



WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL  
PROPOSED REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

---

---

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON  
REVIEW OF STATE SCHOOL  
AID FORMULA

April 30, 2007

PRL 2007-12



---

# Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula

Prepared by:  
Russ Whitesel and Mary Matthias, Senior Staff Attorneys  
April 30, 2007

---

## CONTENTS

<b>PART I - KEY PROVISIONS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
LRB-2279/1, Relating to Awarding Grants to School Districts for School District Consolidation Feasibility Studies; Increasing the Low-Revenue Ceiling for School District Revenue Limit Purposes; Authorizing a School District to Exceed its Revenue Limit Under Certain Conditions; Modifying the School District Revenue Limit Adjustment for Declining Enrollment; Distributing Transportation Aid Balances to School Districts; Providing for a Study; and Making an Appropriation .....	3
<b>PART II - COMMITTEE ACTIVITY.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Assignment.....	5
Summary of Meetings.....	5
<b>PART III - RECOMMENDATION INTRODUCED BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Background .....	9
Description .....	10
Appendix 1 - Committee and Joint Legislative Council Votes .....	13
Appendix 2 - Correspondence Relating to the Votes of Representatives Mursau and Williams .....	15
Appendix 3 - Lists of Joint Legislative Council Members .....	17
Appendix 4 - List of Committee Members.....	19
Appendix 5 - Committee Materials List.....	21



# PART I

## KEY PROVISIONS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula recommends the following bill draft to the Joint Legislative Council for introduction in the 2007-08 Session of the Legislature.

### **LRB-2279/1, Relating to Awarding Grants to School Districts for School District Consolidation Feasibility Studies; Increasing the Low-Revenue Ceiling for School District Revenue Limit Purposes; Authorizing a School District to Exceed its Revenue Limit Under Certain Conditions; Modifying the School District Revenue Limit Adjustment for Declining Enrollment; Distributing Transportation Aid Balances to School Districts; Providing for a Study; and Making an Appropriation**

**LRB-2279/1** makes several changes to the state school finance system. Specifically, the draft does all of the following:

- Directs the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to distribute any balance remaining in the appropriation for local transportation aid by increasing payments to districts on a prorated basis.
- Require DPI to collect data on the total number of miles driven by school buses in each school district and provide that data to the Legislature by May 1, 2009.
- Expands the enrollment adjustment aid period available to districts that experience declining pupil enrollment from one year to three years.
- Increases the low-revenue ceiling for revenue limits by \$400 per pupil in each year of the next biennium.
- Allows a school board, by a 2/3 vote of its members, to increase its revenue limit, on a nonrecurring basis, by an amount equal to 1% of the statewide average allowable revenue per pupil in the previous school year, multiplied by the district's current three-year rolling average pupil count.
- Creates a grant program for school district consolidation feasibility studies.

In addition to recommending LRB-2279/1, the committee also endorses the DPI budget request to increase the school district reimbursement rate for pupils transported more than 12 miles from their homes from \$180 to \$220 annually, to be funded from the current appropriation of \$27,292,500 annually.



## PART II

# COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

### Assignment

The Joint Legislative Council established the Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula and appointed the chairperson by a June 9, 2006 mail ballot. The committee was directed to study the current state school aid formula for public elementary and secondary schools in the state and to develop legislation to improve the method of allocating state funds to school districts. The committee was directed to review the various components that are used to calculate and distribute school aids under the equalization formula and for categorical programs. Also, the committee was authorized to review: issues related to declining enrollment and increasing property values; current statutory restraints on local spending, including revenue limits and general referendum requirements; qualified economic offers (QEOs) to teachers under the Municipal Employment Relations Act; funding formulas in other states; and emerging trends in school finance.

Membership of the Special Committee, appointed by an August 1, 2006 mail ballot, consisted of four Senators, six Representatives, and 11 public members. A list of committee members is included as ***Appendix 4*** to this report.

### Summary of Meetings

The Special Committee held six meetings in Madison on the following dates:

September 13, 2006  
October 5, 2006  
October 25, 2006

November 17, 2006  
December 18, 2006  
January 22, 2007

At the September 13, 2006 meeting, the committee heard invited testimony from Dave Lopnow and Russ Kava of the Legislative Fiscal Bureau (LFB) on the operation of the current school aid formula. They explained that the 2003-05 Biennial Budget eliminated the state's commitment to provide 2/3 funding for K-12 education and the statutory provisions associated with that commitment. The LFB staff reviewed the factors used to determine the amount of equalization aid provided to a school district annually, which include the total amount of funding available for distribution, the district's membership from the prior year, the shared cost from the prior year, the equalized value from the prior year, and the guaranteed valuation.

