
Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars

A Policymaker's Guide to School Finance: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask



University of Wisconsin-Extension
Center for Excellence in Family Studies
School of Human Ecology
University of Wisconsin-Madison

A Policymaker's Guide to School Finance: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask

First Edition

Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars

Edited by

Karen Bogenschneider

Director, Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars
Rothermel-Bascom Professor of Human Ecology,
Human Development & Family Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Family Policy Specialist, University Extension

and

Elizabeth Gross

State Coordinator
Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Meg Wall-Wild

Layout, production, and copy editing

February, 2004

**University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension
Center for Excellence in Family Studies
School of Human Ecology
University of Wisconsin-Madison**

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of
The Helen Bader Foundation, Inc.,
The William T. Grant Foundation,
Phyllis M. Northway,
& Elizabeth C. Davies.

Purpose and Presenters

In 1993, Wisconsin became one of the first states to sponsor Family Impact Seminars modeled after the seminar series for federal policymakers. Because of the success of the Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars, Wisconsin is now helping other states establish their own seminars through the Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars at the University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension.

Family Impact Seminars are a series of seminars, briefing reports, newsletters, and discussion sessions that provide up-to-date, solution-oriented research on current issues for state legislators and their aides, Governor's Office staff, legislative support bureau personnel, and state agency representatives. The seminars provide objective, nonpartisan research on current issues and do not lobby for particular policies. Seminar participants discuss policy options and identify common ground where it exists.

"A Policymaker's Guide to School Finance: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask" is the 20th Family Impact Seminar in a series designed to bring a family focus to policymaking. Family Impact Seminars analyze the consequences an issue, policy, or program may have for families.

This seminar featured the following speakers:

Allan Odden, Ph.D.

Professor, Educational Administration
Wisconsin Center for Education Research
School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison
653 Educational Sciences
1025 W Johnson Street
Madison WI 53706
(608) 263-4260
Fax: (608) 263-6448
arodden@wisc.edu
<http://www.education.wisc.edu/edadmin/people/faculty/odden.html>

John Augenblick, Ed.D.

President, Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc.
700 Broadway, Suite 804
Denver CO 80203
(303) 293-2175
Fax: (303) 293-2178
jga@apaconsulting.net
<http://www.apaconsulting.net>

Heather Weiss, Ed.D.

Director, Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education
3 Garden Street
Cambridge MA 02138
(617) 495-9108
Fax: (617) 495-8594
heather_weiss@harvard.edu
<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp/index.html>

For further information on the Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar series, contact:

Karen Bogenschneider

Director, Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars
Rothermel-Bascom Professor of Human Ecology,
Human Development & Family Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Family Policy Specialist, University of Wisconsin-Extension
1430 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706
(608) 262-4070
Fax: (608) 262-5335
kpbogens@wisc.edu

State Coordinators

Elizabeth Gross

Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars
1180 Observatory Drive
3412 Social Science Building
Madison WI 53706
(608) 262-5779
egross@ssc.wisc.edu

Ross Collin

Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars
130 Human Ecology
1300 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706
(608) 262-6766
recollin@wisc.edu

Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Briefing Reports

Each seminar is accompanied by an indepth briefing report that summarizes the latest research on a topic and identifies policy options from across the political spectrum. Copies are available at:

Cooperative Extension Publishing Operations
103 Extension Building, 432 N. Lake St., Madison, WI 53706
Toll-free: (877) 947-7827 (877-WIS-PUBS); Madison: (608) 262-3346
<http://learningstore.uwex.edu>

BFI #1	Building Policies That Put Families First: A Wisconsin Perspective	March 1993
BFI #2	Single Parenthood and Children's Well-Being	October 1993
BFI #3	Can Government Promote Competent Parenting?	January 1994
BFI #4	Promising Approaches for Addressing Juvenile Crime	May 1994
BFI #5	Welfare Reform: Can Government Promote Parental Self-Sufficiency While Ensuring the Well-Being of Children?	January 1995
BFI #6	Child Support: The Effects of the Current System on Families	November 1995
BFI #7	Teenage Pregnancy Prevention: Programs That Work	March 1996
BFI #8	Programs and Policies to Prevent Youth Crime, Smoking, and Substance Use: What Works?	February 1997
BFI #9	Moving Families Out of Poverty: Employment, Tax, and Investment Strategies	April 1997
BFI #10	Building Resiliency and Reducing Risk: What Youth Need from Families and Communities to Succeed	January 1998
BFI #11	Enhancing Educational Performance: Three Policy Alternatives	March 1998
BFI #12	Long-Term Care: State Policy Perspectives	February 1999
BFI #13	Raising the Next Generation: Public and Private Parenting Initiatives	October 1999
BFI #14	Helping Poor Kids Succeed: Welfare, Tax, and Early Intervention Policies	January 2000
BFI #15	Rising Prescription Drug Costs: Reasons, Needs, and Policy Responses	January 2001
BFI #16	Designing a State Prescription Drug Benefit: Strategies to Control Costs	March 2001
BFI #17	Early Childhood Care and Education: What Are States Doing?	January 2002
BFI #18	Rising Health Care Costs: Employer Purchasing Pools and Other Policy Options	January 2003
BFI #19	Corrections Policy: Can States Cut Costs and Still Curb Crime?	October 2003
BFI #20	A Policymaker's Guide to School Finance: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask	February 2004

Or, visit the Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars website at:
<http://www.familyimpactseminars.org> (enter a portal and click on State Seminars).

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
A Policymakers' Guide to School Funding: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask	1
How Much Money is Being Spent on Education?	3
Why This Interest in Achieving Adequate Education for All Students?	3
How Much Does Money Matter to Student Achievement?	4
What Approaches Are States Using to Decide What an Adequate Education Is and How Much it Costs to Achieve?	5
The Successful School District Approach	6
The Statistical Approach	7
The Professional Judgement Approach	8
The Whole School Approach and the Related Evidence-Based Approach	9
Do These Different Adequacy Approaches Yield Different Dollar Amounts?	10
Can States Provide an Adequate Education With Existing Resources Or Will Additional Resources Be Needed?	11
Evaluating School Funding Formulas: What Questions Should Legislators Ask?	11
Evaluating School Funding Formulas Checklist	12
Conclusion	16
Family Involvement in Education: How Important is It? What Can Legislators Do?	
<i>by Karen Bogenschneider and Carol Johnson</i>	19
Why Should Parents Be Involved in Their Child's Schooling?	19
How Important is Parental School Involvement to School Success? Does It Benefit All Children?	20
Do We Know How to Mount Programs to Improve Parental School Involvement?	21
How Much Do School, Family, and Community Partnerships Cost?	21
Beyond the Classroom, What Policies and Programs Help Families Educate Their Children?	22
What Can State Policymakers Do to Promote Family Involvement in Education?	22
A Checklist for Assessing the Family Impact of School Policies	23
Conclusion:	26
Evidence of the Effectiveness of Complementary Learning	
<i>by Heather Weiss</i>	31
Research Examining the Benefits of Family Involvement in Education ...	31

Data on School District Revenues and Pupil Assessments in Wisconsin

Prepared by David Loppnow and Layla Merrifield,

Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau 35

School District Revenues 35

Pupil Assessments 39

Selected Resources 45

Executive Summary

This report begins by examining why public and political attention has shifted from achieving equity in school finance to striving for adequacy in school performance. In 2000, the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled that Wisconsin's school finance system was constitutional on equity grounds. Yet the court suggested that an adequacy case could be brought, and even specified what the standard could be to raise all students up to adequate levels of school performance. Four approaches are reviewed that states can use to set an adequacy standard and to determine how much money would be needed to achieve it. Cost estimates are given for three approaches using Wisconsin data on spending and student performance.

To help legislators evaluate school funding formulas, this chapter includes a checklist of 15 questions that raises several of the issues that legislators should consider and identifies some of the trade-offs they will face. For example, calls for lower taxes conflict with calls to increase spending to meet the costs of educating students with special needs.

At the heart of many discussions of school finance is the question of whether or not increases in funding lead to increases in student performance. According to recent research, money can influence student achievement if it is used effectively and efficiently. For policymakers, the question turns as much on how to plan for effective use of school funding as it does on how much to allocate.

For example, in one study of low-performing schools in Texas, 15 schools were given an additional \$300,000 annually for five years to raise low achievement scores. Four years later, no change had occurred in 13 of these schools, but two schools had some of the best attendance records in the city and had raised test scores to the city's average. All schools had reduced class size, but the successful schools changed the curriculum and what happened in the classroom. Special education students were moved into mainstream classrooms, thereby freeing up a good deal of money for other purposes. The schools brought in health services, and used a large portion of their funds to get parents involved in their children's education.

Policymakers interested in promoting school success must also look beyond the school door, according to the authors of the next two chapters. What happens in the home and the community can complement and extend what children learn in school. The last 15 years of school reform have focused on course curriculum, instructional methods, and teacher training, according to best-selling author Professor Laurence Steinberg. Yet Steinberg claims that these reforms have accomplished very little, because academic achievement is shaped more by children's lives outside the school walls, particularly their parents. Harvard Professor Robert Putnam agrees, claiming that if he were given a choice between a 10% increase in school budgets or a 10% increase in parent involvement, he would invest in parent involvement.

The evidence is clear. When parents are involved, students get better grades and score higher on standardized tests. Children of involved parents also have better attendance records, drop out less often, have higher aspirations, and more positive attitudes toward school and homework. What's more, these positive

impacts seem most important for those children who need them most—children growing up in disadvantaged, highly-stressed families.

What is less clear, however, is whether parental school involvement is a skill that can be taught and learned. Programs that promote school involvement, particularly among disadvantaged families, are promising but still in need of replication. Researchers have found that funding for school, family, and community partnerships actually translates into higher quality partnerships. The good news is that the average cost for building these partnerships is \$20 to \$30 per pupil per year for all school, district, and state expenses.

Policymakers can also help families educate their children with child care, summer school, and out-of-school programs. Studies that follow children into adulthood demonstrate that kids with higher quality preschool care are more likely to earn better wages and complete high school and college. In recent studies, summer school programs have helped reverse the decline in achievement that occurs among disadvantaged children during the summer months. In addition, out-of-school programs have been shown to benefit achievement when school children receive educational learning experiences in supervised settings.

State legislatures have passed a number of laws to support parent involvement: requiring businesses to allow their employees time off to participate in their child's schooling; granting state workers time to attend parent/teacher conferences or other meetings regarding their child's education; requiring course credits in family involvement for teacher certification; requiring schools to hold at least two parent/teacher conferences per year; providing supplemental funds in high-poverty districts for four-year-old kindergarten, summer school, and parent outreach activities; and requiring school district report cards to include progress on parent involvement.

The final chapter by Dave Loppnow and Layla Merrifield of the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau reviews school funding and student performance in Wisconsin. The Badger State will spend approximately \$9,216 per pupil to educate public school students for the year 2003-04. Of the estimated \$4,747.2 million of state aid to education, almost nine-tenths are used to equalize the school property tax differences between school districts. Over the course of the past twelve years, state aid for K-12 public schools in Wisconsin has increased 137%. However, because of state revenue limits on how much school property tax money can be collected without local referenda, the level of school property taxes citizens pay has risen only 27%.

Just as state aid to education has risen in the past several years, assessments show that the percentage of Wisconsin students scoring at advanced or proficient levels on state standardized tests has risen as well. However, about twice as many students score at advanced or proficient levels on state standardized tests compared to national tests. Also, average gains in achievement across all students can mask the fact that some student groups continue to score lower than others. Children of color, English language learners, students with disabilities, and those from economically-disadvantaged backgrounds consistently perform less well than their White, middle-class, and English-speaking peers. While no single cause for this situation has been identified, Wisconsin has a variety of programs and strategies aimed at closing the achievement gap, including reduced class size, four-year-old kindergarten, and increased availability of school breakfast.

Acknowledgments

For their generosity in providing financial support for the Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar, *A Policymaker's Guide to School Finance: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask*, we extend sincere appreciation to:

The Helen Bader Foundation, Inc., Milwaukee, WI
The William T. Grant Foundation, Inc., New York, NY
Phyllis Northway, Private Supporter
Elizabeth C. Davies, Private Supporter

We are also grateful to the following individuals for their contributions:

Mark Lederer for his advice and many contributions since the seminars began in 1993;

Theodora Ooms for developing the Family Impact Seminar model and for her ongoing technical assistance;

David Loppnow and Layla Merrifield of the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau for writing the briefing report chapter, *Data on School District Revenues and Pupil Assessments in Wisconsin*;

Jane Grinde of Bright Beginnings/Family-School-Community Partnerships, Janet Hansen of the Committee of Economic Development, Ruth Anne Landsverk of Bright Beginnings/Family-School-Community Partnerships, David Loppnow of the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau, and Andrew Reschovsky of the Robert M. LaFollette School of Public Affairs for consulting on the design of the seminar and the content of the briefing report;

Ross Collin, Bettina Friese, Mari Hansen, Carol Johnson, Elissa Mahlik, and Meg Wall-Wild for their assistance in organizing this seminar.

Appreciation is extended to the 20th Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Planning Committee:

Robert Hanle	Division of Executive Budget and Finance, Department of Administration
Robert Lang	Legislative Fiscal Bureau
David Loppnow	Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Allan Odden	Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Brian Pahnke	Division of Finance and Management, Department of Public Instruction
Andrew Reschovsky	LaFollette Institute for Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Russell Whitesel	Wisconsin Legislative Council

Appreciation is extended to the Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars Legislative Advisory Committee:

Former Representative Peter Bock	Senator Gwendolynne Moore
Senator Alberta Darling	Representative Luther Olsen
Lisa Ellinger, Governor's Office	Senator Judy Robson
Representative Jean Hundertmark	Senator Carol Roessler
Senator Julie Lassa	Representative Gary Sherman
Representative Mark Miller	Representative Daniel Vrakas

The Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars Advisory Committee:

Dick Barrows	Associate Dean, Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Inge Bretherton	Human Development & Family Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Tom Corbett	Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Jim Gingles	Health Promotion & Human Development, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Jane Grinde	Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Tom Kaplan	Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Mark Lederer	Private Consultant
Sally Lundeen	School of Nursing, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Margo Melli	Law School, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Theodora Ooms	Center for Law and Social Policy, Washington, DC
Enis Ragland	Mayor's Office, City of Madison
Dave Riley	Human Development & Family Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and University of Wisconsin-Extension
Rae Schilling	Department of Family Medicine, Eau Claire Residency, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Terry Shelton	LaFollette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Denise Skinner	Human Development and Family Studies, University of Wisconsin-Stout
Rebecca Young	Former Wisconsin State Legislator

A Policymaker's Guide To School Funding: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask

This chapter examines why public and political attention has shifted from achieving equity in school finance to striving for adequacy in school performance. In 2000, the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled that Wisconsin's school finance system was constitutional on equity grounds. Yet the court suggested that an adequacy case could be brought and even specified what the standard could be to raise all students up to adequate levels of school performance. Four approaches are reviewed that states can use to set an adequacy standard and to determine how much money would be needed to achieve it. Cost estimates are given for three approaches using data on Wisconsin spending and student performance. This chapter summarizes recent research that money can influence student achievement if it is used effectively and efficiently. For policymakers, the question turns on how to plan for effective use of school funding as much as it does on how much to allocate. To help legislators evaluate school funding formulas, this chapter concludes with a checklist of 15 questions that raise several of the issues that legislators should consider and identifies some of the trade-offs they will face.

