

1 **Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action Regarding Board Contract Year 2016 Local Workforce Development**
2 **Board Performance Measures and Targets**

3
4 **Introduction** – Staff have been using the same basic target setting methodology since BCY08 and that methodology is
5 driven by four components:

- 6 1) Allocation – Average Children Served Per Day is the performance measure most closely linked to the
7 allocation as the vast majority of the funds are used to directly purchase/subsidize Child Care;
- 8 2) Admin/Ops – Money needed to operate the program is unavailable to pay for direct care. Therefore, the first
9 step in CC Target setting has been determining how much to set aside for anticipated Admin/Ops expenses;
- 10 3) Case Mix – There are dozens of different reimbursement rates (combinations of age of child, type of
11 provider, full/part day care, Choices/At Risk-Transitional), making the case mix one of the key components to
12 target setting; and
- 13 4) Approved Board Reimbursement Rates – Providers are reimbursed at the lesser of their usual-and-customary
14 charge or the Boards’ maximum reimbursement rate. Provider charges tend to rise toward these maximums
15 over time.

16 Beginning in BCY14, TWC made changes related to HB376 from the 2013 legislative session. Among the various
17 provisions of the bill were two key provisions which directly impacted target setting starting in BCY14:

- 18 1) The bill provides that Boards will hire staff to provide various types of support to Texas Rising Star (TRS)
19 providers and those providers who wish to become TRS certified;
- 20 2) The bill provides that 2% of Board allocations will be set aside for quality activities;
- 21 3) The bill required review of the TRS standards and recertification of providers under these new standards; and
- 22 4) Beginning in SFY16, enhanced rate reimbursements paid to TRS-certified providers are to be at least
23
 - 24 • 5 percent higher for a provider with a 2-star rating;
 - 25 • 7 percent higher for a provider with a 3-star rating; and
 - 9 percent higher for a provider with a 4-star rating.

26 Complicating the rollout is the fact that not all existing TRS-certified providers have been recertified and providers
27 with other quality designations are likely to become TRS certified. This make is difficult to determine the degree to
28 which children in TWC’s subsidized child care program will be served by TRS providers at each certification level.

29 In addition, as part of its Legislative Appropriations Request, TWC requested child care targets for SFY16 and SFY17
30 that reflected the expected impact of HB376 and allowed for general increases in reimbursement rates because
31 TWC’s Market Rate Surveys have consistently shown increases in market rates. However, the introduced version of
32 the General Appropriations Act provided for no cost increases. The final version of the bill approved by the
33 Legislature only accounted for increases in costs due to HB376 and did not provide flexibility for general
34 reimbursement rate increases.

35 Given the significant unknowns coming under HB376, in developing targets, staff were particularly conservative
36 developing casemix assumptions, tending to err towards a “more expensive” casemix. This was to minimize the risk
37 of setting Boards up to fail to meet performance expectations, while ensuring that the system should be able to meet
38 the target for the average number of children to be served per day between Choices and At Risk/Transitional care.

39 Details on the methodology used to set targets are contained on pages 2 and 3 of this overview and on the Tables
40 and Chart that follow.

41 **Commission Request** – Staff request the Commission approve staff recommendations for BCY16 Board targets
42 presented as “Total Board Targets” on TABLE 3 as developed using the methodology listed in this document.

1 **BCY16 Child Care Targets Methodology**

2 TABLE 1: BCY14 Child Care Expenditure Baselines –

3 While HB376 earmarks funds for quality initiatives and staffing, that funding is distributed to Boards through a special
4 contract (CCQ). Because CCQ funds must be used for specific quality activities, they are not relevant to target setting.
5 Therefore, staff evaluate Board expenditures from the Child Care Fund (CCF) and Child Care Match (CCM) contracts in
6 a variety of categories to determine what percent of BCY14 expenditures were associated with program
7 administration, information systems, and operations (referred to as Admin/IS/Ops). The table also shows amounts of
8 CCF/CCM funding spent quality activities beyond the amounts spent from the CCQ contracts as well as direct care
9 expenditures.¹ The key outputs from this table are the BCY14 Baseline “Total Admin/IS/Ops” and “Admin/IS/Ops %”
10 which are both used on TABLE 2.²

11
12 TABLE 2: BCY16 CC Expenditure Assumptions

13 Table 2 takes the BCY16 allocations and determines how much should be reserved for Admin/IS/Ops and how much
14 should considered available for Direct Care (and thus be “distributed to targets”).

