

Comment Report

HF 14

A bill for an act relating to the statewide preschool program by modifying provisions relating to eligibility, funding, and compulsory attendance and including applicability provisions.(See HF 318.)

Subcommittee Members: Brink-CH, Mascher, Sorensen

Date: 01/20/2021

Time: 12:00 PM

Location: House Lounge

Name: Melissa Peterson

Comment: ISEA is registered in Favor of HF 14. I believe that the collaborative work done on this issue during last session is reflected in this bill. My only concern is that we will see a significant challenge with a lack of capacity to serve the students whose parents/guardians select this option. Prior to the pandemic we struggled to ensure there was capacity for preK. I believe that struggle has been exacerbated by COVID. ISEA looks forward to working with the subcmte and others in a bipartisan fashion to increase capacity for our students to be able to fully take advantage of HF 14.

Name: Margaret Buckton

Comment: see attached fileword doc with explanation of the bill's impact on next year and excel file for PK enrollment changes and some cost savings estimates on the second tab.

| Fiscal Year | Ames | Ankeny | Cedar Falls | Cedar Rapids | College | Council Bluffs | Davenport | Des Moines | Dubuque | Ft. Dodge | Iowa City | Linn-Mar | Marshalltown | Mason City | Muscatine | Ottumwa | Sioux City | Southeast Polk | Waterloo | UEN Total PK Enrollment |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| FY 2008 | 132 | 25 | 0 | 103 | 18 | 550 | 813 | 2148 | 90 | 21 | 161 | 3 | 99 | 119 | 84 | 213 | 309 | 18 | 402 | 5308 |
| FY 2009 | 125 | 29 | | 489 | 26 | 545 | 999 | 2310 | 709 | 225 | 161 | 8 | 144 | 123 | 235 | 302 | 469 | 28 | 515 | 7442 |
| FY 2010 | 247 | 49 | 21 | 785 | 261 | 612 | 1041 | 2306 | 740 | 250 | 262 | 36 | 166 | 116 | 313 | 341 | 535 | 21 | 540 | 8642 |
| FY 2011 | 281 | 180 | 122 | 788 | 261 | 583 | 1030 | 2402 | 716 | 261 | 294 | 247 | 201 | 244 | 370 | 334 | 753 | 248 | 556 | 9871 |
| FY 2012 | 277 | 199 | 84 | 641 | 256 | 487 | 955 | 2230 | 825 | 281 | 358 | 278 | 210 | 258 | 297 | 354 | 734 | 260 | 532 | 9516 |
| FY 2013 | 311 | 281 | 118 | 688 | 248 | 531 | 953 | 2390 | 854 | 276 | 394 | 275 | 237 | 253 | 370 | 257 | 749 | 281 | 601 | 10067 |
| FY 2014 | 284 | 312 | 117 | 751 | 280 | 534 | 945 | 2107 | 828 | 256 | 437 | 250 | 243 | 257 | 368 | 242 | 804 | 280 | 598 | 9893 |
| FY 2015 | 296 | 438 | 146 | 798 | 306 | 535 | 911 | 2197 | 816 | 263 | 467 | 297 | 223 | 256 | 337 | 247 | 822 | 335 | 618 | 10308 |
| FY 2016 | 284 | 467 | 153 | 770 | 302 | 530 | 939 | 1956 | 842 | 254 | 449 | 289 | 195 | 275 | 329 | 298 | 862 | 350 | 615 | 10159 |
| FY 2017 | 297 | 489 | 179 | 825 | 302 | 487 | 911 | 1945 | 854 | 307 | 470 | 295 | 201 | 251 | 321 | 281 | 829 | 368 | 652 | 10264 |
| FY 2018 | 334 | 389 | 170 | 935 | 313 | 490 | 956 | 1976 | 807 | 242 | 555 | 303 | 274 | 271 | 344 | 273 | 861 | 351 | 691 | 10535 |
| FY 2019 | 341 | 408 | 193 | 965 | 308 | 504 | 980 | 1909 | 887 | 265 | 570 | 316 | 320 | 301 | 320 | 395 | 826 | 367 | 650 | 10825 |
| FY 2020 | 301 | 391 | 192 | 967 | 316 | 499 | 912 | 2000 | 853 | 266 | 663 | 324 | 306 | 299 | 328 | 471 | 823 | 399 | 625 | 10935 |
| FY 2021 | 288 | 324 | 200 | 840 | 280 | 425 | 721 | 1483 | 752 | 230 | 481 | 293 | 243 | 217 | 334 | 384 | 703 | 303 | 492 | 8993 |
| Net Change FY21-FY20 | -13 | -67 | 8 | -127 | -36 | -74 | -191 | -517 | -101 | -36 | -182 | -31 | -63 | -82 | 6 | -87 | -120 | -96 | -133 | -1942 |
| Budget Change FY 2022 | \$ (91,624) | \$ (472,216) | \$ 56,384 | \$ (895,096) | \$ (253,728) | \$ (521,552) | \$ (1,346,168) | \$ (3,643,816) | \$ (711,848) | \$ (253,728) | \$ (1,282,736) | \$ (218,488) | \$ (444,024) | \$ (577,936) | \$ 42,288 | \$ (613,176) | \$ (845,760) | \$ (676,608) | \$ (937,384) | \$ (6,843,608) |

| | PK | K | 1st | 2nd | Likely Kindergarten Repeaters $K - (PK + 1st + 2nd) / 3$ |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| 2019-20 | 31468 | 39832 | 35894 | 35274 | 5620 |
| 2018-19 | 31233 | 39230 | 35051 | 35067 | 5446 |
| 2017-18 | 30480 | 38311 | 34953 | 36075 | 4475 |
| 2016-17 | 29344 | 38196 | 36017 | 36599 | 4209 |
| 2015-16 | 29001 | 39237 | 36379 | 37584 | 4916 |
| average | 30305 | 38961 | 35659 | 36120 | |

