EA 008 327

ED 123 771

AUTHOR TITLE . Garcia, Joseph O.

Comparison of Bilingual Education Program Costs to

the Regular Education Program Costs.

PUB DATE

22 Apr 76

28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Prancisco, California, April 19-23, 1976); Pages 22-28 may reproduce poorly due to small print in the

original document

ÉDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

*Bilingual Education; Cost Indexes; Elementary Secondary Education; *Expenditure Per Student;

*Program Costs: *School Statistics: *State Surveys;

Tables (Data)

IDENTIFIERS

*New Mexico-

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a study that calculated program. costs for bilingual education programs operating in New Mexico school districts during 1974-75 and compared those costs to costs for regular educational programs. Data were collected through a surwey of all 88 public school districts in New Mexico. Per-pupil program costs for the regular school program in grades 4-6 were calculated and compared to Per-pupil costs for bilingual programs in each district. When districts were clustered into eight groups, based on total district enrollment, bilingual Program costs ranged from 37 percent of regular program costs (for districts with enrollments whder 200) to 116 percent of regular program costs (for districts with enrollments from 4,000 to 7,500). The statewide average showed bilingual programs cost 103 percenthas much as the regular educational program in grades 4-6). A series of tables present program cost, and enrollment data for each district, as well as average figures for different sizes of districts and figures for the state as a whole. A sample survey questionnaire and samples of the various worksheets used to analyze the survey data are included in the appendix. / (JG)

^{*} Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.



US DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE DF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS-RECEIVED FROM
TIME PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
AT NGLIT POINTS OF VIEW OR POPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assign

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the clearing houses noted to the right, Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Comparison of Bilingual Education Program Costs To The Regular Education Program Costs

Joseph O. Garcia San Diego State University April 22, 1976

Presented at the 60th Annual Meeting of AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

COMPARISON OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM COSTS TO THE REGULAR EDUCATION PROGRAM COSTS

Purpose of the Study

The study was designed to meet the following two primary objectives:

- To determine the program costs for bilingual education programs operating in New Mexico school districts during the 1974-75 school year.
- To compare the bilingual education program costs to the non-bilingual regular education program costs.

Bilingual Education Act in New Mexico

New Mexico is the only state that funds bilingual education as part of its cost differential funding formula. Other states fund bilingual education categorically and still many other states provide no state monies for bilingual education. Studies comparing the cost of bilingual education to non-bilingual education programs are necessary to determine policy formation and appropriations required to adequately meet the bilingual needs of students.

The purpose of the Bilingual Multicultural Education Act as enacted by the 1973 New Mexico State Legislature is to ensure equal education opportunities for students in New Mexico. At their discretion, local school districts may submit to the Department of Education a proposal for bilingual education programs. To be eligible for state financial support, each bilingual program must meet certain specified requirements as stipulated by the Department of Education.

The guidelines require that each bilingual program must:

- Provide for the educational needs of linguistically and culturally different students.
 with priority to be given to programs in grades K through three . . . for which there is an identifiable need to improve the language capabilities of these students before funding programs at higher grade levels.
- Use two languages as mediums of instruction for any part or all of the curriculum.
- 3. Use teachers who have specialized in elementary education and who have received special training in bilingual education conducted through the use of two languages.
- 4. Emphasize the history and cultures associated with the students' mother tongue.

Procedures

No cost studies were found that reported on bilingual education after a thorough review of the literature. This study, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, represents the first attempt to determine the costs associated with bilingual education. This provides vital information to

^ZJoseph O. Garcia, "Cost Analysis of Bilingual, Special, and Vocational Public School Programs in New Mexico," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1976).

states already funding bilingual education or to states proposing bilingual education legislation.

This study represents a part of a larger study. The larger study entitled, "Cost Analysis of Bilingual, Special, and Vocational Rublic School Programs in New Mexico" was designed to compare the program cost indices developed in the larger study to the program cost indices established in New Mexico law for purposes of determining the accuracy of those legal indices. Only those sections of the two data collection instruments which are applicable to this study will be presented and discussed.

Section V of Data Collection Instrument No. 2 was designed to collect data relative to bilingual education programs in New Mexico (See Appendix A). This instrument was field-tested in selected New Mexico school districts for purposes of refining the instrument in terms of item clarity and availability of data in the format requested.

In New Mexico, there are a total of eighty-eight public school districts. The data were collected from the entire population, no sampling technique was used. The researcher felt that no two public school districts in the State of New Mexico had identical spending patterns relative to bilingual education programs. Therefore, in order to identify actual expenditures while simultaneously reflecting the varied costs incurred in providing the programs, it was deemed essential that no sampling technique be employed and that the required data be gathered from all eighty-eight districts. Follow-up telephone calls were made to school districts returning instruments with missing data and/or data requiring clarification. There was a 100 percent response rate from the eighty-eight public school

districts.

Two limitations are inherent in this study. One limitation is that only those districts receiving state funds via the cost differential funding formula or other state operational monies were included in this study. Federal funds or monies from other than state or local funding sources for bilingual education were excluded from the present study. A second limitation of this study is its limited generalizability. No attempt is made to relate the findings of this study to school districts of other states. However, the procedures utilized in this study are applicable to other states conducting cost studies in bilingual education programs.

The regular education program consists of instructional activities provided to students enrolled in grades 4-6. Section 77-6-18.3 of the Public School Code of the State of New Mexico established grades 4-6 as the regular education program to serve as the base with a cost index of 1.00. Cost indices for all other educational programs are relative to that regular education program.

