

Staff Paper 197

Discussion Results From
FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IOWA EDUCATION-
A Statewide Satellite Teleconference

Dr. Mark A. Edelman and James J. Knudsen
Economics Department
Iowa State University

February 1, 1988

Introduction

The Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service organized a statewide satellite "town meeting" titled "Future Directions in Iowa Education" on December 6, 1988. This meeting was co-sponsored by the Iowa Department of Education, Iowa Association of School Boards, School Administrators of Iowa, and the Iowa State Education Association. An attempt was made to encourage local hosts to invite a broad-based group of local leaders and citizens to each downlink site. Approximately 900 state and local leaders and citizens interested in Iowa education participated in the 85 downlink site meetings.

This report includes the statewide tabulations of the small group discussions from the satellite downlink sites across Iowa. Since there were six different sets of questions, this means that about 150 people participated in groups that answered each set of questions.

IMPORTANT NOTE. This Iowa State University policy education program was designed to provide objective research-based information. The authors do not endorse any positions on the issues. The authors are simply providing a summary of the factual discussion results. Furthermore, these responses do not represent a scientific survey of Iowans. However, the authors suggest that the responses are more likely to be representative of those citizens and education leaders who are interested enough in the future of Iowa education to attend local meetings and participate in the political decision-making process.

Program Purpose and Organization

The Future Directions in Iowa Education program was designed with three purposes in mind. First, the program was designed to provide local participants with the latest perspectives on current statewide trends in Iowa schools, school finance, and legislative options. Second, the program was designed to provide each participant with data on local school district trends and directions for comparison with neighboring districts. Finally, the program was designed to provide each participant with a sense of direction (or lack thereof) on many of the major education issues as a result of discussions with other state and local leaders. As a result, the authors hope that the statewide tabulations included in this report represent more informed judgement in comparison to random surveys of Iowa citizens.

The Future Directions in Iowa Education program included three parts. First, the Iowa School Facts bulletin, prepared by the Iowa Cooperative Extension Service, was presented to the statewide audience. Second, questions were called in from the downlink sites and answered by a panel of state education leaders and school finance experts. Finally, after the conclusion of the satellite transmission, many of the downlink sites organized their audiences into small groups of 5-10 people. Each small group was asked to discuss one of six sets of questions. Then each small group was to determine their preferences by majority vote.

The statewide panel included the following people.

Dr. William Lepley, Director
Iowa Department of Education

Dr. Lee Tack, School Finance Division
Iowa Department of Education

Senator Larry Murphy, Co-Chair
Interim School Finance Study Committee

Representative Arthur Ollie, Co-Chair
Interim School Finance Study Committee

Representative Delwyn Stroman, Minority Leader
Iowa House of Representatives

Mrs. Karen Goodenow, Chair
Iowa Board of Education

Dr. Mark A. Edelman
ISU Public Policy Economist and Consultant.
Interim School Finance Study Committee

Statewide "Town Meeting" Offers School Aid Preferences

Ames, IA., "Support for new education standards, current school sharing incentives and elimination of phantom pupils were strongly favored by school leaders and citizens participating in local discussion groups at 85 satellite downlink sites across Iowa," says a newly released Iowa State University report.

"In addition, local school leaders and citizens appear to have questions about the merits of open enrollment and adding district income to property wealth criteria in figuring state aid," according to Dr. Mark Edelman, ISU Public Policy Economist.

Edelman said the report includes statewide tabulations of local discussion group preferences of 900 Iowans who participated in 85 satellite downlink sites across Iowa in December.

"We attempted to invite a broad representation of local groups and citizens to the local meetings. While the preferences do not represent a random scientific survey of Iowans, they are perhaps more representative of local leaders and citizens who are interested enough in the issues to attend local meeting and participate in the decision-making process," Edelman said.

The statewide town meeting was organized by the ISU Extension Service and co-sponsored by the Department of Education, Iowa Association of School Boards, School Administrators of Iowa, and Iowa State Education Association.

