

ED-RED**LEND**
**LUDA**
Large Unit District Association**SCOPE****Testimony for the Education Funding Advisory Board****April 28, 2010**

Collectively, ED-RED, LEND, SCOPE, and LUDA represent over 250 school districts and educate more than half of the children in the state of Illinois. We geographically represent every corner of the state and include both urban and suburban, as well as unit and dual school districts.

We raise the following for your consideration as they relate to the school funding system in Illinois:

FUNDING MODEL:

- Broad, fair, and stable tax system
- Long-range, realistic, multi-year, and continuing
- Focus and limited to public schools

GENERAL STATE AID:

- The General State Aid continuing appropriation should be reinstated and made permanent as recommended by a previous EFAB panel.
- The most dollars available should go towards GSA which allows the most flexibility for local schools to do what they do best based upon their individual system data.
- Future increases should be based on ECI.

CATEGORICALS:

- Consideration should be given to collapsing some funds, such as Education, Transportation, and Operations and Maintenance into one Operations Fund. Districts desire the most flexibility and efficiency in order to maximize resources.
- In 2007-08 ISBE conservatively estimated the Special Education shortfall was \$900 million. Rising special education costs affect every district in the state and are a continuous drain on local dollars.

LOCAL RESOURCES:

Before state money is sent to any school district, we strongly believe that no school district should be eligible for state aid until they have demonstrated that:

Illinois School Finance Adequacy: Comparison of a Statewide Simulation to Current Revenues

Presentation to the
Education Funding Advisory Board
April 28, 2010
Springfield, IL

National-Louis University
Illinois School Finance Adequacy Initiative

Michelle Turner Mangan, Assistant Professor, National-Louis University
Ted Purinton, Dept. Chair & Assistant Professor, National-Louis University
Anabel Aportela, Doctoral Candidate, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Shift in Thinking About School Funding

- Reposition school finance from technical arena of formulas to a supportive center of the education system
- What "works" and "how much does it cost?"
- What resources are needed for ELL and impoverished students in order to help them achieve at higher levels?

What is Adequacy?

A sufficient level of fiscal resources to enable all students to perform at high levels

Research Base

Research Base

- Evidence comes from:
 - Randomized experiments
 - Other high-quality studies that use specific controls or statistical procedures
 - Best practices, either from studies of local districts or schools or from CSR programs

To provide a "model," we simulated a prototype school that incorporates all elements of the research base. This prototype is then adjusted to REAL schools based on school size and demographics.

We used the Wisconsin study of adequate funding as a baseline for our work (Odden et al., 2007). Our taskforce provided input on important state-specific resources for Illinois.

Research Base

Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors

ILLINOIS POLICY:

- Title II funds set aside for mentoring.
- Mentoring funds are available through ABC initiative.
- New teacher mentoring fund disperses \$1,200 per teacher in program.
- No policy specifically regarding instructional coaching.

Research Base

Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors

- ▶ When knowledgeable and capable instructional coaches work with teachers in a comprehensive professional development plan, effect sizes are strongly positive.

Research Base

Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors

Recent Rand Corp. research (Marsh et al., 2008) demonstrates that while instructional coaching is not a direct route to achievement gains, the quality of the coach matters. Furthermore, school staff report that coaching has a positive effect on their ability to carry out challenging instructional expectations.

Research Base

Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- ▶ Schools are resourced to permit 1.0 FTE instructional coach for 200 students.
- ▶ Mentorship resources to remain constant.

Research Base

Sheltered English and ESL Instruction

ILLINOIS POLICY: Bilingual education funding provided to districts based on number of students and intensity of services. FY09: \$75.6m allocated.

Research Base

Sheltered English and ESL Instruction

ELL students in bilingual classes have stronger reading achievement effects. All teachers must utilize best practice strategies for ELL students.

Research Base

Sheltered English and ESL Instruction

RECOMMENDATIONS: With approximately 195,000 bilingual education students in Illinois, the approx. \$75m is less than adequate to provide all bilingual students with qualified teachers. We recommended resourcing schools with 1 FTE bilingual teacher position for every 100 ELL students.

Research Base

Extended Day & Summer Programs

ILLINOIS POLICY: *Summer Bridges* provides approx. \$22m on a grant-basis for summer school. A variety of other summer program grants are available for specific populations (e.g., migrant students). Many districts utilize bilingual and other programs to help fund extended day and summer programs.