The legacy began with the one-room country school. As early as 1647, local taxes were enacted in Massachusetts to finance a public education system to help families educate their children. Early on in the nation's history, the leaders of the new American republic recognized that ensuring the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution depended upon an educated citizenry prepared to participate in the affairs of government. Free public elementary schools, first proposed by Thomas Jefferson, were adopted in the mid-1800s.¹ Through the wisdom of its political and civic leaders, the United States provided the world's first system of universal public education, which was considered the most inclusive in the industrialized world.²

From its origins, what became immediately apparent was that different school systems developed depending upon differences in the local ability to pay. Based on beliefs that a state is best-positioned to equalize the funding capacity of local jurisdictions, statewide education systems began to emerge. By 1820, 13 of the then 23 states had constitutional provisions pertaining to public education. Today, all 50 states are required by their constitutions to provide a free public education.¹

Currently the financing of public education in American is at a crossroads. Education remains the ticket to more prestigious and better-paying employment, and the surest way to move families out of poverty.³ Government, particularly state and local governments, continues to make substantial investments in public education at the elementary and secondary schools levels, accounting for almost one-third of all state government expenditures, half of all local government

In 2000, the Wisconsin Supreme Court suggested that an adequacy case could be brought and specified what an adequacy standard might be.

expenditures, plus 2% of all money spent by the federal government.⁴ In the 1990s, the courts shifted the focus of the role of state government from equalizing differences in local property wealth and spending to ensuring that schools have adequate funding for all students to achieve high standards of performance.

The financing of public education in Wisconsin is also at a crossroads. In the late 1990s, a court case was brought against the state of Wisconsin arguing that wealthy school districts should not receive any state school aid as now exists in Tier 1 of the state school funding formula. In the summer of 2000, the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled that Wisconsin's school finance system was constitutional on equity grounds. The Court wrote that the system was "as uniform as possible," but suggested that an adequacy case could be brought and even specified what that adequacy standard might be. School funding would need to be adequate for all students to achieve adequacy in core subjects (i.e. geography, history, mathematics, reading and writing, science) and to receive instruction in the arts, foreign languages, health, music, physical education, social sciences, and vocational training.¹

In 2003, Governor Doyle formed a "Task Force on Educational Excellence" to review Wisconsin's system of school finance and report on its findings in 2004. Legislative interest in school finance is high, because of the state's historic investment in elementary and secondary education, which currently accounts for 40% of the annual appropriations from the state's General Fund.

Beginning in the 1990s, state policymakers in Wisconsin and across the country were faced with several important questions:¹

1. How can state policymakers determine how much money is needed to educate students to high standards, and how can this money be distributed fairly to districts, schools, programs, and students?
2. How can legislators ensure that the investment of state resources will be used to produce better educational outcomes?
3. Who should pay to support public education, and what should the state and local share be?

This report focuses primarily on the first and second questions, given that decisions about who should pay and how much are political issues rather than research questions. This report begins with a brief historical overview of how much money is being spent on education in the U.S. and why attention has shifted recently from achieving equity in school funding to striving for adequacy in school performance. Next we review the evidence on how much money matters in school performance. Then we overview four approaches states can use to determine how much money is needed to achieve adequacy, and what three of these approaches might cost if implemented in Wisconsin. Finally, 15 questions are proposed that state legislators can use to evaluate school funding formulas.

This chapter draws upon the writing of several school finance experts: University of Wisconsin-Madison Professors Allan Odden and Andrew Reschovsky; Vanderbilt Professor James Guthrie; and school finance consultant John Augenblick. Copies of the studies that this chapter is drawn from are available from the Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars at (608) 262-0369.

How much Money Is Being Spent on Education?

The funding of public schools has an enormous impact on the economy. In 2000, public school revenues totaled \$378.5 billion. In addition, revenues for public schools comprise 3.9% of the country's Gross Domestic Product and 4.5% of all personal income.¹

The public investment in education is substantial, totaling an average \$7,957 per pupil in the United States in 1999-2000. Expenditures vary substantially across states, from a low of \$5,370 in Utah to a high of \$11,543 in New Jersey (see the chapter by Loppnow & Merrifield in this report). In 1999-2000, Wisconsin ranked 12th in the country, with per-pupil revenues of \$8,870.

On average, revenues for the K-12 public school system have more than doubled during each decade from 1940 to 1990, although increases in the 1990s were the smallest of the century.¹ In the past 25 years, every state (with the exception of California) has increased school spending and some have increased dramatically.⁵ "These facts are at odds with public perceptions that schools do not get much more money each year" (p. 5)¹ Even if budgets only increase 1% to 3% each year, this amounts to about a one-third increase across a decade.

In addition to the level of expenditures, state legislatures have traditionally considered whether students in different school districts in the state have equal access to educational revenues. For example, many court cases earlier in the 20th century ruled that it was inequitable if property-poor districts had to tax themselves at high rates to provide a basic education, whereas property-rich districts could tax themselves at low rates and still produce enough revenue to provide a superior education.⁶ For example, in 2000-01 in Wisconsin, when the 10% of students in the most property-poor districts were compared with the 10% in the most property-rich districts, the students in the poorest districts had 18% of the wealth of those in the richest districts.⁷

Wisconsin's school funding formula offsets most of these inequities by guaranteeing the school districts that choose the same property tax rate will have approximately the same amount of money available to spend on education.^{8,9} For example, in property-poor districts, Wisconsin makes up the difference between what is raised locally and a tax base guaranteed by the state, which is set at about the 93rd percentile for wealth. Spending is guaranteed at about the 60th percentile of per pupil expenditures, which was about \$6,533 in Wisconsin in the 2000-01 school year.^{1,7} Achieving equity is an important goal in school finance, yet recent court cases have moved beyond equity to whether funding is sufficient for achieving an adequate education for all students.

Why This Interest in Achieving an Adequate Education for All Students?

Providing an adequate education, which attempts to raise all students to high standards, has generated public and political interest for a number of reasons, four of which are detailed here. First, state legislators are interested in adequacy because, in a growing number of court cases, adequacy has become the new fairness standard to which state school funding formulas are likely to be held accountable. Courts have ruled that the education clause in state constitutions guaranteed students an adequate level of education in states such as Alabama, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio,

***On average,
K-12 spending
in the U.S.
has more than
doubled each
decade from
1940 to 1990.***

Adequacy has shifted debate from inputs (e.g., pupil spending) to outcomes (e.g., student performance).

Tennessee, and Wyoming.¹⁰ Second, providing an adequate education shifts school finance debate from a focus on inputs (such as per pupil spending) to outcomes (such as student educational performance). This interest in student performance is driven, in part, by research that children with a range of natural talents can learn to write good essays, conduct science experiments, and solve difficult math problems.¹¹

Third, school spending has increased in virtually every state, and state legislatures want to know if the new money has produced better student outcomes.⁵ Because adequacy explicitly links education funding to the quality of education, it is consistent with the accountability required by the 2002 No Child Left Behind Act: every child must meet state student performance standards by 2013-14 or risk the loss of federal funding. In a recent report by the National Research Council, “Never before has the nation set for itself the goal of educating all children to high standards (p. 1).¹⁰

Fourth, some economists believe that striving for adequacy has the potential to remedy problems that equity has failed to overcome.¹⁰ For example, equal spending per pupil doesn’t necessarily guarantee equal student performance, given that the cost of achieving a certain level of performance varies across school districts.^{8,9} Focusing on adequacy forces state legislatures to consider how much costs may vary depending upon characteristics such as the size and location of different school districts and the numbers of students needing special services.

How Much Does Money Matter to Student Achievement?

At the heart of many discussions of school finance is the question of whether or not increases in funding lead to increases in student performance. Whereas many educators would not hesitate to say that more money in the schools yields better results, there has been considerable debate in the policy and research communities as to how strong a link can be established between student outcomes and school funding. Some researchers argue that there is no systematic connection between funding level and student outcomes, whereas others argue that money does make a difference.

Perhaps more informative than the issue of whether money matters is the related issue of how that money is used. If the resources are used to lower class size, there is strong evidence that students can benefit, at least at the elementary level. Yet lowering class size is an expensive reform and there is no consensus on whether it is more effective than other reforms that could be undertaken with the same amount of money (Janet Hansen, personal communication, Jan. 8, 2004). On the other hand, spending on facility construction and maintenance, school-level administration, and teacher education levels were not systematically related to increased achievement.

Researchers Richard Murnane and Frank Levy¹² conducted a study of low-performing schools in Texas that demonstrates how scholars on both sides of the fence may be right about the influence of money on student performance. In 1989, 15 schools serving low income, minority children in Austin, Texas were given an additional \$300,000 annually for five years to address low achievement. Four years later, 13 of these schools still showed poor student attendance and achievement. Yet two of the schools had raised test scores to the city’s average and had some of the best attendance records in the city.

To understand how this supports the findings of researchers in both camps, it is necessary to look at how the schools spent the additional money. In the 13 schools where there was no change in student outcomes, the money was spent almost entirely on reducing class size by hiring more teachers. Yet, while the teachers in these low-performing schools had fewer students in the classroom, they still used the same curriculum and instructional methods.

In the two schools that showed success with the new money, the funds had also been spent on lowering class size. But in addition to adding more teachers to their staff, the schools changed what happened in the classroom and a variety of other factors as well. Now that teachers had fewer students per classroom, the schools' administrators could move special education students into mainstream classes, thereby freeing up a good deal of money for other purposes. Additionally, the schools changed curriculum and brought in health services to immunize and care for children who might otherwise miss school to spend all day at the hospital emergency room. Finally, the schools used a large portion of their new funds to get parents involved in their children's education. These efforts included encouraging parents to participate in school governance issues such as hiring and budget committees.

As the example above shows, money can have a strong influence on student achievement if it is used effectively and efficiently. For policymakers, the question turns as much on how to plan for effective use of school finances as it does on how much to allocate.

Money can have a strong influence on student achievement if it is used effectively and efficiently.

What Approaches Are States Using to Decide What an Adequate Education Is and How Much It Costs to Achieve?

Defining an adequate education and determining what it costs are the thorny questions that state legislators face when reforming school finance policy. This question is challenging because no straightforward relationship exists between school finance and student performance. If researchers knew how much money it would take to produce a specific level of achievement, then state legislators could simply determine what level of achievement they wanted and provide the funds necessary to attain it.

Unfortunately, only a few states have attempted to determine whether they have enough money to meet state and federal student performance standards. Without data on what an adequate education costs, decisions on how much revenue is needed for public education must be made based on such considerations as prior year revenues, comparisons with other states, marginal changes driven by newly-required programs, or emerging budget pressures such as rising health insurance costs. In many states, an adequate level of school funding is determined, not by careful analysis of how much money is needed to educate children to state performance standards, but rather by political considerations such as how much money state and local policymakers determine is available or can be raised.

Over the last few years, four alternative approaches have emerged as ways to determine what adequacy is and how much it would cost: 1) the successful school district approach, 2) the statistical approach (also known as the economic cost function approach), 3) the professional judgement approach, and 4) the whole-school reform approach (and a related approach developed by University

The successful school district approach identifies successful districts and then determines how much they spend to reach state standards.

of Wisconsin-Madison Professor Allan Odden called the evidence-based approach). Each of these approaches defines an adequate education differently and each uses a different method to calculate the dollar figure needed to achieve adequacy.

Because this is a relatively new field of study, the science is not yet exact enough to conclude which of these approaches provides the most precise estimate of the cost of meeting a state's adequacy standard. In fact, the best approach may vary from state to state, and several legislatures have actually decided to use more than one approach to see how similar or different the cost estimates are.¹³ Each approach is described below along with its potential consequences.

The Successful School District Approach. The successful school district approach identifies districts that have been successful in reaching state achievement standards and then determines how much these districts spend. This approach is based on the simple premise that any district in the state should be able to meet the standards if given the same level of funding as those districts who have met the standards.¹⁰ This approach has been adapted for use in several states including Illinois, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, and Ohio.

This approach requires three steps. First, the state must define what an adequate education is and specify which school districts have been successful in reaching this standard. Using this approach, Missouri defined adequacy using the Missouri Assessment Program which includes both outcomes on student performance in five content areas, as well as inputs such as requirements for class size, library/media staff, and administrative staff. Schools were considered successful if they scored 100 points on the Missouri Assessment Program. Using this criterion, 102 school districts were classified as successful and, in these schools, 69.3% of students were rated as nearing proficiency or better on Missouri's state tests.¹³

Second, the basic expenditures of these successful districts were examined. The basic expenditures were those that reflected the cost of serving a student with no special needs and a district with no other characteristics that are taken into account in the state aid formula. Therefore, these basic expenditures do not include spending for capital purposes, transportation, special education, other special programs, and any service funded by federal dollars. Third, a base cost figure per student was calculated for these successful districts. Theoretically, the successful school district approach could be used to determine how much the base cost could be adjusted for differences across school districts such as special education or disadvantaged students, but the data for such analysis are not available in most states.¹³

This approach is most appropriate when the state has specific standards and is able to identify districts that have been successful in meeting these standards. One strength of this approach is that it is state-specific, because it is based on state standards and actual evidence that school districts in the state have been successful with this level of resources. Moreover, this approach is appropriate for state education systems with a tradition of local control because it determines only how much is spent, but not in what ways the resources are used.