Edelman said that 6 sets of questions were sent to all sites, so approximately 150 people or 30 discussion groups answered each set of questions. Here is a brief summary of the findings:

- * 29 out of 43 discussion groups favor elimination of the phantom pupil adjustment, 13 groups favor continuing the use of phantom pupils, and one group was not sure.
- * 18 out of 29 groups favor continuing the present school sharing incentives, 6 groups want the incentives to be reduced and 5 groups want the incentives to be expanded.
- * 30 out of 33 discussion groups support the new Iowa high school course offering standards. However only a slight majority of 16 groups felt the emphasis was just right. Four groups said foreign languages received too much emphasis. Two groups said vocational education received too much emphasis. However, four other groups cited foreign languages and vocational education as the areas receiving too little emphasis.
- * When asked whether open enrollment should be tried on an experimental basis, 17 out of 35 discussion groups said no, 9 said yes and 9 were not sure.
- * When asked about adding a district income factor to property wealth as a measure for distributing state aid, 13 out of 31 groups favor continuing the present formula, 12 groups were not sure, and 5 groups were in favor of this concept.
- * 21 out of 29 discussion groups suggest that 60 percent of K-12 education costs in Iowa should be paid by the state. Currently the state funds 59 percent of the costs.
- * Discussion groups were evenly split on whether to shift the tax mix for financing schools. Fifteen groups favored no change in the tax mix. However, ten to fourteen groups favored more emphasis on sales and income and less on property taxes.
- * 15 out of 30 discussion groups favor incorporating Phase I and II funds into the present foundation formula while keeping Phase III funds outside of the present formula. Twelve groups favor keeping Phase I, II and III separate from foundation aid.
- * When asked whether the state should shift some of it's support to help finance local school buildings, 33 out of 34 discussion groups suggest that state government should fund local school district general fund education programs only.
- * When 18 discussion groups were asked how teacher salaries should be determined, the average distribution indicated that 50 percent should be distributed on teaching performance, 25 percent on training and 25 percent on years of experience.
- * When asked about telecommunications technology for remote class instruction, 12 out of 22 groups favor allowing non certified teacher aids to host classrooms that receive courses. 7 groups favor continuing the present policy of requiring certified teachers, and 2 groups were not sure.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IOWA EDUCATION
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION NUMBER 1.

DIRECTIONS: Please have your group solve as many of the following issues as time permits. After your group has discussed each issue, determine the best option by majority vote and record the votes on this tally sheet. After you have reported the results to the meeting audience, turn in this sheet to the meeting host so that the results can be tallied statewide.

EDUCATION FUNDING MIX. State income taxes, state sales taxes and other state revenues presently cover 59 percent of the K-12 public education costs in Iowa. Local property taxes account for 35 percent of the total statewide bill, while other local and federal revenues add 6 percent. The share paid by the state has increased in recent decades while the share paid by property taxes has declined. This Iowa trend has been consistent with national trends. In comparing Iowa to other states, we find some states that fund as little as 30 percent and as much as 100 percent of their total K-12 costs from state revenues.

1. What share of the Iowa K-12 education costs should be paid for by state government revenue sources?

60 percent should be paid by the state.

60% - 21 groups 75% - 2 groups

65% - 5 groups 50% - 1 group

2. What shifts, if any, should be made in the mix of income, sales and property taxes used to finance education?

More emphasis on SALES - 14 groups; INCOME - 10 groups.

Less emphasis on PROPERTY - 14 groups

15 groups Check here for No Change.

3. Should local authority to replace property taxes with local option income and sales taxes be expanded for purposes of financing education?

7 groups Yes 19 groups No 6 groups Not Sure.

INCOME AND PROPERTY WEALTH CRITERIA. Recently there has been some interest in adding "income wealth to property wealth" in the foundation formula. Education research indicates that adding an income index to the present criteria would shift aid from school districts that are "property poor and income rich" to districts that are "property rich and income poor." However, the districts that are both "property rich and income rich" and both "property poor and income poor" would likely remain unaffected. In addition, the variation in school property tax levy rates across Iowa school districts would increase.