Per pupil program costs in the regular school program, grades 4-6, for each of the public school districts were determined. Program costs per pupil in the regular education program provide base laine data for comparing other educational programs. Per pupil costs for bilingual education programs were also determined.

All operational expenditures were included in calculating per pupil costs. Indirect operational expenditures, those her directly related to a specific educational program, were prorated to each program on the basis of either teachers or students. Expenditures for administration and operation and maintenance of plant were prorated on the basis of teachers because teachers served as a better work-load indicator than do number of students since these types of expenditures were more closely related to teachers than students. For example, administrators administer teachers not students. Direct operational expenditures related to a specific educational program were computed as part of the per pupil costs for that particular program.

Program cost per pupil for each of the bilingual education programs in this study and the regular education programs were determined by computing the total expenditures for each program and dividing by the number of FTE or ADM students served in that program.

Hundreds of calculations were required to determine the per pupil expenditures for the regular education program. Four worksheets, I-A, I-B, I-C, and I-D were developed by the researcher to determine the per pupil expenditures for grades 4-6 (See Appendix B). The numbers refer to particular data items in the data collection instruments. A legend is provided for each worksheet to define the calculations.

Worksheet II was designed by the researcher to determine the per pupil expenditures for bilingual education programs (See Appendix C). Data for this worksheet were provided from Data Collection Instruments 1 and 2 and from Worksheets I-A, I-B, I-C, and I-D. Section V of Data Collection Instrument Number 2 provided most of the data for the calculations in Worksheet II.

Expenditures for teacher salaries were determined by multiplying the number of FTE teachers times the average teacher salary for the district plus the expenditures for substitute salaries. This figure is represented by Item A2, Worksheet II.

The total number of FTE students in bilingual education programs was determined by adding the number of FTE students funded specifically by the cost differential funding formula and the FTE students funded by other operational funds. The total number of FTE students is represented by Item A3, Worksheet II.

Expenditures for teacher-aide salaries were determined by multiplying the number of FTE teacher-aides times the average teacher aide salary for the district. Such expenditures were represented by Item C, Worksheet II. Other direct expenditures for bilingual education programs included expenditures for program administration, coordinators, secretarial/clerical, and instructional supplies.

Indirect expenditures for bilingual education programs included expenditures for general district-wide administration and for operation and maintenance of plant as represented by Items E and T, Worksheet II, respectively. The above expenditures were prorated on the basis of teachers.

Some New Mexico school districts received federal categorical funds for the support of bilingual education. Pertinent data relative to federally funded student FTE and salaries paid for instruction were also collected from the school districts. Columns 4 and 5 of Section V, Data Collection Instrument Number 2, collected data regarding federally funded bilingual education programs.

In those cases where New Mexico school districts received both state

and federal funds for bilingual education, it became essential to separate
the expenditure associated with each funding source. Some districts, because
of their lack of funds, had to combine their funding sources to meet the needs
of their students. For example, the expenditures for administration of both
the state and federally funded bilingual education programs might have been
incurred by only one funding source; yet, the services were rendered to two
differently funded bilingual programs.

In Worksheet II, calculations were made to determine if federal expenditures were used to administer state funded bilingual programs (Item M); and if so, were added to the total bilingual education program costs. Calculations were also made to determine if state expenditures were used to administer federal funded bilingual programs (Item 0); if so, were subtracted from the total bilingual education program costs. These calculations were made to reflect a more accurate picture in terms of actual expenditures associated with state funded bilingual education programs.

Item U, Worksheet II, represents the program cost index as opposed to the add-on cost index. The bilingual education program cost index consisted of the total indirect and direct program expenditures per pupil as a ratio to the grades 4-6 expenditures per pupil.

Analysis

Table 1 presents the costs per pupil for bilingual education pro-

grams and the regular education program, grades 4-6, and other relevant data. Of the eighty-eight New Mexico public school districts, sixty-two districts or 70 percent, provided approved bilingual education programs. Column A shows the 1974-75 total average daily membership (ADM) for each of the eighty-eight school districts. School districts in Groups I through Group VIII progress in terms of increased ADM. Column B presents the bilingual education full-time equivalent (FTE) gupils for those districts providing bilingual education programs.

The bilingual education costs per FTE pupil are shown in Column C.

The bilingual education program costs are presented in Column D. These
figures are determined by multiplying Column B times Column C.

Column E presents the regular education program, Grades 4-6, ADM.

Grades 4-6 costs per pupil are shown in Column F. The regular education program costs are shown in Column G. These figures are determined by multiplying Column E times Column F. Finally, Column H presents the cost index or ratio between the per pupil costs of the bilingual education program and the per pupil costs of the regular education program, grades 4-6.

Table 1 also shows District No. 84 in Group VII as the district with the highest expenditure for bilingual education at \$2,809.96 per pupil. District No. 3 in Group I was the district with the lowest expenditure at \$31.31 per pupil. The mean per pupil expenditure was \$77.81. The median per pupil expenditure for bilingual education programs was \$658.65. The standard deviation, a measure of variability calculated around the mean, was 559.85.