Questions: if students have a quality PK, do they ever have Transitional Kindergarten?
Some TK may be older 5-year olds that the bill wouldn't extend eligibility to

Why does preschool matter? The Perry Preschool Project, 40 years later, documents \$1 billion invested are also often cited). Once considered a strategy just to support working poor families, high-quality PK programs as a critical long-term economic investment in the future workforce. *learning-primer.pdf* Oct. 2014: *Six rigorous long term evaluation studies have found that*

- 25% less likely to drop out of school.
 - 40% less likely to become a teen parent.
 - 50% less likely to be placed in special education.
 - 60% less likely to never attend college.
 - 70% less likely to be arrested for a violent crime.
- level 1 Special Education We
Special education weightings
\$ 1,861,518 even if only
\$ 11,169,107 if 6% instead

| Maximum | More Likely |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Savings if Zero TK | Savings if Zero TK for Young 5s |
| \$ 39,609,760 | \$ 19,804,880 |
| \$ 38,385,757 | \$ 19,192,879 |
| \$ 31,539,800 | \$ 15,769,900 |
| \$ 29,667,381 | \$ 14,833,691 |
| \$ 34,645,619 | \$ 17,322,809 |

ndergarten?

PK

17 savings for every dollar invested (earlier findings of \$8 saved for every
; parents with child care needs, the majority of states now view access to
orce. Education Commission of the States, <http://www.ecs.org/docs/early->
that children who participated in high-quality preschool programs were:

ighting is .71 (PK is .5) and typically requires services for many years
; have dropped 8% (from mid 13% to mid 12% of certified enrollment since prior to SVPP)
/ 1% of PK students avoid special education, savings of \$1.8 million over 6 years of special education servi
id of 12% of additional PK students avoid special education

ces at a level 1 weighting)

Name: Margaret Buckton

Comment: Here's the Word Document with written comments about the bill. I just learned that you can only submit one file at a time.

Urban Education Network is registered as undecided and the Rural School Advocates of Iowa are registered in support of allowing young 5-year-olds to attend SVVP and be counted for enrollment purposes. Some things to consider:

- COVID Preschool Enrollment Decline: PK doesn't have a budget guarantee for declining enrollment or on-time funding spending authority for increasing enrollment. Statewide last Oct 1, PK enrollment dropped 4,076 students. That means that school preschool budgets will be down \$14.4 million next fall, when the normal number of 4-year-olds are likely to show up. If districts don't have big carry forwards, there won't be enough slots in many places for 4-year-olds, let alone young 5s. (Spreadsheet attached that shows PK enrollment history for UEN district and the statewide total enrollment number at the bottom.)
- Kindergarten enrollment also dropped by 2,086 students statewide (that's more than 1/3 of the total enrollment decline of 5,935). That means that next fall's kindergarten class is likely to have more 6-year-olds than normal, making sections larger or requiring more kindergarten teachers for those 2,086 students. With a larger kindergarten class than normal, it's would help smooth out that pressure impact of some young 5-year-olds were in PK.
- Currently, kindergarteners count for the full 1.0 district cost per pupil, while PK is half of that, weighted at 0.5. If the enrollment growth next fall in PK isn't funded, there is an additional disincentive to steer any 5-year-olds into PK.
- Rural schools may have a few more slots in a PK class without having to expand the number of sections, but urban school do not. If the legislature can find the way to fund PK enrollment increases timely, UEN would be supportive of this bill too.
- About cost: quality PK lowers costs later. Iowa has seen a drop in special education enrollment since 2010 when we began phasing in four-year-old PK. Although that's not a causal study, it correlates to the research base, sited below. If we can fund and provide a quality PK experience for more students, we are likely to see a special education cost savings (Special Education at 0.7 weighting for one year for level 1 especially if provided for several years, far outweigh the .5 weighting for PK for one year). There will be other savings in the human services and justice appropriations areas down the road too.
- This bill should be effective for the fall of 2021 if it's going to help solve our current PK pressure points.

Margaret Buckton

UEN and RSAI

margaret@iowaschoolfinance.com

515.201.3755

: Education Commission of the States, <http://www.ecs.org/docs/early-learning-primer.pdf> Oct. 2014: *Six rigorous long term evaluation studies have found that children who participated in high-quality preschool programs were:*

- *25% less likely to drop out of school.*
- *40% less likely to become a teen parent.*
- *50% less likely to be placed in special education.*
- *60% less likely to never attend college.*
- *70% less likely to be arrested for a violent crime.*

Sarah Daily, *Initiatives from Preschool to Third Grade: A Policymaker's Guide*, shows reductions in costly outcomes that quality preschool prevents. (Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, October 2014) <http://www.ecs.org/docs/early-learning-primer.pdf>. The National Conference of State Legislatures quotes studies on long term return on investment. <http://www.ncsl.org/research/human-services/new-research-early-education-as-economic-investme.aspx>

•

-