4. Which of the following options do you prefer?

- 13 groups a. Continue the present formula and equalize property wealth per pupil across Iowa school districts.
- 5 groups b. Add income wealth to the foundation formula even though it will likely increase the variation in school property tax rates across the state.
- 12 groups c. Not sure.
- 1 group d. Other _____

FUTURE PHASE FUNDING. During the past three years, an Education Excellence Program was funded in three phases. This "phase funding" has been allocated outside of the foundation formula to increase the minimum teacher salary levels to \$18,000 per year, inservice training, performance pay and innovative programs. In the 1988-89 school year, the phase moneys account for about \$92 million or 5 percent of the total Iowa school bill.

5. In the future should the phase moneys be funded outside of the foundation formula distribution or incorporated in the foundation formula?

- 12 groups a. The phase moneys should remain outside of the foundation formula funding.
- 3 groups b. The phase moneys should be incorporated into the foundation program funding base, but they should continue to be distributed as they are now and not be redistributed as the current foundation formula funds.
- 0 _____ c. The phase moneys should be incorporated into the foundation program funding base and redistributed using the current foundation formula to equalize school spending per pupil?
- 1 group d. Not sure.
- 15 groups e. Other Put Phase I, II In Formula; Keep Phase III out.

Iowa TOTALS

COUNTY _____

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IOWA EDUCATION SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION NUMBER 2.

DIRECTIONS: Please have your group solve as many of the following issues as time permits. After your group has discussed each issue, determine the best option by majority vote and record the votes on this tally sheet. After you have reported the results to the meeting audience, turn in this sheet to the meeting host so that the results can be tallied statewide.

PHANTOM PUPILS. Many states distribute school aid on a per pupil basis. When school districts experience dramatic declines in pupils, they often receive less state aid. In turn, these districts must typically reduce expenditures on instruction and other school functions. Presently, Iowa districts experiencing declining enrollment are allowed to count a portion of enrollment from previous years so that the spending adjustments may occur over a longer period. These weights are called "phantom pupils."

Education research indicates that spending adjustments in response to declining enrollment are typically made in the year of decline or the following three years. The weights in the Iowa school aid law count "phantom" pupils back to 1978. As a result, the Iowa school aid formula includes \$83 million in funding for 31,000 phantom pupils that do not exist. These phantom pupils and funds are spread across Iowa school districts. As a result, under present law it is possible for two districts with identical enrollments to have large differences in the size of their controlled school budgets.

1. Should the Iowa school aid formula continue to include some type of "phantom pupil" concept for spreading the declining enrollment adjustments over a period of years or should the concept of "phantom pupils" be eliminated from the formula?

13 groups

Continue phantoms

29 groups

Eliminate phantoms

1 group

Not Sure

2. If the concept of "phantom pupils" is to be eliminated from the present school aid formula, what should the \$83 million in phantom pupil funding be used for? (Check one.)

0

Shift it to other government functions.

19 groups

Retain it in the budgets of the local school districts that presently have the phantom pupils.

20 groups

Redistribute it among all school districts on a per pupil basis so as to finance other education programs? If so, how many years should be used to phase in the adjustments?

2 groups

Not sure.

3. If some form of phantom pupils are continued, we should:
(Check one.)

3 groups Continue the present method of calculating phantoms back to 1978 enrollment levels.

32 groups Reduce phantoms to a three year adjustment in state aid.

4 groups Not sure.

→ A FEW QUESTIONED THIS NUMBER.

4. If phantom pupils funding is to be reduced or phased out, how many years should be used to make the adjustment? 5 YEARS.

5 YEARS - 12 groups; 3 YEARS - 7 groups; 4 YEARS - 5 groups; other - 3 groups

FUNDING NEW STANDARDS. New standards for accreditation of Iowa schools are scheduled to go into effect July 1, 1989. According to the economic impact statement prepared by the Department of Education, lengthening the school calendar and adding a "full-day" kindergarten may cost as much as \$50 million. However, some of the other requirements are estimated to have no significant cost.

5. Should state mandates for new accreditation requirements and other new programs to improve the excellence of the educational opportunity in Iowa be:

0 a. Funded primarily by local districts.