For districts offering bilingual programs, District No. 1 in Group I was the district with the highest expenditure for the regular education program at \$1,700.48 per pupil. District No. 66 in Group V was the lowest

Table 1

PER PUPIL COSTS AND PROGRAM COSTS FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND RECULAR EDUCATION PRÒGRAMS FOR NEW MEXICO SCHOOL DISTRICTS DURING THE 1973-74 SCHOOL YEAR

	₹	, •	ឧ	IJ	, О	, pa	ţs.	O	. ш
DISTRICT	1974-75 Total ADM		Bilingual FTE	Bil. Cost/ FTE Pupil	Bil: Prog. Cost (B.x.C)	Grades 4-6 ADM	Grades 4-6 Cost/Pupil	Grades 4-6 Prog. Cost (E x F)	Cost Index (C = F)
Group I 0-200 ADM		•		,		•	•		
· .	93	•	3.34	877.04	2,929.31	18.53	1,700,48	31,509.89	.52
v m	. 106		4.79	31.31	149.97	24.00	1,065.25	25,566.00	03
. 4	118		8.34	194.55	1,622.55	29.50	1,554.40	45,854.80	.13
5	145		3,33	66, 29	2,222.08	. 44.00	1,008.20	44,360.80	· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
- 'o	147)	•	.,		•	
~ 8	147			С					
, 6 ,	173	•			·) / .	٠	4.	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
. 310	183		•	· ·		•	, j	•	٠,
11 12	198	,	7.91	834.36	6,599.79	33.95	1,477.40	.50,157.73	.56
	,				,			• , , ,	- ·
GROUP I TOTALS:	1,755		¥ 27.71	•,	13,523,70	149,98		197,449.22	
GROUP I AVERAGES:		12.		488	. 4'	•	1,316.50	· • ·	
	•	۱, ۱ ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱	•	(D = B Total)			. (G - E Total)	*	
GROUP I COST INDEX:	•••	•	•	e .	ر مر		. /	e. L	$\frac{37}{(x-x)}$

in the same	, ,	•		Table 1 (Continued)	[nued]	• ,		•
	A 1974-75 Total	Bilingual	Bil. Cost/	D. Bil. Prog.	Grades 4-6	Gradus 4-6	Grades 4-6	H .
DISTRICT	WGT	FTE	ы	(B × C)			$(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{F})$. (C ÷ F).
Group II	•	4		. ,	,			• •
13 COC - 102	, , , ,		;	. €	1 6			•
T.	208-	00 . 8	433.60	3,468.80	52.05	1,042.25	54,249.11	. 42
15	236	19.12	802.95	15,352.40	66.71,	794.95	53,031.11	, 1.01
16	237.	•	•	•	•	.,		•
72.	245		* *		•	•	1	· .
18	261	•••	ř	. •	,	**		
. I9	267		,	⊌ .			ŧ	•
20 Marie	356	,	,	•	•	f l	**************************************	
22 -	3.59°°		*			· ·		-
23	383	20.04	-640,39	12,833.42	133.41	730.84	97,501.36	.88
24	386			7	- 4 0	a !	•	
. 56	398	, 4,	, 740 OO	2 206 500	, 191 00		- C	
27	445	2.91	1,345,32	3,914,88	99.42	1.160.21	115,348.08	2.42
28.4	, 944	•	, , ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	. 4	*	,		
. 53	644	17.20	376.69	6,479.07	87.26	914.79	79,824.58	
30	458		••		* , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		.*	. '
GROUP II	, ,		*		,			
TOTALS	6,085	68,92		,44,754.57	559.93	* ••	482,122.22	
GROUP II	•	•				- 1	, 	
		,	(D + B Total)	•		(C - E Total)	•	,
GROUP II			* · ·	8		≻ .	·,	
TINE TINE	7	,	•	• •		•		1 75

Table 1 (Continued)

	۰۷	20	Ü	. 0	pi.	ĵż.	O	
DISTRICT	1974-75 Total ADM	#11ingual FTE	Bil. Cost/ FTE Pupil	Biff. Prog. Cost (B x G)	Grades 4-6 · ADM '	Grades 4-6 Cost/Pupil	Grades 4-6 Prog. Cost (ExF)	Cost Index (C + F)
Group III	ą.	•	· ,	•		•	•	
201-1000 ADM	•,			•	•		•	
. 31.	. 558	5.67	439.26	2,490.60	144.70	705.41	102,072.83	.62
3	570	17.53	.798.43	13,996.48	140.69	887.53	124,866.60	. 06.
. 33	. 580	24 598 .	591.66	,14,779.67	- 159.36	.729.58	116,265.87	.81
34.	765	00;54	383.41	5,751.15	155.50	872.22	135,630.21	. 44.
35	(617	8+30 •	755.67	6,272.06	147.75	· 771.84	114,039.36	86.
36	619	42/03	961.52	40,412.69	. 162.56	1,048,89	170,507.56	.92
37	635	· 6.95.	720.65	5,008,52	146.11	753.79	1,10,136.26	/ 96. 1
38	637 .	' ·.	· .				•	•
, 439	651	14,33	. 488.79	7:004.36	155.85	.789.80	123,090.33	.62
07.11	712	3.50	539.20	1,887.20	160.21	897.61	143,806.10	. 09*
. 6.1 0	808	13.80	590:27	8,145,73	. , 189.77,	794.70	150,310.22	. 74
. 42	831	. 8.58	323.34	2,774.26	186.91	900.87	168,381.61	. 36
. 43	857	. 68.28	610.14	41,660.36	226.40	810.33	183,458.71	. 45
777	5	12.53	, 4F3.99	4,187.29	207.10	. 493.84	102,274.26	78.
. 45	696	62.84	274.16	17,228.21	. 262.14	706.01	185,073.46	. 39
. 46	966	42.87	642.23	27,532.40	247.93 -/	803.79	199,283.65	. 80
GROUP ILE.	*z\$5'31'.	347.19	<i>J</i> .	200,130.98	2,692,98	(2,129,697.02	* •
GROUP LEI AVERAGES	•	٠.	7		•	(🕶	•	
CROUP III		•	(G - B Total)			(G - E Total	,	
COST INDEX:	•		· ·	·	•			\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
/	•	<u>_</u> ,			<i>;</i> .			· /

