“Rules”

- Informal format, but we have a lot of ground to cover
- Questions OK; but no time for long debates
- Respect each other’s time, opinion, right to speak
- Do not quote one another – your comments are off the record
Introduction to EPLC
The Education Policy and Leadership Center

Purpose
Strategies
Education Policy Goals
The Mission of EPLC is to encourage and support the development and implementation of effective state-level education policies in order to improve student learning in grades P-12, increase the effective operation of schools, and enhance educational opportunities for citizens of all ages.
EPLC Strategies

• **Strategy #1 - Information**  
  Link relevant and reliable research and other information to state-level education policymakers and others and provide assistance with policy analysis and policy development.

• **Strategy #2 – Leadership**  
  Develop awareness and capacity among policymakers, educators, parents and community leaders to serve as advocates and champions for significant education policy issues.

• **Strategy #3 – Public Advocacy**  
  Promote a public climate that expects and holds policymakers accountable to advocate, adopt and implement effective policies that advance significant education goals.
“Education”

Encourage everyone to think in terms of a broad definition of ‘Education” to include Early Ed, K-12, Career Ed, Special Ed, Post-Secondary Ed, Arts, Museums, Libraries, Adult Literacy and more.
FRAMEWORK FOR EDUCATION POLICY

- Governance (Who makes the policies)
- Standards (Expectations)
- Assessment (How are we doing)
- Consequences (Take seriously)
- Educational Capacity (What works)
- Education Finance (How to pay)
- Alignment
Part 1

K-12 GOVERNANCE

Who makes the policies?
Governance of K-12

Intersection of Federal, State and Local Policymakers
State Government Role

- PA State Constitution – historical and current
- Authority and Responsibility found here
Relationship of State Government and School Boards

- Legislature created school districts and school boards
- Broad Scope of PA School Code, Regulations, Related laws
- Legislature can encourage, mandate, inhibit or prohibit
Local Government Role

• No municipal government role in most districts
• Schools districts and boards created by state legislature
• Authority and responsibility established in state statutes and regulations
Federal Role

- Authority and Responsibility
- Special Education
- Teacher Preparation
- At-Risk Children – special services
- “No Child Left Behind” Law
- Finance Issues
- Future – Re-Authorization of ESEA/NCLB
State Policymakers: The Governor

- Governor
- Director of Policy and Planning
- Secretary of the Budget
- Children’s Cabinet
- A strong executive state
State Policymakers: The Legislature

- House and Senate Leaders
- Education Chairs
- Education Committees
- Appropriations Chairs
- Appropriations Committee
- Committee Staff
- Other members
State Board of Education

- Created by Statute
- Composition, selection & terms
- Chair
- Council on Basic Education
- Council on Higher Education
- Staff

- Authority and Duties
  - Master Plan for Basic Education
  - Master Plan for Post-Secondary Education
Department of Education

- Secretary of Education
  - Appointed by Governor
  - Serves at pleasure of Governor
- Deputy Secretaries
- Role of Department
- Standards, BECs, Guidelines
- Other Departments (DPW, AG)
Those who influence...

- PSBA
- PASA
- PSEA, PFT
- PAESSP (& Teamsters)
- PASBO
- PTA, Advocacy, Religious
- Higher Ed groups also
- Many others (membership, others)
Making State Law

Statutory Process
http://www.legis.state.pa.us/WU01/VC/visitor_info/pdfs/makingLaw.pdf

Regulatory Process
http://www.irrc.state.pa.us

Fiscal Notes
Strong Executive State

- States have different structures & relationships among Governor, State Board, CSSO, & Department
- Influence of PA Gov – State Board, Secretary, Department
- Governor Rendell & politically divided Legislature
State Policy Levers

- Bully-pulpit
- Constitution
- Statutes
- Regulations
- Standards, BECs, Guidelines
- Appropriations
- Conditions to Appropriations
- Appointing Authority
Local Governance Structure