LFB staff also described the history and operation of statutory revenue limits, which restrict the allowable annual increase in a school district's per pupil revenue derived from general school aid, the property tax levy, and computer aid.

The committee also heard a presentation on the constitutional issues related to the state school aid formula from Legislative Council staff, including a discussion of the Wisconsin Supreme Court case *Vincent v. Voight*.

At the October 5, 2006 meeting, the committee received testimony from eight school districts in the state. This invited testimony included a cross-section of school district administrators who described their districts and the problems they are facing under the current school aid formula. Administrators discussed many stressors on school budgets, including special education costs, increases in utility and transportation costs, increases in the costs of health care for employees and declining enrollments, among others. These increasing costs, combined with the impact of revenue limits, have forced many districts to cut staff and programming for pupils.

The speakers also discussed the difficulty of passing spending referenda, especially in districts whose residents have relatively low incomes. Administrators of geographically large districts with low population explained the special challenges they face with long, expensive bus routes and the inability to achieve economies of scale in the classroom. Those from districts with low incomes but high property values, including those experiencing the “lake effect,” explained the unique financial problems they face.

At the October 25, 2006 meeting, the committee heard invited testimony from **Allan Odden** of the UW-Madison, regarding the school finance adequacy study being conducted by the Wisconsin Center for Education and Research. The study goal is to determine the funding needed to “educate Wisconsin’s students to a rigorous, world class-proficiency standard and to develop a programmatic and fiscal approach for that model.” Mr. Odden said the costs of the model would require approximately 6.8% additional spending over what is now spent on shared costs plus categorical programs. This is equivalent to approximately \$584 million in additional spending annually.

**Jack Norman**, Research Director, Institute for Wisconsin’s Future (IWF) briefly outlined the plan for financing public education in Wisconsin that has been developed by the IWF. He said it is an “adequacy” plan, designed to provide adequate revenues for all children to receive the opportunity for a quality education.

Mr. Norman stated that the revenue limits currently in effect are not consistent with adequacy models because they freeze spending at arbitrary 1993 levels and have no meaningful link to today’s students, expectations, or costs.

The committee also heard testimony from representatives of DPI on its proposed biennial budget initiatives relating to school finance.

At the November 17, 2006 meeting, Dave Loppnow, Russ Kava, and Layla Merrifield, LFB, presented papers discussing proposals to increase state aid for pupil transportation costs, provide state aid to sparsely populated school districts, increase revenue limit authority for districts with declining enrollments, assist districts in evaluating the feasibility of district consolidation, and modify the secondary cost ceiling of the equalization aid formula.

The committee discussed the proposals and their potential impact on school district finance and operations. The committee asked the LFB for additional information on these topics and on raising the revenue limit for low-revenue districts.

At the December 18, 2006 meeting, the committee again heard from LFB staff. Layla Merrifield, Fiscal Analyst, outlined the contents of a memorandum prepared on the *Public Transportation Costs – Options For Additional Categorical Aid*. Ms. Merrifield also presented a paper entitled, *Large Area, Low Enrollment School Districts – Options for Sparsity Aid*.

The committee engaged in a lengthy discussion of whether it would be more appropriate to provide transportation aid or sparsity aid to large area, low population density districts. The committee determined that transportation would be a more appropriate focus than sparsity and asked that the staff prepare possible options for the distribution of additional support for high transportation cost districts.

Russ Kava, Fiscal Analyst, LFB, reviewed the memorandum entitled, *Additional Information on Declining Enrollment Alternatives*. After discussing options provided in the paper, the committee decided that restructuring the current declining enrollment adjustment from a single-year to a three-year adjustment was the best alternative.

Mr. Kava also reviewed the memorandum entitled, *Revenue Limits – Low-Revenue Ceiling*. During the discussion on this topic, several members raised the issue of the discrepancy between the revenue limits and the 3.8% increase allowed under the qualified economic offer (QEO). The committee also discussed funding schools with revenue from an expanded sales tax and accommodating the need for additional revenue by allowing school boards to exceed revenue caps.

At the January 22, 2007 meeting, the committee heard presentations by the LFB staff on the topics of pupil transportation aid, declining enrollment alternatives, increasing the low-revenue ceiling, providing revenue limit flexibility to districts and providing grants to districts for consolidation feasibility studies.

The committee discussed and debated the merits of the various provisions. Several members expressed support for enabling school districts to further control their local costs, including labor and health care costs.

