Case Agreement	DFS-FC&A	Borderline IQ, run risk, self-injurious	6/13/2022

BACKGROUND:

The CSA Management Team has delegated authority to approve out of state residential placements for youth. For each month in which a contract is approved, a report of the contract activity is required by the CPMT as a part of the delegation of the approval authority. In the consideration of each request, all clinically appropriate Medicaid providers located in Virginia under APOS were considered and were not appropriate due to the individual needs of the youth.

At the time of this CSA MT approval, there were nine (9) child specific contracts for youth with out of state facilities.

Provider	Location	Case Managing Agency	Barrier to Contract Pool of Providers	Date of Approval
Devereaux - CIDDS (Kanner)	Pennsylvania	FCPS-MAS	IEP for Residential School under the category of Multiple Disabilities with physical aggression	5/1/2015 (CPMT)
Devereux-Brandywine	Pennsylvania	FCPS-MAS	IEP for residential School Setting. ASD and aggression	4/19/2020 (CPMT)
Benedictine School	Maryland	FCPS-MAS	IEP for Residential School Setting	1/24/2020 (CPMT)
Change Academy of the Ozarks (CALO)	Missouri	FCPS-MAS	IEP for Residential School references ADHD, RAD, Emotional Disability,	5/29/2020 (CPMT)

			and Learning Disabilities. VA facilities would not accept.	
Chamberlain Intl School	Massachusetts	FCPS-MAS	IEP for Residential School	9/20/2020 (CPMT)
Justice Resource Institute (Glenhaven Academy)	Massachusetts	CSB	Diagnosis of ASD and physical aggression	3/22/2021
Maplewood School	Armenia, New York	FCPS-MAS	Parental Placement of student with IEP for Private Day School Setting. Contract for Education costs only.	9/09/2021
Latham Centers	Brewster, Massachusetts	FCPS-MAS	Prader-Willi Syndrome with severe aggression and other complicating medical issues.	9/20/2021
Judge Rotenberg Center	Canton, MA	DFS-FC&A	Include Intellectual Disability, Autism, ODD, ADHD, and a seizure disorder with a history of physical aggression towards others, property destruction, self-injury and elopement. Seven month stay at Commonwealth Center for Children and Adolescents.	2/14/2021
Sandy Pines Residential Treatment Center	Jupiter, Florida	DFS-FC&A	Young age, level of criminal offenses, and aggression	5/20/2022

STAFF:

Barbara Martinez, DPMM

MEMO TO THE CPMT

June 24, 2022

Information Item I-1: May Budget Report & Status Update, Program Year 2022**ISSUE:**

CPMT members monitor CSA expenditures to review trends and provide budget oversight.

BACKGROUND:

The Budget Report to the CPMT has been organized for consistency with LEDRS reporting categories and Service Placement types.

The attached chart details Program Year 2022 cumulative expenditures through May for LEDRS categories, with associated Youth counts. IEP-driven expenditures for Schools are separated out. Further information on the attachment provides additional information on recoveries, unduplicated youth count, and:

- Average cost per child for some Mandated categories
- Average costs for key placement types, such as Residential Treatment Facility, Treatment Foster Home, Education placements.

Total Pooled Expenditures: Pooled expenditures through May 2022 for FY22 equal \$25.8M for 928 youths. This amount is a decrease from last year of approximately \$1.7M, or 6.18%. YTD Pooled expenditures for FY21 equaled \$27.5M for 962 youths.

	Program Year 2021	Program Year 2022	Change Amt	Change %
Residential Treatment & Education	\$3,488,852	\$4,142,618	\$653,766	18.74%
Private Day Special Education	\$15,753,874	\$14,033,817	(\$1,720,057)	-10.92%
Non-Residential Foster Home/Other	\$5,334,282	\$4,725,854	(\$608,428)	-11.41%
Community Services	\$2,982,533	\$3,413,580	\$431,047	14.45%
Non-Mandated Services (All)	\$838,931	\$429,705	(\$409,226)	-48.78%
Recoveries	(\$887,623)	(\$934,030)	(\$46,407)	5.23%
Total Expenditures	\$27,510,848	\$25,811,544	(\$1,699,305)	-6.18%
Residential Treatment & Education	113	94	(19)	-16.81%
Private Day Special Education	284	260	(24)	-8.45%
Non-Residential Foster Home/Other	324	311	(13)	-4.01%
Community Services	637	689	52	8.16%
Non-Mandated Services (All)	182	160	(22)	-12.09%
Unique Count All Categories	1,540	1,514	(26)	-1.69%
Unduplicated Youth Count	962	928	(34)	-3.53%

Note: The number of youths served is unduplicated within individual categories, but not across categories.

Expenditure claims have not yet submitted to the State Office of Children's Services (OCS) through April.

RECOMMENDATION:

For CPMT members to accept the May Program Year 2022 budget report as submitted.

ATTACHMENT:

Budget Chart

STAFF:

Timothy Elcesser, Xu Han and Usman Saeed (DFS)

NOTE:

Residential Treatment & Education increased by \$653k with 19 fewer youths served. Residential area overall cost is up, mainly due to increased Residential service and Residential education cost paid YTD.

Private day special education costs paid YTD have decreased by \$1.7M with 24 fewer youths served. Average private day special education costs per youth have decreased by only 3% as compared to last year.

Non-Residential Foster Home/Other has decreased by \$608k with 13 fewer youths served than in same period last year. Average Non-Residential Foster Home/Other costs per youth have decreased by 8% as compared to last year due to more youths are placed with relatives and resulting TFC costs and transportation costs are down.

Community Services increased by \$431k with 52 more youth served year to date, average community services cost per youth has dropped by 6% as compared to last year.

Non-Mandated Services expenses have decreased by \$409k with 22 fewer youths served, average non-mandated services cost has also decreased by 42%.

Program Year 2022 Year To Date CSA Expenditures and Youth Served (through May Payment)

		Local	County	Youth in	Schools	Youth in	Total		
Mandated/ Non-Mand	Residential/ Non-Residential	Serv Type Descrip	Match Rate	& Foster Care	Category	(IEP Only)	Category	Expenditures	
Mandated	Residential	Residential Treatment Facility	57.64%	\$1,360,670	50			\$1,360,670	
		Group Home	57.64%	\$298,528	8			\$298,528	
		Education - for Residential Medicaid Placements	46.11%	\$85,769	2	\$1,335,249	23	\$1,421,018	
		Education for Residential Non-Medicaid Placements	46.11%	\$106,601	3	\$929,584	7	\$1,036,185	
		Temp Care Facility and Services	57.64%	\$26,217	1			\$26,217	
	Residential Total				\$1,877,785	64	\$2,264,833	30	\$4,142,618
	Non Residential	Special Education Private Day	46.11%	\$465,339	10	\$13,568,478	250	\$14,033,817	
		Wrap-Around for Students with Disab	46.11%	\$212,741	50			\$212,741	
		Treatment Foster Home	46.11%	\$2,634,329	88			\$2,634,329	
		Foster Care Mtce	46.11%	\$981,323	114			\$981,323	
		Independent Living Stipend	46.11%	\$267,242	35			\$267,242	
		Community Based Service	23.06%	\$2,705,375	501			\$2,705,375	
		ICC	23.06%	\$708,205	188			\$708,205	
		Independent Living Arrangement	46.11%	\$630,220	24			\$630,220	
Non Residential Total			\$8,604,773	1010	\$13,568,478	250	\$22,173,251		
Mandated Total				\$10,482,558	1074	\$15,833,311	280	\$26,315,869	
Non-Mandated	Residential	Residential Treatment Facility	57.64%	\$101,647	6			\$101,647	
		Temp Care Facility and Services	57.64%	\$724	1			\$724	
	Residential Total			\$102,371	7	\$0	0	\$102,371	
	Non Residential	Community Based Service	23.06%	\$260,528	85			\$260,528	
		ICC	23.06%	\$66,806	68			\$66,806	
Non Residential Total			\$327,334	153	\$0	0	\$327,334		
Non-Mandated Total				\$429,705	160	0	\$429,705		
Grand Total (with Duplicated Youth Count)				\$10,912,263	1,234	280	\$26,745,574		