- Number of districts (500)
- Boards (all elected except Philadelphia)
- Exceptional Cases
  - Financial Distress
  - Empowerment - NCLB Reconstitution
  - Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Chester-Upland
- Directors – Selection, Terms
- Few Pre-requisites, No Professional Dev.
Local School Boards

- Role of Board
- Duties
- Relationship with superintendent
- To Intermediate Units
- To Voc-Ed, Community Colleges
- To Charter Schools
- See 2004 EPLC Report
Intermediate Units

- Established by state law
- Service agencies to districts
- Operate some programs for state
- Governed by board members that come from member districts
- Funded by state and earned funds
- http://paiu.org
Charter Schools

- Authorized by state law in 1997
- Are Public Schools
- Charter given to a not-for-profit
- But may be operated by another firm
- Exempt for some requirements
- Chartered by one or more school districts
- State Appeals Board
- Funded by school districts where charter students live
- Cyber charter schools
EPLC’s K-12 Governance Project

“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”
Changing Roles of Boards
“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

- Education reforms since 1983
- Attention to school boards is overdue
- Growing role for feds and states
- More accountability for student achievement
Roles of School Boards

“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

• Representatives of community
• Agents of state government
• Trustees for education system
• Intermediaries
Represent Community
“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

- A traditional role
- Represent/transmit values
- Protect against complete homogenization of public school system
Agents of State Government
“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

• A traditional role
• State requirements, focused on student achievement, more rigorous
• More state oversight and accountability
Trustees of Education System

“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

- Entrusted to preserve and to strengthen the educational system
- Responsibility to current and future generations of students
Intermediaries
“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

• Growing in importance
• Bridge between district, community and state
• Leadership required
• Take lead in tackling tough issues, making tough choices
Responsibilities of Boards

“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

- Current state law prescribes list of actions requiring board approval; dates from period before professional school administrators
- invites micro-management
- should focus on policymaking and the goal of student achievement
Responsibilities of Superintendents

“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

- Current law - little explicit responsibility/authority
- Does provide authority to sit with board and to speak
- Leads to conflict in some places between board and superintendent
- Should be treated as CEO
- Should have authority enhanced if to be held accountable
Effective Board Members

“Strengthening the Work of School Boards in Pennsylvania”

- Board members have no authority to act individually on district matters
- Each member must be prepared to effectively and simultaneously fulfill the roles as community representative, state agent, trustee, and intermediary
- Currently, no training/professional development required
A Few Policy Questions

• What is the appropriate balance between local-state-federal authority for public education?
• Who Kind of Choices Should Be Available to Parents and Students in Pennsylvania?
• Does Pennsylvania need 500 school districts?
• What requirements should be pre-requisites for citizens to serve as school board members?
• What are the appropriate roles for the board and the superintendent?
• How should a school board be held accountable? For what?
Part 2

STANDARDS

Expectations or “What Do We Value?”
HISTORY OF STATE-WIDE ACADEMIC STANDARDS

• Response of States to “1983 Nation at Risk”
• Describe what is expected of students
• Replaced system based upon seat-time and course labels
• “Standards-Based” - Standards are the basis for a comprehensive reform of system
• Supported now by NCLB and state law
BACKGROUND TO PA STATE STANDARDS

- Traditional Role of State Board of Ed
- Outcomes-Based Ed Debate in early 90’s
- Gov. Ridge and O’Neill Commission mid 90’s
- Impact of NCLB on PA and the nation?
PA STANDARDS 2012

- Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening
- Math
- Science and Technology
- Environment and Ecology
- Arts and Humanities
- Career Education and Work
- Civics and Government
- Economics
- Family and Consumer Sciences
- Geography
- Health, Safety and Physical Education
- History
- World Languages (dropped from list)
National Standards

- National vs. federal
- Common Core Standards
- College and Career Ready Standards
ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Key State Policy Questions

• Will we have state standards? (mandatory?)
• In what subjects?
• Do we have the right standards? (fair, clear, rigorous, focused, number)
• What are the implications for curriculum, instruction, assessment, educator prep and professional development?
• Should PA adopt National Standards?
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ASSESSMENTS