Following further discussion, the committee gave preliminary approval to a package of proposals that would do all of the following:

- Require DPI to collect data on the total number of miles driven by school buses in each school district.
- Expand the one-year adjustment period available to districts that experience declining pupil enrollment to three years.
- Increase the low-revenue ceiling for revenue limits by \$400 per pupil in each year of the next biennium.
- Allow a school board, by a 2/3 vote of its members, to increase its revenue limit, on a nonrecurring basis, by an amount equal to 1% of the statewide average allowable revenue per pupil in the previous school year, multiplied by the district's current three-year rolling average pupil count.
- Create a grant program for school district consolidation feasibility studies.

The committee also agreed to endorse the DPI budget request to increase the amount of state aid provided for districts that transport pupils who live more than 12 miles from school.

The committee did not vote on the package of proposals at the meeting, instead a draft was prepared (LRB-2279/1) and sent to the committee for a mail ballot vote.



# PART III

## RECOMMENDATION INTRODUCED BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

This part of the report provides background information on, and a description of, the draft as recommended by the Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula.

### Background

Under the applicable state statutes, the state provides financial assistance to school districts to achieve two basic policy goals: (1) reduce the reliance on the local property tax as a source of revenue for educational programs; and (2) guarantee that a basic educational opportunity is available to all pupils regardless of the local fiscal capacity of the district in which they reside.

Wisconsin school districts derive their revenue through four major sources: state aid; property tax; federal aid; and other nonproperty tax revenue such as fees and interest earnings.

### Sources of State Aid

The cost of elementary and secondary education is supported by the state through three different methods. First, unrestricted **general aids** are provided through a formula that distributes aid on the basis of the relative fiscal capacity of each school district as measured by the district's per pupil value of taxable property. This formula generally is known as either the "general school aid formula" or the "equalization aid formula." In addition, the Legislature has established other general school aid programs that are associated with the equalization formula.

The second source of state support is **categorical aid** that partially funds specific program costs such as special education, pupil transportation, class size reduction, and driver education. Categorical aid is either paid on a formula basis or awarded as grants.

The third source of state support is the state **school levy tax credit**. Although the school levy tax credit is considered school aid, this aid is paid to municipalities to offset the property tax rather than being paid directly to school districts.

The current school aid formula, upheld by the State Supreme Court as recently as July 2000, operates under the principle of equal tax rate for equal per pupil expenditures. Generally, this means that a school district's property tax rate does not depend on the property tax base of the district, but rather depends on the district's level of expenditures. The rate at which school costs are aided through the formula is determined by comparing a school district's per pupil tax base to the state's guaranteed tax base. **Equalization aids** are provided to make up the difference between the district's actual tax base and the state guaranteed tax base. Stated differently, there is an inverse relationship between equalization aids and property valuations; those districts with low per pupil property valuations receive a larger share of their costs through the equalization formula than districts with high per pupil property valuations. For a more complete description of the state equalization formula, see *Elementary and Secondary School Aids*, Informational Paper #27, issued by the LFB, dated January 2007.

### Revenue Limits

Revenue limits restrict the annual increase in a school district's per pupil revenue derived from general school aid, the property tax levy, and computer aid. Revenue limits were imposed beginning in 1993-94. Categorical aid, federal aid, and other sources of local revenue are not subject to the revenue limits.

A school district can receive voter approval at referendum to exceed revenue limits. Local voters must approve school board resolution supporting inclusion in district budget of an amount that exceeds the limit.

The interaction of revenue limits, collective bargaining provisions, including QEOs, and rising health care and energy costs, among other factors, have resulted in financial difficulties for many districts throughout the state. These financial pressures were apparent in the testimony provided to the committee and the experiences of committee members.

## **Description**

### **Transportation**

#### **Background**

School districts required to provide transportation services to public and private school pupils enrolled in regular education programs, including summer school, are eligible to receive categorical aid. The state pays a flat, annual amount per transported pupil, which varies according to the distance that each pupil is transported to school.

In 2004-05, for aid paid in 2005-06, transportation costs for school districts ranged from little or no cost, to over \$1,000 per pupil. The statewide average was approximately \$300 per pupil. The state categorical aid reimbursed approximately 8% of these transportation costs in 2005-06.

#### **Collection of Mileage Data**

During the course of the study, the committee discussed options for reimbursing school districts for a higher percentage of their transportation costs than the current 8%. The committee discussed the option of reimbursing districts for the number of miles traveled on their bus routes. LFB staff explained that since DPI does not collect this information from districts, it would be very difficult to estimate the cost of providing aid by this method.