15 groups b. Shared according to the present state and local mix of school revenues.

25 groups c. Funded primarily by the state.

1 group d. Not sure.

2 groups e. Other

6. Should state mandates for new accreditation requirements and other new programs be funded outside of the equalization formula or should the revenue for state mandates be generated through the equalization formula?

12 groups a. Outside the equalization formula.

21 groups b. Within the equalization formula.

2 groups c. Other

6 groups d. Not sure.

IOWA TOTALS

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IOWA EDUCATION
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION NUMBER 3

COUNTY

DIRECTIONS: Please have your group solve as many of the following issues as time permits. After your group has discussed each issue, determine the best option by majority vote and record the votes on this tally sheet. After you have reported the results to the meeting audience, turn in this sheet to the meeting host so that the results can be tallied statewide.

DISCRETIONARY SPECIAL PURPOSE LEVIES: Presently, \$83 million in 13 special purpose property tax levies are implemented across Iowa school districts. Nine of these special purpose levies require board action, but not voter approval. These include levies for the schoolhouse site, special education, early retirement, dropout prevention, gifted and talented, school improvement, unemployment compensation, library and tort. Five special purpose levies require voter approval. These are enrichment, schoolhouse, lease-purchase, recreation and bonded indebtedness. In general, special purpose levies may only be spent for the purposes specified and their are legal limits on all but the unemployment compensation and tort levy. The limits on four of the special purpose levies are equalized across districts. However, the limits on the five special purpose schoolhouse levys are not equalized allowing similar sized districts to spend different amounts on school buildings depending upon their local property wealth.

1. Special purpose levies allow a school district to raise additional funds above the foundation levy. Should the special purpose levys be consolidated into fewer levys or into the foundation levy?

- 9 groups Yes, consolidate the special purpose levies.
- 24 groups No, continue special purpose levies as they are
- 2 groups Not Sure.

2. Should local school boards have more, the same, or less authority to levy the current special purpose levys without voter approval?

- 11 groups Give school board more authority.
- 22 groups Continue the same authority.
- 3 groups Give school boards less authority.
- 3 groups Not sure.

3. Should the limits on all special purpose school house levies be equalized across school districts in order to reduce the variation of school building expenditures due to district wealth differences?

- 6 groups equalize school house levies.
- 22 groups Continue current levy limits.
- 6 groups Not sure.

SCHOOL BUILDING SUPPORT. Iowa state government has traditionally supported school general fund programs and has not used state funds to support building school houses. Starting a state supported school building program may tend to reward districts waiting to build new schools and penalize those districts completing construction, unless all school districts receive some future commitment of funds.

4. Should state government shift some support to finance new school buildings or should it continue supporting programs only?

- 33 groups Continue state support for school general fund program only.
1 group Shift some state support to financing new buildings of districts that plan on building in the next few years.
0 Shift some state support to finance new schools only if all districts receive some future commitment of funds.
0 Not sure.

OPEN ENROLLMENT. This is the first year in which Minnesota has fully implemented a policy of allowing students to attend any school district in the state. Presumably, students who have parents with financial resources would migrate toward "higher quality" schools regardless of size. In addition, state aid and local property tax dollars follow the student to their new school district. While some constraints could be placed on the use of open enrollment, the fundamental question is whether a student who resides in one school district should be allowed to attend school in another school district as long as the parents are willing and able to cover the added transportation or lodging costs?

5. Should open enrollment be tried on an experimental basis in Iowa?

9 groups Yes.

17 groups No.

9 groups Not sure.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IOWA EDUCATION
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION NUMBER 4.

DIRECTIONS: Please have your group solve as many of the following issues as time permits. After your group has discussed each issue, determine the best option by majority vote and record the votes on this tally sheet. After you have reported the results to the meeting audience, turn in this sheet to the meeting host so that the results can be tallied statewide.