•	•	•		Table 1 (Continued)	funed)			. •
:	• *	£	<u>ئ</u> .	Q	្ដ	ţ.	υ 	*
DISTRICT	1974-75 Total ADM	Bilingugl	Bil, Cost/	Sil. Prog. Cost	Grades 4-6	Grades 4-6 Cost/Pup11	. Grades 4-0 Prog. Cost (E x F)	Cost Index (C † F)
	-		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					-
Group IV 1001-2500 ADM	· ,	•			· ·	•		
. 67	1/034.	19.16	٢. 522.11	10,003.63	258.03	859.19	221,696.80	19.///
87	1,035	15,20	206.76	3,142.75	272.16	710.24	. 193,298,92	. 294
67	1,0/8	\ \ \	,			. •	•	ن ^{ي د} سر
, 20	1,043	14.70	247.44	3,637.37	233.53 *	7,31,81	170,899.59	. 34
51	1,068	77.95	331.59	25,847.44	248.60	657.04	163,340.14	.50
. 12	1,140	13.50	2,425.08	52, 138.58	285.90	756.36	216,243.32	3.21
53.	1,223	5,18	2,413.81	12,503.54	321,18	716.72	230,196.13	3.37
	1,276	28.14	518,21	14,582.43	336.60	759.20,	255,546.72	89*.
. 55	1,491	5.48	815.45	4,468.67	382,05	713.77	27.2,695.83	1.14
. 36	1,578	6.83	110.91	757.52	4. 385.69	653.23	251,944.28	.17 .
ري ري	1,875	•		3				
. 28	1,880	20.34	851,55	17,320,53	424.97	763.83	. 324,604.84	1.11
59	2,025	•.		-	• .	•	•	
. 09	2,209	13,16	1,193.73	15,769.49	534,28	07'789	365,601.23	1.74
61.	2,253	7	•	_			,	
GROUP IV TOTALS:	.22,148	219,64		140,711.95	3,682,99	۔	2,666,127.80	

14

GROUP IV COST INDEX:

GROUP IV AVERAGES:

Table 1 (Continued)

•		i		4			,	
•	•	, ·	0	Q	Ð	Çe,	5	X
΄.	1974-75			Bil. Prog.	,			. 4400
DISTRICT	Total	Bilingual . FIE ~	Bil. Cost/ FTE Pupil	Cost (B x C)	Grades 4-6 ADM	Grades 4-6 Cost/Pupil	b Frog. Cost 1 (E x F)	(C + E)
		2			•			•
GROUP V	••	,	-	•	•	•	•	-
2501-4000 ADM	.		•			* .		
62	2,618	32,38	895.31	28,990.14	611.65	765.40	468,156.91	1.17
63	2,634	61.98	452.39	28,039.13	689.73	714.71	492,956.93	. 63
79	2,636	91.74	1,656.40	151,958.14	660.57	689.53	455,482.83	2.40
, , 59	2,819	143.92	328.53	. 47,282.04	739.10	784.03	579,476.57	. 42
• 99	2,876	572.44	776.77	444,654.21	744.05	.436.88	325,060.56	1.78
	2,892	53.92	267.72	14,435.46	760.17	.790.25	600,724,34	.34
. 89	3,301	106.38	1,262.49	134,303.69	854.23	.670.55	572,803.93	- 1.88
. 69	3,399	37.66	630.26	23,735.59	838.70	789,10	. 661,818.17	. 08.
0/	- 3,456	•		·' ,		• ,	*	·
₹ •-	3,553	. 47.90	145.20	6,955,08	₩2.608	736:63	596,478,78	. 20
72/	3,698	44.50	792.2B	35, 252	902.37	728.18	657,087.79	1.09
. 13 .	3,794	81.88	685.12	56,097,63	953°03	721.57	687,677,86	\$61.75
GROUP V TOTALS:-	37.674	1.274.70		971.704.46	8.563.34		6,097,724,66	
		, 4						
GROUP V AVERAGES:	•	•	762.30	·		712.07 (G = E Totals)	(918)	•
,			• `					1.07
GOST INDEX:			•		•	-	.•	(X ÷ X)

15.

Table 1 (Continued)

