

# SB 284: Quality Basic Education Act

Legislative Rubric from Science for Georgia

[SB 284](#) would create a weight for the of funding for schools serving children living in poverty and decrease the student-to-teacher ratio. Under the current code, funding is distributed based on weights for amount and age of students.

Criteria	Variables			
<b>Impact</b> <b>Who is going to be impacted? Is it equitable? List stakeholders &amp; opinions.</b>	Negative		Positive	
	This will help Georgia to close the achievement gap in schools that is strongly correlated to <a href="#">race</a> and <a href="#">wealth</a> . After the pandemic, the <a href="#">education gap began widening</a> and more effort is needed to reverse this trend. Education inequality can impact social mobility and further <a href="#">generational income inequality</a> .			
<b>Reach</b> <b>Does it reach its target audience?</b>	0 - No impact on target audience.	1 - Impacts narrow segment.	<b>2 - Impacts majority; exceptions.</b>	3 - Impacts entire target audience
	The schools that need funding the most would be the most impacted. However, disadvantaged students at school that are not predominantly disadvantaged will not benefit.			
<b>Scientific Merit</b> <b>Does it utilize scientific research accurately?</b>	<b>YES - this does follow scientific research accurately. Here's why....</b>		NO - this does not present scientific research accurately.	
	Studies on class size have produced <a href="#">mixed results</a> . However, it can be concluded that students from disadvantaged backgrounds benefit more than the general population with a reduction in class size. The 15:1 ratio falls within the optimum range and the <a href="#">national average</a> . Class size is just one factor that impacts achievement, but there is a larger link to <a href="#">school funding</a> .			
<b>Financial Feasibility</b> <b>Is it financially feasible? or does this have burdensome finances (higher taxes, future costs, etc)?</b>	0 - Extremely high costs	1 - Expensive but can be done	<b>2 - Slight financial burden</b>	3 - No financial burden
	The change in the code would not increase the overall budget but shift more funding to disadvantaged schools. In response, other schools may push for an increase in education spending, creating a slight burden. However, there are <a href="#">long term economic benefits</a> to ensuring students have equally high levels of performance. <a href="#">GBPI estimates</a> every dollar spent on this mission will lead to \$2.60 in savings.			
<b>Political Feasibility</b> <b>Level of opposition and partisan disagreement.</b>	0 - Majority disagreed, regardless of party.	<b>1 - Split along party lines.</b>	2 - Minimal Opposition	3 - Complete consensus (zero to five 'Nays').
	All sponsors are Democrats. The bill was never discussed in the Senate Education and Youth Committee.			

<b>Measurable Metrics?</b> <b>We recommend looking at these 3 metrics. Is the data available or being measured?</b>	0 - no data	1 - some data / not accessible	2 - most data / somewhat accessible	3 - complete transparency
	The funding and performance of schools is tracked and reported on by the state education department.			