13

Research Base

Extended Day & Summer Programs

- » Impact from extended day programs on various outcomes has been documented; however, without stronger studies and better designs, the total results are mixed. Various strategies are recommended, including strong staff, adequate teacher-student ratios, financial resources, and partnerships.
- » Summer school impact is stronger, particularly as many low-achieving students "lose" more learning over the summer. Extended day recommendations apply to summer school programs.

14

Research Base

Extended Day & Summer Programs

RECOMMENDATIONS: Summer school is funded at 50% of students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. One FTE teacher position for every 15 students at 25% annual salary for 12-15 hours per week over 6-8 weeks of the summer.

15

Research Base

Administrators: Odden et al. (2007) recommend one principal for EVERY school, no matter the size. Schools-within-schools would each get a principal, perhaps with one as the super-ordinate administrator. Odden et al. note that instructional coaches may reduce the need for other administration roles.

Our taskforce has recommended the addition of one assistant principal for every prototypical school (about 500 students).

16

Simulation

17

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Simulation Parameters

- Prototypical School Size
 - Elementary School: 432 students
 - Middle School: 450 students
 - High School: 600 students
- Specialist Teacher Allocation
 - Elementary and Middle School: 20% over core teachers
 - High School: 33% over core teachers
- Instructional Facilitators
 - 1 Instructional facilitator per 200 students

18

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Simulation Parameters (continued)

- **Extended Day & Summer School**
 one teacher position for every 15 eligible students (defined as 50 percent of the adjusted free and reduced-price lunch pupil count) and paid at the rate of 25 percent of the position's annual salary to offer
 - An extended-day program for 2 ½ to 3 hours, 5 days per week
 - Summer school for all grades K-12, eight weeks in length, and a six hour day

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Simulation Parameters

Class sizes
 Grades K-3: 1 teacher per 15 students
 Grades 4-12: 1 teacher per 25 students

- Alternative & small schools: 1 teacher per 7 students
- Small schools cutoff: 75 ADM

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

	2008 Avg. State Salary	Benefits
Principal	\$103,385	\$38,811
Asst. principal	\$95,482	\$35,844
Teacher	\$61,016	\$22,905
Library Media Tech	\$69,563	\$26,114
School Secretary	(\$30,000)	\$11,262
School Clerical	(\$25,000)	\$9,385
Aide	(\$20,000)	\$7,508
Benefit Rate	0.3754	

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Simulation Parameters (continued)

Per-Pupil Resources
 Supplies: \$140pp (Elem & Mid), \$175 (High)

- Technology: \$250pp
- Student Activities: \$200pp (Elem & Mid) & \$250pp (High)
- GATE: \$25pp
- Professional Development: \$100pp
- Formative Assessments: \$25pp
- Central Office Misc. Exp: \$300pp

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Simulation Parameters (continued)

- **Special Education**
 1 special education teacher per 150 students
 1/2 special education aide per 150 students
 100% reimbursement for costs of students with severe and profound disabilities, minus Federal Title VI and Medicare funds
- **Substitute Teacher**
 - 10 Extra Sub Days for professional Development
 - Daily rate = \$125 + 37.54% benefits = \$171.93

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Simulation Parameters (continued)

School Office Personnel

- Principal, AP, & Secretary: 1 per prototypical school
- Clerical: 1 per prototypical elementary & middle
 3 per prototypical high school
- Non-instructional aides:
 2 per prototypical elementary & middle
 3 per prototypical high school

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Simulation Parameters (continued)

- Pupil Support
- Guidance counselor (middle & high): 1 per 250 students
 - Librarian: 1 per prototypical school size
 - High school media tech: 1 for every 600 students above 1,000
 - Central Office: \$658pp

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

Comparable Wage Index

- This simulation was calculated without a comparable wage index (CWI).
- If a district-by-district CWI is applied (Taylor & Fowler, 2007), our Illinois adequacy model would cost an additional \$79,570,002.
- Range = 0.73 to 1.06
- Average = 0.92

Understanding the IL Adequacy Simulation

- District-type index
 - The last study of this issue in Illinois was conducted by Jennifer Imazeki in 2001
 - K-12 districts = 1.0
 - Elementary districts = 1.16
 - High school districts = 1.607
 - If applied to our Illinois adequacy model with the CWI, the statewide cost would be an additional \$3,054,867,121
 - Our adequacy model was calculated without district type indices since we did not have recent figures to apply this model

IL Adequacy Simulation Results

Demographics

- Enrollment: 2,023,087 Illinois students
- 43% poverty
- 5% ELL
- 4,058 schools
- 873 districts