### Bil, Cost / Cost / ADM Cost/Pupil FTE		A 18.5	•	U		R	Cz.	5	=
4,815 4,815 4,834 4,834 4,834 4,834 4,967 49,82 1,843,03 91,819,75 1,125,19 708,53 5,491 114,56 1,038,14 25,479,25 1,503,88 824,80 6,016 245,13 1,038,14 25,479,25 1,503,88 824,80 7,042 3,13 7,02,92 3,605,98 1,702,00 743,31 7,194 39,87 881,28 35,136,63 1,867,94 799,13 81,56 81,58 81,58 81,58 81,58 81,58 81,58 81,58 81,56 81,58 81,56 81,58 81	DISTRICT	Total Total Adn	Bilingual FTE	Bil, Comt/ FTE Pupil	Bil. Frog. .Cost (B x C)	Grades 4-6 ADM	Grades 4-6 Cost/Pup11	Prog. Cost. (E x F)	Cost Index (C + F)
74 4,815 74 4,815 75 4,834 48.66 1,205.33 58,651.36 1,292.12 599.92 76 4,967 49.82 1,843.03 91,819.75 1,125.19 7708.53 77 6 4,967 49.82 1,843.03 91,819.75 1,125.19 7708.53 78 6,016 245.13 1,038.14 254,449.25 1,503.88 824.80 79 6,392 29.27 297.31 8,702.26 1,499.82 709.13 89 7,042 3.13 702.92 3,605.98 1,702.00 743,31 80 7,042 39.87 881.28 35,136.63 1,867.94 799.13 ROUP VI. 194 39.87 881.56 ROUP VI. 881.56 ROUP VI. 10.436.28 ROUP VI. 10.481.56 ROUP VI. 10.4824	Group VI	c	# 64 M			,	. •	•	-
74 4,815 4,815 4,814 4,815 4,815 4,834 48.66 1,203.33 58,651.36 1,292.12 599.92 76 4,967 49.82 1,843.03 91,819.75 1,125.19 7708.53 77 7 5,491 114.56 1,843.03 91,819.75 1,125.19 7708.53 78 6,016 245.13 1,038.14 254,479.25 1,503.88 824.80 79 6,392 29.27 297.31 8,702.26 1,499.82 709.13 80 7,042 3,13 7,194 39.87 881.28 35,136.63 10,436.28 ROUP VI. TOTALS: 46,751	MUN 006/-1004				•			. ,	
75 4,834 48.66 1,205.33 58,651.36 1,292.12 599.92 76 4,967 49.82 1,843.03 91,819.75 1,125.19 7708.53 77 6, 4,967 49.82 1,843.03 91,819.75 1,125.19 7708.53 77 7 6, 4,967 49.82 1,843.03 91,819.75 1,125.19 7708.53 77 7 6, 24.91 114.56 148.24 16,982.37 1,445.33 874.32 78 6,016 245.13 1,038.14 254,479.25 1,503.88 824.80 79 6,392 29.27 297.31 8,702.26 1,499.82 709.13 89 7,042 5.13 702.92 3,605.98 1,702.00 743,31 ROUP VI TOTALS: 46,751 532.44 469.377.60 10;436.28 ROUP VI NURACES: (D ** B Total*) ROUP VI OST INDEX: 46,751 (G ** E Total*)	. 74.	4,815		, .	•				
76	-75	4,834	. 99*87	1,205.33	58,651.36	1,292,12	599.92	., 775,168.63	2.01
77' 6 5,491 114.56 148.24 16,982.37 1,445.33 874.32 78 6,016 245.13 1,038.14 254,479.25 1,503.88 824.80 1	, 92	4,967	49.82	1,843.03	91,819,75	1,125.19	7,08.53	797,230.87	2.60
78 6,016 245.13 1,038,14 254,479.25 1,503.88 824.80 1 79 6,392 29.27 297.31 8,702.26 1,499.82 709.13 1 89 7,042 \$.13 702.92 3,605.98 1,702.00 743,31 1 80 7,042 \$.13 702.92 3,605.98 1,702.00 743,31 1 80 7,194 39.87 881.28 35,136.63 1,867.94 799.13 1 80 VI. ROUP VI.	77. 3	5,491	114.56	148.24	16,982.37	1,445.33	874.32	1,236.680.93	.17
79 6,392 29.27 297.31 8,702.26 1,499.82 709.13 1 80 7,042 \$.13 : 702.92 3,605.98 1,702.00 743,31 ROUP VI ROU	78	6,016	245.13	1,038,14	254,479.25	1,503.88	824.80	1,240,400.22	, 1.26
80 7,042 5.13 702.92 3,605.98 1,702.00 743,31 1 1 7,194 39.87 881.28 35,136.63 1,867.94 799.13 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	79	6,392	29.27	297,31	8,702.26	1,499.82	709.13	1,063,567,36	42
ROUP VI 7,194 39.87 881.28 35,136.63 1,867.94 799_13 ROUP VI 46,751 532.44. 469,377.60 10,436.28 ROUP VI (D + B Totals) (G + E Totals) ROUP VI (G + E Totals) ROST INDEX:		7,042	5.13	702.92	3,605.98	1,702.00	743,31	1,265,113.62	66.
ROUP VI TOTALS: 46,751- 532.44. 469,377.60 10;436.28 ROUP VI VERAGES: (D + B Totals) (G + E Totals) (G + E Totals) (OST INDEX:	a *	7,194	39.87	881.28	35,136,63	1,867,94	799_13	1,492,726.89	1.10
GROUP VI AVERACES: (D = B Totals) GROUP VI COST INDEX:	GROUP VI	46,751	532,44.		469,377.60	10,436.28	,	7,897,888,52	_
GROUP VI X I SEALS) COST ENDEX:	GROUP VI AVERAGES:	4	- / / .	. "	ŀ		756.77	•	
TOST FINANCE		•	**************************************	1•	(*)		(G - E Totals)		•
	COST ENDEX:	•	,	•		#			1.16

Table 1 (Continued)