How Are We Doing?
PA STATE ASSESSMENTS

• Pre-NCLB PA State Assessments
  – Reading, Writing, Math

• Pre-NCLB changes in PA Assessments
  – Science; 3rd grade Reading

• Impact of NCLB on PA
  - State policymakers decide much about assessments
  - More grades
  - Mandatory NAEP participation
  - Focus on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
PVASS
PA Value-Added Assessment System

• A new (additional) way of reporting assessment information

• PVAAS provides two types of information
  - *value-added* (or *growth*) *data* on cohorts of students and student level *projection data*
KEYSTONE EXAMS

• End-of-course assessments designed to assess proficiency in the subject.
• The Keystone Exams are one component of Pennsylvania’s new system of high school graduation requirements.
• For diploma, students must also meet local district credit and attendance requirements and complete a culminating project, along with any additional district requirements.
• shall count for at least 1/3 one-third of final course grade.
STATE ASSESSMENTS

State Policy Questions

• What is purpose of tests? How will results be used? By whom?
  ➢ Evaluate student performance
  ➢ Inform Instruction
  ➢ Evaluate school/district performance

• At what grade levels?

• In what subjects?

• What time of year will test be given?
STATE ASSESSMENTS: More Policy Questions

- Are state assessments aligned with the state standards?
- Should there be multiple forms of assessment?
- How will results be graded?
  - Categories of scores?
  - What scores define various categories?
  - What is proficient (our goal, how high)?
STATE ASSESSMENTS: Other Issues

- How much testing?
- How to motivate students?
- Alternative district assessments aligned with state standards?
- Governor’s Commission for College and Career Success
STATE ASSESSMENTS
ADDITIONAL ISSUES

• Do we have confidence in the tests and related policy decisions?
• What about subjects with no state tests?
• Comparing different cohorts year-to-year
• Special needs students/ESL
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CONSEQUENCES

Why take the assessments seriously?
CONSEQUENCES in PA

Pre-NCLB

- For Students
  - Promotion/Graduation/Other recognition
- For Districts
  - Reputation, some state funding
- Empowerment Districts
- State takeover or special laws
  - Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Chester-Upland
CONSEQUENCES

Under NCLB

- Commitment to “every child”
- Schools accountable for “Adequate Yearly Progress”
- Disaggregated data required
  - Better Information - Achievement gaps
  - Implications for use of resources
- Report cards to parents/communities
- Public information, scrutiny and discussion
CONSEQUENCES
for STUDENTS

• Promotion or Graduation
• H. S. Transcripts/Diplomas
• Supplemental Services (NCLB)
• Public School Choice (NCLB)
• Higher education admission?
• Employment?
• Other?
CONSEQUENCES for SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS

- Reputation
- NCLB – “AYP” - “Improvement” Lists
- State Takeover (Academic vs Fiscal)
- NCLB requires:
  - Supplemental Services
  - Public School Choice
  - Reconstitution
POLICY QUESTIONS ABOUT CONSEQUENCES

- Are the consequences fair.......
  - to students?
  - to educators?
  - to schools and communities?
- Are the consequences effective?
- Are there other consequences that would be more effective?
- Are other interventions needed
  - for students, educators, schools, districts?
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Educational Capacity

What Works to Promote Student Achievement?
EDUCATIONAL CAPACITY

“What works to promote student achievement”

NCLB Requires:

• “Highly Qualified Teachers”
• Parent Involvement
• Research-based programs
POLICY QUESTIONS ABOUT CAPACITY

• What educational capacity is necessary at school, district and state levels?
• Teachers, early education, mentoring, nutrition, safe schools, prof. dev., parent and community involvement?
• What are implications for state and local education funding systems?
• Are there implications for role of school boards and for “local control”?
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TEACHERS
TEACHER ISSUES

• Recruitment
• Pre-Service Preparation
• Induction and Support
• Evaluation
• Other?
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NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND
Key Provisions of NCLB

- All children proficient by 2014
- HQ Teachers, Parents, Community
- State standards
- State assessments
- State “cut” scores for proficiency
- Disaggregate Data
- Make AYP
- “Need Improvement” Lists
- Consequences
NCLB FUNDING ISSUES

• What are the additional costs?