- 15 1) 2% of the total allocation is set aside for quality expenditures as required by HB376.³ The “Remaining
16 Allocation” is the amount to be used in setting child care targets.
- 17 2) The BCY14 Admin/IS/Ops% is applied to the Remaining Allocation.
 - 18 a. For the 21 Boards with the largest CC allocations, this amount is the BCY16 Admin/IS/Ops Set Aside.
 - 19 b. For the 7 Boards with the smallest CC allocations, BCY16 Admin/IS/Ops Set Aside is the greater of
20 their amount calculated in step 2 or the BCY14 Admin/IS/Ops Expenditure Total.⁴
- 21 3) The Non-Quality Admin/IS/Ops Set Aside is subtracted from the Remaining Allocation and assumed to be the
22 amount minimally Available for Direct Care.

23
24 TABLE 3: BCY16 Targets

25 After determining how much money should be considered minimally available for Direct Care Expenditures (and
26 should thus be allocated to targets), the next step is to use each Board’s assumed casemix and currently approved
27 maximum rates⁵ to determine the amount of care currently affordable.

28 Choices CC tends to be reimbursed at a higher rate than At Risk/Transitional CC (due to a more expensive casemix)
29 and Choices CC is more expensive to the system because parents are not required to pay for some of the
30 reimbursement. Therefore, staff create separate case mixes for each of these types of care and also estimate the
31 amount of Choices CC that each Board will be required to provide during the year.

32

¹ Enhanced reimbursements are considered direct care expenditures.

² Because the CC program involves a variety of one-time and ongoing expenditures which Boards manage over the course of a contract year, TWC uses the most recent closed out contract year data in order to provide the fullest picture contract year expenditures.

³ Although the 2% reserved by HB376 is contained within the CCQ contracts, the 2% is of the total allocation and thus as to be accounted for in target setting.

⁴ The “greater of” stop-loss provision was only needed for 3 of the potentially eligible Boards: Concho Valley, Golden Crescent, and Middle Rio Grande.

⁵ This includes rates that have already been approved but that have not yet gone into effect.

1 The following describes the specific process for setting the targets:

2 • Choices Targets – Because Choices Targets are a mandatory population, the key is to determine how much
3 Choices CC will be needed. This was accomplished by looking at each Board’s individual trends over the past
4 two years. The number of children served per day through Choices Child Care has been dropping for years
5 but reductions have varied from Board to Board with most boards seeing high double-digit reductions,
6 however some actually show stable caseloads or even slight increases.

7 Rather than assume that the recent trends would continue unabated in BCY16, staff applied a more
8 conservative assumption, which anticipated a slowing in the trends.

9 This target is then used to determine how much money will be necessary to pay for Choices CC using the
10 Mean Max Rate based on each Board’s individual casemix and max rates and the remainder of the amount
11 available for direct care is assumed to be available for At Risk/Transitional Direct Care costs.

12 • At Risk/Transitional Targets – These targets are basically set by dividing the amount available to pay for At
13 Risk/Transitional Direct Care costs by the expected average direct care cost at the “Mean Max Rate” for At
14 Risk/Transitional care.

15 • Total Board Targets – The sum of the Choices and At Risk/Transitional Targets (Column 8 of Table 3) – these
16 are the targets that Boards are expected to meet.