	•		·	Table I (continued)	/ Tunten			
>	¥	£	- ပ	Q. D	, D2	ĵe,	9-7 30 8000	H.
DISTRICT	1974-75 Total ADM	Bilingual FTE	Bil, Cost/ FTE Pupil	Bill, Prog. Cost (B x C)	Grades 4-6 ADM	Grades 4-6 Cost/Pupil	Proc. Cost	Cost Index (C + F)
Group VII 7501-17500 ADM	NG NG	•		ì	,	i)	
, 82	8, 689	14.48	1,223,11	17,710.63	2,180.73	713,25	1,555,405.67	· . 1.11
. 83	9,046	25.98	1,018.37	26,457.25	2,198.39	751.46	1,652,002.15	1.36
. 78	6,902	, 52.27	2,809.96	146,876.61	2,388,80	718.50	1,716,352.80	3.91
85	11,858	176.37	1,096,01	193,303,28	3,174.99	741.77	, 2,355,112,33	. 1.48
. 86	12,462	233.06	406,49	.94,736.56	3,270.01	821.61	. 2,686,672,92	67.
87	15,208	139.06	461.96	64,240,16	3,801.19	746.69	2,838,310.56	.62
CROUP VII TOTALS:	્યું. 67,16 ફ	641.22.		. 543,324,49	17,014.11		12,803,856,43	•
GROUP VII AVERAGES			847.33 (D - B Totals)	· (8)	, ,	752.54 (G ÷ E Totals)	i.	ج سر د

17

Table 1 (Continued)

	Y	£	ပ	Ω.	ស	, tr	, ·	Ħ
DISTRICT	1974-75 Total ADM	Bilingual FTE	Bil. Cost. FTE Pupil	Bil. Prog. Cost (B x C)	Grades 4-6	Grades 4-6 Cost/Pupil	Grades 4-6 Prog. Cost (E x E)	Cost Index (C ÷ F)
Group VIII Over 17,500 ADM	الإ	•		•	· /	,		
88	83,397	455.08	858,88	390,859.11	20,549,19	761.50	15,648,208.18	1.13
GRAND TOTAL: 276,517	276,517	3,566.90	,	2,774,386.86	63,648,80		47,923,074.05	
GRAND AVERAGES:			771.81 (D. ÷ B Totals)	,		752.93 (G ÷ E Totals)		
GRAND COST INDEX:	EX:		. •		,	H.	•	1:03

expenditure district at \$436.88 per pupil. The mean per pupil expenditure was \$752.93. The median per pupil expenditure for grades 4-6 was \$757.78. The standard deviation was 212.06.

Cost indices for the eight groups range from a 0.37 in Group I to
1.16 in Group VI. The following matrix shows the eight groups with their
respective cost indices:

Gı	coup (ADM)	Cost Index
I	(0-200)	0.37
II	(201-500)	0.75
III	(501-1,000)	0.73
IV	(1,001-2,500)	0.88
V	(2,501-4,000)	. 1.07
VI	(4,001-7,500)	1. 16
VII	(7,501-17,500)	1.13
VIII	(Over 17,500)	1.13
	Statewide Average:	1.03

The above matrix suggests that school districts with larger enrollments tend to have higher cost indices for bilingual education programs. The primary reason for the lower cost indices in the first three groups is partially due to the high per pupil expenditures in the regular education program and the relatively lower per pupil expenditures for bilingual education programs. The higher cost indices in the latter groups is partially due to the how per pupil expenditures in the regular education program and the relative-

There exists a number of methods for computing the statewide bilingual education program cost index. One method is to determine the median program cost index, which for this study was 0.81. The/following two equations propose alternate methods:

BCI =
$$\left(\frac{\sum \text{Bil. Program Costs Per Pupil}}{N}\right) \div \left(\frac{\sum \text{Grades 4-6 Cost Per Pupil}}{N}\right)$$
 (1.1)

where

BCI = Statewide Bilingual Education Program Cost Index.

N = Number of districts providing Bilingual Education Programs.

Equation 1.1 presents the weighted mean program cost index for bilingual education. This equation calculated the mean program cost index at 0.95.

$$BCI = \left(\frac{\sum Bil. \ Prog. \ Costs}{\sum Bil. \ Pupil \ FTE}\right) \stackrel{:}{:} \left(\frac{\sum Grades \ 4-6 \ Prog. \ Cost}{\sum Grades \ 4-6 \ ADM}\right)$$
 (1.2)

where

BCI = Statewide Bilingual Education Program Cost Index.

Equation 1.2 presents the mean program cost index for bilingual education. This equation calculated the mean at 1.03. This study utilized this equation to calculate the statewide program cost index. This method was chosen over the previous two methods because it reflects more accurately the statewide costs for both the regular education programs, grades 4-6, and the bilingual education programs.

The results of the study indicate that no significant cost differences exist between bilingual education program costs and non-bilingual regular education program costs on a statewide basis. The study shows that it costs \$777.81 to provide a bilingual education program per FTE pupil. It costs \$752.93 per pupil to provide a non-bilingual regular education program at the elementary school level. The \$24.88 difference between the two programs suggest that it costs approximately 1.03 or 3% more to provide a bilingual

program over the regular program, grades 4-6. Teachers and teacher aides represent the highest expenditure items.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine and compare the costs associated with bilingual education programs and non-bilingual regular education programs, grades 4-6.

The costs associated with bilingual education programs as compared to non-bilingual regular education programs are basically similar with a difference of 3.0 percent higher for bilingual programs. The bilingual needs of limited English-speaking and non-English speaking students should not only be satisfied from a moral, social, and academic perspective, but the results of this study also suggest that cost should not be a limiting factor. That is, bilingual education programs are not as expensive to provide as is commonly believed.

Finally, it is important to note that the bilingual education costs determined in this study do not reflect the costs associated with the quality of the bilingual programs. This study determined the costs of the bilingual education programs as they existed in the 62 New Mexico school districts providing such programs.