• Sufficiency of federal funding?

• Fiscal Impact on States and School Districts
FUTURE ROLES:
Federal, State and Local?

- Standards?
- Assessments?
- Responsibility for Interventions?
- Responsibility for Funding?
- Role of PDE?
- Continuing Role for Legislature?
- Role of School Boards?
ESEA/NCLB RE-AUTHORIZATION

- Due in 2007
- Keep the Goal?
- Assessments – Value Added? Alternatives?
- AYP and “Need Improvement” Lists?
- Parent Info and Engagement
- Community Engagement/Responsibility
NEXT ESEA and “Race-to-the-Top”

• Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
• Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
• Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and
• Turning around our lowest-achieving schools.
POLICY ISSUES

• Narrowing of Curriculum – Stifling those ready to do more
• AYP vs. Value-Added
• Stigmatization of schools/communities
• “Highly qualified” teachers – pre-service, induction, professional development, assignments
• More effective engagement of parents
• Remain committed to high expectations (standards & proficiency)
MORE QUESTIONS

- What are effective interventions
- What capacity is needed at school, district, and state levels
- Implications for Higher Ed & P-16
- More tension of federal (or national) – state
- Greater tension of state – local
- Future role of School Boards
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K-12 Education Funding in Pennsylvania
WHY STATE FUNDING FOR EDUCATION

- State Constitutional Mandate for General Assembly to Provide for System of Schools
- State Incentive for local government to fund schools
- State funding to reduce local taxes
- Need for Equity
- Need for Adequacy
ADEQUATE FOR WHAT?

The Expectations for Student Performance Established by PA’s Academic Standards

The Expectations of No Child Left Behind Law and Related Policies
An ADEQUATE School Funding System will provide and ensure the use of sufficient funding to establish and maintain the effective and necessary educational capacity to provide every student in every school a meaningful opportunity to accomplish the academic proficiencies for which he or she will be held accountable.
An ADEQUATE School Funding System will *provide and ensure the use of sufficient funding to establish and maintain the effective and necessary educational capacity to provide every student in every school a meaningful opportunity to accomplish the academic proficiencies for which he or she will be held accountable.*
Pennsylvania History

• 1776 State Constitution: “A school or schools shall be established in each county by the legislature, for the convenient instruction of youth…."

• 1790 State Constitution: “The legislature shall, as soon as conveniently may be, provide, by law, for the establishment of schools throughout the State, in such manner that the poor may be taught gratis.”

• 1831: Common School Fund established with $100,000 per year available
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

- 1834: Free School Act required each municipality to establish an elected school board; state funding if matched at least 2:1 by county dollars
- 1835-1897: State school funding to counties based on number of taxable inhabitants in county
- Attempt in 1863 to base funding on number of children failed because of difficulty in counting children in attendance
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

- 1874 PA Constitution: “The General Assembly shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of public schools, wherein all the children of this Commonwealth above the age of six years may be educated, and shall appropriate at least one million dollars each year for that purpose.”

- 1895: PA’s first compulsory attendance law

- 1897: Number of children ages 6-16 added to state funding formula
1923: First effort to use state funding for equalization
1930 to 1950: State aid increases from 17% to 40% of costs
1947: General Assembly creates State Tax Equalization Board to determine true market values of real property in each school district
1949: New School Code - State aid based upon “district teaching units” X fixed dollar figure established by Legislature X district’s standard reimbursement fraction
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

• 1957: State aid formula begins to consider “actual instructional expense (AIE)”

• Mid 60’s-1983: Statutory goal that the state pay 50% of the statewide district instructional costs

• 1968: For 1966-67 school year and thereafter, State began to pay on basis of “weighted” pupils and local wealth; state also began to make additional payments for children in poverty, density, sparsity, and homebound instruction
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

- 1971: State income tax established
- 1974-75: State reimbursement at 54%
- 1977: Personal income valuation becomes a factor in determining district aid ratio (40%)
- 1977-1980: State reimbursement averages 46% per year
- 1982: All districts held harmless plus $72 million supplement for “Equalized Supplement for Student Learning (ESSL)
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

