



League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

FINANCING EDUCATION
STUDY GUIDE PACKET

Date: January 18, 1991
To: Local League Presidents/Financing Education Chairs
From: Carolyn Lyngdal (612) 937-2596
Suzanne Blue (612) 388-7506

In this president's mailing, you are receiving:

- Discussion Guide for Facts and Issues #2, HOW SHOULD WE PAY FOR OUR SCHOOLS? Financing Education in Minnesota
- Consensus Questions: Unit meetings can be held in February, March or April, but we must have the reports back by April 26, 1991. If you have your consensus meeting scheduled after April 26, please call one of the co-chairs and make arrangements for late consideration. We must have the consensus ready for presentation to the State Board in May and State Convention in early June.
- LWVMN Financing Education positions from 1985-87 Program for Action.
- Order form for additional Facts and Issues #2 (a copy will be mailed to every League member by February 1, 1991.)
- Reservation form for videotape of April 1990 FOCUS meeting.

We are about two weeks late in mailing the second Facts and Issues, but since meetings were supposed to be scheduled for Feb.-April, we trust that this has not inconvenienced any of you. Please feel free to call on the study co-chairs or any member of the study committee with any questions.

The videotape, while not of the greatest quality (the originals were re-used by the cable company), are very helpful for background on the study. We highly recommend that the study chairs watch it in its entirety and decide how much or little they want to use at unit meetings and/or public discussions.

Now is the time to pull out your copy of the survey you did for the study committee last January-February. Those numbers will begin to mean something to you now. We also suggest that you use your local school officials (business managers, superintendents, etc.) to answer those questions you have at the local level. For example: Is your district receiving Supplemental Revenue, T & E Revenue, Compensatory Funding, etc.? Did your district transfer general funds to transportation? Each League will have different questions depending upon their local school district.

Good luck with this second part of the Financing Education study, and we are eagerly waiting for those consensus forms to come in.

Study Committee: Suzanne Blue, LWV Red Wing (612) 388-7506; Carolyn Lyngdal, LWV MEPH (612) 937-2596; Janet Cardle, LWV Edina (612) 922-2728; Mindy Greiling, LWV Roseville (612) 490-0013; Mary Hepokoski, LWV Golden Valley (612) 541-9801; Karen Ringsrud, LWV Mpls. (612) 922-0555; Ellen Mork, LWV St. Cloud (612) 426-5213; Sue Wolsfeld, LWV White Bear Lake (612) 426-5213.

FINANCING EDUCATION DISCUSSION GUIDE

TO: Local League Education Study Chairs

FROM: Suzanne Blue, 612/388-7506
Carolyn Lyngdal, 612/937-2596
LWVMN Financing Education Study Committee

DATE: January 18, 1991

SUBJECT: DISCUSSION GUIDE
LWV MINNESOTA FINANCING EDUCATION STUDY

FACTS & ISSUES #2, January 1991
"HOW SHOULD WE PAY FOR OUR SCHOOLS? FINANCING
EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA"

CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF FINANCING EDUCATION STUDY:

The first part of the LWVMN study of financing education in Minnesota was published in August 1990. Many of the state Leagues have already had one general and/or unit meeting which was intended to examine the existing Basic Education Funding Formula, its revenue sources, distribution and expenditures. Facts and Issues #1 was intended as a citizens guide to a complex system--the financing of public education: a comprehensible simplification of a complex system.

Facts & Issues #2 is intended to build on the information presented in Facts & Issues #1: to go beyond how do we pay for our schools to how should we pay for our schools. It reviews certain school district funding components, primarily but not solely, in terms of student equity. Specifically, the study reviews bond and excess referendum levies, compensation for training and experience of a school district's staff, cost of living differences, special education and supplemental revenue. It identifies some positive and negative characteristics of each--the shortcomings and strengths of the current system. Finally, the study reviews the equity in education lawsuit with edited excerpts of statements by the plaintiffs, the defendants, and the intervenors.

At the end of this study and discussion, LWV members and citizens should be better able to understand the various philosophical issues of school finance in order to understand and respond to current legislative proposals and initiatives that relate to the education of Minnesota's children.