The draft requires each school board, by February 1, 2009, to report to DPI the number of miles driven in the 2007-08 fiscal year to provide transportation to and from school for public and private pupils. Excluded from this calculation are transportation to and from extracurricular activities, the transportation of children with disabilities, shuttle services, and field trips. The purpose of this data collection is to aid future analysis of the impact of providing transportation aid to districts based on actual miles driven.

The draft directs DPI to submit a report summarizing the data to the Legislature by May 1, 2009.

#### **Full Expenditure of Appropriation**

Current law authorizes DPI to reduce payments under the school transportation appropriation that funds a portion of local transportation costs when that appropriation is insufficient to cover eligible costs filed by school districts.

LRB-2279/1 directs DPI to distribute any balance remaining in the appropriation set aside for such transportation after it has paid the full amount of approved claims, by increasing payments to districts on a prorated basis.

## **Declining Enrollment**

Under revenue limits, the annual increase in a school district's per pupil revenue derived from general school aids, computer aid, and property taxes is restricted. Actual general aids, computer aid, and property tax revenues received in the prior school year are used to establish the base year amount in order to compute the allowable revenue increase for the current school year.

A per pupil revenue limit increase, which is adjusted annually for inflation, is added to the base revenue per pupil for the current school year. A three-year rolling average of a school district's pupil enrollment is used to determine the allowable revenue increase under the limit.

Under the declining enrollment adjustment, if a school district's current year three-year rolling average pupil enrollment is less than the prior year three-year rolling average, the district receives a one-year nonrecurring adjustment to its revenue limit in a dollar amount equal to 75% of what the decline in the three-year rolling average memberships would have generated.

LRB-2279/1 extends the enrollment adjustment aid period for school districts to three years. Under this approach, in the first year of an enrollment decline, a school district would receive 100% of the allowable revenues that the decline would have generated. In the year after the decline, the district would receive an adjustment equal to 75% of the first-year adjustment. In the third year after the decline year, the district would receive an adjustment equal to 50% of the first year adjustment.

## **Low-Spending Districts**

The low-revenue ceiling provision is one of several adjustments that are made under current law to the standard school district revenue limit calculation. The provision is intended to decrease the disparity between low-revenue and high-revenue school districts by providing additional revenue limit authority to low-revenue districts. Any district with revenues below the amount of the low-revenue ceiling is allowed to increase its per pupil revenues up to the amount of the ceiling even if the amount by which revenues are thereby increased exceeds the revenue limit.

The low-revenue ceiling was enacted in the 1995-97 Biennial Budget Act. In each subsequent budget act, the low-revenue ceiling has been increased, typically by \$200 or \$300 per pupil each year. The 2003-05 Budget Act increased the low-revenue ceiling by \$500 per pupil in 2003-04 and \$400 per pupil in 2004-05. In the 2005-07 Biennium, the low-revenue ceiling was increased by \$300 each year. For 2006-07, the low-revenue ceiling is \$8,400.

LRB-2279/1 increases the low revenue ceiling for revenue limits by \$400 per pupil in each year of the next biennium. Thus, the 2007-08 low revenue ceiling would be increased to \$8,800 from the current \$8,400 per pupil. Subsequently, the ceiling in the 2008-09 school year would be increased by \$400 to \$9,200.

## **Revenue Limit Flexibility Option**

Under current law, revenue limits restrict the annual increase in a school district's per pupil revenue derived from general school aids, computer aid, and property taxes. The amount of allowable increase for a given year is set by statute each biennium. A per pupil revenue limit increase, which is adjusted annually for inflation, is added to the base revenue per pupil for the current school year. For example, in 2006-07, this per pupil increase is \$256.93. A school district may exceed this revenue limit only by receiving voter approval at a referendum.

LRB-2279/1 allows a school board, by a 2/3 vote of its members, to increase its revenue limit, on a nonrecurring basis, by an amount equal to 1% of the statewide average allowable revenue per pupil in the previous school year, multiplied by the district's current three-year rolling average pupil count.

Under the draft, the 1% increase would not be included in shared cost and would not be included in the determination of partial school revenues for purposes of calculating state aid. Thus, any amount raised under this option would not generate corresponding state aid and would not be included in the state 2/3 funding goal calculation. The additional costs would be funded solely from local property taxes and would not be supported by state aid.

A district using this option would be required to levy the maximum amount allowed under current revenue caps and would not be allowed to put the additional 1% into a fund balance account or maintain the excess revenue in the balance of any fund beyond June 30 of the school year in which the resolution was adopted. As a nonrecurring cost, the additional spending would not be part of the school district base budget; therefore, for a school board to exceed its revenue cap in any subsequent years, it would need to authorize the additional 1% each year by a 2/3 vote of the members.