• 1983: Equalized Subsidy for Basic Education (ESBE) enacted; includes “Factor for Educational Expense” (FEE); removes 50% funding requirement

• 1991: PARSS Equity Suit filed

• 1991: Special Education funding changed

• 1992: ESBE abandoned

• 1993 and 1994: Modest “foundation” funding guarantee included in state funding
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

• 1995-2002: Ridge/Schweiker Administration
  ➢ Vouchers & Charter School Funding
  ➢ Targeted $ - Link to Learn; Read to Succeed

• 1998- Commonwealth Court decides that PARSS v. Ridge is not justiciable

• 2002 Rendell Campaign/Election

• 2003-04 Budget Debate until 12/03
  ➢ Accountability Block Grants in 2004-05
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

- 2006: Legislature mandates a Costing-Out Study
- November 2007: Costing-Out Study is reported
- February 2008: Governor proposes 6-Year Plan
HISTORY: KEY ELEMENTS OF ESBE FORMULA

WADMs (Number of Students) x
Aid Ratio (Relative Wealth of District) x
FEE (Cost Factor) =
Basic Subsidy to the District +
Other Factors (poverty, density, etc.)
SUBSIDY PLUS “ADD-ONS”

- Poverty
- Density, Low-density
- Sparsity
- “Hold Harmless”
- Transportation
- Special education
- Charter Schools
### PUBLIC K-12 SPENDING
CURRENT EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT - 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th></th>
<th>1991-92</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Pupil Amounts for Current Spending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>$10,499</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$5,001</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>$12,512</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>$6,050</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau – June 2011
PUBLIC K-12 SPENDING

CURRENT EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT – 2008-09

Compared to contiguous states, spending in Pennsylvania was below average and ranked 4th in a group of seven states, exceeding Ohio, West Virginia and Delaware, but trailing, Maryland, New Jersey and New York.

- Pennsylvania $12,512
- National 10,499
- Delaware 12,257
- Maryland 13,449
- New Jersey 16,271
- New York 18,126
- Ohio 10,560
- West Virginia 10,367

Source: US Census Bureau – June 2011
SO WHAT’S THE PROBLEM?
INCREASING EXPECTATIONS and CONSEQUENCES for STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

- State Academic Standards Adopted
- NCLB (All proficient by 2014)
- State Requirement to Show Proficiency for Graduation beginning in 2004
- Implications for Higher Ed/Employment
- Governor’s Commission on College and Career Success Recommendations
- Future State Graduation Requirements
- Globalization and “Flat World”
GOAL OF 50% STATE SHARE ABANDONED (1983)

STATEWIDE ED FUNDING FORMULA ABANDONED (1991)
SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING

- State paid 100% excess cost until 1991.
- Assumes 1% and 15% incidence rates.
- No consideration of district costs or wealth.
- In 2009-201, all LEAS reported special ed expenses of more than $3.189 billion, leaving school districts with unreimbursed special ed costs of more than $2 billion.
CHARTER SCHOOLS

* Approved by district or state appeal board
  • No limit on number in state
  • Cost borne by local districts
  • Law assumes some savings to districts
  • But, more than $750 million annual cost to districts
  • Since 2002-03, state reimbursed districts up to 30%, but was eliminated in 2011-2012
OTHER COST DRIVERS

Retirement Costs
Health Care Costs
Construction
### STATE FUNDING APPROPRIATED PER STUDENT

**Source:** US Census Bureau June 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State $</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>State $</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>State $</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td>per pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td>per pupil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>5,814</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>8,967</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,311</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>6,752</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,196</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>9,555</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5,914</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>6,363</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESULT: 2008-09 BURDEN ON LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total K-12 State-wide Revenues</th>
<th>Local K-12 Property Taxes</th>
<th>% from Prop Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>$590,947,579</td>
<td>$168,767,677</td>
<td>28.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>$25,473,158</td>
<td>$11,014,689</td>
<td>43.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in ooo’s

Source: US Census Bureau – 2011
14.68% Difference = $3.739 billion/year
RESULT: INEQUITY FOR STUDENTS ACROSS PA

Great Inequity for Students Among 500 Districts

In 2008-09, current spending per pupil in Pennsylvania school districts ranged from $8,759 (Valley View) to $22,484 (Lower Merion)

This means, in an average classroom of 25 students, a gap of $343,125 per classroom per year.