Because atypical districts are usually removed from the analysis, successful school districts tend to be nonmetropolitan districts that are of average size and are relatively homogeneous geographically. Critics charge that it is difficult to

make adjustments to the base cost for districts that may differ from those that have been successful. In particular, it is difficult to make adjustments to meet the needs of large urban districts, small rural districts, or districts with high number of students needing special services.⁷

The Statistical Approach. This approach, also known as the economic cost function approach, uses cutting-edge statistical techniques to estimate the cost of achieving a specific level of educational performance. In the statistical approach, an adequate education is commonly, but not always, defined as average scores on achievement tests administered to all students.¹⁴ This approach, still in its infancy, may eventually be the best one after the methodology improves and the cost estimates become more stable.^{10, 11}

The statistical approach estimates how much more or less it costs a district to achieve an adequate education.

The statistical approach originated when economists were asked to use data on school spending and student performance to estimate the costs of achieving an adequate education. Using state-specific data, economists tried to estimate how much more or less it would cost in any given district to educate students to a specific level of performance. Economists believe that one of the reasons why equal spending doesn't result in equal educational performance is that the cost of education may well differ across school districts due to factors beyond their control.

In discussions of school finance, the term costs often is used to mean the same thing as spending. According to Reschovsky,^{8,9} when business people and economists talk about cost, they mean the value of the resources needed to produce a given amount of a particular good or service. To illustrate this, when farmers talk about the cost of producing a hundred-weight of milk, we realize that costs may differ over time and among farmers for reasons that may be largely out of their control. For example, milk costs can increase because of a rise in the price of feed grains or a drought.

Similarly, the cost of educating students to reach a particular educational outcome may also vary. Some school districts may have to spend more money than others to reach this goal. For example, school districts that have more children who are disabled or who come from low-income families may need specialized programs to achieve the same educational outcome. Also, very small or very large school districts, or districts with a high cost of living may have to spend more per pupil than other districts to achieve the same level of student achievement.^{8,9}

The statistical approach typically entails a three-step process which is illustrated here with a study by Imazeki and Reschovsky¹⁴ using Wisconsin data. First, researchers determine the standard of educational adequacy that they are striving to estimate. For example, Imazeki and Reschovsky¹⁴ decided not to use an average achievement score such as 10th grade achievement levels as the adequacy standard because this may reflect achievement experience before school and up to the 10th grade. Instead, they defined adequacy as an outcome that is more apt to capture the schools' contribution to adequacy—the change in test scores between 8th and 10th grade, and the number of advanced courses a school district offers. Second, the researchers quantified a number of different factors that are outside the control of the school district and may affect what it costs to achieve educational goals: children who are disabled, have limited English, or come from

single-parent, low-income families; cost of living, which affects teacher salaries; school size; and the proportion of the students in high school, which requires more resources than the lower grades. Third, the researchers calculated a cost index for each school district, which isolated how much costs varied due to factors outside the district's control. For example, a cost index of 1.27 meant that a school district needed to spend 27% more than the average district to achieve the same adequacy standards.

Not surprisingly, the statistical approach has proven particularly useful in determining how average school costs could be adjusted for differences in the nature of the student body. For example, other approaches have relied on the per pupil weightings developed by the statistical approach to account for the extra cost of educating students with special needs or districts with special characteristics. According to Duncombe and Yinger, "Without such an accounting, some schools get credit for favorable conditions that were not of their making and other schools get blamed for unfavorable conditions over which they have no control" (p. 1).¹⁵

The statistical approach was used in Massachusetts in the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s (Reschovsky, personal conversation, January 8, 2004) and is currently under consideration in Texas. States have been slow to adopt this approach for a number of reasons, four which are detailed here. First, because of its complexity, this approach has proven difficult for policymakers to understand and explain to their constituents.^{5, 10} Second, of all the approaches, the statistical approach pays the least attention to curriculum or educational practices, which are important components of ensuring that resources are used wisely to achieve intended outcomes.⁵

Third, in states where cost estimates have been calculated including Illinois, New York, Texas, and Wisconsin, the cost estimates across districts have been so large that they are difficult to achieve in a real political context.⁷ For example, using Wisconsin data, the average expenditure levels varied from districts that needed 40% less than the average expenditures to districts which needed three times more than the average.¹⁴ Also, city school districts typically need two to three times the average expenditure levels—a cost difference which makes political consensus challenging. Fourth, the statistical analyses take into account teacher salaries, which reflect the cost of living, but do not acknowledge that districts with higher costs of living may also be more desirable places to live.

The Professional Judgement Approach. In this approach, professionals are asked for their best judgement on how to build high-quality schools. In Missouri, where the model was used recently, the goal was to provide all students with an adequate education.¹³ Some of the best educators in the state and sometimes the nation identify what it takes to achieve adequacy, specifically which instructional components are necessary—such as the number and kinds of teachers, programs, professional development, support services, and technology. Once these components are identified, they are costed out to produce a per pupil base cost and adjustments for students with special needs.

Typically, panels of teachers, administrators, and other experts are asked to identify what educational components are necessary in the state for prototypic school sizes (e.g., small, moderate, and large) or types (e.g., elementary, middle,

The professional judgement approach asks experts for their best judgement on how to build high-quality schools that teach students to adequacy standards.

and high schools). These panels have been organized differently across states, but they often tap into the views of people who are actually delivering education, as well as researchers familiar with current evidence on best practices.¹³ In some states, panel members come from within the state and in others, they come from outside the state. Sometimes a single panel is used, and other times multiple panels are used with one panel reviewing the work of another. In Missouri, a total of nine panels were created: four schools panels to specify the education components of small and very small schools, moderate-size schools, large schools, and very large schools; four district panels to specify the educational components of small and very small districts, moderate-size districts, large districts, and very large districts; and one systemwide panel to review the work of all the district panels and the consultant's preliminary cost estimates.

Following the meetings of the school and district panels, the consultants made some preliminary decisions about the price tag of each educational component and the cost of services for students with special needs. These cost estimates, the educational components, and the prices of each component were then reviewed by the systemwide panel.¹³

The professional judgement approach has been used most recently in Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Oregon, and Wyoming. This approach has been easier for policymakers to understand than the statistical approach because the reasons for the cost estimates are obvious (e.g., recommended class size, number of personnel, and technology). This approach has also proven popular with states that have a tradition of local control. The approach is designed to develop prototypic models of how best to deliver education services, yet the per pupil costs are distributed as block grants. This gives local school districts the flexibility of adapting the expert recommendations to local needs and circumstances.⁵

Critics worry that this approach is based on current practice, and there may be no evidence that the educational components developed by the expert panels actually increase student performance.⁷ Even for those educational components that do have scientific evidence of effectiveness, there is no guarantee that school districts will deploy them, given that the aid is distributed as block grants. Critics also question whether different expert panels, even within the same state, could arrive at different base costs. This did not happen in Wyoming, however, where two panels operating six months apart arrived at similar conclusions.¹⁰

The Whole-School Approach and the Related Evidence-Based Approach.

The whole-school approach specifies the cost of an adequate education for all students based on the price of packaged school improvement programs that are thought to reflect the best thinking about how schools can ensure student success. Typically these programs, known as whole-school or comprehensive models, focus on improving the school success of all students, but particularly the most high-risk and disadvantaged students who might be better served by schoolwide reforms.¹⁶ The cost of an adequate education then depends upon the cost of purchasing these model programs and of implementing them in a local school district. The costs of these programs vary, but the programs designers are sensitive to price given that it will be difficult to market these programs to school districts if they are too expensive.¹⁰

The whole-school approach specifies the cost of an adequate education based on packaged reform programs that reflect the best thinking about how schools can ensure success.

These model programs differ in regard to which educational strategies they employ, how comprehensive they are, in what ways they are implemented, and how prescriptive they are.¹⁷ To ensure that the program is implemented in ways that maintain its integrity, most insist on providing training to the school district and sometimes oversight to the implementation process.¹⁰

These whole-school reform models, intended to be adopted as an entire package by schools, include such programs as the Roots and Wings/Success for All program developed by Robert Slavin at Johns Hopkins University; the School Development Program developed by James Comer; the Modern Red Schoolhouse program designed by the Hudson Institute; and the Direction Instruction Program developed at the University of Oregon.¹⁰ These programs can be implemented relatively quickly and without the cost of conducting an adequacy study. To date, Arkansas, Arizona, Kentucky, and New Jersey have used the whole-school approach or a variation of it.

Clearly, the components of these models are based on research, yet only a few of these programs have been rigorously evaluated to show that they actually cause improvements in students' school performance.¹⁰ In a recent review of 29 of these model programs by University of Wisconsin-Madison Professor Geoffrey Borman, three were found to have positive benefits on achievement across a number of U.S. schools: Direct Instruction, the School Development Program, and Success for All. Four other model programs had benefits for achievement, but have not been studied in as many schools: Expeditionary Learning, Outward Bound, Modern Red Schoolhouse, and Roots and Wings.¹⁶

Of the four approaches to adequacy, whole-school reform probably provides the least opportunity for local adaptation. These packaged school reform programs would need a review panel of leading educators and policymakers to tailor them to the state and local contexts.⁷ Critics are concerned about the political ramifications of requiring that all schools incorporate one of these reform programs. For example, if legislatures mandate that schools use one of these whole-school designs and they are not successful, who will be held responsible?

Professor Allan Odden of the University of Wisconsin-Madison has adapted the whole-school approach into what he calls the evidence-based approach. Using the comprehensive, schoolwide model programs, he has developed a list of components for achieving educational adequacy and a price tag is assigned to each. According to Odden,⁷ his approach incorporates just about every strategy that research shows benefits school success, so it helps guide schools in the most effective use of their dollars.

Do These Different Adequacy Approaches Yield Different Dollar Amounts?

The short answer is yes. Typically, the successful school district and the whole-school approaches produce lower costs than the professional judgement or the statistical approaches.¹³ These different dollar estimates are not surprising because determining the cost of educating students to high performance standards is not yet an exact science. What's more, these four approaches to achieving adequacy derive from different philosophies and each sets different student performance standards.⁷

Typically, the successful school district and whole-school approaches produce lower costs than the professional judgement or statistical approaches.

As an example, Augenblick and Myers¹³ recently used both the successful school district and professional judgement approaches to estimate the cost of providing an adequate education in Missouri. The two approaches produced different cost figures and, consistent with estimates in other states, the professional judgement approach yielded a higher dollar amount than the successful school district approach. One explanation is that the two approaches have different goals. The professional judgement approach estimates the cost of teaching *all* students to proficient standards, whereas the successful school district approach reflects the extent to which that goal is currently being met. For example, in the 102 successful school districts in Missouri, 69.3% of students were being rated as proficient or better. Calculating 69.3% of the figure arrived at from the professional judgement approach arrived at a figure similar to that from the successful school district approach.

Can States Provide an Adequate Education With Existing Resources or Will Additional Resources Be Needed?

It depends on the approach to achieving adequacy and it depends on the state. Because of their sensitivity to geographic considerations and the nature of the student body, the cost figures for achieving adequacy typically vary from state to state. Studies have been conducted in Wisconsin using three of these approaches: the statistical approach by San Diego State Professor Jennifer Imazeki and University of Wisconsin-Madison Professor Andrew Reschovsky; a modified professional judgement model by the Wisconsin Alliance for Excellent Schools; and the whole-school reform model by Professor Allan Odden and colleagues.

As a word of caution, these estimates are each based on a single study by one set of authors using data from a specific school year. Clearly, other studies of these approaches could arrive at different dollar estimates than are reported here. These examples are included here to illustrate three of the four approaches described in this paper and are not intended as an endorsement of any particular approach or plan.

The Estimated Costs of Adequacy in Wisconsin Using the Statistical Approach. Professors Imazeki and Reschovsky used the statistical model to calculate the cost of an adequate education in Wisconsin using 1994-95 spending data for 368 K-12 school districts. The analyses predicted the cost of producing two educational outcomes: the number of advanced courses a school district offers, and the change between 8th test scores in 1993-94 and 10th grade test scores two years later.

Based on their analysis, the costs of providing an adequate education were found to vary tremendously across school districts in Wisconsin. School districts with the lowest costs could achieve an average level of achievement by spending nearly 40% less per pupil than the district with average costs. With the exception of two districts, the districts with the highest costs must spend 90% more than average for the same educational outcomes.

Costs tended to be highest in rural districts due to their small size and high concentrations of low-income students. Costs also tended to be higher in both the

Using the statistical model, costs tended to be higher in both the property-poor and property-rich districts.

property-poor and property-rich districts. Property-poor districts tended to have more students with special needs and more students from economically-disadvantaged families. Property-rich districts had higher costs because of the higher costs of living in those districts.

Reschovsky⁸ produced a cost index for each district that isolated how much costs varied due to factors outside the school district's control. As an example, Madison's cost index was 1.27, which meant that Madison would have to spend 27% more than the district with average costs to provide an adequate education. Madison's higher costs were due primarily to the fact that the cost of living in Madison is relatively high and because of a higher proportion of students from low-income families. In contrast, the cost index for Stevens Point was 0.89, which means that the costs were 11% below average. Stevens Point has relatively lower costs because of a lower cost of living and a below-average proportion of special needs and poor children.

Of interest to Wisconsin policymakers is how these cost adjustments will affect the level of state aid in Wisconsin school districts. Adjusting the school aid formula for these cost differences increased aid for districts with above-average costs and decreased aid for districts with below-average costs. Using the cost-adjusted formula with 1994-95 spending data, 132 of the 368 K-12 districts with higher costs saw an increase in per pupil aid. Over three-fourths of the smallest districts saw an increase in their aid, and per pupil aid remained substantially higher in low-property wealth districts. However, the largest percentage increases in aid went to some wealthy districts because they were receiving less aid at the time. Using their cost-adjusted foundation formula and 1994-95 spending data, Imazeki and Reschovsky¹⁴ concluded that the State of Wisconsin could finance adequacy for all students by increasing state aid to local districts by approximately 16%.

Imazeki and Reschovsky¹⁴ also calculated a cost-adjusted foundation formula that required no additional state revenues. What happened is that school districts with below-average costs lost aid, as aid increased among those districts with the highest costs. As a result, districts with both high costs and high wealth received the largest increases in state aid. With no additional state revenues, only 90 of the 368 school districts received an increase in aid, compared to 132 districts if the state invested more money as described above.