EQUALIZATION AND FOUNDATION AID. The Iowa School Foundation formula requires all school districts to levy a property tax of \$5.40/1000 valuation. Iowa school districts, on average, levy an additional \$3.32/1000 valuation above the required levy which generates about \$240 million statewide. However, this "second effort" levy varies from \$.43/1000 to \$6.70/1000 valuation depending upon the school district. State aid is distributed so to partially equalize the revenues per pupil raised across districts with variations in property wealth per pupil. In other words, "property poor" districts receive more state aid per pupil and "property rich" districts receive less.

Under the current formula, the required levy of \$5.40/1000 is equalized, but the "discretionary levy" above the \$5.40 is not. Presently, about 5 percent of Iowa school districts have greater than \$400,000 in property valuation per pupil while 2/3s of Iowa school districts have less than \$200,000 in property valuation per pupil. As a result, when the "second effort" levy is applied uniformly to property in both groups at \$3.32/1000 valuation, the five percent "property rich" districts raise more than \$1328 per child, while two-thirds of the Iowa districts that are "property poor" raise less than \$664 per child.

Further complicating the issue is the fact that, most of the "property rich districts" are small rural districts with higher costs per pupil and most of the "property poor" districts are the large urban districts.

1. Which of the following options do you favor?

- 10 groups a. Make no change in the present equalized required levy of \$5.40/1000 for all districts plus the unequalized "second effort" foundation levy.
- 6 groups b. The state should provide funding to equalize the "second effort" levy and reduce the \$6.30/1000 levy rate variation across Iowa school districts.
- 2 groups c. The state should impose one statewide uniform required levy rate for all school property taxes statewide.
- 5 groups d. Not sure.

TEACHER PAY. Teachers are paid according to various criteria. Among the most often used criteria are level of training, years of experience and teaching performance.

2. How much weight should be placed on each criterion when determining pay raises?

25	percent for training.	50%-2, 40%-2, 33%-1, 30%-3, 25%-6, 20%-3, 10%-1
25	percent for years of experience.	50-1, 33-2, 25-5, 20-3, 15-1, 10-4, 5-1
50	percent for teaching performance rating.	
	percent other.	100%-1, 80%-1, 60%-4, 50%-8, 30%-3, 25%-1
100 %		

TELECOMMUNICATIONS. The 1987 General Assembly initiated the development of a telecommunications system which may be used for education purposes, including classroom instruction. The legislation included a provision which prohibits the use of telecommunications as the "exclusive means to provide any course which is required by the minimum educational standards for approval or accreditation." In addition, school districts using interactive telecommunications to teach courses are required to have a certified teacher present in the receiving classroom.

3. Should the state continue the prohibition against exclusive telecommunications use in courses, such as foreign languages, if the course is used to meet minimum accreditation standards or should the decision be left to the discretion of the local school board?

- 5 groups a. Continue current prohibition of telecommunications for courses used to meet minimum standards.
- 14 groups b. Allow local school boards to decide which courses are appropriate for using the telecommunications technologies.
- 3 groups c. Not sure.

4. Should the state continue to require a certified teacher to be present in all classrooms receiving courses via telecommunications or should the state allow teacher aides or other non certified personnel to maintain discipline and host the receiving classrooms?

- 7 groups a. Continue present policy of requiring certified teachers in all classrooms receiving courses via telecommunications.
- 12 groups b. Allow non certified teacher aides to host classrooms receiving courses via telecommunications.
- 2 groups c. Not sure.

Iowa Totals

COUNTY _____

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IOWA EDUCATION SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION NUMBER 5.

DIRECTIONS: Please have your group solve as many of the following issues as time permits. After your group has discussed each issue, determine the best option by majority vote and record the votes on this tally sheet. After you have reported the results to the meeting audience, turn in this sheet to the meeting host so that the results can be tallied statewide.

TRANSPORTATION AID. Transportation costs account for about 5 percent of Iowa school costs. Transportation costs are presently included in the state foundation formula used to support general programs. However, the transportation expenditures in some districts are typically over \$300/pupil while other districts spend less than \$100/pupil. Because of their geographic size, the geographically large districts presently must spend a higher proportion of their equalization aid and controlled budget on transportation. It has been suggested that transportation costs should be taken out of the foundation formula and controlled portion of the budget and funded separately, so that administration, instruction and building operations and maintenance funding is equalized across districts.