Recoveries	-\$934,030
Total Net of Recoveries	\$25,811,544
Unduplicated child count	928

Key Indicators		Cost Per Child	Prog Yr 2021 YTD	Prog Yr 2022 YTD
		Average Cost Per Child Based on Total Expenditures /All Services (unduplicated)	\$28,596	\$27,814
		Average Cost Per Child Mandated Residential (unduplicated)	\$42,000	\$55,981
		Average Cost Per Child Mandated Non- Residential (unduplicated)	\$27,637	\$26,491
		Average Cost Mandated Community Based Services Per Child (unduplicated)	\$4,641	\$5,400
		Average costs for key placement types		
		Average Cost for Residential Treatment Facility (Non-IEP)	\$20,784	\$27,213
		Average Cost for Treatment Foster Home	\$27,353	\$29,936
		Average Education Cost for Residential Medicaid Placement (Residential)	\$37,277	\$56,841
		Average Education Cost for Residential Non-Medicaid Placement (Residential)	\$70,032	\$103,619
		Average Special Education Cost for Private Day (Non-Residential)	\$55,471	\$53,976
		Average Cost for Non-Mandated Placement	\$4,610	\$3,065

Category	Program Year 2022 Allocation	Year to Date Expenditure (Net)	Remaining
SPED Wrap-Around Program Year 2022 Allocation	\$694,188	\$204,941	70%
Non Mandated Program Year 2022	\$1,630,458	\$360,318	78%
Program Year 2022 Total Allocation	\$42,187,551	\$25,811,544	39%

MEMO TO THE CPMT

June 24, 2022

Information Item I- 2: Methodology for Budget Projections

ISSUE: That agency data may provide new sources of information for future budgetary projections for CSA.

BACKGROUND:

During the past two years of pandemic response, the CSA budget has experienced declining youth counts and expenditures. By many indicators there are children and families who are experiencing behavioral health care challenges who may be involved with child-serving agencies and the schools who may also be eligible for CSA. In addition, many providers are asking for contract rate increases due to the need to offer higher salaries for staff recruitment and retention. DFS is interested in exploring new methods for budget projections for CSA considering existing agency data as leading indicators.

ATTACHMENT: None

STAFF:

Michael Becketts, DFS Director

Janet Bessmer, CSA Director

MEMO TO THE CPMT

June 24, 2022

Information Item I- 3: Update on Private Day Rate Setting

ISSUE: That implementation of rate setting for Private Day special education schools has been postponed to July 1, 2023.

BACKGROUND:

The Office of Children’s Services selected a contractor, Public Consulting Group (PCG), to conduct a study of rates for Private Day programs, in compliance with the Appropriations Act in 2019. The study was inconclusive due to low participation by providers and was continued in 2021. Attached is the summary of their findings which recommended a nine-tier system of rates for these programs. The tiers are based on the teacher to student ratio and teacher aide to student ratio. Programs in Northern Virginia will have a geographic add-on to address higher costs in this region and separate “tiers” for coding in state reporting.

OCS held a training with PCG on June 17, 2022 to inform local government staff, schools and private providers about new requirements for LEDRS reporting to include these tiers. The expectation is that by August 1, 2022 the service name Special Education Day School will be replaced by 19 new codes, one for each tier (NOVA, other regions, and out of state). The state did clarify that out of state programs that already have rate setting will not be required to use the new tiers, or rate setting methodology. In addition, Private Day programs will be expected to complete data about each youth served by locality for submission to OCS for them to use for their fiscal analysis of the impact of rate setting. OCS expressed their intent to use the new service codes and this data to determine projected impact for implementation of the methodology in FY24.

Staff have not had sufficient opportunity to work with private day school providers. Next steps are working with our software vendor to update the system for reporting, finalize contracts with private day providers, and begin attempting to classify current placements into the tier system. Additional training will be offered on June 29th and consultation will be offered by PCG. Staff will provide CPMT with our projected fiscal impact and other implementation concerns.

ATTACHMENT: OCS Administrative Memo – Service Names for Private Day Programs:
Cost Study of Private Day Special Education Programs

STAFF:

Janet Bessmer, CSA Director
Kelly Conn-Reda, FCPS



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

OFFICE OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Administering the Children's Services Act

Scott Reiner, M.S.
Executive Director

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMO #22-03

To: CPMT Chairs, CSA Coordinators, and Report Preparers
From: Preetha Agrawal, Information Technology Director
CC: Scott Reiner, Executive Director
Date: June 2, 2022

Subject: Service Names for Private Day Special Education – Fiscal Year 2023

As a result of the need to develop a fiscal impact analysis for the new standardized rate-setting model for private day special education (per the state budget language awaiting the Governor/s approval), there is a need to make changes to the LEDRS Service Names for this service.

Beginning with purchase orders for the 2022-2023 school year (any purchase orders for services beginning on or after August 1, 2022), the Service Name Private Day School (26) shall no longer be active/accepted. A new set of Service Names and Codes will be issued in conjunction with the upcoming training on the rate-setting process and all Purchase Orders for the new (2022-2023) school year need to be entered after the training is complete. The new coding is being disseminated to the various "front-end" software systems (e.g, Thomas Brothers) so they can add the new codes to their systems.

This issue will be discussed in detail at the upcoming training events so you are strongly encouraged to attend one of those sessions.

NOTE: Under the current budget language, the actual implementation of the new rate structure is delayed until July 1, 2023. You may, therefore, continue to establish your contracts with providers for the upcoming year as the rate-setting process will not be in effect until next year.

Please contact the OCS Office at 804-662-9815 or csa.office@csa.virginia.gov for additional information.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Office of Children's Services

Cost Study of Private Day Special Education Programs

Final Report

Report to the Governor and Chairmen of the House
Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees pursuant to
Item 293 (B) of Chapter 552 of the 2021 Appropriation Act

November 22, 2021

This page intentionally left blank

Authority

This report has been prepared and submitted to fulfill the requirements of Item 293(B) of Chapter 552, the 2021 Appropriation Act. This provision requires the Office of Children's Services (OCS) to contract for the continuation of the study on the current rates paid by localities to special education private day programs licensed by the Virginia Department of Education.

Overview

The Office of Children's Services conducted the initial study on this topic as required by the Appropriation Act in 2019 through a competitive Request for Proposals to solicit a contractor to conduct the study. Public Consulting Group (PCG) was selected as the contractor. Due to an insufficient response rate by the private school providers, OCS was directed to continue the study in 2021. Additional requirements, incentives, and conditions were adopted for the 2021 continuation. OCS again contracted with PCG to continue the study. The remainder of this report reflects the work of PCG and OCS to meet the requirements of the project.