## **Grants for School District Consolidation Feasibility Studies**

LRB-2279/1 creates a grant program for school district consolidation feasibility studies.

The draft permits a consortium of two or more school districts to apply to DPI for a one-time grant to conduct a school district consolidation feasibility study. Applicants for the grant must submit a plan identifying the school districts engaged in the study, the issues the study will address, and specifying how the grant funds will be allocated.

The grant program is funded with a one-time appropriation of \$250,000 in the 2008–09 fiscal year. Grants under the draft would be limited to \$10,000 per year to any consortium.

The draft requires DPI to give priority to applications that demonstrate prior district attempts to address underlying issues associated with management and operation of the district's programs.

The draft authorizes grants only for the 2008-09 school year and provides that a school district may not be a member of more than one consortium seeking a grant.

## Appendix 1

### Committee and Joint Legislative Council Votes

LRB-2279/1 was recommended by the Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula to the Joint Legislative Council for introduction in the 2007-08 Session of the Legislature.

#### Special Committee Vote

The Special Committee voted to recommend LRB-2279/1 to the Joint Legislative Council for introduction in the 2007-08 Session of the Legislature. The vote on the draft was as follows:

- LRB-2279/1, relating to awarding grants for school district consolidation feasibility studies; increasing the low-revenue ceiling; authorizing a school district to exceed its revenue limit under certain conditions; modifying the revenue limit adjustment for declining enrollment; distributing transportation aid balances to school districts; providing for a study and making an appropriation. The motion to recommend LRB-2279/1, passed on a vote of Ayes, 14 (Sens. Olsen, Erpenbach, Lassa; Rep. Vruwink; and Public Members Andrews, Berry, Borch, Burnett, Gaier, Hendrickson, Lang, Nate, Reschovsky, and Welch); Noes, 7 (Sen. Darling; Reps. Davis, Fields, Mursau, Strachota, and Williams; and Public Member Towns).

See **Appendix 2** for correspondence relating to the votes of Representatives Mursau and Williams.





## Wisconsin State Assembly

P.O. BOX 8952 • MADISON, WI 53708

April 17, 2007

Legislative Council  
One East Main Street, Suite 401  
Madison, WI 53701

Russ Whitesel:

We write this letter as an attachment to the ballots we recently submitted as members of the Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula.

The issues and challenges facing the school districts that we represent are daunting. We had high hopes for what might materialize from the special committee made up of legislators and education leaders from around the state. This is why we each agreed to participate as a member. We wanted our dialogue to result in several tools for our locally elected school boards to work with, while still protecting taxpayers.

Unfortunately, at the end of the process, we could not support the package of ideas that was presented to the members to vote on. While our discussions had value, the decision to lump just some of the ideas into one question (LRB-2279/1) resulted in a poor product.

However, we do support portions of what we were asked to vote upon. Therefore, we have already drafted some of these concepts as separate pieces of legislation. We worry that the package as presented to the special committee members is already dead on arrival. There is a reason that legislators rarely draft omnibus style bills, there always is something within them that keeps them from getting passed.

We broke some of these ideas into individual pieces of legislation to be debated independently for the same reason we agreed to be members of the special committee. We sincerely want to see us accomplish progress on the dilemmas facing the school boards in our respective legislative districts.

Respectfully,

Handwritten signature of Jeff Mursau in cursive.

Rep. Jeff Mursau  
36<sup>th</sup> Assembly District

Handwritten signature of Mary Williams in cursive.

Rep. Mary Williams  
87<sup>th</sup> Assembly District

Cc: Sen. Luther Olsen  
Rep. Brett Davis  
Speaker Mike Huebsch  
Mary Matthias



## Appendix 3

### Joint Legislative Council

*[Joint Legislative Council Members Who Selected and Appointed Committee and Its Membership]*

**Co-Chair**

**ALAN LASEE**  
*Senate President*  
2259 Lasee Road  
De Pere, WI 54115

**Co-Chair**

**STEVE WIECKERT**  
*Representative*  
1 Weatherstone Drive  
Appleton, WI 54914

#### SENATORS

**RONALD W. BROWN**  
1112 Violet Avenue  
Eau Claire, WI 54701

**DAN KAPANKE**  
1610 Lakeshore Drive  
La Crosse, WI 54603

**DALE SCHULTZ**  
*Majority Leader*  
515 N. Central Avenue  
Richland Center, WI 53581

**RUSSELL DECKER**  
6803 Lora Lee Lane  
Schofield, WI 54476

**MARK MILLER**  
4903 Roigan Terrace  
Monona, WI 53716

**DAVID ZIEN**  
*President Pro Tempore*  
1716 63<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Eau Claire, WI 54703