Inequitable and Inadequate Resources in a NCLB and Standards-Based Environment with Equal Expectations for All Students
RESULT: INEQUITY FOR TAXPAYERS ACROSS PA

Great Discrepancies in Local Effort and Resultant Burden on Local Taxpayers
RESULT: INADEQUATE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES IN MANY DISTRICTS

- Qualified Teachers
- Class Size
- Early Ed/Kindergarten Programs
- Curriculum
- Books, Computers and Materials
- Labs, Foreign Languages, Honors/AP Courses
- Facilities not conducive to learning
WHAT HAS BEEN WRONG WITH THE PA FUNDING SYSTEM

- We have had a “Non-System” and there has been no attention to development of a statewide “system” of education funding
- State Government has had no sense of obligation to students or to honor a commitment to a funding formula
- Annual K-12 Funding had been based on political considerations rather than educational
- Advocates had to re-negotiate basic funding elements such as growth in enrollments every year
POLITICAL CHALLENGES TO OVERCOME

• No relief from state courts
• Many think schools already spend too much
• Many think Pennsylvania taxes are high
• Pennsylvania’s difficult fiscal condition
• Many PA legislators oppose any tax increase
• Political support for tax cuts/caps
POLITICAL CHALLENGES TO OVERCOME

• “Bring home the bacon” expectations
• “Printout” focus of lawmakers
• Tension of “what works” vs “local control”
• No accountability for state lawmakers on this issue
• Funding advocates ineffective in delivering a compelling message
2007 COSTING-OUT STUDY

- Mandated by General Assembly in 2006
- Commissioned by State Board of Education
- Conducted Augenblick & Palaisch
- Reported in November 2007
- Cost of all students accomplishing proficiency in all areas of standards
- Considered special ed, poverty, ELL, regional costs
- Identified district-by-district a total spending gap of $4.6 billion
ACKNOWLEDGE SOME PROGRESS in 2003-2007

- State Funding for Pre-School started
- Basic Subsidy line item increased
- Attention to “Foundation” funding
- Accountability Block Grants initiated
- School districts reimbursed 27% for charter school payments
- Increasing attention to adequacy issues and calls for costing-out study
BUT.....

• State share and state appropriations per student remained far below the national average
• Dependency on property taxes remained, with resultant inequity and inadequacy
• No development of a “system”
• Re-negotiating basic elements such as growth every year
OTHER RELEVANT ACTIVITY

- 2007 Report on Cost Reduction
- 2007 Costing-Out Study
- Statewide Health Benefits Program
- Education Finance Reform Commission
- Discussion about TABOR, limits on state spending/taxes, tax cuts
- More Property Tax Relief/Elimination
- School District Consolidation
BASIC SUBSIDY PROGRESS 2007-2010

• Successful completion of the Pennsylvania Costing-Out Study in November 2007.

• Major School Funding Proposal made by Governor Rendell in February 2008.

• $275 million Basic Subsidy increase and new formula and statutory language enacted in July 2008.

