

Board Study Session
Discussion Items
May 17, 2004
5:00 p.m.

- **Budget Development Update** 20 minutes
- **Campus Staffing** 20 minutes
- **Legislative Position Statement** 10 minutes
- **Public Comment** 10 minutes

EISD BUDGET DATA FY - 05 RATIO STUDY w/ projected enrollment

See notes below

The number under each campus name represents the staffing level for that campus

AS OF 2/18/04 RATIOS HIGH RATIOS MIDDLE RATIOS ELEM

	WHS	HC WPA	Eanes	Cedar Valley	Forest	Barton	Bridge	Totals					
(1) FTE'S AT	16	150.4	14.5	55.2	62.3	14	33.9	28.3	29.4	40.4	29.4	52.9	482.1
(2) ENROLLMENT projected for FY -05	2406	800	904	475	396	411	565	741	411	565	741	7109.0	

Note 1: Line (2) enrollment was developed by using the cohort method, then trends for the last two years in order to project transfer students.

Note 2: The number below the school name in Line (1) is the number of FTE's that is allotted to staff your campus programs.

Note 3: Each campus shall allow one(1) FTE for growth/changes

Note 4: The above FTE's exclude: Spec. Ed. teachers and aids, ESL teachers, Principal and Assistant Principals, custodians and food service staff.

corrections
per Prin. Miller
↓

	BCE	CCE	EE	VVE	FTE	BPE
Classrooms	19.00	19.00	22.00	19.00	27.00	36.00
Art	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.30	2.00
GT	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Music	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.30	2.00
PE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.30	2.00
CTC	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00
Accel ed	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00
Office staff	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
TA	0.00	1.00	2.40	1.00	1.75	3.15
Counselor	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Nurse	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	1.00	1.00
Librarian	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	1.00	1.00
Reserve	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.75	0.00
Totals	27.00	28.50	33.90	29.50	40.40	53.15
Student proj	385.00	396.00	475.00	411.00	565.00	758.00
Elementary Staffing						
updated 5-13-04						

corrections
↓

	WRMS	HCMS	
Math	6.60	6.00	
Science	6.40	6.00	
Social Studies	6.40	6.00	Middle School Staffing
Language Arts	8.80	8.00	
Foreign Lang	3.40	2.60	
Music	4.40	4.80	
Power Learning	1.20	0.80	
GT	1.00	1.00	
Other Electives	4.00	5.20	
CTC	0.60	1.00	
Computer Science	1.00	1.10	
PE/Health	5.40	5.00	
Accelerated Ed	1.80	0.90	
Counselor	2.00	2.00	
Counselor secretary	0.94	1.00	
Librarian	0.50	0.50	
Library Assist.	1.00	0.50	
Nurse	1.00	1.00	
Office Staff	3	3.4	
Teacher Assts.	1.6	0.6	
Reserve	1.00	0.00	
Total	62.04	57.80	
Projected Enrollment	904	777-840	
Allocated FTE's	62.3	55.2 to 57.9	
Updated 5-13-04			

	WRMS	HCMS	
Math	0.40	0.67	
Science	0.00	0.67	
Social Studies	0.00	0.67	Middle School Reductions
Language Arts	3.36	0.00	
Foreign Lang	0.00	1.40	
Music	0.60	0.00	
Power Learning	0.00	0.00	
GT	0.00	0.00	
Other Electives	1.63	1.72	
CTC	0.40	0.00	
Computer Science	0.50	0.00	
PE/Health	0.20	1.72	
Accelerated Ed	0.00	0.00	
Counselor	1.00	1.00	
Counselor secretary	0.00	0.00	
Librarian	0.50	0.50	
Library Assist.	0.00	0.50	
Nurse	0.00	1.00	
Office Staff	0	1.1	
Teacher Assts.	0.4	0.4	
Total	8.99	11.35	
additions	2.72	1.7	
total reductions	6.27	9.65	

	FTE's	Reductions	
Math	17.00	0.40	
Science	17.20	0.00	Westlake Staffing & Reductions
Social Studies	18.10	0.00	
Eng/Journ/Speech	19.50	1.00	
Foreign Lang	10.40	0.00	
Music	6.20	0.00	
Hyline (dance)	1.00	0.00	
Visual Arts	4.80	0.00	
Theatre Arts/Debate	1.80	0.00	
Athletics <i>coaches(FTE)</i>	10.50	0.00	
Sac lunch/ACE	2.40	0.00	
PE/Health	4.70	0.00	
Tech/Career Educ	6.80	1.00	
Counselor	7.00	0.00	
Counselor secretary	3.00	0.00	
Librarian	2.00	0.00	
Library Assist.	3.00	0.00	
Nurse	1.60	0.00	
Office Staff	, 13	1	
Total	150.00	3.40	
Projected Enrollment	2394		
Updated 5-13-04			

From: "Donna Halstead" <dhalstead.dcc@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Dallas Citizens Council Membership" <lnunns.dcc@sbcglobal.net>
Date: 5/11/04 11:56:48 AM
Subject: CORRECTED COPY - DCC Position-Public School Finance

Following is the position adopted by the DCC Board regarding tax reform for the financial support of our public schools. It will be released to the press later today.