If the goal of state legislators is to achieve educational adequacy, Reschovsky⁸ recommends turning to another type of formula—a cost-adjusted foundation formula. First, the state would set a standard of what an adequate education is. Then a dollar amount would be set equal to the amount of spending necessary to achieve this standard in a district with average costs. Each district would have its own foundation level of spending depending upon whether its costs were above or below average. Thus, the foundation level would be 10% above average in districts with costs 10% above the average costs. Districts with below average costs would have a below-average foundation level.

Reschovsky⁸ also recommends that the state determine a property tax rate that all districts are required to levy. Then the state aid would be the difference between the district's foundation level and the amount of revenue the district could raise using the state-imposed rate.

It is possible to use the statistical approach with no additional state revenues, although school districts with below-average costs would lose aid.

The Estimated Costs of Adequacy in Wisconsin Using the Modified Professional Judgement Approach. The Wisconsin Alliance for Excellent Schools (a statewide network of individuals and organizations) used a modification of the professional judgement model developed by Professors James Guthrie and Richard Rothstein to determine the cost of an adequate education in Wisconsin. The Alliance plan was developed by a core group including district superintendents and business officers, school board members, parent activists, teachers, clergy, community leaders, policy analysts, and business persons.

First, a three-step process was used to develop recommendations for the key staffing, programming, and equipment for schools in Wisconsin to provide an adequate education. Panels of educational experts built prototypic quality schools and identified the staff, programs, and materials needed to operate these schools. Second, a survey was sent to principals and teachers statewide as a reality check on the recommendations of the expert panel. Third, the results of this survey and the recommendations of the first expert panel were brought to a second expert panel.

To finance adequacy in Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Alliance for Excellent Schools recommended that the 2003-05 budget include a foundation plan or base amount of \$8,500, which would be guaranteed to all children in the state, regardless of where they live. Also, districts are guaranteed reimbursement for students in three additional categories targeted by the State Supreme Court decision in 2000: students with disabilities, students in poverty, and students with limited English skills. Finally, the Wisconsin Adequacy Plan adds a fourth special adjustment to cover the cost of student transportation and inefficiencies of many small, rural districts.

The Wisconsin Adequacy Plan places dollar figures on each of these elements. Districts would receive 80% of the additional costs of educating students with disabilities, 90% of the cost of students whose disabilities result in exceptionally high costs; and 90% of the additional costs of teaching to children with limited English proficiency. For students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, the Plan calls for an additional \$3,200 for all students up through third grade and \$700 for students in grades four through twelve. Per-pupil adjustments would be made based on a district's student density (i.e., students per square mile). Per-pupil amounts range from \$1,260 in the most rural districts to \$70 in the most urban districts. In addition, districts can spend more by assessing an additional two-mill local property tax, which would also be supplemented with state aid.

According to its developers, the Wisconsin Adequacy Plan would require spending that exceeds current levels. Over and above the adjustment in the revenue cap of \$230 per student, an additional \$176 million, an increase of about 2%, would be needed in the first year of the plan and an additional \$184 million, a further increase of about 2%, in the second year. The discretionary local levy could cost an additional \$100 million in state aid each year.

The bulk of funds for the plan would come from state government. School districts would be required to maintain a local school property tax of six mills, which would provide immediate property tax relief given that the state average is presently about ten mills. The plan proposes that this reduction in local property tax and all state costs would be funded by an increase in the state sales tax from 5.0% to 6.2%. Details are available on the web at: <http://www.excellentschools.org/Adequacy.htm>.

One way to fund the plan of the Wisconsin Alliance for Excellent Schools is with an increase in the sales tax from 5% to 6.2%.

The Estimated Costs of Adequacy in Wisconsin Using the Whole-School Design Approach. Professor Allan Odden and his colleagues examined whether schools in Wisconsin could implement a comprehensive reform using one of the whole-school design models using existing resources.¹⁷ For this analysis, the researchers used the Modern Red Schoolhouse (MRS) design for several reasons. First, the MRS is a comprehensive whole-school design which has been evaluated and shown to boost student achievement in those schools in which it has been tested. Second, MRS is one of the most expensive school designs, so school districts that could afford to implement this program could also afford to implement almost any comprehensive school design. Finally, the MRS emphasizes content areas which are similar to the Wisconsin standards and emphasizes computer technology which is a priority in almost all Wisconsin schools.

To assess whether Wisconsin schools could afford to implement the Modern Red Schoolhouse design, Odden and his colleagues¹⁷ collected data from 17 school districts (57% of the sample) including low and high spending schools in five regions of Wisconsin: the Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, Southwest, and Milwaukee. The researchers calculated the costs of items that would typically vary with a new school design—instruction, instructional support, and site administration—but omitted other school expenditures such as transportation, food, maintenance, and operations.

Of 12 elementary schools in the urban and suburban categories, two schools could not afford the design. All three rural schools in the sample had enough money to finance the MRS design. In fact, one of these rural schools demonstrated that a school in the 10th percentile of spending for the state could afford a whole-school design. Adopting the MRS design would cut the classroom teachers from 17 in the traditional school to 14 multi-functional teachers in MRS. Four regular education specialists are reduced to two, and 16 teacher aides are potentially eliminated. Fewer teachers are needed because of the multiple age grouping of the students. If the school chooses the MRS, the spending for professional development would increase 200 times. Yet, the school would still have \$539,743 leftover in the budget that the school and community could use as desired.

To date, the MRS has been implemented in a few middle schools, but no high school. In this study, a middle school and a high school in Milwaukee could each afford MRS with existing resources. Thus, Odden and colleagues¹⁷ conclude that most schools in Wisconsin have sufficient resources to engage in comprehensive, whole-school reform if they choose to do so.

Evaluating School Funding Formulas: What Questions Should Legislators Ask?

Where this report ends is where the work of state legislators begins. Developing school funding formulas that equitably and adequately distribute school aids is no easy task. School finance experts have identified a number of questions that legislators can ask to evaluate school funding formulas (See the checklist on the following page).

Most schools in Wisconsin have sufficient resources to engage in comprehensive, whole-school reform if they choose to do so.

Evaluating School Funding Formulas Checklist: What Questions Should Legislators Ask?

This checklist raises important issues that can help legislators sort out how well legislative proposals meet the goals of education in Wisconsin; how compatible they are with Wisconsin's history of funding elementary and secondary schools; how responsive they are to the demographic characteristics of Wisconsin students, families, and communities; and how appropriate they are given the state's available resources. These questions are not rank-ordered and sometimes conflict with each other, forcing legislators to make trade-offs about which deserve the highest priority. Because these questions are not designed to lead to a particular policy solution, they can be useful to policymakers across the political spectrum. Unless otherwise noted, these questions derive primarily from the work of Augenblick, Van de Water and Myers.¹⁸

- 1. What does the proposal want the educational system to accomplish and what kind of educational opportunities must be provided for students to meet these objectives?¹⁰
- 2. Does the proposal invest in nonschool influences on student achievement such as early childhood education, summer school, out-of-school time, and parent involvement?^{19, 20}
- 3. Does the proposal explicitly fund the formation of family/school/community partnerships which, according to recent national estimates, cost \$20 to \$30 per pupil per year for all school, district, and state expenses?^{21, 22}
- 4. How sensitive is the proposal to the allocation of state aid to the needs of school districts (e.g., number of low-income families, concentration of disadvantaged students, number of students requiring special education, number of children needing instruction in English, transportation needs, enrollment levels, and school size)?
- 5. How sensitive is the proposal to the wealth of school districts (e.g., property tax base, nonproperty revenues, or income level of the district)?
- 6. Is state aid that is not sensitive to the wealth of the school district limited (e.g., incentive or hold harmless funds)?
- 7. How sensitive is the allocation of state aid to the tax rates of school districts (e.g., to avoid situations in which higher tax rates are associated with lower spending levels)?
- 8. Is the variation among school districts' spending explained primarily by differences in their local costs and tax effort?
- 9. Do school districts have a reasonable amount of flexibility to determine how much they want to spend, and to generate revenues at the levels they select?
- 10. Do school districts have reasonable flexibility to spend funds?
- 11. Are all types of expenditures considered by the school finance system (e.g., operation, capital/debt, and personnel benefits)?
- 12. Are taxpayers treated equitably (e.g., property is assessed uniformly, low income taxpayers are relieved of some of the obligation to pay property tax, and the burden of paying for schools is shared equitably among homeowners and businesses)?
- 13. Does the state define and measure equity and periodically assess how equitable the school finance system is?
- 14. Does the state define and measure adequacy and periodically determine whether adequate funding is being provided in all school districts?
- 15. Does the proposal include features that will position Wisconsin as a leader on school finance?²³

Conclusion

Since 1647, government has played a role in helping families educate their children. Policy decisions about how to finance public school have evolved over the years, but what has remained constant is this: the need for a democracy to have an educated citizenry fully prepared to participate in governmental affairs.

Since the 1990s, four approaches have emerged to help policymakers calculate the cost of educating all students to high standards: (1) the successful school district approach; (2) the statistical approach; (3) the professional judgement approach; and (4) the whole-school approach and the similar evidence-based approach. Each of these approaches is based on a different philosophy of how to achieve educational adequacy and, not surprisingly, each produces a different dollar estimate of the cost of doing so. Current research is not advanced enough to endorse one approach over another, so selecting the best school funding formula for Wisconsin will be determined by state policymakers elected by the citizenry to make these tough decisions.

In developing a school funding formula, state legislators face other equally challenging questions: who pays and what the state and local share should be. To date, there is no research on whether the funding source—local, state, or federal dollars—affects the quality of education. Because the research is inconclusive, this report includes a checklist of 15 questions that raise several of the issues that legislators should consider when evaluating school funding formulas. This checklist underscores the trade-offs that state legislators will face when one of the goals of developing a school funding formula conflicts with another. For example, calls for lower costs conflict with calls to increase spending to meet the costs of educating students with special needs.

Yet decisions made at the State Capitol to establish an equitable and adequate school funding formula is only the beginning.²³ Money is clearly important, especially when school funding is connected to effective educational strategies for engaging and teaching students in the classroom. Policymakers can maximize the public's involvement in education by deliberately taking steps to mobilize two powerful forces beyond the school door—the families and communities in which students reside.

Public officials at all levels should take steps to encourage parents to make parental involvement in schooling a personal priority, and to develop policies that create the conditions that make it easier for families to act on these priorities. For more on the importance of family and community involvement in education, see Chapters 2 and 3 of this report.

Policymakers can maximize the public's investment in education by mobilizing two powerful forces beyond the school door—families and communities.

References

- ¹Odden, A., & Picus, L. O. (2004). *School finance: A policy perspective*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- ²Skocpol, T. (1995). *Social policy in the United States: Future possibilities in historical perspective*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- ³McMurrer, D. P., & Sawhill, I. V. (1998). *Getting ahead: Economic and social mobility in America*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- ⁴Guthrie, J. W. (1997) School finance: Fifty years of expansion. *The Future of Children*, 7(3), 24-38.
- ⁵Guthrie, J. W., & Rothstein, R. (1999) Enabling “Adequacy” to achieve reality: Translating adequacy into state school finance distribution arrangements. In H. F. Ladd, R. Chalk, & J. S. Hansen (Eds.), *Equity and Adequacy in Education Finance: Issues and Perspectives* (pp. 209-259). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- ⁶Future of Children (1997, Winter). Executive summary: Financing schools. *The Future of Children*, 7(3).
- ⁷Odden, A. (2003). Equity and adequacy in school finance today. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(2), 120-125.
- ⁸Reschovsky, A. (1998, March). Cost-based school finance formulas: Assuring an adequate education for all students. In K. Bogenschneider & J. Olson (Eds.), *Enhancing educational performance: Three policy alternatives* (Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Briefing Report No. 11, pp. 15-19). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Excellence in Family Studies.
- ⁹Reschovsky, A. (2002). *Wisconsin's school finance: A policy primer*. Madison, WI: Robert M. LaFollette School of Public Affairs, December 2002. Also published in *State Tax Notes*, 27, February 17, 2003: 605-616.
- ¹⁰Ladd, H. F., & Hansen, J. S. (1999). *Making money matter: Financing America's schools*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- ¹¹Odden, A., & Clune, W. H. (1998). School finance systems: Aging structures in need of renovation. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20(3), 157-178.
- ¹²Murnane, R., & Levy, F. (1996). Evidence from fifteen schools in Austin, Texas. In G. Burtless (Ed.), *Does money matter? The effect of school resources on student achievement and adult success*, (pp. 93-96). Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- ¹³Augenblick, J., & Myers, J. L. (2003). *Calculation of the cost of an adequate education in Missouri using the professional judgement and the successful school district approaches*. Report prepared for the Missouri Education Coalition for Adequacy (MECA). Denver, CO: Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc.
- ¹⁴Imazeki, J., & Reschovsky, A. (1997, November). *The development of school finance formulas to guarantee the provision of adequate education to low-income students*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Washington, DC.

- ¹⁵Duncombe, W., & Yinger, J. (1999). Performance standards and educational cost indexes: You can't have one without the other. In H. F. Ladd, R. A. Chalk & J. S. Hansen (Eds.) *Equity and adequacy in education finance: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 260-297). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- ¹⁶Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and student achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 73*, 125-230.
- ¹⁷Odden, A., Archibald, S., & Tychsen, A. (2000). Can Wisconsin schools afford comprehensive school reform? *Journal of Education Finance, 25*(3), 323-42.
- ¹⁸Augenblick, J., Van de Water, G., & Myer, J. L. (1995). *How do you know a "good" school finance system when you see one?* Denver, CO: Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc.
- ¹⁹Bogenschneider, K., Friese, B., Balling, K., & Mills, J. (Eds.) (2002). *Early childhood care and education. What are other states doing?* (Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Briefing Report No. 17, 48 pages) Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Excellence in Family Studies.
- ²⁰Harvard Family Research Project. (2003). A review of out-of-school time program quasi-experimental and experimental evaluation results. *Out-of-School Time Evaluation Snapshot, 1*, 1-12.
- ²¹Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School and family partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- ²²Van Voorhis, F. L. (2003, April) *What does a program of school, family, and community partnerships cost? Estimates from schools, districts, and states in the National Network of Partnership Schools*. Paper presented at the 11th International Roundtable on School, Family, and Community Partnerships, New Orleans, LA.
- ²³Family Impact Seminars (2003). Based on Family Impact Seminar conversations with Wisconsin legislators.
- ²⁴Odden, A. (2003, December). *School finance and teacher compensation: State-level initiatives*. Invited presentation to the Governor's Task Force on Educational Excellence, Madison, WI.
- Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars (2004). A policymaker's guide to school finance: Approaches to use and questions to ask. In K. Bogenschneider & E. Gross (Eds.), *A policymaker's guide to school finance: Approaches to use and questions ask* (Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Briefing Report No. 20, 54 pages). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Excellence in Family Studies.