This page intentionally left blank

Continuation of Study on Rates for Private Day Special Education Services

Commonwealth of Virginia
Office of Children's Services

November 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY2
 Themes 2
 Recommendations 2

I. PROJECT GOALS.....4

II. SUMMARIES OF STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS4

III. MODIFICATIONS TO THE COST COLLECTION TOOL6

IV. METHODOLOGY & FINDINGS6
 Cost Collection Process..... 6
 Cost Report Analysis 7
 Operating Expenses 10
 Adjustment Factors..... 11
 Services Included in the Rates 12
 Rate Methodology 13

V. RECOMMENDATIONS15
 Rate Recommendations 15
 AdditionalRecommendations 15

VI. FISCAL IMPACT17

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS18

VIII. APPENDIX A. MODIFICATIONS OF THE COLLECTION TOOL19

IX. APPENDIX B. BASE RATE MODEL BUDGETS20
 1:3 Teacher, 1:1 Teacher Aide Budget..... 20
 1:3 Teacher, 1:2 or 1:3 Teacher Aide Budget..... 21
 1:3 Teacher, 1:4 or More Teacher Aide Budget 22
 1:4 to 1:7 Teacher, 1:1 Teacher Aide Budget..... 23
 1:4 to 1:7 Teacher, 1:2 or 1:3 Teacher Aide Budget 24
 1:4 to 1:7 Teacher, 1:4 or More Teacher Aide Budget 25
 1:8 or more Teacher, 1:1 Teacher Aide Budget 26
 1:8 or more Teacher, 1:2 or 1:3 Teacher Aide Budget 27
 1:8 or more Teacher, 1:4 or More Teacher Aide Budget 28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public Consulting Group LLC (PCG) was contracted by the Commonwealth of Virginia Office of Children's Services (OCS) to continue the study of the current rates paid by localities to private day special education programs licensed by the Virginia Department of Education (DOE) and develop findings and recommendations based on the analysis for these rates. This executive summary condenses the report into the following components: themes and recommendations.

THEMES

The following major themes emerged during the study:

- Private day special education schools serve students with a mix of behavioral, emotional, physical, developmental, and educational needs.
- The number (and salaries) of teachers and teacher aides are the primary, although not exclusive, cost driver for program expenses.
- Services such as occupational and/or physical therapy, speech-language therapy, and psychological testing are billed almost exclusively outside of the daily rate and should remain that way.
- Costs are higher in northern Virginia than the rest of the State.
- The cost collection tools utilized in the previous PCG study (completed in 2019) were too burdensome; cost collection tools utilized by the 2020 Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) study were less burdensome.
- Providers felt that a mix of actual revenue and expenses (FY19) and budgeted rates and staffing levels (FY21 and FY22) on the cost report tool would allow a more accurate picture, particularly in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

With these themes in mind, PCG revised the cost collection tools, analyzed cost and program budget data, and developed the recommendations below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools reported their FY21 rates along with the staffing levels associated with each rate. The majority (65%) reported having a program model with a ratio of one teacher to eight or higher students. For teacher aides (known by various titles in different programs), most (44%) reported having a model with one teacher aide to every four or more students in a classroom. The table below shows the number of programs reported by staffing ratio. The table does not indicate how many students are served at each level.

Program Staffing Matrix		Teacher Aide to Student Ratio		
		1:1	1:2 or 1:3	1:4 or more
Teacher to Student Ratio	1:3 or lower	1 (0.9%)	3 (2.5%)	3 (2.5%)
	1:4, 1:5, 1:6, 1:7	4 (3.4%)	10 (8.5%)	19 (16.1%)
	1:8 or higher	24 (20.3%)	24 (20.3%)	30 (25.4%)

PCG created nine (9) base rate models using three different teacher to student ratios, each with three different teacher aide to student ratios. These models allow for a range of programs to meet student needs and mirror the programs currently being utilized. A 23% salary add-on is proposed for programs in northern Virginia to account for a higher cost of living in those areas. The Northern Virginia (NOVA) geographic area was identified using the geographic area and pay band differential guidance issued by the Virginia Department of Human Resource Management for Northern Virginia. PCG recommends the rates in the following table based on the methodologies and calculations described in this report.

Model	Teacher to Student Ratio	Teacher Aide to Student Ratio	Base Rate	Northern Virginia (NOVA) Add-On*
1	1:3	1:1	\$503.12	\$96.95
2	1:3	1:2 to 1:3	\$341.70	\$62.83
3	1:3	1:4+	\$301.34	\$54.30
4	1:4 to 1:7	1:1	\$448.72	\$85.39
5	1:4 to 1:7	1:2 to 1:3	\$287.29	\$51.27
6	1:4 to 1:7	1:4+	\$246.95	\$42.74
7	1:8+	1:1	\$418.11	\$78.88
8	1:8+	1:2 to 1:3	\$256.70	\$44.76
9	1:8+	1:4+	\$216.34	\$36.23

*Northern Virginia (NOVA) geographic add-on (23% increase based on staff costs) was calculated for schools in the counties of: Fairfax, Arlington, Prince William, and Loudon and the cities of: Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park

I. PROJECT GOALS

This project was authorized to continue the study of the current rates paid by localities to private day special education programs licensed by the Virginia Department of Education (DOE) and funded through the Children’s Services Act (CSA) and to “... (i) provide definitions and clear delineation between all staff and positions used by private day schools and assessed in the study; (ii) define which staff positions can be included in the classroom staff ratio assessment; (iii) assess all costs associated with regulatory licensing; and (iv) require providers to report costs and distinguish between different locations.” (2021 Virginia Appropriation Act, Chapter 552.Item 293. B.)

Specific goals included:

- Standardize the rate methodology while also meeting the needs of a diverse range of students.
- Account for geographic differences in cost.
- Create a transparent, replicable, and implementable methodology.

The project consisted of two phases:



Phase I consisted of:

- Determining priorities for OCS and other stakeholders.
- Designing cost collection tools and data collection methodology.

Phase II consisted of:

- Collecting and analyzing data.
- Developing the rate methodology and final report, including recommended rates for private day special education schools.

II. SUMMARIES OF STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

PCG and OCS identified a voluntary and representative Provider Advisory Council (the Advisory Council) to meet monthly for the purpose of providing guidance and input to the project team throughout the rate setting study process.

Throughout the data collection process, PCG invited all private day school providers to participate in focus groups and held meetings with the Advisory Council, and other community partners, to discuss key issues to consider in the rate methodology. The table below lists all such meetings.

Meeting Date	Engagement Type	Summary
March 23, 2021	Advisory Council Kick Off	Introduced the project teams and collected initial feedback on prior rate study
April 15, 2021	Advisory Council Meeting	Reviewed model rate structure and cost collection tool
May 14, 2021	Advisory Council Meeting	Responded to cost collection tool feedback and timeline review
June 2, 2021	Data Collection Tool Training	All providers were invited to a training on how to complete and submit the cost collection tool
July 15, 2021	Advisory Council Meeting	Discussed cost collection tool submissions and introduced focus group topics
August 17, 2021	Focus Group	Collected input on elements of a program and costs
August 18, 2021	Focus Group	Collected input on program staffing
August 23, 2021	Focus Group	Collected input on rates of service
October 13, 2021	Advisory Council Meeting	Collected input on draft rate model structure
October 21, 2021	VAISEF Virtual Fall Conference & Membership Meeting	Reviewed draft proposed new model rate structure

Below is a summary of recurring themes gathered during stakeholder sessions.