Thank you.

Donna

Dallas Citizens Council

Public School Finance

May 11, 2004

Our Position

Real Tax Reform Essential. Real school finance reform is essential and it is required now. Additional stop-gap measures, such as the now ten-year old Robin Hood stopgap system, are not acceptable.

Major Property Tax Reductions: Local school property tax rates must be reduced by 50 percent (\$8 billion), which will be a vigorous economic stimulus for consumer spending and capital investment in communities across the state. We believe the positive economic development impact of property tax reductions of this magnitude has been undervalued in the policy discussions on school finance.

30% Local Property Tax Share. Local school property taxes need to be reduced to about 30% of total school costs to maintain the concepts of local control and accountability.

70% State Share. The state's share of school funding needs to be increased to 70 percent which means the state must generate between \$8 and \$10 billion in new annual tax revenues for that purpose.

Additional Provision for Adequate Funding. The state needs to fund between \$2 and \$3 billion of new revenue to adequately fund the schools.

Reformed Business Franchise Tax: The additional state revenue needed to fund property tax relief and higher levels of investment in public education should be derived primarily from a revised business franchise tax that is inclusive and equitable amongst all business taxpayers, with a threshold exemption for small businesses. A reformed franchise tax must correct existing inequities in the current method of state business taxation. A revised franchise tax must be fair and inclusive of all industries and sectors of the state's economy and have the ability to create revenue in paralleling economic growth.

Maintain Local Control and Accountability Over Local Property Tax Policy Decisions. We support the continued authority of local government officials and the voters who elect them over property tax rate and appraisal decisions. We oppose state-mandated caps or limitations which impinge on the ability of local officials to make their own determinations on property tax policies consistent with the needs of their communities.

Background Information

Key School Facts

Funding must at least keep pace student growth rate. There are 42 million public school students in 1,041 districts across Texas. The annual student population growth is 70,000 - the equivalent of adding a school district the size of Austin every year. In 2003-04, operating expenditures are estimated to be \$27 billion. In order just to keep pace with student population growth and inflation, total public school expenditures currently grow by \$1.1 billion a year and that annual amount is projected to grow over the next 10 to 15 years.

Student achievement is improving. Since legislative reforms aimed at improving student achievement took hold more than a decade ago, Texas students have been steadily improving math and reading skills as measured on standardized tests. The gap between minority and Anglo students has narrowed and, in some cases, Texas' gains have slightly outpaced the nation's. Texas is widely regarded as having one of the best accountability systems in the country.

There is greater equity in school funding than a decade ago. Because of legislation in 1993, disparities among the state's school districts to raise funds have improved dramatically. Instead of a 700 to 1 ratio between the richest and poorest districts, there is now a 28 to 1 ratio.

School Funding Concerns

Both high-wealth and low-wealth districts are facing budget crunches. Most school districts have reached or soon will reach the mandated property tax rate cap and thus are wholly dependent on property tax base growth for additional funding. In many cases, this is inadequate to provide funding for new students and "catch-up" funding to restore adequate funding levels. Unacceptable cutbacks are occurring, including the elimination of teaching positions, and educational programs and increased classroom size.

Texas risks endangering recent gains in performance. A cautionary model can be found in the state of California, which because of caps on taxes has severely limited school funding for two decades. As a result, California has gone from boasting one of the best school systems in the nation to one of the worst.

School Property Tax Shortcomings

Over Reliance. The crux of the problems in the Texas school finance is the state's over-reliance on local property taxes to fund public schools. Since 1980, the state's contribution to school funding has shrunk from 52% to 38%, increasing the local school property tax burden to 62%.

Tax Cap. There are two problems with relying so heavily on local property taxes. One, the system's capacity for growth is limited by property tax base and the caps on taxing it. Today, most school districts have reached or will soon reach the \$1.50 tax rate cap. In sum, the school property tax has run its course. Second, the system creates severe economic dislocations such as penalizing home ownership and capital-intensive businesses.

The result? Inadequate funding that is a direct result of a public school funding system that is not up to the task.

First Fix the State Tax System

Unlike most states that primarily rely on three taxes (property tax, sales tax and personal income tax), Texas has relied only on the school property tax and the sales tax to fund most of the costs of state government. Due to the fact that school property taxes are now largely tapped out due to \$1.50 tax cap, it is disturbing that Texas is left with only the sales tax to fund growth. Needless to say, Texas needs to

establish a major new tax revenue source that grows as Texas is projected to grow. Bottom line, the school finance system cannot be fixed unless Texas first boldly reforms the state tax system.