Family Involvement in Education: How Important Is It? What Can Legislators Do?

By Karen Bogenschneider and Carol Johnson
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University Extension

Policymakers interested in promoting school success must look beyond the school door. The last 15 years of school reform have focused on course curriculum, instructional methods, and teacher training. Yet these reforms have not accomplished as much as they might because academic achievement is shaped more by children's lives outside the school walls, particularly their parents. When parents are involved, students get better grades, score higher on standardized tests, have better attendance records, drop out less often, have higher aspirations, and more positive attitudes toward school and homework. What's more, these positive impacts seem most important for children growing up in disadvantaged, highly-stressed families. The good news is that the average cost for building family, school, and community partnerships is \$20 to \$30 per pupil per year for all school, district, and state expenses. Policymakers can also help families educate their children with child care, summer school, and out-of-school programs—all which have promising evidence on their benefits to student achievement.

To improve student achievement, the last 15 years of school reform have focused on course curriculum, instructional methods, and teacher training. Yet Steinberg¹ claims that these reforms have accomplished very little, because academic achievement is shaped more by children's lives outside the school walls, particularly their parents, peers, and how they spend out-of-school time. Policymakers interested in ensuring a good education for all children must look beyond the school door. This chapter examines nonschool influences on academic achievement. We focus primarily on parental involvement in their child's schooling, but we also discuss child care, summer school, and out-of-school programs.

Why Should Parents Be Involved in Their Child's Schooling?

Recently Harvard Professor Robert Putnam² said that given a choice between a 10% increase in school budgets or a 10% increase in parent involvement, he would invest in parent involvement.

Another best-selling author, Professor Laurence Steinberg,¹ agrees that parental involvement is key to children's success in school. He writes that our high school graduates are among the least intellectually competent in the industrialized world. Steinberg assembles an impressive body of evidence indicating that the problem of poor academic achievement is "genuine, substantial, and pervasive across ethnic, socioeconomic, and age groups" (p. 184).¹ Youngsters' success in school affects how they do later in life and, in the United States, is one of the surest ways to move families out of poverty.³

Parental school involvement is most important for children growing up in disadvantaged, highly-stressed families.

If this country is going to turn around poor school performance, one of the most significant problems that must be addressed is the high prevalence of disengaged parents. A lack of interest on the part of parents is associated with academic difficulties and low school achievement. Steinberg² estimated that nearly 1 in 3 parents in this country is disengaged from their adolescent's life and particularly their adolescent's school:

Only about one-fifth of parents consistently attend school programs. Nearly one-third of students say their parents have no idea how they are doing in school. About one-sixth of all students report that their parents don't care whether they earn good grades in school or not (p. 187).¹

Clearly, lack of parental interest and involvement in their child's schooling is not the only influence on poor academic achievement. School failure is also associated with a peer culture that downplays academic success, students' beliefs about the causes of school success and failure, young people's excessive time spent in after-school jobs, teaching practices that do not engage students and encourage critical thinking, low quality child care, too few school-sponsored extracurricular activities, and a lack of programs for out-of-school time.¹

How Important Is Parental School Involvement to School Success? Does It Benefit All Children?

A consistent body of research concludes that parents are the first and foremost influence on their children's development and school success. When parents are involved, students get better grades and score higher on standardized tests. What's more, children of involved parents have better attendance records, drop out less often, have higher aspirations, and more positive attitudes toward school and homework.^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}

But does this positive impact of parental involvement apply to all families or just to those with more education and material advantages? Bogenschneider⁵ studied 8,000 high school students in nine high schools in Wisconsin and California. With only a couple exceptions, when parents were involved in their teen's schooling, kids reported higher grades in school. Moreover, when either mothers or fathers were involved, it benefited the grades of both boys and girls. Parental school involvement had positive effects when parents had less than a high school education or more than a college degree. What's more, the benefits held for Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White teens in single-parent, step-family, or two-parent biological families. Finally, parental school involvement seems most important for those children who need it most—children growing up in disadvantaged, highly-stressed families.^{5, 8}

In fairness, however, not all types of parent involvement are equally beneficial to school success. Parents can be involved by helping their child learn at home, volunteering in school, or serving on school decision-making bodies.¹² To date, the strongest evidence that parent involvement helps improve school success comes when parents get involved in helping their child learn at home.^{8, 13} However, when parents get involved at school, emerging evidence suggests that it can strengthen school reform efforts.^{14, 15}

Do We Know How to Mount Programs to Improve Parental School Involvement?

Virtually, all parents say they value education for their children.¹⁶ Parental involvement in schooling is one concrete way that parents act on this value. Students must make a number of decisions about courses, activities, programs, and opportunities that will affect their futures. According to Epstein,¹⁷ parents need to be involved in these decisions as knowledgeable partners. They need to know how the school system works, what programs and activities are available, how these decisions will affect their child's chances for future success, which courses are needed to prepare for future jobs and careers, what teachers expect in their courses for students to do well, and in what ways parents can get involved in decisions that affect how schools operate.

Parents are also involved at home by ensuring their children attend school, providing a variety of reading materials and learning opportunities, and limiting excessive television viewing.¹² One of the most important ways that parents can influence their children's achievement, however, is by conveying to their children high expectations that they will do well in school.^{13, 18}

The need for parental involvement is clear. But do we know how to mount effective programs to increase parents' involvement in their child's schooling? We have some evidence that parental school involvement is a skill that can be taught and learned. Programs that promote school involvement, particularly among disadvantaged families, are promising but still in need of replication.^{18, 19, 20, 21, 22}

We do know, however, that parental involvement is strongest in elementary school and, without special efforts, few families continue as active partners with the school during the middle and high school years.^{8, 11} We also know that the most important influence on whether parents are included or excluded from involvement in their child's education is teachers and administrators. What the teacher does has proven more important in how knowledgeable parents are about helping their child with school work than parents' education or marital status.¹⁷ In fact, the Harvard Family Research Project has recently compiled the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary for teachers to work successfully with families.²³

How Much Do School, Family, and Community Partnerships Cost?

One way that policymakers can promote family involvement in education is by taking deliberate steps to build school, family, and community partnerships. Researchers found that schools with more funding had higher quality partnerships.^{24, 25} Also, districts that had a line item in the budget for partnerships had partnership programs of higher quality. To determine what it costs to build these partnerships, Epstein and colleagues collected data from 11 states, 67 school districts, and 566 schools. The good news is that the average cost for building these partnerships is \$20 to \$30 per pupil for all school, district, and state expenses.^{24, 25}

To help schools develop and maintain strong family, school, and community partnerships, Joyce Epstein directs the National Network of Partnership Schools, which currently includes 900 schools, 91 districts, and 17 state departments of education. Epstein has developed a checklist that schools can use to assess how family-friendly they are. This checklist is available on the Family Impact Seminar website at: <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/familyimpact/impact.htm>.

The average cost for building family, school, and community partnerships is \$20 to \$30 per pupil for all school, district, and state expenses.

Policymakers can help parents educate their children through child care, summer school, and out-of-school programs.

Beyond the Classroom, What Policies and Programs Help Families Educate Their Children?

Given the increasing numbers of parents in the work force, policymakers can help parents educate their children in many ways. Three examples will be given here: (1) child care, (2) summer school, and (3) out-of-school programs.

The quality of a child care setting—from poor to excellent—can affect a child today and throughout adulthood. High quality child care translates into measurable improvements in language, math, and social skills through second grade. One estimate shows substituting a poor quality caregiver with an excellent one would improve a child's school readiness by 50%. Looking even further down the road, studies which follow children into adulthood demonstrate that kids with higher quality preschool care are more likely to earn better wages and complete high school and college.^{26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31} For further information, see the Family Impact Seminar Briefing Report on *Early Childhood Care and Education: What are States Doing* at <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/familyimpact/fis17.htm>.

In recent studies, summer school programs have helped reverse the decline in achievement that occurs among poor children during the summer months. For example, reading scores of poor children have been shown to fall about three months behind the scores of middle class children during the summer. Furthermore, these summer learning losses appear to add up over time. At the end of high school, the achievement gap between middle class and disadvantaged students could be completely explained by summer learning losses and the achievement differences when the children entered first grade. University of Wisconsin-Madison Professor Geoffrey Borman and colleagues recently evaluated the effectiveness of the Teach Baltimore Summer Academy which used college volunteers to teach summer school to kindergartners in urban, high-poverty schools. No effects occurred following the first year of the program. After the third year, however, the program significantly boosted student achievement.³²

Fueled by public concern that young people need safe places in nonschool hours, a number of out-of-school programs provide educational learning experiences for school children in supervised settings. For example, programs are provided by such organizations as University Extension's 4-H Youth Development Program, the Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. In a recent study of 25 programs by the Harvard Family Research Project, these out-of-school time programs were linked to better performance in school, more positive attitudes toward school, higher educational aspirations, and improved school attendance. Moreover, youth in supervised programs were less involved in risky behaviors, more involved in their communities, had better social and communication skills, and were more self-confident.³³ For the full report, see the July 2003 Out-of-School Evaluation Summary published by the Harvard Family Research Project.

What Can State Policymakers Do to Promote Family Involvement in Education?

One of the most prominent researchers in this area, Joyce Epstein of Johns Hopkins University, has developed a checklist of what state legislators and school officials can do to promote parental school involvement (See the checklist on the next page).

A Checklist for Assessing the Family Impact of School Policies

When legislators and school officials are developing school finance policies, this checklist could help them identify a number of specific ways to acknowledge and support family well-being. Some of these items require funding, and others can be implemented when policymakers and public officials believe that family involvement is important to children's success in school.

- 1. Write a policy that supports comprehensive programs of family, school, and community partnership.
- 2. Establish a single office with an expert leader and adequate staff to facilitate the development and continuous improvement of programs of partnership. This office provides staff development and technical assistance and coordinates partnerships across departments.
- 3. Allocate a per-pupil expenditure or lump-sum budget for school, family, and community partnerships to cover staff and program costs.
- 4. Establish small grants and other support for developing and implementing partnerships.
- 5. Establish a clearinghouse to disseminate promising practices of partnership.
- 6. Support requirements for teacher and administrator credentials on partnerships.
- 7. Develop courses for pre-service, advanced, and/or inservice education on partnerships.
- 8. Support a master teacher, lead teacher, or professional coordinator in each school to assist with partnerships.
- 9. Develop partnership tools or products (e.g., brochures, lunch menus, calendars, newsletters, publications for all schools and families, and guidelines for communicating with non-English-speaking families).
- 10. Encourage business, industry, and other community connections to strengthen school, family, and community partnerships.
- 11. Establish an advisory committee for school, family, and community partnerships including educators, parents, and community teachers.
- 12. Institute an accountability system to monitor and evaluate progress; recognize and reward excellent work on partnerships.
- 13. Support evaluations of the effects of demonstration and ongoing partnership programs.
- 14. Conduct an annual conference for schools to share best practices with each other and to continue annual plans for improving partnership programs.

Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder CO: Westview Press. (Chapter 4, pp. 349-350.)

State legislatures across the country have passed a number of laws to promote family involvement in education. Unless otherwise noted, the examples are from Epstein's recent book:¹⁷

In **Arizona**, the legislature amended a bill in 1995 to require the Department of Education to create a program that trains parents as teachers.³⁴

In 2000, the **Baltimore** city public school system mandated summer school for students in second and fourth grade whose scores on the district test were below the cutoff.³²

California passed a bill in 1994 and expanded it in 1997, which specified that employers with 25 or more employees should allow up to 40 hours for employees to participate in their child's schooling. Under this law, parents, grandparents, or guardians are permitted to use vacation time, personal or sick leave, compensatory time, or leave without pay to participate in school-related activities.

Louisiana, as of 1991, required the State Department of Education, local school boards, and schools to select parent advocates who help increase parent involvement, hear parents' complaints, and facilitate communication between schools and families.³⁴

Massachusetts passed a bill in 1996 to assess a number of parent outreach programs, with universal implementation required by the start of 1997.³⁴

In **Minnesota**, in 1990 the legislature permitted state workers who are parents to use up to 16 hours of accrued vacation time, sick leave, or other arranged time to attend parent/teacher conferences or other meetings related to their children's education.

New Jersey, in response to court decrees in the 1990s, raised the amount of money that it was spending to bring low income students up to state standards. To help poverty-affected districts meet state standards, the state provides supplemental funds for such activities as full-day kindergarten, integrated whole-school effective programs, parental outreach activities, preschool for children ages three and four, school-based youth services, and summer school.³⁵

In **Ohio**, since the 1997-98 school year, school district report cards must include their progress in building school, family, and community partnerships.

In 1984 **South Carolina** became one of the first states in the nation to mandate School Improvement Councils in every school. These councils, comprised of parents, teachers, and administrators, were charged with creating school improvement plans and developing better home/school relations.

In **Tennessee**, the legislature passed a bill in 1989 requiring schools to hold parent/teacher conferences twice a year for each student.³⁴

Virginia passed a bill in 1992 that provided eight hours of paid leave for any parent who worked for the Commonwealth. This leave could be used to meet with teachers, attend school functions, or volunteer at school.

Washington state requires specific course credits in parent involvement for teacher certification. Only about 4% to 15% of teachers have had formal classes or course work in parent involvement.

**Only 4% to 15%
of teachers have
had course work
in parent
involvement.**

Wisconsin has a long history of state leadership on school, family, and community partnerships. Starting with the Year of the Family in Education in 1987-88, the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) has creatively used limited resources to promote and implement partnerships based on the research of Epstein and others. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, business and foundation partners helped bring attention to the need for family involvement. Later federal Goals 2000 funds enabled the DPI to provide seed grants to schools to establish action teams and develop partnership plans aimed at connecting partnership practices to school improvement. The DPI provides resource materials, including “Learning Together” packets and training, funded by federal Title I and IV grants. Through an AmeriCorps/VISTA grant, the DPI has been able to provide VISTA (Volunteer In Service to America) members to schools to facilitate the development of partnerships. The VISTA members work with schools on implementing action team plans to help students improve reading, literacy, math, and other skills that are part of school improvement plans and measured on state tests.