CONSENSUS QUESTIONS:

Eight consensus questions have been identified by the Financing Education Committee in order to clarify and expand our current LWVMN education position. These are due to the LWVMN office by April 26, 1991. If any local Leagues have meetings scheduled after April 26, please call one of the financing education co-chairs and make

FINANCING EDUCATION DISCUSSION GUIDE (page 2)

arrangements for late consideration. We must have the consensus ready for presentation to the State Convention in early June.

RESOURCE MATERIALS:

-Mailed to every member of the LWVMN:

Facts & Issues #2, "How Should We Pay for Our Schools? Financing Education in Minnesota," January, 1991 Mailed early February, 1991

Facts & Issues #1, "How We Pay for Our Schools: Financing Education in Minnesota," August 1990, mailed September 1990

-Included in materials to LWV Education chairs, mailed to local LWVMN presidents, January 1991:

Discussion Guide

Consensus Questions - Due to the LWVMN office, April 26, 1991

LWVMN Financing Education positions

-Available from LWVMN, 550 Rice Street, St. Paul, MN 55103 - 224-5445 - Copies available by reservation (form included in the mailing):

Edited Video tape of Part 1 State focus meeting, April 1990 (approximately 35 minutes and unedited part 2, lawsuit discussion (about 50 minutes) -- might be used at general or unit meetings.

-Additional resource materials which might be of use to discussion leaders (optional):

Metropolitan Desegregation: An analysis of Possible Solutions in the Twin Cities of Minnesota. Council of Metropolitan Area Leagues of Women Voters, Lis Jones, editor. January 1991.

How Will We Pay for Our Schools? Financing Public Education in Minnesota K-12. LWVMN, 1982. Obtain from local League library.

Criteria for evaluating state education finance proposals. April 25, 1990. State of Minnesota. Department of Education. May be obtained from Tom Melcher, 612/297-2194.

General Education Funding Proposal. April 4, 1989. State of Minnesota. Department of Education. Education Finance and Analysis, 612/296-2400.

School District Spending. February, 1990. State of Minnesota. Office of the Legislative Auditor.

FINANCING EDUCATION DISCUSSION GUIDE (page 3)

Minnesota School Finance: A Guide for Legislators. February, 1990. Strom, Tim. State of Minnesota. House of Representatives, Research Department, 612/296-1886.

School District Profiles, 1988-89. August, 1990. Minnesota Department of Education. Request copy from Minnesota Department of Education, Education Finance and Analysis Section, 537 Capitol Square Building, St. Paul, MN 55101 (612) 296-2400.

Miscellaneous news articles, clippings.

BEFORE THE UNIT MEETINGS:

Remind members to bring their copy of both Financing Education studies (Facts & Issues #1 [mailed to all members September 1990] and #2 [mailed early February 1991]) to their unit meetings.

Arrange for use of video tape from LWVMN office and arrange for VCR (VHS format) at meeting site if desired.

SUGGESTED UNIT MEETING DISCUSSION GUIDE

Time suggestions are based on a 2 hour meeting and total 1 hour and 45 minutes. Page references are to the current study, Facts & Issues #2, January 1991. References to Facts & Issues #1, August 1990, and other references are so noted. Additional comments and suggestions are included.

I. INTRODUCTION TO STUDY: (10 minutes)

See introduction to Facts & Issues #2 and Background and Objectives of Financing Education Study in this discussion guide.

Additional Comments:

As shown in Facts & Issues #1, "How We Pay for Our Schools," the financing of education in Minnesota, as elsewhere, is not a simple matter. All districts, when looking from a narrow perspective, will probably claim that they have unique problems which are complicated by lack of sufficient funds to educate the students in their district. Rural districts might claim they need more funding for sparsity; property wealthy inner ring suburban districts for their relatively expensive, high seniority faculty; property poor districts for expenses which cannot be raised through referendum levies, both excess levy and bond referendums; and urban districts for their increasingly diverse student population and perceived need for reduced class size. Yet we live in a time of diminishing financial resources with ever increasing needs and demands.

All of these differing needs are funded to a certain extent. The question is -- is it sufficient, and is it equitable? The question might be asked, is the current system as equitable as possible for the greatest number of students? Another

FINANCING EDUCATION DISCUSSION GUIDE (page 4)

question might be, who do we want to be equitable to; should it be to students, to districts, or to citizens at large (taxpayers)? How do we balance these often conflicting needs?

