

# Truth in American Education

Addressing education issues related to: parental rights, local control of schools, and classical liberal arts education.

HOME ABOUT US ▾ RESOURCES ▾

ACTION CENTER ▾



**Sign-up for our E-mails!**

GO

**Common Core Info**

## State Costs for Adopting and Implementing the Common Core State Standards

### National Education Standards and Tests: Big Expense, Little Value

Lindsey Burke February 18, 2011 The Heritage Foundation

*Spending on Standards and Assessment Systems: Selected States*

*The budgetary impact of jettisoning state accountability structures and replacing existing standards and testing could be significant—likely much more than RTTT funding provides.*

*Over the past decade, taxpayers have spent considerable sums to develop*

Common  
Core State  
Standards

National  
Education  
Standards

Gates  
Foundation &  
NCEE  
Influence

State Costs  
for Adopting  
and  
Implementing  
the Common  
Core State  
Standards

National  
Curriculum

Common  
Core State  
Standards  
Content

Standard  
Algorithms in  
the Common  
Core State  
Standards

Myths Versus  
Facts

States  
Fighting Back  
Map

Closing the  
Door on  
Innovation

CCSSI  
Development  
Teams

*spent considerable sums to develop existing state accountability systems:*

**California.** *California's Standardized Testing and Reporting Program, which began in 1998, tests students in grades 2–11 in English, math, science, social science, and history. **Estimates suggest that it would cost California taxpayers \$1.6 billion to replace the existing state standards with the Common Core standards.***<sup>[4]</sup> *Yet California has agreed to overhaul its existing system with the new national standards and assessments.*

**Florida.** *The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test measures student achievement in grades 3–11 in reading, math, and science. Since 1996, Florida has spent more than \$404 million to develop and maintain the system.*<sup>[5]</sup> *Taxpayer investment in the existing high-quality assessments has been substantial, and overhauling the system for unproven national assessments, which Florida has agreed to adopt, could produce significant new implementation costs to taxpayers.*

**Texas.** *Texas has resisted the push for national standards. **The Lone Star State estimates that the adoption of new standards and tests would cost taxpayers upwards of \$3 billion.*** *"Adopting national standards and tests would also require the purchase of new textbooks, assessments, and professional development tools, costing Texas taxpayers an estimated \$3 billion, on top of the billions of dollars Texas has already invested in developing our strong standards," stated Governor Rick Perry (R) in a letter to U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan in opposition to national standards and tests.*<sup>[6]</sup>

**Virginia.** *The Virginia Board of Education unanimously rejected adoption of the*

Common  
Core  
Assessments  
Opt Out Info

Race To The  
Top

District-Level  
Race to the  
Top–Race to  
the Top IV

Privacy Issues  
and State  
Longitudinal  
Data Systems

Statewide  
Longitudinal  
Data Systems

ESEA/NCLB

Statements  
and Proposed  
Plans

Every Child  
Achieves Act  
July 2015

Student  
Success Act

Every Child  
Ready for  
College or  
Career Act

No Child Left  
Behind  
Waivers

ESEA  
Blueprint,  
Briefing Book,  
and Position  
Paper

*unanimously rejected adoption of the proposed Common Core State Standards and tests. One of the board's chief arguments against adopting national standards was fiscal, with members noting that "Virginia's investment in the Standards of Learning [SOL] since 1995 far exceeds the \$250 million Virginia potentially could have received by abandoning the SOL and competing in phase two of Race to the Top." [7] Indeed, since 1996, Virginia taxpayers have paid more than \$379 million to develop and implement the state SOLs. The costs for developing the SOLs include expenditures for the initial development and subsequent revisions of the curriculum frameworks and assessments, as well as the development of new supporting materials and professional development related to using the new testing system.*

## California

### California and the Common Core: Will There Be a New Debate About K–12 Standards?

June 2010 EdSource

*Based on the state's past experience, **new curriculum frameworks and instructional materials could cost about \$800 million for English and math combined.** In addition, **training teachers in both subjects could cost as much as \$765 million**, based on an assumption of \$2,500 per teacher per subject and counting teachers both in self-contained classrooms and those that teach single subjects. An additional \$20 million would be needed for training principals to help them in their work as instructional leaders (based on the amount that the state and the Gates Foundation appropriated in 2001–02 for initial training of administrators). Finally, developing tests based on new standards*