17

18

19

TABLE 1: BCY14 CC Child Care Expenditure Baselines

		BCY14 Expenditures (CCF/CCM)					BCY14 Admin/IS/Ops Baseline		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Admin	Info Sys	Ops	Quality*	Child Care Direct Care	Total Admin/IS/Ops Exp	Total CC Exp	Admin/IS/Ops%
1	Panhandle	\$ 343,970.20	\$ -	\$ 1,025,293.14	\$ 105,940.48	\$ 6,151,520.63	\$ 1,369,263	\$ 7,626,724.45	17.95%
2	South Plains	\$ 330,282.69	\$ 10,163.89	\$ 837,341.82	\$ 3,933.36	\$ 6,040,978.98	\$ 1,177,788	\$ 7,222,700.74	16.31%
3	North Texas	\$ 300,831.88	\$ -	\$ 581,810.00	\$ -	\$ 2,560,488.49	\$ 882,642	\$ 3,443,130.37	25.63%
4	North Central	\$ 1,198,102.98	\$ -	\$ 4,335,330.67	\$ 0.00	\$ 26,797,723.88	\$ 5,533,434	\$ 32,331,157.53	17.11%
5	Tarrant County	\$ 1,563,631.97	\$ -	\$ 2,788,218.58	\$ 164,448.12	\$ 26,970,155.94	\$ 4,351,851	\$ 31,486,454.61	13.82%
6	Dallas County	\$ 512,282.54	\$ -	\$ 4,038,703.28	\$ 1,192.42	\$ 45,795,166.58	\$ 4,550,986	\$ 50,347,344.82	9.04%
7	North East	\$ 246,753.50	\$ -	\$ 649,904.04	\$ 93,712.60	\$ 3,723,021.93	\$ 896,658	\$ 4,713,392.07	19.02%
8	East Texas	\$ 651,756.00	\$ 3,845.00	\$ 1,880,496.00	\$ 4,663.00	\$ 10,155,011.00	\$ 2,536,097	\$ 12,695,771.00	19.98%
9	West Central	\$ 138,803.15	\$ 1,827.78	\$ 916,761.80	\$ 15,898.46	\$ 4,140,786.67	\$ 1,057,393	\$ 5,214,077.86	20.28%
10	Upper Rio	\$ 823,236.59	\$ 12,033.26	\$ 1,713,279.11	\$ 75,612.91	\$ 16,233,291.41	\$ 2,548,549	\$ 18,857,453.28	13.51%
11	Permian Basin	\$ 277,244.33	\$ -	\$ 986,124.57	\$ 400,148.97	\$ 5,825,573.13	\$ 1,263,369	\$ 7,489,091.00	16.87%
12	Concho Valley	\$ 240,852.95	\$ 7,926.01	\$ 348,913.41	\$ 181,630.88	\$ 1,686,087.52	\$ 597,692	\$ 2,465,410.77	24.24%
13	Heart of Texas	\$ 245,808.27	\$ 2,516.45	\$ 873,194.98	\$ 131,050.15	\$ 4,662,162.59	\$ 1,121,520	\$ 5,914,732.44	18.96%
14	Capital Area	\$ 539,875.88	\$ -	\$ 2,161,621.43	\$ 220,740.88	\$ 14,221,578.94	\$ 2,701,497	\$ 17,143,817.13	15.76%