**SCOTT FITZGERALD**  
N4692 Maple Road  
Juneau, WI 53039

**FRED A. RISSER**  
5008 Risser Road  
Madison, WI 53705

**GLENN GROTHMAN**  
111 South 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
West Bend, WI 53095

**JUDY ROBSON**  
*Minority Leader*  
2411 E. Ridge Road  
Beloit, WI 53511

#### REPRESENTATIVES

**JOHN AINSWORTH**  
W6382 Waukechon Road  
Shawano, WI 54166

**MICHAEL HUEBSCH**  
*Majority Leader*  
419 West Franklin  
West Salem, WI 54669

**MARLIN D. SCHNEIDER**  
3820 Southbrook Lane  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494

**PEDRO COLON**  
338 West Walker Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53204

**DEAN KAUFERT**  
1360 Alpine Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

**DAVID TRAVIS**  
5440 Willow Road  
Waunakee, WI 53597

**STEPHEN J. FREESE**  
*Speaker Pro Tempore*  
310 East North Street  
Dodgeville, WI 53533

**JIM KREUSER**  
*Minority Leader*  
3505 14th Place  
Kenosha, WI 53144

**JOHN GARD**  
*Speaker*  
481 Aubin Street, P.O. Box 119  
Peshtigo, WI 54157

**ANN NISCHKE**  
202 W. College Avenue  
Waukesha, WI 53186

This 22-member committee consists of the majority and minority party leadership of both houses of the Legislature, the co-chairs and ranking minority members of the Joint Committee on Finance, and 5 Senators and 5 Representatives appointed as are members of standing committees.

# Joint Legislative Council

*[Current Joint Legislative Council Members Receiving Committee Report]*

## Co-Chair

**FRED RISSER**  
*Senate President*  
5008 Risser Road  
Madison, WI 53705

## Co-Chair

**STEVE WIECKERT**  
*Representative*  
1 Weatherstone Drive  
Appleton, WI 54914

## SENATORS

### **ROGER BRESKE**

8800 Hwy. 29  
Eland, WI 54427

### **TIM CARPENTER**

*President Pro Tempore*  
2957 South 38<sup>th</sup> Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53215

### **G. SPENCER COGGS**

3732 North 40<sup>th</sup> Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53216

### **ALBERTA DARLING**

1325 West Dean Road  
River Hills, WI 53217

### **RUSSELL DECKER**

6803 Lora Lee Lane  
Weston, WI 54476

### **SCOTT FITZGERALD**

*Minority Leader*  
N4692 Maple Road  
Juneau, WI 53039

### **SHEILA HARSDORF**

N6627 County Road E  
River Falls, WI 54022

### **ALAN LASEE**

2259 Lasee Road  
De Pere, WI 54115

### **MARK MILLER**

4903 Roigan Terrace  
Monona, WI 53716

### **JUDY ROBSON**

*Majority Leader*  
2411 E. Ridge Road  
Beloit, WI 53511

## REPRESENTATIVES

### **JOAN BALLWEG**

170 W. Summit Street  
Markesan, WI 53946

### **TERESE BERCEAU**

4326 Somerset Lane  
Madison, WI 53711

### **JEFF FITZGERALD**

*Majority Leader*  
910 Sunset  
Horicon, WI 53032

### **MARK GOTTLIEB**

*Speaker Pro Tempore*  
1205 Noridge Trail  
Port Washington, WI 53074

### **MICHAEL HUEBSCH**

*Speaker*  
419 West Franklin  
West Salem, WI 54669

### **DEAN KAUFERT**

1360 Alpine Lane  
Neenah, WI 54956

### **JIM KREUSER**

*Minority Leader*  
3505 14th Place  
Kenosha, WI 53144

### **MARK POCAN**

309 N. Baldwin Street  
Madison, WI 53703

### **KITTY RHOADES**

708 4th Street  
Hudson, WI 54016

### **MARLIN SCHNEIDER**

3820 Southbrook Lane  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494

This 22-member committee consists of the majority and minority party leadership of both houses of the Legislature, the co-chairs and ranking minority members of the Joint Committee on Finance, and 5 Senators and 5 Representatives appointed as are members of standing committees.