• 2009-10 and 2010-2011 State Budgets Continued Implementation of 6-Year Reform Plan with Basic Subsidy increases of $300 million and $250 million.
NEW BASIC FORMULA IN 2008-2009

- Linked to Costing-Out Study
- But did not include Special Ed
- Planned to increase State Funding by $2.6 billion over 6 years
- Would get state share to 44% in 6 years
- Student focused - focused on closing adequacy gaps
- Would change budgeting “culture” to one of what is owed the districts and students.
ACCOUNTABILITY

• Districts receiving basic ed increase in 2008-09 through 2010-2011 above Act 1 inflation index were required to spend portion above index on “proven school improvement strategies”

• Districts identified as Warning, Improvement or Corrective Action & districts with a school identified for improvement or Corrective Action were required to have PDE approval for use of resources above inflation index
2009-10 Education Budget

• First time cut in state funding for Basic Ed Subsidy ($354 million)
• But… $300 million net increase for Basic Ed Subsidy to school districts
• Cuts to other education and education-related line items
• Use of $654 million federal stimulus funds for Basic Ed Subsidy
2010-11 Education Budget

- Initially, $250 million increase in state funding for Basic Ed Subsidy.
- With numerous cuts to other education and education-related line items.
- With continued use of $654 million federal stimulus funds for Basic Ed Subsidy.
- But... Rendell cut $50 million in August 2010.
- And... Corbett cut $337 million January 2011, but replaced with $387 million federal funds.
- Dependency on federal $ grows to $1.04 billion.
Federal Stimulus Funds for Education 2009 and 2010

- Special Education
- Title I
- Stabilization Fund
- EdJobs Funds
2011-12 Basic Education Budget

• State Funding for School Districts cut by nearly $900 million with greatest impact on poorest districts.

• Includes $150 million cut to Accountability Block Grants and elimination of $225 million Reimbursement to Districts for Part of Charter School Costs

• No increase for special education or career-technical education

• More limits on local tax increases.
• Consequences for students.
LOOKING AHEAD TO 2012-13 BUDGET

• More than $900 million cut to school districts in 2011-12
• “No Tax Increase” Pledge
• Revenue shortfall so far this year of about $500 million
• School districts facing increase in school employee pension payments of more than $300 million
• Budget Message on February 7
Governor Corbett’s 2012-13 Basic Education Budget

- An Increase or a Cut?
- Districts lose $100 million Accountability Block Grant.
- No increase for special education.
- 1.8% increase for career-technical ed.
- No increase in basic subsidy.
- Student Achievement Education Block Grant
- Local Tax collections down during recession.
- Districts already using reserves.
- Another $300 million increase in school employee retirement system payments.
Student Achievement Education Block Grant

- Not about student achievement.
- Does not provide flexibility to school districts.
- Ultimately shifts future increased costs/responsibility to school districts.
Governor Corbett’s 2012-13 Early Education Budget

- Pre-K Counts reduced 5% to $83,620,000.
- Head Start Supplemental cut 5% to $35,414,000.
- Early Intervention (PDE) increased by 4.1% to $206,173,000.
- Impact of elimination of Accountability Grants to districts?
Governor Corbett’s 2012-13 Higher Education Budget

- Community Colleges cut 3.8%.
- State-Related Universities cut 30%.
- SSHE Universities cut 20%.
- IAG’s for Privates cut by 30%.
- PHEAA Grants cut 5% to $361,888,000.
- PA already has some of the highest tuition rates for public higher ed and among the lowest state funding rates for higher ed.
Governor Corbett’s 2012-13 Education-Related Budget

- Adult and Family Literacy cut 5% to $11,675,000.
- State Library cut 5.5% to $1,946,000.
- Public Library Subsidy cut 5% to $50,832,000.
- Library Access cut 5%.
- Museum Assistance Grants remain at $0.
- Grants to Arts Organization level funded at $8,179,000.
Impacts

• On Equal Opportunities?

• On an Educated Citizenry?

• On an Educated Workforce?

• On the well-being of communities and the Commonwealth?
POLICY QUESTIONS FOR STATE POLICYMAKERS

• How much state funding?
• By what formula will state funding be distributed?
• What conditions will be attached to the state funds?
• What taxing authority will be provided to generate local revenues?
• Targeted for some vs. general for all?
• Categorical vs. basic subsidy?
BIG ISSUES

• Should every student have a fundamental right to a quality public education?
• What is student or school “success”? What do we value? How do we measure it?
• Does Money Matter? Consider both the amount and how it is used!
• Accountability for what? Inputs or Performance? With what consequences?
BIG ISSUES