15	Rural Capital	\$ 154,529.76	\$ 29,551.93	\$ 2,087,710.46	\$ 203,583.15	\$ 9,249,818.57	\$ 2,271,792	\$ 11,725,193.87	19.38%
16	Brazos Valley	\$ 286,353.71	\$ 15,750.25	\$ 763,612.25	\$ 316,671.96	\$ 4,044,665.56	\$ 1,065,716	\$ 5,427,053.73	19.64%
17	Deep East	\$ 148,616.30	\$ 80,990.77	\$ 1,021,870.71	\$ 139,908.56	\$ 4,665,272.04	\$ 1,251,478	\$ 6,056,658.38	20.66%
18	Southeast	\$ 285,784.62	\$ 138,642.21	\$ 902,942.30	\$ -	\$ 5,215,825.57	\$ 1,327,369	\$ 6,543,194.70	20.29%
19	Golden Crescent	\$ 249,771.51	\$ 14,652.02	\$ 408,184.05	\$ 9.57	\$ 2,704,347.12	\$ 672,608	\$ 3,376,964.27	19.92%
20	Alamo	\$ 1,711,416.82	\$ -	\$ 3,678,660.76	\$ (384.24)	\$ 32,123,117.10	\$ 5,390,078	\$ 37,512,810.44	14.37%
21	South Texas	\$ 330,011.89	\$ -	\$ 797,062.71	\$ 53,638.33	\$ 6,789,986.27	\$ 1,127,075	\$ 7,970,699.20	14.14%
22	Coastal Bend	\$ 259,084.73	\$ 33,413.88	\$ 1,489,873.38	\$ 111,573.29	\$ 8,573,449.94	\$ 1,782,372	\$ 10,467,395.22	17.03%
23	Lower Rio	\$ 702,527.86	\$ -	\$ 2,587,014.53	\$ 1,790.90	\$ 22,296,313.28	\$ 3,289,542	\$ 25,587,646.57	12.86%
24	Cameron	\$ 242,951.83	\$ 47,853.72	\$ 1,422,228.77	\$ 376,560.40	\$ 9,423,909.81	\$ 1,713,034	\$ 11,513,504.53	14.88%
25	Texoma	\$ 123,380.10	\$ 9,291.09	\$ 308,134.66	\$ 45,136.86	\$ 2,459,803.67	\$ 440,806	\$ 2,945,746.38	14.96%
26	Central Texas	\$ 464,477.93	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,455,539.25	\$ 440,939.73	\$ 6,455,224.95	\$ 1,920,017	\$ 8,816,181.86	21.78%
27	Middle Rio	\$ 188,456.22	\$ -	\$ 654,864.91	\$ 38,767.53	\$ 3,264,344.57	\$ 843,321	\$ 4,146,433.23	20.34%
28	Gulf Coast	\$ 2,300,395.61	\$ 46,830.17	\$ 5,765,737.84	\$ 1,604,574.59	\$ 106,307,518.83	\$ 8,112,964	\$ 116,025,057.04	6.99%
LWDA Totals		\$ 14,861,191.82	\$ 455,288.43	\$ 46,480,429.41	\$ 4,731,742.86	\$ 398,537,144.97	\$ 61,796,910	\$ 465,065,797.49	13.29%
Reported to TWC Finance Division							Sum (Col1,2,3)	Sum (Col1,2,3,4,5)	Col6÷Col7