## Appendix 4

### Review of State School Aid Formula

Senator Luther S. Olsen, **Chair**  
1023 Thomas Street  
Ripon, WI 54923

Representative Brett H. Davis  
1420 Ravenoaks Trail  
Oregon, WI 53575

Representative Jason Fields  
5686 N. 60th Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53218

Representative Jeffrey L. Mursau  
4 Oak Street  
Crivitz, WI 54114

Representative Amy Sue Vruwink  
9425 Flower Lane  
Milladore, WI 54454

Gary Andrews  
216 West Kelly  
Cuba City, WI 53807

Robert Borch  
Elmbrook School District  
P.O. Box 1830  
Brookfield, WI 53008

John Gaier  
Neillsville School District  
614 East 5th Street  
Neillsville, WI 54456

Dianne Lang  
1041 E Park Ridge Avenue  
Appleton, WI 54911

Andrew Reschovsky  
LaFollette School of Public Affairs  
1225 Observatory Drive  
Madison, WI 53706

Ron Welch  
School District of Algoma  
1715 Division Street  
Algoma, WI 54201

Senator Alberta Darling  
1325 West Dean Road  
River Hills, WI 53217

Senator Jon Erpenbach  
7781 Elmwood Avenue, # 106  
Middleton, WI 53562

Senator Julie M. Lassa  
1900 Clark Street  
Stevens Point, WI 54481

Representative Pat Strachota  
639 Ridge Road  
West Bend, WI 53095

Representative Mary Williams  
542 Billings Avenue  
Medford, WI 54451

Todd Berry  
Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance  
401 North Lawn Avenue  
Madison, WI 53704-5033

John Burnett  
324 East Larkspur Lane  
Onalaska, WI 53650

Nancy Hendrickson  
Pecatonica Area School District  
704 Cross Street  
Blanchardville, WI 53516

Michelle Nate  
3748 West Lakefield Drive  
Milwaukee, WI 53215

Debi Towns  
7930 N. Eagle Road  
Janesville, WI 53548

**STUDY ASSIGNMENT:** The committee is directed to study the current state school aid formula for public elementary and secondary schools in the state and to develop legislation to improve the method of allocating state funds to school districts. The committee shall review the various components that are used to calculate and distribute school aids under the equalization formula and for categorical programs. Also, the committee may review issues related to declining enrollment and increasing property values. The committee may also review the current statutory restraints on local spending, including revenue limits and general referendum requirements, and qualified economic offers to teachers under the Municipal Employment Relations Act. In addition, the committee may review funding formulas in other states and emerging trends in school finance as well as issues associated with rising property values and declining enrollments.

**21 MEMBERS:** 4 Senators, 6 Representatives, and 11 Public Members.

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STAFF:** Russ Whitesel and Mary Matthias, Senior Staff Attorneys; and Tracey Uselman, Support Staff.



## Appendix 5

### Committee Materials List

(Copies of documents are available at [www.legis.state.wi.us/lc](http://www.legis.state.wi.us/lc))