1. Should transportation assistance be taken out of the foundation formula and financed separately or should it continue to be equalized along with the educational program costs?

17 groups a. Yes, fund transportation separately.

8 groups b. No, continue the present method of funding transportation.

4 groups c. Not sure.

2. If transportation is categorically funded outside of the foundation formula, what share of statewide transportation costs should be paid by the state and what share should be paid by taxpayers who live in the local school districts?

80	percent state government share	100%-2, 90%-1, 85%-5, 70%-1, 65%-1
20	percent local district share	60%-1, 50%-2, 33%-1, 0%-1
	not sure	100%-1, 67%-1, 50%-2, 40%-1, 35%-1, 30%-1
		20%-5, 10%-1, 0%-2

SCHOOL SHARING INCENTIVES. Iowa presently provides three school sharing incentives in the present school aid formula. School districts may receive an extra "phantom pupil" weight (about \$1600 for a district budget with 50 percent state financing) for sharing certain math, science and foreign language courses. For sharing a school administrator, school districts receive one-twentieth of a "phantom pupil" time their enrollment up to about \$25,000 for a district budget with 50 percent state financing. Third, school districts may receive an extra one-half "phantom

pupil" for each pupil in a whole grade sharing program. For a district budget with 50 percent state financing, sharing 100 pupils would generate about \$80,000 more state aid. Recent Iowa education research indicates that both large and small schools are involved with sharing programs.

3. Should school sharing incentives be expanded, reduced or continued as currently offered?

5 groups a. Expand school sharing incentives. If so, how? _____

18 groups b. Continue current school sharing incentives.

6 groups c. Reduce current school sharing incentives. If so, how? _____

0 d. Not sure.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION STANDARDS. A 1988 proposal would have changed who sets the teacher licensing standards. Presently the the nine member bipartisan State Board of Education is appointed by the governor. These members are to be knowledgeable about education and they presently have the responsibility for setting teacher certification standards. The new proposal would have set up a board comprised by a majority of certified educators to set these standards.

4. Who should set the teacher certification standards?

24 groups a. Continue licensing by the State Board of Education.

2 groups b. Set of a board comprised of certified educators.

2 groups c. Not sure.

1 group d. Other _____

5. Which of the following criteria should be used to license teachers?

9 groups a. Teachers should have a minimum grade point average before receiving a teaching certificate?

22 groups b. Teachers should be evaluated in the classroom before receiving a teaching certificate?

10 groups c. Teachers should be given a comprehensive oral exam by a panel of examiners before receiving a teaching certificate?

2 groups d. All education majors who graduate from college should be allowed to teach if they choose to do so and if they can find a job.

1 group e. Not sure.

Iowa Totals

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IOWA EDUCATION SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION NUMBER 6.

COUNTY _____

DIRECTIONS: Please have your group solve as many of the following issues as time permits. After your group has discussed each issue, determine the best option by majority vote and record the votes on this tally sheet. After you have reported the results to the meeting audience, turn in this sheet to the meeting host so that the results can be tallied statewide.

SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING INCENTIVES. In addition to conducting local restructuring studies free to local school districts and providing incentives for sharing programs, Iowa provides two school reorganization incentives for districts with less than 600 pupils in the Iowa school aid formula. First, an initial property tax credit of \$1/1000 is provided to property taxpayers in the reorganized district. This property tax credit is phased out over five years. Second, the state of Iowa guarantees no property tax rate increase for five years for the districts to be reorganized. Presently, there is no limit to the amount of aid that may be provided under this provision.