*HB376 requires Boards to provide staff to support TRS providers and providers seeking TRS certification and further earmarks 2% of Board Allocations for quality activities. However, these amounts are funded separately and are not relevant to target setting. The quality amounts shown here were charged to the CCF/CCM grants and are thus relevant to determining the Admin/IS/Ops %.

The enhanced rate differential paid to certified providers is considered a direct care expenditure and is included in the Col5.

TABLE 2: BCY16 CC Expenditure Assumptions

		Adjustment for HB376			BCY16 Assumptions			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		BCY16 Allocation	2% Quality Set aside	Remaining Allocation	BCY14 Admin/IS/Ops Exp	Admin/IS/Ops%	Admin/IS/Ops Set Aside	Available for Direct Care
1	Panhandle	\$ 8,194,580	\$ 163,892	\$ 8,030,688	\$ 1,369,263	17.95%	\$ 1,441,789	\$ 6,588,899
2	South Plains	\$ 7,945,303	\$ 158,906	\$ 7,786,397	\$ 1,177,788	16.31%	\$ 1,269,709	\$ 6,516,688
3	North Texas	\$ 3,548,623	\$ 70,972	\$ 3,477,651	\$ 882,642	25.63%	\$ 891,491	\$ 2,586,160
4	North Central	\$ 36,429,409	\$ 728,588	\$ 35,700,821	\$ 5,533,434	17.11%	\$ 6,110,147	\$ 29,590,674
5	Tarrant County	\$ 33,668,880	\$ 673,378	\$ 32,995,502	\$ 4,351,851	13.82%	\$ 4,560,421	\$ 28,435,081
6	Dallas County	\$ 51,050,356	\$ 1,021,007	\$ 50,029,349	\$ 4,550,986	9.04%	\$ 4,522,242	\$ 45,507,107
7	North East	\$ 5,161,982	\$ 103,240	\$ 5,058,742	\$ 896,658	19.02%	\$ 962,356	\$ 4,096,386
8	East Texas	\$ 14,486,286	\$ 289,726	\$ 14,196,560	\$ 2,536,097	19.98%	\$ 2,835,893	\$ 11,360,667
9	West Central	\$ 5,565,326	\$ 111,307	\$ 5,454,019	\$ 1,057,393	20.28%	\$ 1,106,052	\$ 4,347,967
10	Upper Rio	\$ 19,073,863	\$ 381,477	\$ 18,692,386	\$ 2,548,549	13.51%	\$ 2,526,240	\$ 16,166,146
11	Permian Basin	\$ 7,688,302	\$ 153,766	\$ 7,534,536	\$ 1,263,369	16.87%	\$ 1,271,035	\$ 6,263,501
12	Concho Valley	\$ 2,487,985	\$ 49,760	\$ 2,438,225	\$ 597,692	24.24%	\$ 597,692	\$ 1,840,533
13	Heart of Texas	\$ 6,614,634	\$ 132,293	\$ 6,482,341	\$ 1,121,520	18.96%	\$ 1,229,147	\$ 5,253,194
14	Capital Area	\$ 18,585,111	\$ 371,702	\$ 18,213,409	\$ 2,701,497	15.76%	\$ 2,870,042	\$ 15,343,367
15	Rural Capital	\$ 12,822,105	\$ 256,442	\$ 12,565,663	\$ 2,271,792	19.38%	\$ 2,434,636	\$ 10,131,027
16	Brazos Valley	\$ 5,823,785	\$ 116,476	\$ 5,707,309	\$ 1,065,716	19.64%	\$ 1,120,750	\$ 4,586,559
17	Deep East	\$ 6,868,380	\$ 137,368	\$ 6,731,012	\$ 1,251,478	20.66%	\$ 1,390,818	\$ 5,340,194
18	Southeast	\$ 6,726,226	\$ 134,525	\$ 6,591,701	\$ 1,327,369	20.29%	\$ 1,337,209	\$ 5,254,492
19	Golden Crescent	\$ 3,337,199	\$ 66,744	\$ 3,270,455	\$ 672,608	19.92%	\$ 672,608	\$ 2,597,847
20	Alamo	\$ 41,538,258	\$ 830,765	\$ 40,707,493	\$ 5,390,078	14.37%	\$ 5,849,110	\$ 34,858,383
21	South Texas	\$ 8,325,601	\$ 166,512	\$ 8,159,089	\$ 1,127,075	14.14%	\$ 1,153,713	\$ 7,005,376
22	Coastal Bend	\$ 10,710,961	\$ 214,219	\$ 10,496,742	\$ 1,782,372	17.03%	\$ 1,787,369	\$ 8,709,373
23	Lower Rio	\$ 26,722,082	\$ 534,442	\$ 26,187,640	\$ 3,289,542	12.86%	\$ 3,366,677	\$ 22,820,963
24	Cameron	\$ 12,370,706	\$ 247,414	\$ 12,123,292	\$ 1,713,034	14.88%	\$ 1,803,761	\$ 10,319,531
25	Texoma	\$ 3,095,722	\$ 61,914	\$ 3,033,808	\$ 440,806	14.96%	\$ 453,984	\$ 2,579,824
26	Central Texas	\$ 9,309,729	\$ 186,195	\$ 9,123,534	\$ 1,920,017	21.78%	\$ 1,986,953	\$ 7,136,581
27	Middle Rio	\$ 4,055,234	\$ 81,105	\$ 3,974,129	\$ 843,321	20.34%	\$ 843,321	\$ 3,130,808
28	Gulf Coast	\$ 116,991,662	\$ 2,339,833	\$ 114,651,829	\$ 8,112,964	6.99%	\$ 8,016,942	\$ 106,634,887
LWDA Totals		\$ 489,198,290	\$ 9,783,968	\$ 479,414,322	\$ 61,796,910	13.29%	\$ 64,412,108	\$ 415,002,214
		Excludes \$ for TRS Staff under HB376	Req by HB376	Col1 - Col2	Table1, Col6	Table1, Col8	See Notes to the right	Col3-Col6 (To be distributed to target)

Admin/Is/Ops Set Aside based BCY14 Admin/IS/Ops% (column 5) applied to BCY16 Remaining Allocation (column 3) for all but the 7 Bds w/ the Smallest NonQuality Allocations (indicated by shaded names).