All of this is being played out, to some extent in what is commonly called the Equity Lawsuit. The outcome of this suit, scheduled to be heard in early 1991, may have far reaching effects on the financing of education in Minnesota.

It is hoped that the unit discussions will give League members a background upon which to evaluate the current situation and future proposals that will inevitably come. The consensus will give the League of Women Voters a strong position for action.

II. LWVMN FINANCING EDUCATION POSITION: (5 minutes)

See copy of LWVMN Financing Education position included in this mailing.

The present overall financing of education position of the LWVMN states that,

"All Minnesota children should have equal access to a good public education. A student's access to a good education should not depend on the wealth of his or her school district nor upon the willingness of local voters to tax themselves. State funding for education should be at a level that makes programs of comparable substance and quality available to all."

The concept of equal access to a good public education, independent of the wealth of school district or the willingness of local voters to tax themselves, has long been a position of the LWVMN. This position predates the so called Minnesota Miracle of 1971 which was supported by the LWV. However, the details of our position may be contradictory and the wording of the overall position unclear. (See LWVMN Position and supporting detail number 5 under "Any revisions in the current school finance law should:") The present consensus will be used to clarify these inconsistencies.

The present general method of school finance had its inception in the 1971 Omnibus Tax Law (the Minnesota Miracle). Equalizing tax effort rather than equalized school expenditures was the principal thrust of the law. The option of the excess levy referendum was created in 1971 - but rarely used until recent years when, for a variety of reasons, school districts began to seek this source of funding. In 1981, 171 of the states 438 school districts had excess levy referenda in place. By '88-'89, 239 of the states 436 districts had local referendum levies in place.

III. FAIRNESS AND EQUITY: (10 minutes)

Review the concepts of fairness and equity as described on pp. 1-5 of the Facts & Issues #2. Note that equitable funding is not equal funding. This recognizes the existence of legitimate cost differences among districts. Which of these cost differences should be funded is asked in consensus questions #1 and #2.

FINANCING EDUCATION DISCUSSION GUIDE (page 5)

IV. CONSENSUS QUESTION 1. (12 minutes)

What cost differences between districts should be funded?

Note: Some, but not all, of the cost differences in consensus questions 1 and 2 are fully explained in the study(s). Those differences which are generally accepted concepts of difference are not. Additional comments are included in this discussion guide for your information.

a. Sparsity (Facts & Issues #2, page 1)

According to the House of Representatives Research Department, "Minnesota School Finance: A Guide for Legislators," sparsity revenue is intended to provide additional revenue to geographically large districts that have relatively few students. This reflects sparsity and isolation: it is limited to districts with less than 400 secondary students or an elementary school located 20 or more miles from the nearest elementary school and also has fewer than 20 pupils per elementary grade.

b. Training and Experience (Facts & Issues #2, page 4)

c. Cost of Living (Facts & Issues #2, page 5)

d. Desegregation (Facts & Issues #2, page 7)

e. Transportation (Facts & Issues #1, page 8)

According to the Minnesota Auditor, "School District Spending" report of February, 1990, about 1/5 of the state's districts transferred money from their general fund to make up for transportation program losses.

f. Facilities (new and maintenance/renovation) (Facts & Issues #2, page 2)

g. Other

VI. CONSENSUS QUESTION #2. (12 minutes)

What cost differences between students should be funded?

a. Pupil unit weighting (Facts & Issues #1, p. 7)

Answer in terms of the concept of per pupil unit (ppu) weighting, not the specifics of the current formula.

b. Special Education (Facts & Issues #2, page 6, Facts & Issues #1, page 8, and LWVMN position based on 1967 study.)

c. Gifted (Facts & Issues #1, page 8 under State Restrictions and LWVMN position based on 1967 study.)

FINANCING EDUCATION DISCUSSION GUIDE (page 6)

- d. Poverty/Compensatory aid (Facts & Issues #2, page 1, and Facts & Issues #1, page 7)
- e. Language Differences (ESL/LEP) (Facts & Issues #2, page 1)
- f. Other

VI. EQUITY AND REFERENDUM LEVIES (15 minutes)

Review material covered on pages 2-4 in Facts & Issues #2 concerning equity and referendum levies, pages 8-9 concerning the equity lawsuit and then page 3 giving some proposals for change. This material includes important background material for the following consensus questions.