In 1997, the State Superintendent established a Parent Advisory Committee. In 2002, the new state superintendent continued the concept with the establishment of the Parent Leadership Corps, which is working on the development and implementation of a DPI policy on family, school, and community partnerships. The Corps also advises the state superintendent, particularly on the No Child Left Behind Act. Wisconsin’s new teacher licensing standards (PI 34.02) include references to parents and community, including: “The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support pupil learning and well being.”

Wisconsin established the nation’s first kindergarten in 1856 and the first public kindergarten in 1873. Today, Wisconsin is one of three states that provides state funding for four-year-old kindergarten for any district that chooses to offer it. In 2003, 42% of school districts offered four-year-old kindergarten, with about two-thirds of the cost provided by the state and about one-third by the local school district. In 1991, the Legislature enhanced four-year-old kindergarten by providing assistance to districts that provide parent outreach activities. Examples of outreach activities include home visits, parent meetings at school, parent education, parent-child activities, family activity nights, orientation into and out of four-year-old kindergarten, classroom involvement training, family resource center visits, and participation in parent advisory committees.³⁶

Across the 50 states, 15 states (29%) require most or all teachers to study family development and methods to improve parent involvement. Six states (12%) require middle and high school teachers to study parent involvement and display competence in promoting parent involvement, whereas 14 states (27%) require elementary school teachers to achieve parent involvement skills. As for principals and school administrators, seven states (14%) require training in parent involvement and proficiency in encouraging parent involvement.³⁴

Wisconsin school districts that offer four-year-old kindergarten can receive state aid for parent outreach activities.

Conclusion

In a rapidly changing society with schools that differ substantially from those at the turn of the century, one fundamental thing about children and families has not changed very much at all—the central role that families play in the academic achievement of their children.³⁷ Families continue to retain primary authority and responsibility for their children’s education in legal order, moral authority, and social thought.³⁸

State policymakers have within their grasp the potential to play a powerful role in creating the conditions for families to become more involved in their children’s schooling. According to Epstein,¹⁷ funds spent on parent involvement are likely to yield a healthy return in the form of more successful students, better-informed parents, more effective teachers, fewer student failures, and fewer demands on expensive social services. In a recent study, the average cost for building family, school, and community partnerships is about \$20 to \$30 per pupil for all school, district, and state expenses.

No state has developed a comprehensive well-funded vision for family involvement.

State legislatures across the country have passed a number of laws to support other ways of involving families in education such as: requiring businesses to allow their employees time off to participate in their child’s schooling; granting state workers the right to use vacation, sick leave, or other arranged time to attend school functions; including course credits in family development and parent involvement for teacher certification; requiring schools to hold two parent/teacher conferences each year; providing supplemental funds for high-poverty districts for preschool, four-year-old kindergarten, summer school, and parent outreach activities; and requiring school district report cards to include progress on parent involvement.

To date, state legislatures have taken a number of individual actions to promote family school involvement, but to date no state has developed a comprehensive, well-funded vision for family involvement. The potential exists for a state to position itself as a leader in promoting family involvement in the education of its children. The bottom line is this: policymakers do not have a choice about whether they affect families’ ability to educate their children. They already do.

References

- ¹Steinberg, L. (1996). *Beyond the classroom: Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- ²Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. NY: Simon & Schuster.
- ³McMurrer, D. P., & Sawhill, I. V. (1998). *Getting ahead: Economic and social mobility in America*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- ⁴Baker, D. P., & Stevenson, D. L. (1986). Mothers' strategies for children's school achievement: Managing the transition to high school. *Sociology of Education*, *59*, 155-166.
- ⁵Bogenschneider, K. (1997). Parental involvement in adolescent schooling: A proximal process with transcontextual validity. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *59*(3), 718-733.
- ⁶Epstein, J. L. (1982). *Student reactions to teachers' practices of parent involvement*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- ⁷Epstein, J. L. (1985). Home and school connections in schools of the future: Implications of research on parent involvement. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *62*, 18-41.
- ⁸Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools
- ⁹Miedel, W. T., & Reynolds, A. J. (1999). Parent involvement in early intervention for disadvantaged children: Does it matter? *Journal of School Psychology*, *37*(4), 379-402.
- ¹⁰Rumberger, R. W., Ghatak, R., Poulos, G., Ritter, P. L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1990). Family influences on dropout behavior in one California high school. *Sociology of Education*, *63*, 283-299.
- ¹¹Stevenson, D. L., & Baker, D. P. (1987). The family-school relation and the child's school performance. *Child Development*, *58*, 1348-1357.
- ¹²Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- ¹³Catsambis, S. (1998, Fall) *Expanding knowledge of parental involvement in secondary education: Its effects on high school academic success*. Baltimore, MD: CRESPAR (Center for the Education of Students Placed at Risk), Johns Hopkins University, Report No. 27.
- ¹⁴Lopez, M. E. (2003, December). *Transforming schools through community organizing: A research review*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

- ¹⁵Westat & Policy Study Associates. (2001). *The longitudinal evaluation of school change and performance in Title I schools, Volume 1: Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Deputy Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service.
- ¹⁶Epstein, J. L. (1989). Family structures and student motivation: A developmental perspective. In R. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education, Vol 3: Goals and Cognitions* (pp. 259-295), New York: Academic Press.
- ¹⁷Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School and family partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- ¹⁸Marchant, G. J, Paulson, S. E., & Rothlisberg, B. A. (2001). Relations of middle school students' perceptions of family and school contexts with academic achievement. *Psychology in the Schools, 38*(6), 505-519.
- ¹⁹Seginer, R. (1983). Parents' educational expectations and children's academic achievements: A literature review. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29*, 1-23.
- ²⁰Smith, M. B. (1968). School and home: Focus on achievement. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), *Developing programs for the educationally disadvantaged* (pp. 87-107). New York: Teachers College Press.
- ²¹Simich-Dudgeon, C. (1993). Increasing student achievement through teacher knowledge about parent involvement. In N. F. Chavkin (Ed.), *Families and schools in a pluralistic society* (pp. 189-203). New York: State University of New York Press.
- ²²Hernandez, L. P., Hernandez, A., Lopez, M. E., Kreider, H., & Coffman, J. (2000). Local and national implementation of Families and Schools Together (FAST) program. *The School Community Journal, 10*(1), 85-110.
- ²³Shartrand, A. M., Weiss, H. B., Kreider, H. M., & Lopez, M. E. (1997). *New skills for new schools: Preparing teachers in family involvement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.
- ²⁴Epstein, J. L. (1991). Effects on student achievement of teachers' practices of parent involvement. *Advances in Reading/Language Research, 5*, 261-276.
- ²⁵Van Voorhis, F. L. (2003) *Find funds to support partnerships programs*. Presented at the Fall National Network for Partnership Schools Leadership Development Conferences. Baltimore, MD: Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships.
- ²⁶Campbell, F.A. & Ramey, C.T. (1995). Cognitive and school outcomes for high-risk African-American students at middle adolescence: Positive effects of early intervention. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 743-772.
- ²⁷Ramey, C.T., Campbell, F.A., Burchinal, M., Skinner, M.L., Gardner, D.M., & Ramey, S.L. (2000). Persistent effects of early intervention o high-risk children and their mothers. *Applied Developmental Science, 4*(1), 2-14.
- ²⁸NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (1999). *Effect sizes from the NICHD study of early child care*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM. April.

- ²⁹NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (2000). The relation of child care to cognitive and language development. *Child Development*, 71, 960-980.
- ³⁰Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2001). Long-term effects of an early childhood intervention on educational achievement and juvenile arrest. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285(18), 2339-2346.
- ³¹Schweinhart, L. J., Barnes, H. V., & Weikart, D. P. (1993). *Significant benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through age 27*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.
- ³²Borman, G. D., Overman, L. T., Fairchild, R., Boulay, M., & Kaplan, J. (in press). Can a multiyear summer program prevent the accumulation of summer learning losses? In G. D. Borman & M. Boulay (Eds.), *Summer learning: Research, policies, and programs*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- ³³Harvard Family Research Project. (2003). A review of out-of-school time program quasi-experimental and experimental evaluation results. *Out-of-School Time Evaluation Snapshot*, 1, 1-12.
- ³⁴Education Commission of the States. (1996). Parent/family involvement in education. *ECS StateNotes: Parent/Family*. Denver, CO: Author.
- ³⁵Odden, A., & Clune, W. H. (1998). School finance systems: Aging structures in need of renovation. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20(3), 157-178.
- ³⁶Burmester, E. (2003, December). *Strategies for financing quality preschool: The Wisconsin model*. Speech presented at the National Governors Association Forum on Quality Preschool, Orlando, FL. Retrieved from http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dltcl/eis/pdf/dpi2003_110.pdf
- ³⁷Steinberg, L. (1989). *Adolescence*. New York: Knopf
- ³⁸Weston, W. P., & Weston, W. J. (1987). *Education and the family*. United States Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Karen Bogenschneider is a Rothermel-Bascom Professor of Human Ecology, a professor of Human Development and Families Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and a Family Policy Specialist in University Extension. She directs the Family Impact Seminars and the Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars. Her book, *Family Policy Matters: How Policymaking Affects Families and What Professionals Can Do*, was published by Erlbaum in 2000. Carol Johnson is an Interim Family/School Specialist in University Extension and is a Master's student in Human Development and Families Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Bogenschneider and Johnson direct the Families, Schools, and Communities United for Students (US) Project. In collaboration with county Extension educators, they are working with selected Wisconsin middle schools to build stronger family, school, and community partnerships.

Bogenschneider, K., & Johnson, C. (2004). Family involvement in education: How important is it? What can legislators do? In K. Bogenschneider & E. Gross (Eds.), *A policymaker's guide to school finance: Approaches to use and questions ask* (Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Briefing Report No. 20, 54 pages). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Excellence in Family Studies.

Evidence of the Effectiveness of Complementary Learning

by Heather Weiss
Harvard Family Research Project

In this era of accountability and transparent performance data, the limits of school approaches alone, particularly for disadvantaged children, are clear. Learning that occurs beyond the school door—at home and in the community—can complement and extend what children learn in school. When families are involved in children’s learning, no matter what their income or background, they have a positive influence on student social and academic outcomes. Family involvement in education holds promise for fostering academic achievement and healthy development among children. To facilitate family involvement, schools and communities can draw from exemplary practices listed in this article.

Current school reform efforts are largely focused within the K–12 school system, but this is beginning to change. More communities are looking beyond the school for complementary learning activities and support to help improve school and student performance. This is the case for several reasons. In this era of accountability and transparent performance data, the limits of school approaches alone, particularly for disadvantaged children, are clear. The evidence about the performance payoffs of investments in complementary learning opportunities and resources—such as preschool, after school, and summer school programs and efforts to promote parent involvement in learning at home and school—is slowly accumulating.

To broaden the debate about how to increase school and student performance to include complementary learning, the Family Research Project at the Harvard Graduate School of Education (HFRP) collects and disseminates the evidence about its effectiveness through its website and periodic publications. It also tracks and posts the related work of other researchers and organizations. The materials that follow present current evidence about the ways family involvement in education and out-of-school time programs support children’s development and achievement.

Research Examining the Benefits of Family Involvement in Education

Learning that occurs beyond the school door—at home and in the community—can complement and extend what children learn in school. When families are involved in children’s learning, no matter what their income or background, they have a positive influence on student social and academic outcomes.¹ Some consistent research findings about family involvement processes suggest their significance for children’s learning and development.

- ❖ Parent values and expectations are associated with children’s motivation to learn as well as their academic achievement.^{2,3} Beneficial values can take the form of high but realistic educational aspirations and expectations, a focus on effort rather than ability, and the value placed on specific subject matter.
- ❖ Parent behaviors around learning activities such as reading, conversations about school-related matters, and visiting the public library are correlated with improvements in children’s reading comprehension.^{4,5}
- ❖ Parent participation in school—in the form of attending conferences and class events, and volunteering—also supports student achievement. Such involvement is associated with students’ getting high grades; enjoying school; avoiding grade repetition, suspension, and expulsion; and participating in extracurricular activities.^{6,7}
- ❖ Parent engagement through community organizing brings about school policy changes and delivers new resources to under-resourced schools.⁸ These changes create the school conditions that enhance student achievement.⁹

Family involvement in education holds promise for fostering academic achievement and healthy development among children. To facilitate family involvement, schools and communities can draw from exemplary practices, such as:

- ❖ Schools that facilitate family involvement by providing transportation, child care, translation services, flexible meeting times, and parent resource libraries.¹⁰
- ❖ Community collaboratives of social service agencies and schools that provide social support to parents.^{11, 12}
- ❖ Projects that train and involve parents to become parent leaders and facilitators for other parents’ learning.^{13, 14}
- ❖ Community organizing that engages families to focus on school performance and accountability.¹⁵

References

- ¹Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of family, school, community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- ²Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students’ academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(1), 1–22.
- ³Scott-Jones, D. (1995). Parent-child interactions and school achievement. In B. Ryan, G. Adams, T. Gullotta, R. Weissberg & L. Hampton (Eds.), *The family-school connection: Theory, research and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- ⁴Anderson, S. A. (2000). How parental involvement makes a difference in reading achievement. *Reading Improvement*, 37(2), 61–86.

- ⁵Lee, V., & Croninger, R. (1994). The relative importance of home and school in the development of literacy skills for middle-grade students. *American Journal of Education, 102*, 286–329.
- ⁶Nord, C., Brimhall, D., & West, J. (1997). *Fathers' involvement in their children's schools*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.
- ⁷Child Trends Databank. (n.d.) *Parental involvement in schools*. Retrieved January 9, 2004, from <http://www.childtrends.databank.org/indicators/39ParentalInvolvementinSchools.cfm>
- ⁸Shirley, D. (1997). *Community organizing for urban school reform*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- ⁹Gold, E., Simon, E., & Brown, C. (2002). *Strong neighborhoods, strong schools: The indicators project on education organizing*. Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.
- ¹⁰Funkhouser, J. E., & Gonzales, M. R. (1997). *Family involvement in children's education: Successful local approaches*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- ¹¹Hernandez, L. P., Hernandez, A., Lopez, M. E., Kreider, H., & Coffman, J. (2000). Local and national implementation of Families and Schools Together (FAST) program. *The School Community Journal, 10*(1), 85–110.
- ¹²United States Department of Health and Human Services. (n.d.). *Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration*. Retrieved January 9, 2004 from <http://www.samhsa.gov>
- ¹³The Family Research Project at the Graduate School of Education. (2003). Program spotlight. *FINE Forum, 7*. Retrieved January 9, 2004, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/fine/fineforum/forum6/spotlight.html>
- ¹⁴Lopez, M. E., & Kreider, H. (2003). Beyond input: Achieving authentic participation in school reform. *The Evaluation Exchange, 9*(2). Retrieved January 9, 2004, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/issue22/theory.html>
- ¹⁵Lopez, M. E. (2003). *Transforming schools through community organizing: A research review*. Retrieved January 9, 2004, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/fine/resources/research/lopez.html>

Heather Weiss is the founder and director of the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She also founded and facilitates the Home Visit Forum, a group of six national home visit programs who work together to carry out research to strengthen home visitation. She has written on the history of home visitation and strategies for evaluating early childhood programs. She and her colleagues produce the *Evaluation Exchange*, a national publication devoted to improving evaluation practice. Dr. Weiss has an Ed.D. in Education and Social Policy from the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She writes, speaks, and advises on child and family policy, family support programs and systems, evaluating out-of-school time programs, and on innovative evaluation strategies. She is a consultant and advisor to numerous foundations on evaluation strategies and on early childhood, youth, and family initiatives.