District Code No. (Leave Blank)

APPENDIK A BILINGUAL EDUCATION

All questions are to be enswered for Operational funded FTZ's, Salaries and Other Expenditures extept where etherwise specified for the flocal year 1974-75.

Expenditure information must correspond to Remort. 1974-75 for the month of June 1973, column 5. Same FTZ and expenditure settles for the month of the same for the personnel only. Column 5. Same FTZ and expenditure and the formation is required from the 2200 Special Projects and is a designated. Expenditure account code numbers are designated for all questions in brackets either firmediately following the question of undergrath the blank to be filled in. When an expenditure account code curber is not designated for a savered for a savered for the formation of the formation of the filled in. When an expenditure account code curber is not designated for a savered for a savered for the formation of the filled for the fil

13	C:::\$::[C::S::S::S::S::S::S::S::S::S::S::S::S::S						
	75	¥	operational FTE	•	Non-operational Federal Funded FTE	* ,-	
	 Number of FIE classroom teachers merving Bilingual Education Programs in each of the respective educational program categories: 		270.04	+	2200 -	. •	Fre Total
*	2. Number of FIE teacher aiden serving Bilingual Education Programs in cath, of the respective educational program cathgorisms:	,	2723		274	.•	275 FTE Total
្តា ់ <u>ខ</u>	3. Number of FIE and salaries for #filegeal Education Program Administration by the folicying categories;	Expend. Acct. Code Number	. Si	Oper. Salaries Paid 278	279	Categorical Federal Funded Salaries Paid 280	
	a: Program Administrator/Director b. Assistants/Coordinators/Others	281	282	283.	(2250) 284 - (2200)	(2200) 285 (2200)	,
•	e. Secretarial/Clerical	286	287	288	289.	290	
•	4. Number of FTE students served by operational and federal funds. (fee 40 or 80 Day reporting period information whichever was used for funding purposcal.	291 State Equalization	292 + Othor Oper.	•	293 Federal FIE	•	294 Tetal FTE
•	S. Tetal expenditures for Bilingual Education Program instructional supplies (220.01 + /210.02 + 210.01 + 240.01)				,		Expenditures

Person completing Section V : Signatures

Print or Type

Phones

(Print or Type

Disertee Names

APPENDIX B

WORKSHEET I-A

DETERMINATION OF PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR REGULAR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, GRADES 4-6

Administration (100)

Total Items: 77 + 80 + 83 =

Total Items: 100 + 101 = ____, Item 101 ÷ ____ = ___.

Total Items: (113 + 116 + 119 + 153 + 158 + 163 + 237 + 242 + 247 + 278 + 288 + 303 + 308 + 313 if 100 Series or 210.01 is stated in the expenditure account code number) = _____.

Total Items: 20 + 22 + 24 + 26 + 27 + 41 =

F A E G + Item B, Worksheet I-B =

R Item 101 = ____ + __ = ___ __ J

- + Item 3 = _____

- A = Expenditures for administration for grades 1-6
- B = Total FTE teachers grades 1-6.
- C = Percent FTE teachers in grades 4-6
- D = Expenditures for administration for grades 4-6 specified by proration
- E = Expenditures for administration specified in other educational programs
- F = Expenditures for administration including principals district-wide
- G = Expenditures for administration district-wide unspecified
- M = Per teacher expenditures for administration district-wide unspecified
- I = Expenditures for administration grades 4-6 mertion of unspecified
- J Total expenditures for administration grades 4-6
- K = Per pupil expenditures for administration for grades 4-6

```
Instruction (200) and Attendance Services (300)
Total Items: 91 + 95 + 99 = _____. Total Items: 28 + 31 =
Total Items: 102 + 103 + 104a + 105a + 138 + 139 + 140a + 141a + 325a
+ B = D x Item 101 = E
Item 3 + Item 101 = _____ - Item 177 = _____
Total Items: 37 + 54 = _____, Total Items: 38 + 55 =
Item 58 ÷ ____ = __ x Item 101 = ___ .
Total Items: 89 + 91 + 125 + 127 + (any corresponding expenditure where 210.03
             is stated in the expenditure account code number)
              T B U x Item 101 =
 Total Items: 45 + 47 + 49 + 51
 Total Items; 93 + 95 + 129 + 131 + 188 + 190 + 192 + 197 + 199 + 201/ + 206
             + 208 + 210 and any corresponding expenditure where 210.5 series
             is stated in the expenditure account code number
      -- x = -- + Item 1 = - x Item 3 = -
 Total Items: 97 + 99 + 132 + 135 + (any corresponding expenditure where 210.0
             is stated in the expenditure account code number) =
 Item 53 - _____ = ____ + Item 1 = ___
 Total Items: 109 7 145 + 146 7 (172 if 170 = 220.01, 220.02, 230.01, or 240.01)
             + 212 + 214 + 216 + 218 + 295 + 321 =
 Item 60 - (Item 110 + ___
                        _ + Item 110 = 4
```