VII. CONSENSUS QUESTION #3 (5 minutes)

Do differing community values justify different levels of expenditures for local program offerings?

Additional Comments:

This question relates to the idea of local control and that all districts and all program offerings do not need to be identical in order to be equitable. If these differences, based on a community's values require different levels of spending, are they then equitable? See also LWVMN position of 1983 concerning local levies to maintain local choice.

VIII. CONSENSUS QUESTION #4 (5 minutes)

Should the State of Minnesota continue to allow local school districts to raise additional money from property tax with local excess referendum levies? (Facts & Issues #2, pages 2 and 8-9)

IX. CONSENSUS QUESTION #5 (5 minutes)

If local excess referendum levies continue to be allowed as a component of school funding, should they: (Facts & Issues #2, pages 2-4)

(Answer these questions regardless of your answer to question #4. That is, even if you are opposed to the use of local referendum levies, choose which of these funding mechanisms you prefer if they remain as an option.)

- a. remain as they are, funded solely by local property taxes?
- b. be equalized by the State of Minnesota?
- c. be capped by the State of Minnesota?
- d. other?

FINANCING EDUCATION DISCUSSION GUIDE (page 7)

X. CONSENSUS QUESTION #6 (5 minutes)

Should the State of Minnesota continue to require school districts to raise money from property taxes for building construction and debt service with local bond referendums? (Facts & Issues #2, page 2)

XI. CONSENSUS QUESTION #7 (5 minutes)

If local bond referendums for buildings and renovation continue to be the method used for funding debt service, should they: (Facts & Issues #2, pages 2-4)

(Answer these questions regardless of your answer to question #6.)

- a. remain as they are, funded solely by local property taxes?
- b. be equalized by the State of Minnesota?
- c. require approval of need by the State Department of Education?

Currently the State Department of Education (SDE) reviews local school district's building and renovation plans proposed for funding through bond referendum. If approval is given, based on SDE criteria, communities need to pass bond referendums by a majority vote. If approval is not granted, communities must approve bond referendums by a 60% margin.

- d. other?

III. CONSENSUS QUESTION #8 (10 minutes)

Regarding supplemental revenue, should the Legislature: (Facts & Issues #2, page 6, and Facts & Issues #1, page 7)

- a. continue it?
- b. eliminate it?
 - 1. immediately?
 - 2. phase it out gradually?

Additional Comments:

For the '90-'91 school year, all districts are guaranteed at least \$258 ppu more than they received in '87-'88. Because the new general education formula may generate substantially fewer dollars for some districts than they would have received under some previous calculation, they are guaranteed that they will not receive less than they would have under some prior formula calculation. ("Minnesota School Finance: A Guide for Legislators," Minnesota House Research, February 1990.)

EDUCATION

(See Social Policy section for additional positions.)

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

LWVMN Position — Support of increased state responsibility in creating equal public educational opportunities for all Minnesota children through measures to correct racial imbalance.

Details:

- Support of correction of racial imbalance in the schools. The state should have the power to investigate, to set and enforce standards, and to give extra financial help to achieve these standards. (1987)

FINANCING OF EDUCATION

LWVMN Position — All Minnesota children should have equal access to a good public education. A student's access to a good education should not depend on the wealth of his or her school district nor upon the willingness of local voters to tax themselves. State funding for education should be at a level that makes programs of comparable substance and quality available to all.

Details:

- The League of Women Voters of Minnesota supports the concept of the foundation formula program. Any revisions in the current school finance law should:
 - support provision of adequate funding to meet the real costs of education (1983);
 - support encouragement of financial efficiencies (1983);
 - support continuing the concept of state-provided categorical aids (1983), including adequate financing of special aids for children with physical and mental problems, and children with other learning disabilities. Support of funding for special programs for gifted and high potential students (1987);
 - support reorganization of school districts with extremely low enrollments (1983);
 - Support allowing local districts to raise a limited amount of additional funds for supplemental programs through local levies, to maintain local choice and ensure local accountability (1983);
 - support using the income tax as the mainstay of school funding (1983);
 - support maintaining most social and recreational services now offered at schools but seek alternative funding sources for many (1983).
- League members are opposed to continuation of the current Minnesota private school tuition tax deduction. (1983)

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND TENURE

LWVMN Position — Support of improvements in the collective bargaining and tenure laws of the state as they apply to K-12 teachers only.