• Hold Harmless every year?
• Who should pay for state mandates?
• Tension of Local Control of Funding vs. State Requirements/Conditions attached to some/all of the Funding.
• How can state funding be used most effectively to level the “playing field” of opportunity?
BIG ISSUE

How will communities and school boards make decisions that will ensure sufficient resources are available, and effectively invested, to support the educational capacity that is necessary and most effective to promote student achievement consistent with state and local academic standards?
PA Education Advocacy Network

- Statewide Network of registered voters identified by legislative districts.
- Build relationship with Lawmakers and Staff.
- Teams in some Legislative Districts.
- More information and sign-up at: http://www.eplc.org/advocacy/network.html
Pennsylvania School Funding Campaign

An Opportunity to Learn and Education Justice Campaign

A Moral Imperative – An Economic Necessity

www.paschoolfunding.org
BIG ISSUES

• Should every student have a fundamental right to a quality public education?

• What is student or school “success”? What do we value? How do we measure it?

• Does Money Matter? Consider both the amount and how it is used!

• Accountability for what? Inputs or Performance? With what consequences?
BIG ISSUES

• Hold Harmless every year?
• Who should pay for state mandates?
• Tension of Local Control of Funding vs. State Requirements/Conditions attached to some/all of the Funding.
• How can state funding be used most effectively to level the “playing field” of opportunity?
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HIGHER EDUCATION
HIGHER EDUCATION IN PA

- The “Non-System”
- State System of Higher Education (14)
- Community Colleges (14)
- State-Related (4)
- State-Aided
- Private
- Private-for-Profit
HIGHER EDUCATION

Governance Structures vary from sector to sector in PA

Funding System
Preferred, Non-Preferred, Capital
PHEAA
Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency

Grants – Full-time Students
Grants – Part-Time Students
Loans
Loan Servicing
Student Aid Information

Copyright 2012 The Education Policy and Leadership Center
State Support for Higher Education – 2011-2012

Per $1000 of Personal Income:
National - $ 6.17
Pennsylvania - $3.39 – Ranked 46th
(Behind NH, CO, MA, VT)
(DE $5.67; MD $5.39; NJ $4.28; NY $4.78; OH $4.63; WV $8.65)

Per Capita:
National - $233.03
Pennsylvania - $143.36 – Ranked 46th
(Behind only NH, AZ, CO, VT)
(DE $235; MD $274; NJ $226; NY $239; OH $174; WV $289)
HIGHER ED ISSUES

• Should Public Funding go to Institutions vs. Students?
• What (if any) Conditions should be attached to Public Funding?
HIGHER ED ISSUES

• What is effect of cost on Access?
• What is effect of cost as Financial Burden?
• To what degree is Access dependent on Geography?
• Is there a role for Public Policy to measure/assure Quality?
• Transfer/Articulation Issues.
• Link back to Basic Ed?
• Workforce Preparation Issues
HIGHER ED ISSUES

- Cost of Higher Education in PA Study (2008)
Grapevine as resource for information on state funding for higher education
http://www.grapevine.ilstu.edu
Center for the Study of Education Policy Illinois State University

State Higher Education Executive Officers
State Higher Education Funding Report
www.sheeo.org
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INFORMATION RESOURCES
INFORMATION TOOLS

- Pennsylvania Bulletin
- History of Bills
- House/Senate Journal
- Legislative websites
- PDE and SBE websites
- www.eplc.org and links to others
- Get on EPLC mailing lists
- *Education Week*
ACHIEVE
www.achieve.org

Center on Education Policy
www.cep-dc.org

Council of Chief State School Officers
www.ccsso.org

Education Commission of the States
www.ecs.org

National Association of State Boards of Education
www.nasbe.org

National Center for Higher Education and Public Policy
www.highereducation.org
RESOURCE PANEL

- Brief introduction of organizations
- Question & Answer and General Discussion Session
Contact Information

Ron Cowell
717-260-9900
cowell@eplc.org

The Education Policy and Leadership Center
800 North Third Street, Suite 408
Harrisburg, PA 17102
www.eplc.org