- A = Expenditures for instructional salaries excluding teacher and instructional aides salaries
- B = Total teachers district-wide
- B; = Total expenditures for teachers increments and extended contracts
- C = Total teachers' salaries district-wide
- C1 = Total teachers' salaries district-wide minus increments and extended contracts
- D = Average teacher salary district-wide
- E = Expenditures for teacher salaries grades 4-6
- F. = Pupil/teacher ratio
- F, Total teachers minus teachers in Class B programs
- I = Total instructional aides district-wide.
- J Total instructional aides salaries district-wide
- K Average instructional aide salary district-wide
- L Expenditures for instructional aide salaries grades 4-6
- M = Per pupil expenditures for instructional aide salaries grades 4-6
- # = Substitute salaries per FTE teacher district-wide
- O = Substitute salaries expenditures grades 4-6
- P = Total expenditures for teacher salaries grades 4-6
- Q = Per pupil expenditures for teacher salaries grades 4-6
- \$ = Total expenditures for coordinators specified .
- T = Expenditures for coordinators district-wide unspecified
- U Per teacher expenditures for coordinators district-wide unspecified
- V = Expenditures for coordinators portion of unspecified for grades 4-6
- W = Expenditures for other instructional personnel district-wide
- X = Total expenditures for other instructional personnel specified .
- Y = Expenditures for other instructional personnel district-wide unspecified
- Per pupil expenditures for other instructional personnel district-wide unspecified
- AA = Expenditures for other instructional personnel portion of unspecified for grades 4-6
- BB = Expenditures for secretarial/clerical assistants specified
- CC = Expenditures for secretarial/clerical assistants unspecified
- DD Per pupil expenditures for secretarial/clerical assistants unspecified
- EE = Expenditures for secretarial/clerical assistants portion of unspecified for grades 4-6
- FF = Expenditures for instructional supplies specified
- GG = Expenditures for instructional supplies district-wide unspecified
- BH Per pupil expenditures for instructional supplies district-wide unspecified
- II = Expenditures for instructional supplies grades 4-6 portion unspecified *
- JJ Total expenditures for instructional supplies grades 4-6
- KK = Per pupil expenditures for instructional supplies
- LL = Total expenditures for instruction and attendance services grades 426
- M' = Per pupil expenditures for instruction and attendance services grades 4-6.

WORKSHELD I-C

Health Services (400), Operation (600) and Maintenance of Plant (700), Fixed Charges (800), and Student Activities (1000)

Total Items : 62 + 63 =

Motal Items: 65°+ 66 =

Total Items: 68 + 69

A - Total expenditures for health services district ide

- Per pupil expenditures for health services district-wide - Expenditures for health services grades 4-6

C = Total FTE teachers minus Class A program FTE teachers

- Total expenditures for operation of plant district-wide

- Per teacher expenditures for operation of plant district-wide

Expenditures for operation of plant grades 4-6

"Total expenditures for maintenance of plant district-wide

- Per teacher expenditures for maintenance of plant district-wide

I - Expenditures for maintenance of plant grades 4-6

= School district ADM excluding Early Childhood Education, student. FTE

= Fixed charges (employee benefits) per pupil district-wide

* Expenditures for (employee benefits) grades 4-6

- Fixed charges (other) per pupil district-wide

Expenditures for fixed charges (other) grades 4-6

Expenditures for student activities district-wide

= Expenditures for student activities grades 4-6

Total expenditures for health services, operation & maintenance of plant, fixed charges, and student services grades 4-6

- Per pupil expenditures for the above educational functions grades 4-6

WORKSHEET I-D

Total: From Worksheet I-A, Item K = ____

From Worksheet "I-B, Item M"=

From Worksheet I-C, Item R = _____

S

Sparsity Corrections

Total Items: 2 + 3 + 4 + 9 + 10 =

Item 14 + ____ = ___

Item 1 - Item 6 -

Item 18 ÷ ____ = ___

S = Per pupil operational expenditures for grades 4-6

T = Total elementary, Jugior high, Special Education Classes C & D ADM

U = Per pupil allocations for elementary and junior high sparsity

▼ = School district ADM excluding Early Childhood Education student FTE

W = Per pupil allocations for discrict sparsity

X = Total per pupil allocations for sparsity

Y = Per pupil operational expenditure for grades 4-6 excluding sparsity

APPENDIX C

DETERMINATION OF PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

_. Total Items: 11 + 292 Item 270 x Item D, Wa Item 270 m Item N, Worksheet I-B = A₂ - B \ A₂ Item 273 x Item K, Worksheet I-B . Item H, Worksheet I-A x Item 270.= Total Items: 278 + 283 + 288 = _. Item 270 + Item 272 = Total Items: 280 + 285 + 290 = _ ____. Items (291 + 292) ÷ Item 294 = Iten 👺 Worksheet I-B x Item 270 = _ If I = K, then no further calculations on program administration are required. _. Item 295 ÷ _ + Item S, Worksheet I-D - Expenditures for teacher salaries Expenditures for substitute salaries for bilingual education A2 = Total expenditures for teacher salaries - Total operational student FTE in bilingual education = Per pupil expenditures for teacher salaries Pupil/Teacher Ratio = Expenditures for teacher aide salaries Per pupil expenditures for teacher aide salaries State expenditures specified for program administration - Expenditures for general district-wide administration Federal expenditures for program administration - Percent state funded FTE teachers of total funded bilingual education teachers = Expenditures for coordinators portion of unspecified for bilingual education, = Percent state funded student FTE of total funded bilingual education student FTE - Expenditures for program administration excluding coordinators expenditures = Total expenditures for program administration = Percent state expenditures for program administration of total administration costs Percent state funded FTE students over percent state program administration . . expecditure = Federal expenditures used to administer state bilingual programs Percent state program edministration expenditures over percent state funded FTE students State expenditures used to administer federal bilingual programs Adjusted program administration expenditures Per pupil expenditures for instructional supplies Total expenditures for bilingual education
Per FTE pupil expenditures for bilingual education programs
Prorated expenditures for operation and maintenance of plant

Program Cost Index