

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 192

EA 030 523

AUTHOR Sheldon, George H.  
TITLE Financing America's Public Schools. Issue Brief.  
PUB DATE 1998-03-01  
NOTE 6p.  
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; \*Finance Reform; \*Money Management; \*Public Schools; \*School Districts; School Taxes; Special Education; \*State Legislation; Teacher Student Ratio

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines school finance issues that have emerged due to litigation on the constitutionality of school funding at the state level. Such funding varies from state to state, ranging from 8 percent in New Hampshire to 74 percent in New Mexico; per-child expenditures range from \$1,500 to \$15,000. Beginning in the 1970s, poor school districts and some advocates for minority and disadvantaged children challenged the state-funding formula in the courts. These court cases have focused on the constitutional provisions on the ground of equity or adequacy. Equity is generally defined as a relatively equal per-pupil expenditure across the school districts in the state. Recent court cases have begun to address the issue of an "adequate" education for all students. States must shift their focus from monitoring students' inputs (student-to-teacher ratios) and focus on the outputs (graduation rates and reading levels). States must focus on the definition of what an adequate education is and what amount of funding is needed for all students to have a possibility of obtaining it. The paper describes the six different funding methods used to achieve an adequate education: flat grants, foundation programs, guaranteed tax base programs, percentage equalization programs, full state funding, and pupil weights.  
(DFR)

EA

George H. Sheldon  
March 1, 2000

Financing America's Public Schools

Financing America's Public Schools  
Education Policy Studies Division  
Issue Brief September 1, 1998  
Dane Linn

ED 443 192

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Sheldon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FA 030523



Financing America's Public Schools  
Education Policy Studies Division  
Issue Brief September 1, 1998  
Dane Linn

This article is an Issue Brief, which outlines the school finance issues that have emerged due to litigation in the courts on the constitutionality of school funding at the state level. The funding of education at the state level is a complex picture. State funding varies from state to state ranging from the state funding 8% as in New Hampshire to 74% in New Mexico. Also the per child expenditures range from \$1500 to \$15,000.

Beginning in the 1970's poor school districts and some advocates for minority and disadvantaged children have challenged the state funding formula in the courts. These court cases focus on the constitutional provisions on the ground of equity or adequacy. In eighteen of thirty-six cases, state courts ruled the state funding formulas to be unconstitutional. These rulings are based on the premise that every child is entitled to an adequate education to be successful in work and as citizens. Due to funding differences when comparing rich school districts to poorer ones, it is near to impossible for the poorer school districts to provide an adequate education. When you add in the factor that disadvantaged and special need children require more funding the gap between the rich and poor school districts widen. In three states, Arizona, Ohio and Texas, the inequities in facilities were grounds for the school funding system to be declared unconstitutional.

Equity is generally referred to as a relative equal per pupil expenditure across the school districts in the state. Courts ruling on equity issues mostly look to some form of supplemental state funding to correct the funding difference between districts. Most

states have gone to a minimum spending level per child and then use state funds to subsidize local efforts. The most common program is a foundation program. This type of subsidized effort is used in about forty states.

Recent court cases have begun to address the issue of an "adequate" education to all students. States must shift their focus from monitoring students inputs (student to teacher ratios) and focus on the outputs (graduation rates and reading levels). States must focus on the definition of what an adequate education is and what amount of funding is needed for all students to have a possibility of obtaining it.

To achieve a degree of an adequate education the states use six different funding methods. These methods are:

1. Flat Grants-A state divides the available funds by a unit of measure and then distributes an equal amount of funding per unit to school districts.
2. Foundation Programs-Used in about forty states. Combines state and local funds to provide a level of funding for an adequate education.
3. Guaranteed Tax Base Programs-States subsidize locally generated revenue through a formula, which accounts for the local effort.
4. Percentage Equalization Programs-Provides local control and taxpayer equity and it is based on a ratio that determines the state-local funding partnership.
5. Full State Funding-State pays for all the education needs.
6. Pupil Weights-The cost of providing services is based on per-pupil expenditure.

The states must select the best method to determine the level of funding to be used. The three methods are; available state revenues system, education expenditures system and cost model approach.

To reduce the burden on local districts, two have recently redone their methods of funding. These states are Kentucky and Michigan. Kentucky, as a result of a court ruling enacted the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 (KERA) with the following components.

- A state adjusted based guarantee or a minimum foundation program
- Tier I funding allow local districts to generate funds not to exceed 15% of the guaranteed base and matched by the state.
- Tier II funds allow districts to generate up to 30% of the guaranteed base but are not matched by the state.

Michigan on the other hand did a major overhaul of its tax structure. The local property tax was eliminated as a funding source. The sales tax was increased by 2%, and authorized a local levy on property (non-homesteaded). With these changes, property taxes now account for about 1/3 of school funding versus 2/3 prior to the overhaul.

School finance is a very complex with numerous factors to consider including issues of equity, local control and social equity. With thirty states already having their systems taken to court and with expenditure differences remaining, further litigation is a very possible response. With the academic standards becoming more rigorous states need to realize that these very standards could or may become the defined content of an adequate education. State assessments could or will become the measurement instrument to determine if a student received an adequate education.

States need to prepare for continued challenges dealing with issues of equity or adequacy of financial resources. As the curriculum is assessed using instruments which test the standards mandated by the state and child fail it, questions of equity will continue to rise. Districts should realize that funding is very important but it is only one piece in the equity puzzle. How funds are spent and what they are spent on should also be considered.



**U.S. Department of Education**  
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement*  
 (OERI)  
*National Library of Education (NLE)*  
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*



## Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

### I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Financing America's Public Schools</i>	
Author(s): <i>George H. Sheldon M.Ed</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: <i>March 1, 2000</i>

### II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2A</b>	<b>Level 2B</b>
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: 	Printed Name/Position/Title: George H. Sheldon	
Organization/Address: 427 Rumberg Seguin, Texas 78155	Telephone: 830-305-3748	Fax:
	E-mail Address:	Date: March 13, 2000

gsheldon@contoe.isd.texas.edu

**III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):**

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:



### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:
---

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**  
**4483-A Forbes Boulevard**  
**Lanham, Maryland 20706**  
**Telephone: 301-552-4200**  
**Toll Free: 800-799-3742**  
**e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov**  
**WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com**

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)

- ▷ Request Review
- ▷ Policies
- ▷ Searchopolis Resources
- ▷ Printable Version



Powered by ALZ

**FILTERED INTERNET BROUGHT TO YOU BY...**

Sponsored By  
**Microsoft**



Search The Web  