CURRENT RATES: The current rates contain a variety of services, staffing arrangements, and programs offer varying numbers of student days per year. Staff is the most significant, but not the only cost driver. Services such as speech-language, occupational, and physical therapy are generally covered outside of the daily rate.

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT NEED: Schools must meet the needs of a diverse range of students and the overwhelming concern was that a standardized methodology would hinder the ability of schools to do that. Tiered rate options were discussed, and schools noted some concerns with implementing a tiered model equitably and being able to move children through tiers as needed.

COVID-19: Cost shifts in response to environmental factors, especially considering COVID-19 infrastructure requirements, improvements in technologies, curriculum development, and staffing issues/shortages.

GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS: The cost of living is higher in northern Virginia than the rest of the state and this should be accounted for in the rates.

COST COLLECTION: The cost collection tools utilized in the previous PCG study were too burdensome; cost collection tools utilized by the recent Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) study were less burdensome. Also, cost collection tools were not able to capture unmet needs that could not be addressed due to lack of funds.

III. MODIFICATIONS TO THE COST COLLECTION TOOL

A primary goal of this rate study process was to gather as much feedback and data from schools as possible. The project team prioritized the first few months of the project timeline developing a simplified cost collection tool to increase response rates. The PCG team incorporated feedback from the Advisory Council to tailor the data collection tool to the needs of this study and better align it with previously completed data collection reports (i.e., the JLARC report).

A full summary of modifications made to the data collection tools from the 2019 rate setting study can be found in [Appendix A](#). Below are highlights.

- The detailed personnel roster data collection tool was eliminated entirely, instead utilizing one cost collection tool that required less detail.
- For ease of reporting, the format of the report was aligned with the JLARC study where possible, especially in the staffing questions.
- Schools were asked to complete a cost report for each location, to meet the legislative study requirements and so geographic differences in costs could be evaluated.
- Expenses were collected from FY19 (last full year prior to the COVID-19 disruptions).
- Additional sheets were added to the cost report to collect staffing rates, types of staff, number of students, and services included in the rates for each program's rates in FY21 and FY22.
- An additional comment section was added to capture issues unmet by the above modifications and information outside of the cost report.

IV. METHODOLOGY & FINDINGS

COST COLLECTION PROCESS

Public Consulting Group sent a letter to all DOE-licensed private day special education programs which included the expectations and plan for the rate setting effort. PCG provided all schools with the cost collection tool and instructions for how to provide their cost information on June 1, 2021. A virtual training session was held on June 2, 2021, to discuss how to complete the cost collection tool. Schools were "walked through" the instructions and the PCG team answered any questions about the data collection tool. The training was recorded, and the recording was provided to schools along with written instructions for how to complete the cost reports. Schools were able to ask questions to the PCG team by email anytime or by phone during designated office hours. Office hours were held twice each week throughout the cost collection period from Wednesday, June 2, 2021, through Friday, July 23, 2021.

Cost Collection Activities	Date(s):
Data Collection Tool Distribution and Posting	June 1, 2021
Data Collection Tool Training	June 2, 2021
Data Collection Tool Return to PCG by email	July 30, 2021

Each report underwent a quality assurance process upon submission. Reports were reviewed to ensure that the data provided for each field of the cost collection tool aligned with the instructions. Questions about specific cost information provided were sent back to the school contact to ensure that the cost collection tool captured the data in a uniform manner, allowing cost data to be analyzed across the different programs. Once all outstanding questions were answered and numerical discrepancies updated, the school's cost collection report was validated for use in the rate analysis.

COST REPORT ANALYSIS

PCG collected and validated cost report data from 64 (of 93 or 69%) licensed private day schools. Schools ranged in size from four students to 200 students (Table 1). Data were collected for three school years, FY19 (actual revenue and expenses), FY21 (budgeted costs) and FY22 (projected budgeted costs). However, all three years of data were not available and/or submitted for all 64 schools that submitted cost reports. Below shows a breakdown of the information obtained.

Table 1: Cost Report Data by Year

Submitted Cost Report	FY19 Revenue and Expenses	FY21 Budgets	FY22 Projected Budgets
64	47 (73%)	62 (97%)	36 (56%)

The cost report data was analyzed using the below methods:

Data Quality Analysis: Individual cost reports were reviewed, then combined. After combining all cost report data, a second layer of analysis was completed to identify outliers from the combined data. After consultation with OCS, the outliers were addressed for consistency measures.

Fiscal Years of Data: 97% of the submitted cost reports included budgeted costs and staffing for FY21 (note that FY22 budgeted costs were optional to submit). Because of the high response rate, FY21 data was used to identify common staffing patterns, services included in the daily rates, and for the fiscal impact analysis. FY19 expenses were used as the basis for costs in the rate models (with a cost adjustment factor for annualized "inflation" applied).

Personnel

The expenditure analysis revealed that teacher salaries accounted for 29% of school expenses and teacher aide salaries accounted for 23%, overall accounting for more than half of all expenses; pointing to teacher and teacher aide salaries being key cost drivers for the programs. Due to the impact that teacher and teacher aide salaries had on expenses, PCG analyzed the programmatic teacher and teacher aide structure of the reporting schools. Schools reported the teacher to student ratio and the teacher aide to student ratio for each of their existing daily rates. Each tier of daily rates reported for the FY21 school year was plotted in a matrix to identify the most common program structures. Programs were aggregated into groupings of staffing levels to increase the number of programs within each group (Table 2). One-to-one teacher aide to student ratios was retained for each teacher to student ratio to account for when an IEP dictates this staffing level. Most programs had a 1:8 or more teacher to student ratio (66.0%) compared to 1:3 teacher to student ratio (5.9%) and the combined 1:4- 1:7 teacher to student ratios (28.0%). Similarly, more programs reported having a 1:4 or more teacher aide to student staffing ratio (44.0%) compared to the lower ratios.

Table 2: Program Staffing Matrix		Teacher Aide to Student Ratio		
		1:1	1:2 or 1:3	1:4 or more
Teacher to Student Ratio	1:3 or Fewer	0.9%	2.5%	2.5%
	1:4, 1:5, 1:6, 1:7	3.4%	8.5%	16.1%
	1:8 or more	20.3%	20.3%	25.4%

Nine base models were developed using three different teacher to student ratios, each with three different teacher aide to student ratios. These models allow schools to provide intensive 1:1 services at a variety of teacher to student intensities and receive a higher rate to cover the additional costs of more intensive staffing configurations. Base rate models include 1:3 teacher to student, 1:4 - 1:7 teacher to student, and 1:8 or higher teacher to student ratios (Table 3). Teacher aide to student ratios were broken down as 1:1, 1:2 or 1:3, and 1:4 or more. Since models covered more than one teacher to student and teacher aide to student ratio, staffing costs used to create the daily rates were calculated using 3, 5, and 8 for teachers and 1, 2.5, and 4 for teacher aides (average for the model).