Details:

- Support of collective bargaining for teachers, with changes in Minnesota's collective bargaining law to:
 - require that teacher bargaining agents and school boards publish first offers and all subsequent written offers during the negotiations.
 - require that arbitrators hearing teacher contracts know school law and procedures.
 - allow a limited number of school board bargaining strategy sessions that are closed to the public.
- Support of the present bargaining law provision that allows parties to negotiations in each district to determine for themselves which items they consider negotiable. If necessary, the district court would make the final decision.
- Support of the school board as the representative of the public in the negotiation process. Neither parent-community advisory committees nor representatives on the negotiation team should be required by the state.
- LWVMN does not support extension of the right to strike.
- Support of Tenure/Continuing Contract laws for teachers, with changes in the current state law to:
 - require periodic review and evaluation of tenured teachers' performance, leading to remedial help when indicated.
 - retain teacher probationary periods, but lengthen the probation period of Continuing Contract teachers. (Continuing Contract does not apply to first class cities.)
 - require school boards to consider factors in addition to order of employment when they must make staff dismissals due to reduction of positions. Such factors include recent teaching experience in the field of certification, program needs of the district, and special expertise of the individual faculty member.
- Opposition to mandatory negotiation of procedures for reducing staff.
- Support for retention of state laws defining fair dismissal procedures. (1978)

LOCAL LEAGUE FINANCING EDUCATION CONSENSUS REPORT FORM

Local League: _____

Name of person preparing report: _____

Phone: _____

Total Membership in your League: _____

Number participating in consensus: _____

DEADLINE: Please return your consensus report to the state League office as soon as possible after your League's consensus meeting. To receive a copy of the report, return it to the state League office by April 26th, 1991.

FINANCING EDUCATION CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

The Minnesota Constitution mandates uniform educational opportunity for Minnesota children.

1. What cost differences between school districts should be funded?

- | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| a. Sparsity | yes _____ | no _____ |
| b. Training and Experience | yes _____ | no _____ |
| c. Cost of Living | yes _____ | no _____ |
| d. Desegregation | yes _____ | no _____ |
| e. Transportation | yes _____ | no _____ |
| f. Facilities (new and maintenance/renovation) | yes _____ | no _____ |
| g. Other _____ | | |

Comments:

2. What cost differences between students should be funded?

- | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| a. Pupil unit weighting | yes _____ | no _____ |
| b. Special education for various handicapping conditions | yes _____ | no _____ |

LOCAL LEAGUE FINANCING EDUCATION CONSENSUS REPORT FORM

Local League: _____

Name of person preparing report: _____

Phone: _____

Total Membership in your League: _____

Number participating in consensus: _____

DEADLINE: Please return your consensus report to the state League office as soon as possible after your League's consensus meeting. The report must be received by the state League office by April 26th, 1991.

FINANCING EDUCATION CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

The Minnesota Constitution mandates uniform educational opportunity for Minnesota children.

1. What cost differences between school districts should be funded?

a. Sparsity

yes _____ no _____

b. Training and Experience

yes _____ no _____

c. Cost of Living

yes _____ no _____

d. Desegregation

yes _____ no _____

e. Transportation

yes _____ no _____

f. Facilities (new and maintenance/renovation)

yes _____ no _____

g. Other _____

Comments:

2. What cost differences between students should be funded?

a. Pupil unit weighting

yes _____ no _____

b. Special education for various handicapping conditions

yes _____ no _____

c. Gifted

yes_____ no_____

d. Poverty (now supported as Compensatory aid and based on AFDC eligibility)

yes_____ no_____

e. Language differences (English as a second Language and Limited English Proficiency)

yes_____ no_____

f. Other_____

Comments:

3. Do differing community values justify different levels of expenditures for local program offerings?

yes_____ no_____

Comments:

4. Should the State of Minnesota continue to allow local school districts to raise additional money from property tax with local excess referendum levies?

