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

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

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

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

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

**LOCAL RESOURCES:**
Before state money is sent to any school district, we strongly believe that no school district should be eligible for state aid until they have demonstrated that:
Illinois School Finance Adequacy: Comparison of a Statewide Simulation to Current Revenues

National-Louis University

What is Adequacy?
A sufficient level of fiscal resources to enable all students to perform at high levels.

Research Base
- Evidence comes from:
  - Randomized experiments
  - Other high-quality studies that use specific controls or statistical procedures
  - Best practices, either from studies of local districts or best practices used in the CFS program

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

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

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

Research Base
Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors

ILLINOIS POLICY:
- Title I funds set as do for mentor pg.
- Mentoring funds per hour, 1.5 through 2.5
- New teacher induction funds at $6,200 per teacher
- Other special programs
- No policy specifically regarding instructional coaching.
**Research Base**

**Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors**

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

**Research Base**

**Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors**

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

**Research Base**

**Instructional Facilitators/Coaches/Mentors**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

**Research Base**

**Sheltered English and ESL Instruction**

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

**Research Base**

**Sheltered English and ESL Instruction**

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

**Research Base**

**Sheltered English and ESL Instruction**

RECOMMENDATIONS: With approximately 195,000 bilingual education students in Illinois, the approx. $75m is less than adequate to provide all bilingual students with qualified teachers. We recommended resourcing schools with 1 FTE bilingual teacher position for every 100 ELL students.
ILLINOIS POLICY: Summer Bridges provides approx. $22m on a grant-basis for summer school. A variety of other summer program grants are available for specific populations (e.g., migrant students). Many districts utilize bilingual and other programs to help fund extended day and summer programs.

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

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

Out taskforce has recommended the addition of one assistant principal for every prototypical school (about 500 students).
Simulation Parameters (continued)
- Extended Day & Summer School:
  - one teacher position for every 15 eligible students (defined as 50 percent of the adjusted free and reduced-price lunch pupil count) and paid at the rate of 25 percent of the assistant's annual salary for an extended-day program for 2½ to 3 hours, 5 days per week.
  - Summer school for all grades K-12, eight weeks in length, and a six-hour day.

Simulation Parameters (continued)
- Class sizes:
  - Grades K-3: 1 teacher per 25 student
  - Grades 4-8: 1 teacher per 25 students
  - Alternative & small schools: 1 teacher per 7 students

Simulation Parameters (continued)
- Small schools cap: 75 ADM.

Simulation Parameters (continued)
- Per-Pupil Resources:
  - Supplies: $140p (Elem & Mid), $175 (High)
  - Technology: $250p
  - Student Activites: $200p (Elem & Mid) & $125pp (High)
  - GATE: $25p
  - Professional Development: $100p
  - Formative Assessments: $25p
  - Central Office Mgr: Exp. $300p

Simulation Parameters (continued)
- Special Education:
  - 1 special education teacher per 150 students
  - 1/2 special education aide per 150 students
  - 100% reimbursement for costs of students with severe and profound disabilities, minus Federal Title Viii and Medicare funds.
  - Substitute Teacher:
    - 12 Sub Days for professional Development
    - Daily rate = $125 + 37.5% benefits = $171.93

Simulation Parameters (continued)
- School Office Personnel:
  - Principal, AP, & Secretary: 1 per prototypical school
  - Clerical: 1 per prototypical Elementary & Middle
  - Non-instructional aide: 2 per prototypical elementary & middle
  - 3 per prototypical high school
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Simulation Parameters (continued)

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

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

Demographics
- Enrollment: 2,023,087 Illinois students
- 4K-12
- SR ELL
- 4,058 schools
- 873 districts

Model Cost
- Total = $15,454,575,686
- Per Pupil = $7,572
- "Hold Harmless" = 22,102,261,196
- Current Revenues (2008)
- State and Local Revenues = $21,894,089,547
- Per Pupil = $10,882

Difference
- Total = $3,540,119,043 (without hold harmless)
- Per Pupil = $1,720.04
- "Winners" = 696, "Losers" = 177

IL Adequacy Simulation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Teachers</td>
<td>97,175</td>
<td>$8,185,089,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>$1,307,498,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Teachers</td>
<td>10,110</td>
<td>$945,051,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>6,411</td>
<td>$725,706,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Teachers</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>$83,040,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Day</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>$800,156,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>$600,166,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>$1,721,934,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas Special Education Staff</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>$1,383,505,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IL Adequacy Simulation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Support</td>
<td>9,411</td>
<td>$1,154,766,227</td>
<td>$990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>$319,977,006</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>$484,046,256</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Tech</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>$46,819,425</td>
<td>$131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Teacher Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$115,708,816</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District-level Simulation Results:
Example 1

- DeKalb CUSD 428
- Adequacy Model Costs
  - Total = $46,419,630
  - Per Pupil = $11,159
  - Current Costs (2008)
  - Total District Revenues = $57,740,379
  - Difference
    - Total Model vs Current = +$10,929,861
    - Per Pupil = +$31.375
  - Assuming local revenues remain the same, percent local funding would increase from 37% to 43%.

District-level Simulation Results:
Example 2

Wilmette School District 39
- Adequacy Model Costs
  - Total = $45,514,596
  - Per Pupil = $11,112
  - Current Costs (2008)
  - Total District Revenues = $43,764,856
  - Difference (without hold harmless)
    - Total Model vs Current = +$11,753,240
    - Per Pupil = +$239
  - Assuming local revenues remain the same, percent local funding would increase from 97.2% to 98.4%.

District-level Simulation Results:
Example 3

Vienna High School District 133
- Adequacy Model Costs
  - Total = $6,496,578
  - Per Pupil = $12,152
  - Current Costs (2008)
  - Total District Revenues = $3,229,772
  - Difference
    - Total Model vs Current = +$1,292,186
    - Per Pupil = +$25
  - Assuming local revenues remain the same, percent local funding would increase from 46% to 51%. 
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Discussion

- Preschool is not included. (This is not within the parameters of Illinois' constitutional obligations.)
- Comparable wage index
- Resources for high cost, low incidence special education students are in addition to this model (another approximately $120 million)
- Required tax rates. This model assumes local tax rates will remain the same.

Required drug: This model assumes local tax rates will remain the same.
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Salaries for secretaries, clerical, and aides - need better data to estimate
- Cost structure differences according to district type (Imsakic, 2002).