Table 3: Staffing Model Ratios

Model	Teacher Ratio	Teacher Aide Ratio	Teacher to Student Ratio used for Cost Calculations	Teacher Aide to Student Ratio used for Cost Calculations
1	1:3	1:1	3	1
2	1:3	1:2 to 1:3	3	2.5
3	1:3	1:4+	3	4
4	1:4 to 1:7	1:1	5	1
5	1:4 to 1:7	1:2 to 1:3	5	2.5
6	1:4 to 1:7	1:4+	5	4
7	1:8+	1:1	8	1
8	1:8+	1:2 to 1:3	8	2.5
9	1:8+	1:4+	8	4

Table 4: Staff to Student Ratios (Other Personnel)

Program Personnel Salaries	FTE to Student Ratio	FTE per student
Administrators	1: 50	0.020
Other Direct Student Support Staff (Bachelors)	1: 50	0.020
Other Direct Student Support Staff (Masters)	1: 25	0.040
Medical Staff	1: 25	0.040
Trade Staff	1: 60	0.017

Other staff included in the rate model are school administrators, other direct student support staff (with and without a master's degree), medical staff, and trade staff. These positions were found to be tied to student capacity at a school and did not need to be altered based on the intensity of the model. Therefore, staffing ratios and costs for these positions were the same across all models. Schools were allocated one FTE per 50 students for school administrators and direct student support staff with a bachelor's degree, additional staff was allocated for direct student support staff with a master's degree and medical staff one FTE per 25 students, and trade staff were calculated at one FTE per 60 students (Table 4). To calculate the per student per day cost, the FTE per student was calculated for each position.

Based on feedback from the focus groups, schools consider different numbers of annual work hours to be defined as full-time. To standardize staffing costs across programs, PCG calculated per hour pay for all staff positions using the total expense per position, the number of full-time equivalents reported for each position and the number of hours worked using the FY19 school year data. All hourly salaries that were below the 2022 Virginia minimum wage were increased to \$11 an hour. Outlier costs were identified for each staff position by flagging any hourly wage that was two or more

standard deviations from the mean within each staffing type. Outliers were removed from the analysis and accounted for no more than three responses for any specific staff position. PCG compiled the hourly wage data (after the outliers were removed and salaries below minimum wage were increased), and calculated the average hourly pay for each reported position: school administrators, teachers, teacher aides, other direct student support staff with a bachelor's degree, other direct student support staff with a master's degree, medical staff, and trade staff. Since an add-on cost was developed for schools located in the Northern Virginia region and in the focus groups stakeholders voiced that this region had higher salary costs, staff salaries from those schools identified as located in Northern Virginia were removed from the calculation. The salary differential for Northern Virginia will be captured in a regional add-on cost that Northern Virginia schools can apply.

Administrators were the highest paid positions making on average \$32.48 per hour, while teacher aides had the lowest average wages, \$16.75 per hour (Table 5). Teachers and other direct student support staff with a master's degree made similar amounts per hour (\$25.55 and \$27.69, respectively). Based on the cost reports, teacher salaries were built into the rate calculations at an average annual salary of \$53,144. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the national mean salary for special education teachers ranged from \$48,530 to \$52,680 depending on the grade level in 2019. The salary proposed in the

models is slightly higher than this. Looking specifically at Virginia, the Department of Education reported in 2019 the average wage for special education teachers across the state was \$57,146, which is slightly higher than the base salary proposed in the models. However, when computing the weighted average of the salaries for the new models using the additional salary increase for schools in Northern Virginia, the weighted average wage is \$56,094.41, which is very close to the DOE-reported average.

Table 5: Hourly Wage by Position

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage
Administrators	\$34.48
Teachers	\$25.55
Teacher Aides	\$16.75
Other Direct Student Support (Bachelors)	\$21.22
Other Direct Student Support (Masters)	\$27.69
Medical Staff	\$21.92
Trade Staff	\$19.16

A staffing relief factor provides schools with additional funds to cover costs incurred when teachers and teacher aides are on vacation or sick leave. These monies can be used to pay for substitute teachers or aides. In consultation with OCS, a relief factor of 3.85% was calculated based on 80 hours per year of time-off per teacher and teacher aide FTE. The relief factor was applied to the salary costs for these two positions. Using the nine base models that were created, the number of relief FTEs were calculated to determine the cost associated with the relief factor. Teacher relief FTEs ranged from 0.770 to 0.289, while aides ranged from 2.31 to 0.578 (Table 6).

Table 6: Teacher and Teacher Aide Relief FTEs for Base Rate Models

Model	Teacher to Student Ratio	Teacher Aide to Student Ratio	Number of Relief Teacher FTE's	Number of Relief Teacher Aide FTE's
1	1:3	1:1	0.770	2.31
2	1:3	1 :2 to 1: 3	0.770	0.924
3	1:3	1: 4+	0.770	0.578
4	1:4 to 1:7	1:1	0.462	2.31
5	1:4 to 1:7	1: 2 to 1:3	0.462	0.924
6	1:4 to 1:7	1:4+	0.462	0.578
7	1:8+	1:1	0.289	2.31
8	1:8+	1:2 to 1:3	0.289	0.924
9	1:8+	1:4+	0.289	0.578

Information about fringe benefits was collected in two areas in the cost report. Programs were asked to provide their required fringe benefit costs as well as the costs of any optional benefits they provide to staff. These two types of benefits were added together for each program and the average was taken. The results showed a lower percentage of fringe benefits to salary expenses than were expected, 16.5% of the personnel costs. Therefore, a more robust 23% was applied for fringe benefits based on knowledge PCG has from similar rate studies, most tax and fringe rates used in other PCG methodologies range between 20-30%.

Operating Expenses

Operating costs were similarly analyzed for outliers. Expenses were calculated for each item (i.e., travel, vehicles, occupancy/facility costs, student technology, classroom supplies, program equipment, insurance, translation/interpretation services, and other costs) as per student per day costs. The total expenditure for each item was divided by the total number of student days served. Teacher training was the exception, which was calculated as the cost per teacher and teacher aide FTE. The average cost for each item across all programs was calculated and outliers were identified to be those costs that were two standard deviations above or below the mean. No more than four outlier responses were removed from any cost category.

Teacher training expenses averaged to be \$754.36 per teacher and teacher aide FTE. Since training expenses are tied to staffing levels, these expenses are different across all nine models in the per student per day cost. The most expensive cost is \$5.59 per student per day, while the least expensive is only \$1.57 per student per day and corresponds to the intensity of the program (Table 7). All other per student per day operating costs remain the same across all models.

Among the other operating costs, the most expensive per student per day cost was associated with occupancy or facility payments, \$24.51. The remaining costs were each under \$5.50 per student per day (Table 8).

Table 7: Training Costs per Student for each Base Model

Model	Teacher to Student Ratio	Teacher Aide to Student Ratio	Cost Per Student Per Day
1	1:3	1:1	\$5.59
2	1:3	1 :2 to 1: 3	\$3.07
3	1:3	1: 4+	\$2.44
4	1:4 to 1:7	1:1	\$5.03
5	1:4 to 1:7	1: 2 to 1:3	\$2.51
6	1:4 to 1:7	1:4+	\$1.89
7	1:8+	1:1	\$4.71
8	1:8+	1:2 to 1:3	\$2.20
9	1:8+	1:4+	\$1.57

Table 8: Operating Expenses per Student per Day

Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day Cost
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$ 0.67
Vehicle Expenses	\$ 1.22
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51
Student Technology	\$ 1.19
Classroom Supplies	\$ 3.61
Program Equipment	\$ 1.94
Insurance	\$ 2.54
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$ 2.25
Other Costs	\$ 5.16

Adjustment Factors

Programmatic costs were collected from schools to reflect the expenses incurred during the FY19 school year. Since budget models were created to reflect costs in 2022, a cost adjustment factor was calculated. The cost adjustment factor (CAF) was determined using the most recent Consumer Price Index (CPI) data published for Virginia and the surrounding area by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. CPI data for all items was used for the CAF data. The percent difference in the costs in 2019 compared to 2022 was calculated to be about 6.85%. Therefore, an additional 7% of all budget costs was added into the daily rates for the cost adjustments that occurred between 2019 - 2022.

