



WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
REVIEW OF STATE SCHOOL
AID FORMULA

[2007 SENATE BILL 365 AND
2007 ASSEMBLY BILL 653]

January 8, 2008

RL 2007-12

Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula

Prepared by:
Russ Whitesel and Mary Matthias, Senior Staff Attorneys
January 8, 2008

CONTENTS

PART I - KEY PROVISIONS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	3
2007 Senate Bill 365 and 2007 Assembly Bill 653, Relating to 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; and Providing for a Study	3
PART II - COMMITTEE ACTIVITY.....	5
Assignment.....	5
Summary of Meetings.....	5
PART III - RECOMMENDATIONS INTRODUCED BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	9
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 Joint Legislative Council recommends the following proposal for introduction in the 2007-08 Session of the Legislature, based on the recommendation of the Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula. [**Note:** Each proposal has been introduced in both houses of the Legislature as companion bills. For simplicity, this report refers to the companion bills as “the bill.”]

2007 Senate Bill 365 and 2007 Assembly Bill 653, Relating to 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; and Providing for a Study

Subsequent to the conclusion of the committee’s work and the drafting of the proposed legislation, the Legislature enacted 2007 Wisconsin Act 20 (the Biennial Budget Act) which affects a number of provisions included in the committee’s recommendations. Therefore, the committee’s recommendations have been redrafted to reflect those changes.

The bill 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.

The recommendation to create a grant program for school district consolidation feasibility studies was included in the Biennial Budget Act.

In addition, the committee endorsed 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. This provision was included in the Biennial Budget Act.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS INTRODUCED BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

This part of the report provides background information on, and a description of, the bills as recommended by the Special Committee on Review of State School Aid Formula. [**Note:** Each proposal has been introduced in both houses of the Legislature as companion bills. For simplicity, this report refers to the companion bills as “the bill.”]

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 bill 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 bill 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.

The bill 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.

The bill extends the enrollment adjustment aid period for school districts to three years. Under the Biennial Budget Act, as in the committee's original proposal in the first year of an enrollment decline, a school district will receive 100% of the allowable revenues that the decline would have generated. The bill maintains the 100% payment in the first year of the decline. 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. The bill provides that 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 2007-08, the low-revenue ceiling is \$8,700.

The bill increases the low revenue ceiling for revenue limits by \$400 per pupil in each of the next two years. Thus, the 2008-09 low revenue ceiling would be increased to \$9,100 from the current \$8,700 per pupil as set in the Biennial Budget Act. Subsequently, the ceiling in the 2009-10 school year would be increased by \$400 to \$9,500.

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. A school district may exceed this revenue limit only by receiving voter approval at a referendum.

The bill 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 bill, 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.

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.

Joint Legislative Council Vote

At the December 12, 2007 meeting, the Joint Legislative Council voted as follows on the following recommendation of the committee:

- Sen. Decker moved, seconded by Sen. Miller, that LRB-2279/3, relating to 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; and providing for a study, be introduced by the Joint Legislative Council. The motion passed on a roll call vote as follows: Ayes, 18 (Sens. Risser, Breske, Carpenter, Darling, Decker, Harsdorf, Lasee, Miller, and Robson; and Reps. Wieckert, Gottlieb, Huebsch, Kaufert, Kreuser, Nelson, Pocan, Rhoades, and Schneider); Noes, 3 (Sen. Fitzgerald; and Reps. Ballweg and Fitzgerald); and Absent, 1 (Sen. Coggs).



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
36th Assembly District

Handwritten signature of Mary Williams in cursive.

Rep. Mary Williams
87th 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 63rd 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 6th 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

ROGER BRESKE
8800 Hwy. 29
Eland, WI 54427

TIM CARPENTER
President Pro Tempore
2957 South 38th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53215

SPENCER COGGS
3732 North 40th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53216

ALBERTA DARLING
1325 West Dean Road
River Hills, WI 53217

JOAN BALLWEG
170 W. Summit Street
Markesan, WI 53946

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

Co-Chair

STEVE WIECKERT
Representative
1 Weatherstone Drive
Appleton, WI 54914

ALAN LASEE
2259 Lasee Road
De Pere, WI 54115

MARK MILLER
4903 Roigan Terrace
Monona, WI 53716

JUDY ROBSON
2411 E. Ridge Road
Beloit, WI 53511

SENATORS

RUSSELL DECKER
Majority Leader
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

REPRESENTATIVES

DEAN KAUFERT
1360 Alpine Lane
Neenah, WI 54956

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

THOMAS NELSON
1510 Orchard Dr.
Kaukauna, WI 54130

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)

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

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