

Building Tennessee's Tomorrow:

Anticipating the State's Infrastructure Needs

July 2009 through June 2014

APPENDIX F: TACIR METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATED COSTS OF NEW SCHOOLS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

Because the descriptions for reported projects were insufficiently clear to allow staff to allocate costs any other way that could be considered accurate, TACIR staff developed a formula to estimate the proportion of the reported costs that could be attributed to the EIA's class-size mandates. Staff did this based on student counts provided by the Department of Education for 1991-92 and 2000-01. They applied the old and the new class-size standards to determine the number of new teachers required then and now under the old and the new standards (see the table below) and used that information to allocate costs between the EIA and growth.

**Class-size Requirements Before and After Passage
of the Education Improvement Act**

Class	Old Requirements*		New Requirements**	
	Without Waivers	With Waivers	School-wide Averages	Individual Class Maximums
Kindergarten through Grade Three	25	28	20	25
Grade Four	28	31	25	30
Grades Five and Six	30	33	25	30
Grades Seven through Twelve	35	39	30	35
Vocational	23	25	20	25

*Rules and Regulations, State of Tennessee, Chapter 0520, Rule 0520-1-3-.03(3). Ten percent waiver granted upon request. [<http://www.state.tn.us/sos/rules/0520/0520.htm>]

**Public Chapter 535, Section 37, Acts of 1992; codified at *Tennessee Code Annotated*, §49-1-104(a).

- Four figures were calculated for each school system, grade-level unit by grade-level unit, but not school by school:
 1. the minimum number of teachers necessary to meet the old class-size standard without waivers in school year 1991-92

2. the minimum number of teachers necessary to meet the new class-size averages in school year 1991-92
 3. the minimum number of teachers necessary to meet the old class-size standard without waivers in school year 2000-01
 4. the minimum number of teachers necessary to meet the new class-size averages in school year 2000-01
- Once those figures were calculated, the school systems were screened as follows:
 1. If the number of teachers needed to meet the EIA standard in 2000-01 was the same or less than the number necessary to meet the old standard in 1991-92, then none of the reported cost was attributed to the EIA. This was the case for 31 of the 138 school systems.
 2. Otherwise, if the number of teachers needed to meet the old standard in 2000-01 was less than the number necessary to meet the old standard in 1991-92, then all of the reported cost was attributed to the EIA. This was the case for five of the 138 school systems.
 3. Otherwise, the reported cost of new construction was allocated between growth and the EIA based on the proportion of additional teachers needed to meet the new standard in 2000-01 versus the number that would have been needed under the old standard.

Because staff did not have consistent information from all school systems to determine which, if any, new schools were replacing old schools and had no aspect of growth or EIA mandates, they did not attempt to exclude any reported costs from this formula. Less than ten percent of the reported costs were for new schools that had the word replace somewhere in their descriptions, and in many of those cases, growth and the EIA were specifically mentioned in relation to the size of the project.