Additional Material				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Memo No. 1</a>, <i>Summary of Actions Taken by the Joint Legislative Council's Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula</i> (January 31, 2007)</li> </ul>				
January 22, 2006 Meeting	Notice	Agenda	Audio	Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Memoranda from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Pupil Transportation Aid</a> - <i>Example of Option for Aid for Excess Costs</i></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Revenue Limits</a> - <i>Information on Additional \$100 Increase in Low-Revenue Ceiling</i></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Revenue Limits</a> - <i>Flexibility Options</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Memorandum</a>, from Jerry Trochinski, Superintendent, School District of Phillips (December 6, 2006)</li> <li>• <a href="#">WLC: 0029/1</a>, relating to creating a grant program for school district consolidation feasibility studies, making an appropriation, and creating rule-making authority</li> <li>• Charts, submitted by Andrew, Robert M. La Follette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Public Member:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Characteristics of "Low Revenue" K-12 School Districts</a>, 2005-06</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Proposal to Loosen Revenue Limits</a>, Impacts by School District Property Value per Student</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Characteristics of School Districts Classified by Property Value per Student</a>, 2005-06</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Proposal to Loosen Revenue Limits</a>, Impacts by Size of School District</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Characteristics of School Districts Classified by Number of Students</a>, 2005-06</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				
December 18, 2006 Meeting	Notice	Agenda	Audio	Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Memoranda from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Pupil Transportation Costs – Options for Additional Categorical Aid</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Large Area, Low Enrollment School Districts – Options for Sparsity Aid</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Additional Information on Declining Enrollment Alternatives</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Revenue Limits – Low-Revenue Ceiling</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">WLC: 0029/1</a>, relating to creating a grant program for school district consolidation feasibility studies, making an appropriation, and creating rule-making authority</li> </ul>				
November 17, 2006 Meeting	Notice	Agenda	Audio <span style="font-size: small;">AM</span> Audio <span style="font-size: small;">PM</span>	Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Memoranda from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Pupil Transportation Costs</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Options for Aid Based on District Sparsity</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Revenue Limits - Declining Enrollment</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">School District Consolidation Aid Under Current Law</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Equalization Aid - Secondary Cost Ceiling</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Memorandum</a>, <i>Follow-up on my presentation of October 25, 2006</i>, from Jack Norman, Institute for Wisconsin's Future (November 8, 2006)</li> </ul>				
October 25, 2006 Meeting	Notice	Agenda	Audio <span style="font-size: small;">AM</span> Audio <span style="font-size: small;">PM</span>	Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Memorandum</a>, <i>School District Referenda</i>, from David Carlson, Director, School Financial Services Team, Department of Public Instruction (October 3, 2006)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Letter</a>, from Green Bay School District (October 10, 2006)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Publication</a>, <i>Wisconsin's School Finance, A Policy Primer</i>, the Robert M. La Follette School of Public Affairs University of Wisconsin Madison</li> <li>• <a href="#">Publication</a>, <i>Wisconsin Atlas of School Finance, Geographic, Demographic, and Fiscal Factors Affecting School Districts Across the State</i>, Institute for Wisconsin's Future (February 2004)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Publication</a>, <i>Wisconsin Atlas of School Finance, Geographic, Demographic, and Fiscal Factors Affecting School Districts Across the State</i>, Institute for Wisconsin's Future (2004) (SUMMARY VERSION)</li> <li>• <a href="#">PowerPoint Presentation</a>, <i>Moving From Good to Great in Wisconsin: Funding Schools Adequately and Doubling Student Performance</i>, distributed by Allan Odden, The Wisconsin School Finance Adequacy Initiative (October 20, 2006)</li> </ul>				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">PowerPoint Presentation</a>, <i>2007-09 DPI Biennial Budget School Finance Initiatives</i>, by the Department of Public Instruction</li> <li>• <a href="#">Handout</a>, <i>Eligible School Districts for Sparsity Initiative in DPI 2007-09 Biennial Budget</i>, distributed by the Department of Public Instruction</li> <li>• <a href="#">PowerPoint Presentation</a>, <i>Financing Public Education</i>, by Jack Norman</li> </ul>				
October 5, 2006 Meeting	<a href="#">Notice</a>	<a href="#">Agenda</a>	<a href="#">Audio AM</a> <a href="#">Audio PM</a>	<a href="#">Minutes</a>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Article</a>, <i>Must Enrollment Declines Spell Financial Chaos For Districts?</i>, distributed by Chair Olsen</li> <li>• <a href="#">Handout</a>, Dr. Bob Kellogg - Administrator CESA 9</li> <li>• Testimony by Selected School District Administrators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Susan Alexander</a>, Markesan School District</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Gerald Trochinski</a>, Phillips School District</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Richard Parks</a>, Phelps School District</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Thomas Evert</a>, Janesville, School District</li> <li>○ <a href="#">James Friesen</a>, Owen-Withee School District <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">Table</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <a href="#">Randal Rosburg</a>, Somerset School District</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Mel Lightner</a>, Kimberly Area School District</li> <li>○ <a href="#">William Andrekopoulos</a>, Milwaukee Public School District <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">Comparative Budget</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Enrollment</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Fact Sheet</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>				
September 13, 2006 Meeting	<a href="#">Notice</a>	<a href="#">Agenda</a>	<a href="#">Audio AM</a> <a href="#">Audio PM</a>	<a href="#">Minutes</a>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Legislative Fiscal Bureau Informational Paper No. 27</a>, <i>Elementary and Secondary School Aids</i> (January 2005)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Publication</a>, <i>State Financing of K-12 Education in Wisconsin, Overview</i>, Legislative Fiscal Bureau (September 13, 2006)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Memorandum</a>, <i>2005-06 Estimated State Support for School Districts</i> (May 15, 2006)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Legislative Fiscal Bureau Informational Paper No. 12</a>, <i>Local Government Expenditure and Revenue Limits</i> (January 2005)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Information Memorandum 00-08</a>, <i>Constitutionality of Wisconsin School Aid Formula</i> (July 31, 2000)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Principles of a Sound State School Finance System</a> (July 1996)</li> </ul>				