Focus group responses and Advisory Council members indicated that staff costs were not uniform across the state of Virginia. This differentiation is also recognized in the State pay band differential. Therefore, PCG identified the region in Northern Virginia in accordance with the State of Virginia pay differential. The Northern Virginia region includes the counties of Fairfax, Arlington, Prince William, and Loudon, and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park. The average staff salary for each position was calculated for the Northern Virginia schools and for the schools in the rest of the state. The percent difference was identified for each position. An average of the percent differences was taken to identify a 23% salary add-on for schools located in the Northern Virginia region. The calculated geographic increase was compared to the geographic pay band differential used by the Virginia Department of Human Resource Management for Northern Virginia compared to the rest of the state. The average wage differential across all pay bands between Northern Virginia and the rest of the state was found to be 24%, which was almost identical to the difference calculated using program cost data. To remain in line with the other model measures, it was decided to use the differential calculated from the program costs. The 23% salary add on was applied to each of the models to create nine different geographic add-ons each tied to a corresponding base rate (Table 9). Models that are more staff intensive receive a higher add on cost.

Table 9: Northern Virginia (NOVA) Add-On to Base Models

Model	Teacher Ratio	Teacher Aide Ratio	Northern Virginia (NOVA) Add On
1	1:3	1:1	\$96.95
2	1:3	1 :2 to 1: 3	\$62.83
3	1:3	1: 4+	\$54.30
4	1:4 to 1:7	1:1	\$85.39
5	1:4 to 1:7	1: 2 to 1:3	\$51.27
6	1:4 to 1:7	1:4+	\$42.74
7	1:8+	1:1	\$78.88
8	1:8+	1:2 to 1:3	\$44.76
9	1:8+	1:4+	\$36.23

Services Included in the Rates

Programs were asked to indicate which services were included in each of their daily rates. Using the FY21 school year information, schools most often included IEP case management and counseling/behavioral therapy services in their daily rates (Table 10). Very few programs included services such as speech and occupational therapy or physical therapy in their daily rates. About a quarter of the schools include nurses; many included therapeutic services, and Career and Technical Education (CTE).

Table 10: Positions Included in Program Daily Rates

Position	Percent of Daily Rates with the Service Included
IEP Case Management	85%
Career & Technical Education / Vocational	60%
Counseling / Social Work / Psychotherapy	45%
Intensive Behavior Therapy	45%
ABA Therapy	43%
One-to-One Classroom Aide	41%
Other	35%
School Nursing	24%
One-to-One (Non-classroom Aide)	6%
Occupational and/or Physical Therapy	3%
Speech-Language	3%
Psychological Testing	2%
Extended School Day (ESD)	2%

Since speech-language services, occupational and/or physical therapy, and psychological testing were not generally assumed in the staffing models, it is expected that these costs are (and will continue to) be billed outside of the daily rate. Other services are assumed to be covered in the proposed rates, since their costs were reflected in the cost reports.

RATE METHODOLOGY

Table 12 below shows an example of the overall rate methodology utilized. The Table shows a draft budget for a school with 60 students with a 1:8 teacher to student and 1:2 or 1:3 teacher aide to student classroom.

**Table 12: Example Budget
60 Students in a 1:8 Teacher to Student and 1:2 Teacher Aide to Student Classroom**

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	7.50	2080	\$398,580.00
Teacher Aids	\$16.75	24.00	2080	\$836,160.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.29	2080	\$15,345.33
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	0.92	2080	\$32,192.16

Tax and Fringe Benefits	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$393,026.44

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$2.20	31.50	\$754.36	\$23,762.34
Travel Expenses (i.e., mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy / Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$181,367.83
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$1,708,810.61
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$393,026.44
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$489,134.34
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$181,367.83

Grand Total	\$2,772,339.22
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$256.70
-------------------------------------	-----------------

Using the same methodology as above, the remaining daily rates were calculated to capture varying levels of instructional staffing. Across all rates, the variable costs were associated with the number of teacher and teacher aides. This variance impacted the number of FTEs for those positions resulting in differences in costs associated with teacher and teacher aide salary, relief, and training expenses. While the CAF was applied universally at 7%, the dollar amount that it added to each daily rate varied based on the staffing costs (salary, fringe benefits, and training) and was driven by the teacher and teacher aide FTEs. This resulted in nine base rates that range from \$503.12 to \$216.34, prior to application of a Northern Virginia (NOVA) geographic add-on (Table 13).

Table 13: Model Base Rates and Geography Add On Rates

Model	Teacher Ratio	Teacher Aide Ratio	Base Rate	Northern Virginia (NOVA) Add On*
1	1:3	1:1	\$503.12	\$96.95
2	1:3	1 :2 to 1: 3	\$341.70	\$62.83
3	1:3	1: 4+	\$301.34	\$54.30
4	1:4 to 1:7	1:1	\$448.72	\$85.39
5	1:4 to 1:7	1: 2 to 1:3	\$287.29	\$51.27
6	1:4 to 1:7	1:4+	\$246.95	\$42.74
7	1:8+	1:1	\$418.11	\$78.88
8	1:8+	1:2 to 1:3	\$256.70	\$44.76
9	1:8+	1:4+	\$216.34	\$36.23

*Northern Virginia (NOVA) add on (23% increase based on staff costs) was calculated for schools in the counties of Fairfax, Arlington, Prince William and Loudon and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

RATE RECOMMENDATIONS

PCG recommends the following daily rates for private day special education schools in VA.

Model	Teacher to Student Ratio	Teacher Aide to Student Ratio	Base Rate	Northern Virginia (NOVA) Add On*
1	1:3	1:1	\$503.12	\$96.95
2	1:3	1 :2 to 1: 3	\$341.70	\$62.83
3	1:3	1: 4+	\$301.34	\$54.30
4	1:4 to 1:7	1:1	\$448.72	\$85.39
5	1:4 to 1:7	1: 2 to 1:3	\$287.29	\$51.27
6	1:4 to 1:7	1:4+	\$246.95	\$42.74
7	1:8+	1:1	\$418.11	\$78.88
8	1:8+	1:2 to 1:3	\$256.70	\$44.76
9	1:8+	1:4+	\$216.34	\$36.23

*Northern Virginia (NOVA) add on (23% increase based on staff costs) was calculated for schools in the counties of Fairfax, Arlington, Prince William and Loudon and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park

PCG makes these recommendations based on the preceding sections and reasons detailed below.

- **Rate Study Results:** The models are based on a consistent, objective, and reasonable methodology that uses school data to determine the actual cost of services and are driven by staffing ratios.
- **Stakeholder Feedback:** While it was not always possible for stakeholders to agree on every element of the model budgets or the rates themselves, these rates were developed with significant stakeholder feedback both from this cost study process and the previous VA OCS rate study engagement.
- **Alignment with Program Goals:** The recommended rates align with program goals, realistically reflect actual provider staffing levels and expenses, are more transparent, and allow for program changes and future updates to the rates as the programs evolve.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Annual Cost Adjustment:

Rates should be updated to account for inflation on an annual basis. The rates should also be updated to account for any new statutory mandates, such as minimum wage increases.