Weiss, H. B. (2004). Evidence of effectiveness of complementary learning. In K. Bogen-schneider & E. Gross (Eds.), *A policymaker's guide to school finance: Approaches to use and questions ask* (Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Briefing Report No. 20, 54 pages). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Excellence in Family Studies.

Data on School District Revenues and Pupil Assessments in Wisconsin

Prepared by David Loppnow and Layla Merrifield,
Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau

The Badger State will spend approximately \$9,216 per pupil to educate public school students for the year 2003-04. Of the estimated \$4,747.2 million of state aid to education, almost nine-tenths are used to equalize the school property tax differences between school districts. Over the course of the past twelve years, state aid for K-12 public schools in Wisconsin has increased 137%. However, because of state revenue limits on how much school property tax money can be collected without referenda, the level of school property taxes citizens pay has risen only 27%. Just as state aid to education has risen in the past several years, assessments show that the percentage of Wisconsin students scoring at advanced or proficient levels on state standardized tests has risen as well. However, about twice as many students score at advanced or proficient levels on state standardized tests than on national tests. Also, average gains in achievement across all students can mask the fact that some student groups continue to score lower than others. Children of color, English language learners, students with disabilities, and those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds consistently perform less well than their peers. While no single cause for this situation has been identified, Wisconsin has a variety of programs and strategies aimed at closing the achievement gap.

School District Revenues

State aid for the K-12 public school system in Wisconsin has increased from \$2.05 billion in 1992-93 to a budgeted amount of \$4.86 billion in 2004-05, which represents an increase of 137% over 12 years. However, state revenue limits that restrict the amount of local school property taxes that can be levied without referenda approval, after consideration of state general school aids, have been in effect since 1993-94. As a result, even though state school aids will increase by 137% from 1992-93 through 2004-05, school property taxes will increase by an estimated 27%, so that total revenues from the sum of state aid and school property taxes will reflect an estimated 73% increase over these 12 years.

School districts derive their revenue through four major sources, including: (a) state aid; (b) property tax; (c) federal aid; and (d) other local non-property tax revenues such as fees and interest earnings. Table 1 shows these revenue amounts for 2001-02, both in total and on a per pupil basis (2001-02 is the most recent year for which expenditure data is available from the Department of Public Instruction).

Table 1
2001-02 Revenues for K-12 Public Schools

Revenue Source	Amount (in Millions)	Percent of Total	Revenues per Pupil
State Aid	\$4,563.5	53.2%	\$5,190
Property Tax	\$3,071.8	35.8%	\$3,493
Local Receipts	\$473.9	5.5%	\$539
Federal Aid	\$468.8	5.5%	\$533
Total	\$8,578.0	100.0%	\$9,755

For 2003-04, data on the amount of federal aid and local non-property tax revenues are not available. However, state aid is estimated at \$4.75 billion and the school property tax at \$3.37 billion in 2003-04. To show recent changes in these major revenue sources for K-12 public schools, Table 2 presents information on state aid and local school property taxes from 2001-02 through 2003-04. On a per pupil basis, these two sources of revenue would provide an estimated \$9,216 per pupil in 2003-04, compared to the \$8,683 per pupil in 2001-02 as shown in Table 1.

Table 2
State Aid and Local Property Taxes for K-12 Public Schools

Revenue Source	Revenue in Millions			Revenue per Pupil		
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
State Aid	\$4,563.5	\$4,721.0	\$4,747.2	\$5,190	\$5,357	\$5,391
Change to Prior Year		\$157.5	\$26.2		\$167	\$34
Property Tax	\$3,071.8	\$3,192.0	\$3,367.6	\$3,493	\$3,622	\$3,825
Change to Prior Year		\$102.2	\$175.6		\$129	\$203
Total	\$7,635.3	\$7,913.0	\$8,114.8	\$8,683	\$8,979	\$9,216
Change to Prior Year		\$277.7	\$201.8		\$296	\$237

In 2003-04, of the estimated \$4,747.2 million of state aid, \$4,212.5 million is provided as general school aids (or 88.7% of state aid), which is used to equalize the school property tax between school districts. General school aids are largely provided in the form of equalization aid, which is intended to result in the same property tax mill rate for school districts with the same shared costs per pupil.

One factor that is of interest is the distribution of state aid and local school property taxes per pupil by school district. Table 3 shows the distribution of school districts of the estimated state aid plus local property taxes per pupil. As shown in Table 3, most of the 426 school districts had state aid and property taxes between \$8,000 and \$10,000 per pupil in 2002-03, which is the most recent year that data on these revenues per pupil are available by school district. However, 22 school districts had revenues less than \$8,000 per pupil, and nine school districts had revenues in excess of \$12,000 per pupil.

Table 3
Distribution of School Districts by Estimated
State Aid Plus Property Taxes per Pupil in 2002-03

Revenue per Pupil	School Districts		Cumulative
	Number	Percentage	Percentage
Under \$8,000	22	5.2%	
\$8,001 to \$8,500	69	16.2%	21.4%
\$8,501 to \$9,000	111	26.1%	47.5%
\$9,001 to \$9,500	105	24.6%	72.1%
\$9,501 to \$10,000	53	12.4%	84.5%
\$10,001 to \$11,000	43	10.1%	94.6%
\$11,001 to \$12,000	14	3.3%	97.9%
Over \$12,000	9	2.1%	100.0%
Total	426	100.0%	

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) compiles information for each state on revenues per pupil. Data are available from NCES for 1999-00, which is the most recent year available. Table 4 shows revenue per pupil for each state and the District of Columbia as well as the state's ranking in revenues per pupil. The states are shown in descending order by revenues per pupil.

Table 4
Revenues per Pupil in 1999-2000 as Reported
by the National Center for Education Statistics

State	Revenues per Pupil	Rank	State	Revenues per Pupil	Rank
New Jersey	\$11,543	1	New Hampshire	\$7,542	27
District of Columbia	11,343	2	Iowa	7,470	28
New York	11,221	3	California	7,462	29
Connecticut	10,949	4	South Carolina	7,375	30
Alaska	10,118	5	Missouri	7,292	31
Massachusetts	9,533	6	Kansas	7,219	32
Delaware	9,505	7	Texas	7,179	33
Rhode Island	9,256	8	Colorado	7,124	34
Vermont	9,240	9	Florida	7,116	35
Pennsylvania	8,931	10	Montana	6,992	36
Michigan	8,916	11	Nevada	6,947	37
Wisconsin	8,870	12	New Mexico	6,905	38
Maine	8,659	13	North Carolina	6,895	39
Maryland	8,555	14	Kentucky	6,681	40
Wyoming	8,540	15	North Dakota	6,651	41
Indiana	8,524	16	South Dakota	6,601	42
Minnesota	8,417	17	Alabama	6,523	43
Ohio	8,293	18	Louisiana	6,487	44
Illinois	8,183	19	Arizona	6,455	45
Oregon	7,952	20	Arkansas	6,054	46
West Virginia	7,864	21	Idaho	6,005	47
Georgia	7,786	22	Oklahoma	5,909	48
Virginia	7,716	23	Tennessee	5,870	49
Nebraska	7,690	24	Mississippi	5,549	50
Hawaii	7,559	25	Utah	5,370	51
Washington	7,546	26	U.S. Average	\$7,957	--

Pupil Assessments

Three types of assessments are regularly administered to Wisconsin public and charter school students. The Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test (WRCT) is administered to all third grade pupils annually. The Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE), which assesses skills for reading, language, mathematics, science and social studies, is administered to all fourth, eighth, and tenth grade pupils annually. Alternate assessments are administered to limited English proficiency students and students with disabilities. Table 5 shows the percentage of third grade pupils who scored at the advanced or proficient levels on the WRCT from 1998 through 2003. The following tables, six through eight, show the statewide average proficiency levels for the WKCE assessments administered in the 2002-03 school year for grades 4, 8 and 10.

Table 5
Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test (WRCT) — Grade 3
Advanced and Proficient

	Enrolled	Advanced and Proficient Total
March 1998	63,765	64.8%
March 1999	64,282	70.1%
March 2000	63,575	74.4%
March 2001	62,707	76.5%
March 2002	61,221	74.1%
March 2003	60,747	81.1%

Table 6
Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) — Grade 4
2002-03*

	Enrolled	Not Tested/ Tested	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading	62,390	4%	4%	12%	40%	40%
Language	62,390	4%	5%	15%	43%	35%
Mathematics	62,390	3%	17%	11%	41%	30%
Science	62,390	3%	5%	17%	58%	19%
Social Studies	62,390	3%	2%	5%	29%	61%

**Cut scores for WKCE proficiency levels were changed in November, 2002. Therefore, test results are not comparable to results from prior testing years.*

Table 7
Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) — Grade 8
2002-03*

	Enrolled	Not Tested/ Tested	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading	67,527	2%	6%	9%	44%	39%
Language	67,527	2%	12%	23%	42%	20%
Mathematics	67,527	2%	11%	13%	47%	26%
Science	67,527	2%	9%	15%	46%	28%
Social Studies	67,527	2%	4%	12%	44%	37%

**Cut scores for WKCE proficiency levels were changed in November, 2002. Therefore, test results are not comparable to results from prior testing years.*

TABLE 8
Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) — Grade 10
2002-03*

	Enrolled	Not Tested/ Tested	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading	71,678	5%	9%	14%	19%	52%
Language	71,678	5%	7%	18%	49%	21%
Mathematics	71,678	5%	14%	12%	45%	24%
Science	71,678	5%	16%	10%	34%	35%
Social Studies	71,678	5%	16%	7%	30%	42%

**Cut scores for WKCE proficiency levels were changed in November, 2002. Therefore, test results are not comparable to results from prior testing years.*

State and federal laws require the annual review of school performance to determine if student academic achievement and progress is adequate. Beginning in 2002-03, DPI's review has included a comparison of actual achievement levels of students in reading and mathematics and Wisconsin's "annual measurable objectives" in these subjects. These annual measurable objectives were set separately based on actual achievement levels of students in 2001-02 and increase over time. The same annual measurable objectives apply to all districts, schools, and student groups in the Wisconsin public school system.

TABLE 9
Percent of Students Who Need to Score
at Proficient/Advanced
Annual Measurable Objectives

		Reading	Math
Starting Point	2001-02	61%	37%
	2002-03	61%	37%
	2003-04	61%	37%
Intermediate Goal (Begin new 3-8 tests)	2004-05	67.5%	47.5%
	2005-06	67.5%	47.5%
	2006-07	67.5%	47.5%
Intermediate Goal	2007-08	74%	58%
	2008-09	74%	58%
	2009-10	74%	58%
Intermediate Goal	2010-11	80.5%	68.5%
Intermediate Goal	2011-12	87%	79%
Intermediate Goal	2012-13	93.5%	89.5%
Goal: All Proficient	2013-14	100%	100%

The proficiency rates are based on WKCE and Wisconsin Alternate Assessments for both limited-English-proficiency pupils and students with disabilities. Test scores are reported for students enrolled in the school for a full academic year. The overall goal is for all Wisconsin students to attain the proficient or advanced levels in reading and mathematics by the year 2014.

Finally, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), commonly referred to as the “Nation’s Report Card,” is administered periodically to representative, randomly selected national and state samples of fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade pupils, in a variety of subject areas. In 2003, state-level assessments in reading and mathematics were administered in grades four and eight.

Table 10
National Assessment of Educational Progress
Wisconsin Scores Compared to the National Average for 2003

Subject	Grade	National Average	State Average	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Mathematics	4	234	237	21%	44%	31%	4%
(Scale: 0-500)	8	276	284	25%	40%	29%	6%
Reading	4	216	221	32%	35%	26%	7%
(Scale: 0-500)	8	261	266	23%	40%	34%	3%

Increased emphasis on standards and assessments has concurrently brought an increased awareness of a nationwide “achievement gap” among ethnic and racial groups, as well as among socioeconomic groups. Students who are African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and American Indian consistently lag behind their white peers on grade point averages, standardized test scores, and high school graduation rates. While no single cause for the gap has been identified, Wisconsin has implemented a variety of programs and strategies at least partly aimed at reducing the achievement gap, including reduced class sizes via the SAGE and P-5 programs, four-year-old kindergarten, and increased availability of school breakfast. These programs are in addition to federal initiatives such as Title I, which provides targeted assistance to low-income pupils and to schools located in areas of concentrated poverty. The following tables present WKCE test scores disaggregated in order to illustrate the achievement gap among several groups of pupils in 2002-03.

Table 11
Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) Reading
Percentage of Pupils Rated Proficient or Advanced
2002-03*

	4th Grade	8th Grade	10th Grade
Economically Disadvantaged	67%	65%	50%
Not Economically Disadvantaged	87%	90%	76%
American Indian/Alaska Native	69%	73%	58%
Asian/Pacific Islander	69%	69%	55%
Black/Non-Hispanic	61%	54%	36%
Hispanic	62%	60%	45%
White/Non-Hispanic	86%	89%	78%
Limited English Proficient	51%	39%	20%
English Proficient	82%	85%	73%

**Cut scores for WKCE proficiency levels were changed in November, 2002. Therefore, test results are not comparable to results from prior testing years.*

Table 12
Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) Mathematics
Percentage of Pupils Rated Proficient or Advanced
2002-03*

	4th Grade	8th Grade	10th Grade
Economically Disadvantaged	52%	49%	43%
Not Economically Disadvantaged	79%	82%	74%
American Indian/Alaska Native	54%	56%	48%
Asian/Pacific Islander	66%	68%	54%
Black/Non-Hispanic	41%	30%	23%
Hispanic	51%	46%	38%
White/Non-Hispanic	76%	81%	76%
Limited English Proficient	47%	38%	19%
English Proficient	72%	75%	70%

**Cut scores for WKCE proficiency levels were changed in November, 2002. Therefore, test results are not comparable to results from prior testing years.*

David Loppnow is a Program Supervisor at the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau. Mr. Loppnow has 23 years' experience with the Bureau, with recent work focusing on education and school finance.