For 7 Bds with the smallest Allocations, Admin/Is/Ops Set Aside was based on Greater of:
 1) BCY14 Admin/IS/Ops% (column 5) applied to BCY16 Remaining Allocation (column 3) OR
 2) the BCY14 Admin/IS/Ops Expenditures (from TRS-Quality Adjustment tab).

This ensures that these smallest Bds have a minimal level of Admin/IS/Ops available to them based on their actual BCY14 expenditures.

Concho Valley, Golden Crescent, and Middle Rio ended up needing their BCY14 Admin/Ops Set Aside boosted to the BCY14 level. In the other 4 cases, the standard application of the % to the Remaining Allocation resulted in an Admin/IS/Ops Set Aside higher than the BCY14 actual expenditure level.

TABLE 3: BCY16 Targets

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
	CHOICES			AT RISK/TRANSITIONAL				FINAL COMBINED #s				
	Avg Max Rate	Choices Portion of Board Target	Cost of Choices at Affordable Max Rate	Amount available for At Risk/Trans Direct Care	Avg Max Rate	PSOC on At Risk/Trans	At Risk/Trans portion of Board Target	Total Board Targets	Max Rate (Combined)	Mean Market Rate at Final Choices/At Risk Casemix	% of Mean Market (Final)	
1	Panhandle	\$ 19.58	26	\$ 133,400	\$ 6,455,499	\$ 18.63	\$ 4.36	1,727	1,753	\$ 18.64	\$ 20.08	92.86%
2	South Plains	\$ 18.68	25	\$ 122,379	\$ 6,394,309	\$ 17.78	\$ 4.34	1,816	1,841	\$ 17.80	\$ 18.56	95.87%
3	North Texas	\$ 18.32	50	\$ 240,051	\$ 2,346,109	\$ 17.54	\$ 4.52	688	738	\$ 17.59	\$ 17.57	100.16%
4	North Central	\$ 25.60	170	\$ 1,140,318	\$ 28,450,356	\$ 24.72	\$ 4.55	5,383	5,553	\$ 24.75	\$ 27.33	90.55%
5	Tarrant County	\$ 24.65	252	\$ 1,627,239	\$ 26,807,842	\$ 23.98	\$ 4.71	5,309	5,561	\$ 24.01	\$ 26.93	89.15%
6	Dallas County	\$ 22.02	914	\$ 5,272,776	\$ 40,234,331	\$ 21.19	\$ 4.13	9,001	9,915	\$ 21.27	\$ 23.55	90.32%
7	North East	\$ 18.81	45	\$ 221,765	\$ 3,874,622	\$ 17.95	\$ 4.04	1,063	1,108	\$ 17.99	\$ 17.32	103.84%
8	East Texas	\$ 20.45	51	\$ 273,235	\$ 11,087,432	\$ 19.53	\$ 4.48	2,812	2,863	\$ 19.54	\$ 18.98	103.00%
9	West Central	\$ 16.11	20	\$ 84,415	\$ 4,263,552	\$ 15.90	\$ 4.01	1,369	1,389	\$ 15.90	\$ 18.07	88.00%
10	Upper Rio	\$ 15.85	314	\$ 1,303,833	\$ 14,862,313	\$ 15.04	\$ 2.95	4,692	5,006	\$ 15.09	\$ 17.30	87.23%
11	Permian Basin	\$ 17.46	20	\$ 91,496	\$ 6,172,005	\$ 17.41	\$ 4.35	1,805	1,825	\$ 17.41	\$ 20.78	83.80%
12	Concho Valley	\$ 17.14	20	\$ 89,828	\$ 1,750,705	\$ 16.78	\$ 4.47	543	563	\$ 16.80	\$ 19.27	87.18%
13	Heart of Texas	\$ 18.86	44	\$ 217,373	\$ 5,035,821	\$ 17.70	\$ 4.01	1,405	1,449	\$ 17.73	\$ 18.60	95.33%
14	Capital Area	\$ 27.40	136	\$ 976,241	\$ 14,367,125	\$ 25.69	\$ 4.25	2,559	2,695	\$ 25.77	\$ 29.72	86.73%