Home  
School/Private  
School

*would add a relatively small amount to the total cost, with the exact sum depending on how quickly the new test questions were phased in and whether the state would retain the existing tests' format, which currently contains almost entirely multiple-choice questions. Participation in an assessment consortium could also affect this cost. **Thus, an estimate of the total cost of a more comprehensive retooling is about \$1.6 billion over a few years.***

## Washington State

### Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics: Analysis and Recommendations Report to the Legislature January 2011

#### Estimated Costs for CCSS Implementation

Estimated State Level Costs	Per Fiscal Year	Five Year Total
2010-11 (FY 11)*	\$2,500,000	
2011-12 (FY 12)*	\$3,400,000	
2012-13 (FY 13)*	\$3,600,000	
2013-14 (FY 14)*	\$3,800,000	
2014-15 (FY 15)*	\$3,800,000	
<b>Total Five Year Estimated State Level Costs</b>		<b>\$17,100,000</b>
<b>Estimated District Level Costs</b>		
2010-11 (FY 11)*	\$25,300,000	
2011-12 (FY 12)*	\$29,600,000	
2012-13 (FY 13)*	\$35,100,000	

2013-14 (FY 14)*	\$41,800,000
2014-15 (FY 15)*	\$33,700,000
<b>Total Five Year Estimated District Level Costs Total Five Year Estimated State Level and District Level Costs</b>	<b>\$165,500,000</b>
	<b>\$182,600,000</b>

\*Yearly cost estimates are from the [OSPI report](#). See Pages 24 and 29.

#### Funding Sources for CCSS Implementation

Funding Sources for the Implementation of the CCSS State Level Sources	Annual	Five Year Total
State Assessment Budget*	\$150,000	\$750,000
State Funding for Regional Mathematics Coordinators*	\$1,600,000	\$8,000,000
Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Quality (federal)*	\$510,000	\$2,550,000
Title II, Part B, Math Science Partnership Grant Funds (federal)*	\$125,000	\$625,000
School Improvement Grant Funds (federal)*	no amount provided	
SMARTER Balanced		

<b>Balanced Assessment Consortia (SBAC)</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>
<b>Supplemental Grant \$250,000-\$300,000 over four years*</b>	
<b>Five Year Total of State Level Fund Sources</b>	<b>\$12,225,000</b>
<b>Estimated Five Year State Level Costs Total</b>	<b>\$17,100,000</b>
<b>Est. State Level Costs Minus State Level Fund Sources</b>	<b>\$4,875,000</b>
<b>District Level Sources*</b>	
<b>Basic Education Funding (state) #</b>	
<b>Title I (federal) and Learning Assistance Program (LAP, state) &amp; Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Quality (federal) %</b>	<b>Unable to determine indeterminate amounts</b>
<b>School Improvement Grant Funds (SIG, federal) &amp; Title II, Part B, Math Science Partnership Grant Funds (federal) @</b>	
<b>The district level funding sources have been identified and listed above. Given the information in the report it is not possible to determine the amount of funds from any given source that would be allocated to support the implementation of the CCSS. Districts may have commitments for funds on</b>	

**may have commitments for funds, or portions of funds, from any given source that would preclude them from being available to support the implementation of the CCSS.**

**Estimated Five**

**Year District**

**\$165,500,00**

**Level Costs**

**Total**

**\* Fund source information is from the [OSPI report](#). State level sources pages 2-26. District level sources pages 30-32.**

**# Figures presented were not consistent and could not be used to determine an annual or five year total amount of funds available**

**& An unspecified portion of an undisclosed amount may be used by qualifying districts**

**% An unspecified portion of an undisclosed amount may be used according to individual district's comprehensive plan**

**@ WA receives \$2.5 million annually of which \$2 million may support implementation efforts**

Tables from [Where's the Money?](#) pdf developed by [The Underground Parent](#).

## **Missouri**

### **Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education Frequently Asked Questions Common Core State Standards**

As stated earlier, the Department has not requested additional or new funding for the implementation or professional development associated with revised standards and assessments.

All rights reserved © Truth in American Education Hosted by 4:15 Communications, LLC