2. Implementation Standards and Monitoring

PCG recommends that VA OCS work with schools and local CSA offices to develop an implementation plan and approach. The application of the rate payments will need to be consistent with student's needs and growth. The bullets below describe important factors for VA OCS to consider during the implementation of the new rates.

- **Application of the new Rates:** Guidance needs to be developed for schools and CSA programs regarding how to select the appropriate rate to bill, how and when rates should be adjusted, and how extraordinary circumstances will be addressed.
- **Periodic Cost Collection:** Periodic cost collection, approximately every three to five years, would allow VA OCS to better understand and monitor the adequacy of the rates. This would allow OCS, local CSA programs, and other interested parties (e.g., legislative budget Committee members and staff, the Department of Planning and Budget) to monitor provider expenditures and staffing levels relative to contractual and staffing ratio requirements.

3. Stakeholder Engagement

PCG recommends VA OCS continue to engage with the Advisory Committee assembled during this process through the implementation and monitoring of the established rates. The group of private school stakeholders provided critical feedback which directly impacted the final recommended rates.

4. **Extended School Year:** The recommended daily rates are calculated based on a 180-day calendar. If a school plans to operate an extended school year, VA OCS will need to determine if the daily rate may remain the same or change during the extended school year period. This determination should be based on whether the same services or a lower level of services are being provided. If a lower level of service offerings are provided, then a reduced rate should be determined.

VI. FISCAL IMPACT

The overall average impact of implementing the rates proposed in this study would result in an approximate 4% increase from the reported FY21 rates using a weighted average assumption. It is important to note, since it is not possible to determine how many students would fall into each model under the proposed rate structure, that a specific overall fiscal impact is undetermined at this time.

PCG estimated the fiscal impact of the proposed rate structure by looking at the reported FY21 daily rates for each program and comparing those to the average proposed new rate, using a weighted average based on the number of student days served in FY19. In addition to comparing the budget rates for FY21, PCG also mapped the teacher and teacher aide ratios for each tier to the new model rates. Below are four examples of schools that had varying daily rates in FY21. *Note: All FY21 daily rates are examples and do not represent any actual school.* In applying this method, if schools had two different daily rates in FY21 that mapped to the same new daily rate (School Example 2 and 3), PCG kept the tiers separate when calculating the school average daily rate to account for the likelihood there would be more students within those rates.

School 1 Example	New Rates	FY21 Example Daily Rate	Percentage of Program Allocated
1:3 Teacher / 1:2 Teacher Aide	\$341.70	\$328.17	33.3%
1:8 Teacher / 1:4 Teacher Aide	\$216.34	\$197.25	33.3%
1:4 Teacher / 1:1 Teacher Aide	\$448.72	\$427.48	33.3%
School Average Rate	\$335.59	\$317.63	

School 2 Example	New Rates	FY21 Example Daily Rate	Percentage of Program Allocated
1:3 Teacher / 1:2 Teacher Aide	\$341.70	\$320.54	33.3%
1:7 Teacher / 1:4 Teacher Aide	\$246.95	\$225.19	33.3%
1:4 Teacher / 1:5 Teacher Aide	\$246.95	\$246.46	33.3%
School Average Rate	\$278.53	\$264.06	

School 3 Example	New Rates	FY21 Example Daily Rate	Percentage of Program Allocated
1:7 Teacher / 1:4 Teacher Aide	\$246.95	\$219.67	50.0%
1:4 Teacher / 1:5 Teacher Aide	\$246.95	\$220.41	50.0%
School Average Rate	\$246.95	\$220.04	

School 4 Example	New Rates	FY21 Example Daily Rate	Percentage of Program Allocated
1:3 Teacher / 1:2 Teacher Aide	\$341.70	\$317.15	100.0%
School Average Rate	\$341.70	\$317.15	

PCG used the average school daily rates from FY21 and the average new rates to calculate a weighted average daily rate for the year. Using this method, it is important to note that the average daily rate accounted for larger schools serving more students and ultimately representing a larger percentage of the annual costs.

PCG used the number of FY19 student days served from the cost reports to calculate a percentage of annual school days that each school contributed (*Note: This information was not available for FY21*). For example, School 1 has 16,075 school days served accounting for 43% of all school days served in FY19. School 1 drives more of the annual costs than School 4 which only contributes 6% of the daily rate payments each year. PCG multiplied the weighted percent of student days by the average school daily rate to find the school cost it contributes to the average annual daily rate. The contribution costs were

added across all four example schools to find the average annual daily rate. PCG applied the same methodology to compare with the new daily rates.

School Examples	Total Annual Student Days Served by Program	Weighted Percent of Total Student Days Served by Program (<i>Annual Student Days Served/Total Annual Student Days Served for All Program Schools</i>)	Contribution to the Average Annual Average Daily Rate (<i>Average Program New Rate x Weighted Percentage of Student Days Served by Program</i>)	Averages of FY21 Example School Rates (<i>Average Program FY21 School Example Rate x Weighted Percentage of Student Days Served by Program</i>)
School 1 Example	16,075	43%	\$145.07	\$137.31
School 2 Example	8,657	23%	\$64.85	\$61.48
School 3 Example	10,338	28%	\$68.66	\$61.17
School 4 Example	2,115	6%	\$19.44	\$18.04
Total for All Programs	37,185	100%	\$298.01	\$278.00

PCG found that the estimated weighted average annual daily rate for FY21 was \$278.00 across all programs, and for the new model average, which included the Northern Virginia (NOVA) geographic 23% rate differential, was \$298.01, an increase of 3.96% overall. These calculations assume that schools have equal numbers of students in each daily rate and therefore are only estimates of the impact of the new rates.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Public Consulting Group would like to thank the many individuals and agencies that contributed to this report. PCG greatly appreciates the time and effort invested towards this project. Also, thanks to the Advisory Council, that provided invaluable input, as well as all the schools that participated in submitting data.

Rate Study Advisory Council	
Member & Title	Organization
Beth Ackerman, CEO	Rivermont Schools
Kyle Averill, Director & Principal	The Kellar School
William Elwood	VAISEF
Rich Von Gersdorff, Vice President of Operations & CFO	Youth for Tomorrow
Ed Gillaspie, Director of Finance & Administration	Virginia Institute of Autism
Vanessa Lane	Grafton
Chuck Longerbeam, Education Coordinator	Elk Hill
Lori Perez	Youth for Tomorrow
Robyn Puryear, Vice President of Educational Services	KEYS Academy
Beth Putnam, Director of Education	The Hughes Educational Center
Nancy Toscano, COO	Charterhouse School
Terri Webber, Director of Education	Minnick Schools

VIII. APPENDIX A. MODIFICATIONS TO THE COST COLLECTION TOOL

An overview of the modifications to the cost collection tool from the 2019 study are listed below.