IL Adequacy Simulation Results

- Model Costs
- Total = \$25,434,575,686
 - Per Pupil = \$12,572
 - *Hold Harmless = \$1,142,281,186
- Current Revenues (2008)
- State and Local Revenues = \$21,894,089,547
 - Per Pupil = \$10,822
- Difference
- Total = \$3,540,486,139 (without hold harmless)
 - Per Pupil = \$1,750.04
 - "Winners" = 696, "Losers" = 177

IL Adequacy Simulation Results

	FTE	Cost	Per Pupil
Core Teachers	97,175	\$8,155,085,048	\$4,031
Specialist Teachers	22,726	\$1,907,189,870	\$943
Instructional Facilitators	10,115	\$848,901,532	\$420
Teacher Tutors	9,411	\$789,756,327	\$390
ELL Teachers	995	\$83,490,050	\$41
Extended Day	7,156	\$600,556,270	\$297
Summer School	7,156	\$600,556,270	\$297
Census Sped Teachers	13,487	\$1,131,868,709	\$559
Census Sped Aides	6,744	\$185,503,591	\$92

IL Adequacy Simulation Results

	FTE	Cost	Per Pupil
Pupil Support	9,411	\$789,756,327	\$390
Guidance Counselors	4,432	\$371,977,606	\$184
Library	4,229	\$404,606,536	\$200
Media Tech	385	\$36,819,042	\$18
Substitute Teacher Days	N/A	\$289,796,616	\$143

IL Adequacy Simulation Results

	FTE	Cost	Per Pupil
Principal	4,229	\$601,328,964	\$297
Assistant Principal	4,229	\$555,361,921	\$275
Secretary	4,229	\$174,492,131	\$86
Clerical	6,338	\$217,945,954	\$108
Non-Instructional Aides	9,513	\$261,670,512	\$129

IL Adequacy Simulation Results

Resource Element	Statewide Cost	Per Pupil
Supplies	\$305,382,140	\$151
Technology	\$505,771,750	\$250
Activities	\$436,260,200	\$216
GATE	\$50,577,175	\$25
Formative Assessments	\$50,577,175	\$25
Professional Development	\$202,308,700	\$100
Central Office Staff	\$1,331,191,246	\$658
Central Office Carry Forwards	\$4,465,896,989	\$2,207
Small Schools Adjustment	\$ 79,947,036	N/A

**District-level Simulation Results:
Example 1**

DeKalb CUSD 428

Adequacy Model Costs

- Total = \$64,459,630
- Per Pupil = \$11,269

Current Costs (2008)

- Total District Revenues = \$57,740,379

Difference

- Total Model vs Current = **+\$6,719,251**
- Per Pupil = **+\$1,175**

- Assuming local revenues remain the same, percent local funding would decrease from 72.2% to 64.7%

**District-level Simulation Results:
Example 2**

Wilmette School District 39

Adequacy Model Costs

- Total = \$40,614,596
- Per Pupil = \$11,152

Current Costs (2008)

- Total District Revenues = \$42,767,856

Difference (*without hold harmless)

- Total Model vs Current = **-\$2,153,260***

Per Pupil = -\$591*

- Assuming local revenues remain the same, percent local funding would increase from 91.5% to 96.4%

**District-level Simulation Results:
Example 3**

Vienna High School District 133

Adequacy Model Costs

- Total = \$4,400,570
- Per Pupil = \$11,313

Current Costs (2008)

- Total District Revenues = \$3,329,772

Difference

- Total Model vs Current = **+\$1,020,798**
- Per Pupil = **+\$2,624**

- Assuming local revenues remain the same, percent local funding would decrease from 46% to 35.3%

Simulation Results

Discussion

- Preschool is not included. (This is not within the parameters of Illinois' constitutional obligations.)
- Comparable wage index
- Resources for high cost, low incidence special education students are in addition to this model (another approximately \$200 million)
- Required tax rates: This model assumes local tax rates will remain the same.

Simulation Results

Discussion (continued)

- Salaries for secretaries, clerical, and aides – need better data to estimate
- Cost structure differences according to district type (Imazeki, 2002)

National-Louis University Illinois School Finance Adequacy Initiative

Michelle Turner Mangan
Assistant Professor
Educational Foundations & Inquiry
National College of Education
National-Louis University
122 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603
tel/fax 312.261.3924
michelle.mangan@nl.edu

Ted Purinton
Chair & Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
National College of Education
National-Louis University
122 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603
tel/fax 312.261.3071
ted.purinton@nl.edu

Anabel Aportela
Doctoral Candidate
University of Wisconsin-Madison
aaportela@wisc.edu

**GET IT
AT NLU**