15	Rural Capital	\$ 24.81	87	\$ 565,575	\$ 9,565,453	\$ 24.18	\$ 5.29	1,934	2,021	\$ 24.20	\$ 26.74	90.51%
16	Brazos Valley	\$ 19.91	20	\$ 104,343	\$ 4,482,216	\$ 19.34	\$ 3.32	1,069	1,089	\$ 19.35	\$ 21.77	88.89%
17	Deep East	\$ 18.72	36	\$ 176,593	\$ 5,163,601	\$ 18.02	\$ 4.60	1,469	1,505	\$ 18.04	\$ 17.74	101.67%
18	Southeast	\$ 17.63	45	\$ 207,888	\$ 5,046,604	\$ 16.58	\$ 2.47	1,365	1,410	\$ 16.62	\$ 18.27	90.94%
19	Golden Crescent	\$ 18.17	10	\$ 47,597	\$ 2,550,250	\$ 17.37	\$ 4.11	735	745	\$ 17.38	\$ 20.68	84.04%
20	Alamo	\$ 23.50	281	\$ 1,730,325	\$ 33,128,058	\$ 22.62	\$ 3.81	6,723	7,004	\$ 22.65	\$ 24.78	91.42%
21	South Texas	\$ 17.56	64	\$ 294,444	\$ 6,710,932	\$ 17.89	\$ 3.86	1,826	1,890	\$ 17.88	\$ 18.78	95.22%
22	Coastal Bend	\$ 20.68	100	\$ 541,820	\$ 8,167,553	\$ 20.58	\$ 4.51	1,940	2,040	\$ 20.59	\$ 21.36	96.36%
23	Lower Rio	\$ 15.53	143	\$ 581,763	\$ 22,239,199	\$ 15.13	\$ 3.57	7,341	7,484	\$ 15.14	\$ 17.01	89.04%
24	Cameron	\$ 14.88	100	\$ 389,921	\$ 9,929,610	\$ 14.19	\$ 3.27	3,473	3,573	\$ 14.20	\$ 16.49	86.15%
25	Texoma	\$ 22.07	30	\$ 173,507	\$ 2,406,317	\$ 22.17	\$ 3.67	497	527	\$ 22.16	\$ 20.81	106.48%
26	Central Texas	\$ 16.94	162	\$ 719,056	\$ 6,417,525	\$ 16.46	\$ 5.00	2,138	2,300	\$ 16.49	\$ 18.79	87.78%
27	Middle Rio	\$ 14.85	26	\$ 101,158	\$ 3,029,650	\$ 14.64	\$ 4.09	1,096	1,122	\$ 14.64	\$ 16.60	88.22%
28	Gulf Coast	\$ 24.15	1,350	\$ 8,543,408	\$ 98,091,479	\$ 22.15	\$ 4.56	21,288	22,638	\$ 22.27	\$ 25.23	88.28%
	LWDA Totals	\$ 21.77	4,541	\$ 25,971,747	\$ 389,030,467	\$ 20.07	\$ 4.17	93,066	97,607	\$ 20.15	\$ 22.32	90.25%
	Projected Choices Casemix applied to approved Max Rates	See Note Below	Col1 * Col2 * 262 CC Days	Table 2, Col7 - Col3 from this table	Projected At Risk-Trans Casemix applied to approved Max Rates	Projected At Risk-Trans Casemix applied to PSOC Data	Col4 ÷ (Col5 - Col6) ÷ 262 CC Days	Col2 + Col7 Based on LBB Target of 97,610	[(Col1 * Col2) + (Col5 * Col7)] ÷ Col8	Projected Casemixes applied to Mean Mkt Rates from Survey	Col9 ÷ Col10	

All Avg Max Rates are based on either "current" max rates or rates that had been approved prior to the end of the Legislative Session but which were not yet in effect.

Casemixes are based on each Board's April 2013 to March 2014 casemix with a slight adjustment to reduce relative care and accounting for a larger portion of children being served by providers with a quality certification.

Col2 is based on individual Board trends in Choices CC looking at the Avg % Over-the-Year Change in Kids Per Day comparing recent R12 periods to the same R12 periods one year earlier and in some cases involving smaller Boards, setting slightly higher numbers in the event of unexpected increases.