1. Should school restructuring incentives be expanded, reduced or continued as currently offered?

- 10 groups a. Increase the incentives for school consolidation. If so, how? _____
- 19 groups b. Continue current incentives for school reorganizations.
- 3 groups c. Reduce the school reorganization incentives. If so, how? _____
- 2 groups d. Not sure. _____

CORE COURSE REQUIRMENTS. Recently, Iowa school accreditation standards have been changed to require local school districts to offer 41 course units in grades nine thru twelve instead of 27. The new requirements include 6 units of English, 6 units of math, 5 units of science, 5 units of social studies, 4 units of foreign language, 10 units of vocational courses, 3 units of fine arts, 1 unit of health and 1 unit of physical education. While the minimum accreditation standards are set by the state, the graduation requirements are set by the local school board. A student will take a maximum of 28 course units during a four year high school career, if there are seven class periods during the school day.

2. Do you support the new standards?

- 30 groups a. Yes.
- 1 group b. No.
- 2 groups c. Not sure.

3. Do you believe that there is too much or too little emphasis being placed on certain courses being taught in high school?

Emphasis is just right. 16 groups

Too much emphasis on the following subject areas. For. LANG. - 4 groups
Voc. EO. - 2, HEALTH - 1, Music - 1, ART - 1

Too little emphasis on the following subject areas. For. LANG. - 4 groups
Voc. EO. - 4, English - 3, MATH - 2, GEOGRAPHY - 1, HEALTH - 1, COMPUTER - 1
LIFE SKILLS - 1, STUDY SKILLS - 1, COLLEGE PREP. - 1, BASICS - 1.

LIMITS ON SCHOOL BUDGETS. Presently, local school spending is limited by a stat. "controlled budget" limitation on each district. The controlled budget equals "district costs" multiplied by weighted enrollment plus annual allowable growth. The district cost for each district is based on the 1971-72 general fund budget expenditures. The allowable growth set by the legislature and is normally based on the growth in state revenues. As a result, the spending limits per pupil have never been equalized across school districts and the present school district spending limits are based on the relative levels of spending during the 1971-72 school year.

4. Which of the following options do you favor?

- 7 groups a. Continue the current method of controlled budget expenditures.
- 10 groups b. Explore equalizing the spending limitations across all school districts.
- 10 groups c. Allow local school boards to determine their spending limits if revenues are equalized by district wealth.
- 1 group d. Other
- 2 groups e. Not sure.

EQUALIZATION CRITERIA. Should state school aid dollars be distributed to equalize the ability to all districts to spend the same amount of dollars per pupil or should the equalization criteria be adjusted for districts variations in costs per pupil across district enrollment size groups?

5. Which of the following options do you prefer?

- 6 groups a. Equalize with no adjustments for district size.
- 16 groups b. Equalize with adjustments for district size.
- 3 groups c. Not sure.

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF PROGRAM

1. Please rate the effectiveness of the teleconference in the following areas.

a. Meeting your learning objectives.

50	Excellent	277	Average	4	Not Effective
384	Good	28	Poor		

b. Presenting a balanced discussion of the topic.

104	Excellent	185	Average	2	Not Effective
411	Good	23	Poor		

2. Please rate the effectiveness of the following components of the teleconference.

a. The pre-video transmission activity.

65	Excellent	229	Average	19	Not Effective
329	Good	52	Poor		

b. The Teleconference tape and panel presentation.

110	Excellent	196	Average	5	Not Effective
403	Good	28	Poor		

c. Local "wrap around" discussion program.

175	Excellent	144	Average	8	Not Effective
368	Good	17	Poor		

3. How involved did you feel during the teleconference?

58	Excellent	258	Average	7	Not Effective
380	Good	41	Poor		

4. How useful do you think future teleconferences will be for your information /education needs?

156	Excellent	161	Average	4	Not Effective
394	Good	18	Poor		

Site Coordinator's Teleconference Evaluation

1a. How was the technical quality of the video?

49 Excellent 15 Adequate 0 Poor

1b. How was the technical quality of the audio?

51 Excellent 8 Adequate 4 Poor

2. Did the teleconference match the expectations set by the promotional literature?

49 Yes 13 No

3. Did the equipment function well?

66 Yes 2 No

4. Did the information packets arrive in time?

41 Yes 17 No

5. Did the registration process go smoothly?

57 Yes 8 No

6. Were there adequate conference materials for the number of participants?

66 Yes 0 No