- PCG simplified the cost collection tool from two surveys to one. The level of detail requested was also decreased to allow schools to provide their information in a less granular level.
- The format of the report was aligned with the JLARC study, especially in the staffing questions, so schools could utilize their previous reporting materials.
- Schools were asked to report separately on individual locations and/or programs. For example, if a school operates four different program locations, they were asked to submit four individual cost reports.
- The cost report asked for more information about factors associated with school and cost differentiators:
 - Staffing, including which kind of staff.
 - How many students.
 - Program model assumptions built into budget.
- The staffing questions were streamlined into an array of staff categories, instead of asking schools to list each program staff. The following staffing categories below were combined into one line-item:
 - Counseling / Social Work / Psychotherapy
 - Occupational Therapy (OT) / Physical Therapy (PT)
- All expenses, school and indirect data was collected from FY19 (full year prior to COVID – not including virtual rates).
 - A line for student technology was added to school expenses.
- Additional category questions about school's Daily Rates were added:
 - Based on current year's budget expenditures.
 - Asked for a percentage of students receiving level or service.
 - Provided option for 7/1/21 – 6/30/22 but still requiring 7/1/20 – 6/30/21.
- Added question to the FY22 tab: "Are you budgeting for anything in FY22 related to the COVID-19 pandemic?" which included an open textbox.
- Added question: "Are there any expenses anticipated that are above and beyond what they've included in this cost report? For example, capital improvement costs."

IX. APPENDIX B. BASE RATE MODEL BUDGETS

PCG used 60 students as the basis for calculation of the nine base model example budgets. The daily rate at the end of each model is the per student per day cost and will be the same regardless of the number of students in the models.

1:3 TEACHER, 1:1 TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	20.00	2080	\$1,062,880.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	60.00	2080	\$2,090,400.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.77	2080	\$40,920.88
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	2.31	2080	\$80,480.40

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$851,279.31

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$5.59	80.00	\$754.36	\$60,348.80
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$355,476.64
------------------------------	--------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$3,701,214.40
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$851,279.31
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$525,744.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$355,476.64

Grand Total	\$5,433,714.35
-------------	----------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$503.12
------------------------------	----------

1:3 TEACHER, 1:2 OR 1:3 TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	20.00	2080	\$1,062,880.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	24.00	2080	\$836,160.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.77	2080	\$40,920.88
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	0.924	2080	\$32,192.16

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$551,697.82

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$3.07	44.00	\$754.36	\$33,191.84
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$241,423.84
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$2,398,686.16
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$551,697.82
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$498,528.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$241,423.84

Grand Total	\$3,690,335.82
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$341.70
-------------------------------------	-----------------

1:3 TEACHER, 1:4 OR MORE TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	20.00	2080	\$1,062,880.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	15.00	2080	\$522,600.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.77	2080	\$40,920.88
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	0.5775	2080	\$20,120.10

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$476,802.44

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$2.44	35.00	\$754.36	\$26,402.60
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$212,910.64
-------------------------------------	--------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$2,073,054.10
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$476,802.44
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$491,724.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$212,910.64

Grand Total	\$3,254,491.18
--------------------	----------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$301.34
-------------------------------------	----------

1:4 TO 1:7 TEACHER, 1:1 TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	12.00	2080	\$637,728.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	60.00	2080	\$2,090,400.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.462	2080	\$24,552.53
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	2.31	2080	\$80,480.40

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$749,729.63

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$5.03	72.00	\$754.36	\$54,313.92
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$317,038.38
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$3259694.05
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$749,729.63
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$519,696.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$317,038.38

Grand Total	\$4,846,158.06
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$448.72
-------------------------------------	-----------------

1:4 TO 1:7 TEACHER, 1:2 OR 1:3 TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	12.00	2080	\$637,728.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	24.00	2080	\$836,160.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.462	2080	\$24,552.53
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	0.924	2080	\$32,192.16

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$450,148.14

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$2.51	36.00	\$754.36	\$27,156.96
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$202,985.58
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$1,957,165.81
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$450,148.14
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$492,480.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$202,985.58

Grand Total	\$3,102,779.53
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$287.29
-------------------------------------	-----------------

1:4 TO 1:7 TEACHER, 1:4 OR MORE TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	12.00	2080	\$637,728.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	15.00	2080	\$522,600.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.4620	2080	\$24,552.53
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	0.5775	2080	\$20,120.10

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$375,252.76

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$1.89	27.00	\$754.36	\$20,367.72
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$317,038.38
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$1,631,533.75
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$375,252.76
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$485,784.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$174,479.94

Grand Total	\$2,667,050.45
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$246.95
-------------------------------------	-----------------

1:8 OR MORE TEACHER, 1:1 TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	7.50	2080	\$398,580.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	60.00	2080	\$2,090,400.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.28875	2080	\$15,345.33
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	2.310	2080	\$80,480.40

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$692,607.94

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$4.71	67.50	\$754.36	\$50,919.30
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$295,413.08
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$3,011,338.85
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$692,607.94
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$516,240.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$295,413.08

Grand Total	\$4,515,599.87
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate <u>per</u> Student	\$418.11
--	-----------------

1:8 OR MORE TEACHER, 1:2 OR 1:3 TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	7.50	2080	\$398,580.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	24.00	2080	\$836,160.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.28875	2080	\$15,345.33
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	0.924	2080	\$32,192.16

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$393,026.44

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$2.20	31.50	\$754.36	\$23,762.34
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$181,367.83
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$1,708,810.61
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$393,026.44
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$489,132.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$181,367.83

Grand Total	\$2,772,336.88
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$256.70
-------------------------------------	-----------------

1:8 OR MORE TEACHER, 1:4 OR MORE TEACHER AIDE BUDGET

Program Personnel Salaries	Hourly Wage	FTE	Full Time Hours	Expense
Administrators	\$34.48	1.20	2080	\$86,062.08
Teachers	\$25.55	7.50	2080	\$398,580.00
Teacher Aides	\$16.75	15.00	2080	\$522,600.00
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Bachelors)	\$21.22	1.20	2080	\$52,965.12
Other Direct Student Report Staff (Masters)	\$27.69	2.40	2080	\$138,228.48
Medical Staff	\$21.92	2.40	2080	\$109,424.64
Trade Staff	\$19.16	1.00	2080	\$39,852.80
Teacher Relief	\$25.55	0.28875	2080	\$15,345.33
Teacher Aide Relief	\$16.75	0.5775	2080	\$20,120.10

Tax and Fringe	Percent of Staff Salary	Expense
	23%	\$318,131.07

Other Operating Expenses	Per Student Per Day	Teacher and Aide FTEs	Per Teacher Cost	Expense
Training Expenses for Teachers and Aides	\$1.57	22.50	\$754.36	\$16,973.10
Travel Expenses (i.e. mileage)	\$0.67	N/A	N/A	\$7,236.00
Vehicle Expenses	\$1.22	N/A	N/A	\$13,176.00
Occupancy/Facility (mortgage, rent, etc.)	\$24.51	N/A	N/A	\$264,708.00
Student Technology	\$1.19	N/A	N/A	\$12,852.00
Classroom Supplies	\$3.61	N/A	N/A	\$38,988.00
Program Equipment	\$1.94	N/A	N/A	\$20,952.00
Insurance	\$2.54	N/A	N/A	\$27,432.00
Translation/Interpretation Services	\$2.25	N/A	N/A	\$24,300.00
Other Costs	\$5.16	N/A	N/A	\$55,728.00

Cost Adjustment Factor (CAF)	\$152,854.63
-------------------------------------	---------------------

Budget Section	Expense Total
Program Salaries	\$1,383,178.55
Tax and Fringe Benefits	\$318,131.07
Total Program Operating Expenses	\$482,328.00
Cost Adjustment Factor	\$152,854.63

Grand Total	\$2,336,492.25
--------------------	-----------------------

Total Daily Rate per Student	\$216.34
-------------------------------------	-----------------