Layla Merrifield is a Fiscal Analyst for the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau. Ms. Merrifield joined the Bureau in 2000. Her areas of responsibility include federal K-12 education programs, state categorical aids and pupil assessment.

Loppnow, D., & Merrifield, L. (2004). Data on school district revenues and pupil assessments in Wisconsin. In K. Bogenschneider & E. Gross (Eds.), *A policymaker's guide to school finance: Approaches to use and questions ask* (Wisconsin Family Impact Seminar Briefing Report No. 20, 54 pages). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Excellence in Family Studies.

Selected Resources in School Finance Issues

*By Ross Collin, Project Assistant
Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars*

Wisconsin Legislative Service Agencies

Russ Kava, Fiscal Analyst

Legislative Fiscal Bureau
1 E Main St #301
Madison WI 53703
(608) 266-3847
Fax: (608) 267-6873
russ.kava@legis.state.wi.us

Interests: Wisconsin's school finance system

David Loppnow, Program Supervisor

Legislative Fiscal Bureau
1 E Main St #301
Madison WI 53703
(608) 266-3847
Fax: (608) 267-6873
Dave.Loppnow@legis.state.wi.us

Interests: Wisconsin's school finance system

Layla Merrifield, Fiscal Analyst

Legislative Fiscal Bureau
1 E Main St #301
Madison WI 53703
(608) 266-3847
Fax: (608) 267-6873
layla.merrifield@legis.state.wi.us

Interests: Wisconsin's school finance system

Russ Whitesel, Senior Staff Attorney

Wisconsin Legislative Council
1 East Main Street, Suite 401
Madison WI 53703
(608) 266-0922
Fax: (608) 266-3830
Russ.Whitesel@legis.state.wi.us

Interests: K-12 and higher education issues; local, state, and federal school finance issues

State Agencies

David Carlson, Director

School Financial Services Team
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S Webster St #5
Madison WI 53702
(608) 266-6968
david.carlson@dpi.state.wi.us

Interests: K-12 education

Jane Grinde, Director

Bright Beginnings/Family-School-Community Partnerships
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S Webster St #3
Madison WI 53702
(608) 266-9356
jane.grinde@dpi.state.wi.us

Interests: Family-school-community partnerships; community relations; the Bright Beginnings Team directs the Wisconsin Network of Partnership Schools and two AmeriCorps grants that focus on literacy and student achievement through partnerships

Jill Haglund, Early Childhood Consultant

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S Webster St #3
Madison WI 53702
(608) 267-9625
Fax: (608) 267-1052
jill.haglund@dpi.state.wi.us

Interests: Four-year-old kindergarten; community collaboration

Bob Hanle, Team Leader

Education, Workforce and Local Government Team
State Budget Office
Department of Administration
101 E Wilson St
Madison WI 53702
(608) 266-1037
bob.hanle@doa.state.wi.us

Interests: School finance issues; school district revenue limits; qualified economic offer; teacher compensation issues

Diane Jenkins, Children's Policy Coordinator

Office of Strategic Finance
Department of Health and Family Services
1 W Wilson St #618
Madison WI 53707-7850
(608) 266-7723
FAX: (608) 267-0358
jenkidm@dhfs.state.wi.us

Interests: Early childhood development; school readiness; and children's health and safety

Jerry Landmark, Assistant Director

School Financial Services Team
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S Webster St #5
Madison WI 53702
(608) 266-3464
Fax: (608) 267-1052
jerome.landmakr@dpi.state.wi.us

Interests: K-12 education

Ruth Anne Landsverk, Coordinator

Family-School-Community Partnerships
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S Webster St #3
Madison WI 53702
(608) 266-9757
Fax: (608) 267-1052
ruthanne.landsverk@dpi.state.wi.us

Interests: Parental involvement in schools

Brian Pahnke, Assistant State Superintendent for Finance and Management

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S Webster St #5
Madison WI 53702
(608) 267-9124
Fax: (608) 267-1052
brian.pahnke@dpi.state.wi.us

Interests: K-12 education

Mary L. Peters, Consultant

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S Webster St #4
Madison WI 53707
(608) 267-9172
FAX: (608) 267-3746
mary.peters@dpi.state.wi.us

Interests: Early childhood; special education

Laura Saterfield, Early Childhood Collaboration Manager

Department of Workforce Development
Division of Workforce Solutions
201 E Washington Ave
Madison WI 53703
(608) 266-3443
laura.saterfield@dwd.state.wi.us

Interests: Child care

Paul Ziegler, Budget Analyst for School Finance Issues

Department of Administration
101 E Wilson St
Madison WI 53702
(608) 266-5468
FAX: (608) 267-3746
paul.ziegler@doa.state.wi.us

Interests: School finance issues; school district revenue limits; qualified economic offer; teacher compensation issues

University of Wisconsin-Madison and University Extension

Karen Bogenschneider, Professor and Extension Specialist

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Rothermel-Bascom Professor of Human Ecology
Human Development and Family Studies
Family Policy Specialist, University Extension
1430 Linden Dr #201A
Madison WI 53706
(608) 262-4070
FAX: (608) 262-5335
kpbogens@wisc.edu

Interests: Parental involvement in schooling; Bogenschneider, Carol Johnson, and their county Extension colleagues conduct a program that builds family/school/community partnerships in Wisconsin Middle Schools

Geoffrey D. Borman, Professor

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Assistant Professor, Educational Administration
1161D Educational Sciences Building
1025 W Johnson St
Madison WI 53706
(608) 263-3688
Fax: (608) 265-3135
gborman@education.wisc.edu

Interests: School reform; equity; research-based policy; evaluating summer school programs; evaluations of comprehensive, whole-school reforms

David Edie, Extension Specialist

University of Wisconsin Extension
Public Policy Education Specialist
Family Living Education
B121 Extension Building
432 N Lake St
Madison WI 53706
(608) 265-2935
Fax: (608) 263-7969
david.edie@uwex.edu

Interests: Early child care in Wisconsin and public policy issues related to early care and education

Andrew Reschovsky, Professor

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Professor, LaFollette School of Public Affairs
Interdisciplinary Research Programs—Social Sciences
College of Letters and Sciences
307 Observatory Hill Office Building
1225 Observatory Dr
Madison WI 53706
(608) 263-0447
reschovsky@lafollette.wisc.edu

Interests: School finance, school finance formulas, tax policy, and measuring the cost of an adequate education

Deborah Vandell

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Professor, Educational Psychology
Professor, Human Development and Family Studies
880-E Educational Sciences Building
1025 W Johnson St
Madison WI 53706
(608) 263-3883
dvandell@wisc.edu

Interests: The role of government in the child care market; whether the quality of child care matters; what government can do to improve child care; after-school programs and academic achievement

Local and National Organizations and Programs**Center on Reinventing Public Education**

Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs
University of Washington
Box 353060
Seattle WA 98195-3060
(206) 685-2214
Fax: (206) 221-7402
crpe@u.washington.edu
<http://www.crpe.org/>

Reports:

“A New Look at Inequities in School Funding: A Presentation on the Resource Variations Within Districts” (May 2002); available online at:

http://www.crpe.org/pubs/pdf/report_schoolfundingweb.pdf

“Are Charter Schools Getting More Money into the Classroom? A Micro-Financial Analysis of First Year Charter Schools in Massachusetts” (October 2000); available online at:

http://www.crpe.org/pubs/pdf/CSF_report.pdf

The Education Commission of the States

700 Broadway, #1200
Denver CO 80203-3460
(303) 299-3600
Fax: (303) 296-8332
www.ecs.org

Reports:

“Constructing New Finance Models that Balance Equity, Adequacy and Efficiency with Responsiveness.” (2001). James Guthrie. Available online at:

<http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/28/19/2819.htm>

“21st Century School Finance: How Is the Context Changing?” (2001). Janet Hansen. Available online at:

<http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/28/04/2804.htm>

“The Status of School Finance Today.” (2001). John Augenblick. Available online at:

<http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/28/01/2801.htm>

Families and Schools Together (FAST)

Lynn McDonald

Wisconsin Center for Education Research

University of Wisconsin-Madison

1025 W. Johnson Street

Madison WI 53706

(608) 263-9476

Fax: (608) 263-6448

<http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/fast/>

The FAST program, developed in Wisconsin, is a multifamily group intervention that builds protective factors for children and trains parents to be the primary prevention agents for their own children. FAST has been implemented in 45 states and in five countries.

The Harvard Family Research Project and The Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE)

3 Garden Street

Cambridge MA 02138

Tel: 617-495-9108

Fax: 617-495-8594

<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp/>

<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp/projects/fine.html>

The Harvard Family Research Project at the Harvard Graduate School of Education works to promote learning activities in the home and community that complement and support children’s learning in school.

The Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE) is a national network of over 2,000 people who are interested in promoting strong partnerships among children’s educators, their families, and their communities.

Reports:

“Concepts and Models of Family Involvement.” (2001) Harvard Family Research Project. Available online at:

http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp/projects/fine/resources/case_study/intro.html

“Federal Funding in Out-of School Time with Accountability Requirements and Evaluations.” (2000). Harvard Family Research Project. Available online at:

www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/afterschool/resources/index.html#funding

The McKnight Foundation

710 Second Street South, Suite 400
Minneapolis MN 55401
(612) 333-4220
<http://www.mcknight.org>

Reports:

“Hot Issues: School Finance;” available online at:
http://www.mcknight.org/hotissues/schoolfin_1.asp

The National Network of Partnership Schools

Joyce Epstein, Director

Johns Hopkins University
3003 N Charles Street, Suite 200
Baltimore MD 21218
(410) 516-8800
nnps@csos.jhu.edu
www.partnershipschools.org

Epstein heads up a network committed to developing and maintaining strong programs of school-family-community partnerships. As of November 2002, 900 schools, 91 districts, 17 state departments of education, and 50 university/organizations are active members of the Network.

Reports:

Network Handbook; available online at:
<http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/manual.htm>

Promising Partnership Practices; available online at:
<http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/ppp.htm>

Type 2 (NNPS Semi-annual Newsletter); available online at:
<http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/type2.htm>

Research briefs (e.g. “Focus on Results,” an analysis of the effectiveness of NNPS programs); available online at:
<http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/research.htm>

State Programs

Families, Schools, and Communities United for Students (US)

The program aims to build stronger family, school, and community partnerships in Wisconsin middle schools. The program was developed by the University of Wisconsin-Extension and Jane Grinde and Ruth Ann Landsverk of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Bright Beginnings/Family-School-Community Partnerships Program and works in cooperation with county Extension educators and cooperating middle schools.

Linda Culligan Bruce, Superior Middle School

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Douglas County
Family Living Educator
1313 Belknap Street, Courthouse # 107
Superior WI 54880
(715) 395-1363
Fax: (715) 395-1399
linda.bruce@ces.uwex.edu

Jane Jensen, Riverview Middle School, Sheboygan

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Sheboygan County
Family Living Educator
650 Forest Avenue
Sheboygan Falls WI 53085
(920) 467-5740
Fax: (920) 467-5743
jane.jensen@ces.uwex.edu

Karen Joos, Sparta Meadowview Middle School and Tomah Middle School

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Monroe County
Family Living Agent
Room 1
14345 County Hwy B
Sparta WI 54656
(608) 269-8722
Fax: (608) 269-8767
karen.joos@ces.uwex.edu

Marilyn Kooiker, Grantsburg Middle School

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Burnett County
Family Living Educator
7410 County Road K #107
Siren WI 54872
(715) 349-2151
Fax: (715) 349-2102
marilyn.kooiker@ces.uwex.edu

Ruth N. Schriefer, River Valley Middle School, Spring Green

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Iowa County
Family Living Agent
Department Head
222 N Iowa Street
Dodgeville WI 53533
(608) 935-0391
Fax: (608) 935-3024
ruth.schriefer@ces.uwex.edu

**Families, Schools, and Communities United for Students (US)
Research Office:**

Karen Bogenschneider, Professor and Extension Specialist

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Rothermel-Bascom Professor of Human Ecology
Professor, Human Development and Family Studies
Family Policy Specialist, University Extension
1430 Linden Dr #201A
Madison WI 53706
(608) 262-4070
kpbogens@wisc.edu

Carol Johnson, Extension Specialist

Interim Family/School Specialist
University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension
1430 Linden Dr
Madison WI 53706
(608) 262-9694
cjohnson@ssc.wisc.edu

©2004 by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System doing business as the division of Cooperative Extension of the University of Wisconsin-Extension. Send inquiries about copyright permission to: Cooperative Extension Publications Operations, 103 Extension Bldg., 432 North Lake St., Madison, WI 53706.

Produced by the Center for Excellence in Family Studies, School of Human Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Editors: Karen Bogenschneider, Director, Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars, Rothermel-Bascom Professor of Human Ecology, Human Development & Family Studies, UW-Madison, and Family Policy Specialist, UW-Extension; and Beth Gross, State Coordinator, Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars. Authors: David Loppnow and Layla Merrifield of the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau; and Karen Bogenschneider and Carol Johnson, University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension. Meg Wall-Wild, designer and copy editor.

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Wisconsin counties, publishes this information to further the purpose of the May 8 and June 30, 1914, Acts of Congress. UW-Extension provides equal opportunities and affirmative action in employment and programming, including Title IX and ADA. If you need this material in an alternative format, contact Cooperative Extension Publishing Operations at (608) 262-2655 (Voice & TDD), or the UW-Extension Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity Programs.

This publication is available from your Wisconsin county UW Extension office or:

Cooperative Extension Publishing Operations
103 Extension Building
432 North Lake St., Madison, WI 53706
Toll-free: (877) 947-7827 (877-WIS-PUBS)
Madison: (608) 262-3346; FAX (608) 265-8052
Internet: <http://learningstore.uwex.edu>

BFI#20 A Policymaker's Guide to School Finance: Approaches to Use and Questions to Ask (2004)