yes_____ no_____

Comments:

5. If local excess referendum levies continue to be allowed as a component of school funding, should they

a. remain as they are (funded solely by local property taxes)?

yes_____ no_____

b. be equalized by the State of Minnesota?

yes_____ no_____

c. be capped by the State of Minnesota?

yes_____ no_____

d. Other: _____

Comments:

6. Should the State of Minnesota continue to require school districts to raise money from property taxes for building construction and debt service with local bond referendum levies?

yes_____ no_____

Comments:

7. If local bond referendums for building and/or renovation continue to be the method used for funding debt service, should they:

a. remain as they are, funded solely by local property taxes?

yes_____ no_____

b. be equalized by the State of Minnesota?

yes_____ no_____

c. require approval of need by the State Department of Education?

yes_____ no_____

d. Other? (explain)_____

Comments:

8. Regarding supplemental revenue, should the Legislature:

a. Continue it?

yes_____ no_____

b. Eliminate it?

1. immediately

yes_____ no_____

2. phase it out gradually

yes_____ no_____

Comments:

LWVMN Education Fund, 550 Rice Street, St. Paul, MN 55103

TO: Local League Presidents & Education Study Chairs

FROM: S [redacted] Lyngdal
-chairs

RE: [redacted] gred Issues #2

DATE: [redacted]

Facts and Issues #2, "How Should We Pay for Our Schools?" will be sent by bulk mail to every League member by February 1st, free of charge.

You may order more copies from the LWVMN Office for distribution to school officials, school board members and members of your community. You will want to have a supply on hand for your local public meeting on school finance (see Work Plan and Discussion Guide).

Copies are available at \$1 per copy. Bulk discount rates are:

11-50 copies	10% discount
51-200 copies	20% discount
201- + copies	30% discount

You may pay for your orders with monies from your LWVMN account. Attached is the appropriate form for ordering publications with your EF funds.

Order form for Facts & Issues #2

LWV of: _____

Mail to: _____

Address: _____

Contact Person: _____ Phone: _____

No. of publications _____ @ _____

Total cost \$ _____

You will be billed for publication(s) plus actual postage and handling.

LWVMN Education Fund, 550 Rice Street, St. Paul, MN 55103

TO: Local League Presidents & Education Study Chairs
FROM: Suzanne Blue & Carolyn Lyngdal
Education Study Co-chairs
RE: Ordering Facts & Issues #2
DATE: January 21, 1991

Facts and Issues #2, "How Should We Pay for Our Schools?" will be sent by bulk mail to every League member by February 1st, free of charge.

You may order more copies from the LWVMN Office for distribution to school officials, school board members and members of your community. You will want to have a supply on hand for your local public meeting on school finance (see Work Plan and Discussion Guide).

Copies are available at \$1 per copy. Bulk discount rates are:

11-50 copies	10% discount
51-200 copies	20% discount
201- + copies	30% discount

You may pay for your orders with monies from your LWVMN account. Attached is the appropriate form for ordering publications with your EF funds.

Order form for Facts & Issues #2

LWV of: _____

Mail to: _____

Address: _____

Contact Person: _____ Phone: _____

No. of publications _____ @ _____

Total cost \$ _____

You will be billed for publication(s) plus actual postage and handling.

June, 1989

PROJECT REQUEST TO PURCHASE LWVMNEF PUBLICATIONS

Form A-4

Send to: LWVMNEF, above address (612)224-5445

FROM: Name _____

League of Women Voters of _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Project request to purchase: _____

(name of LWVMNEF publication)

Distribution Plan:

Minimum Order: \$25.00

LWVMNEF PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

All publications will be mailed 3rd Class unless you check one of the following boxes:

☐ Will pick up at the office ☐ Mail First Class ☐ Other _____

The Office will determine the mailing charge and add a 50¢ handling fee.

QUANTITY	LWVMNEF PUB #	TITLE	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
----------	------------------	-------	------------	-------------

Publication(s) cost				
Postage & handling (to be added by office)				
TOTAL (to be billed to local League)				

REQUEST FOR CASH ADVANCE FROM LOCAL LEAGUE EDUCATION FUND ACCOUNT

(Local League must have money in LWVMNEF account before requesting an advance.)

(Minimum Order: \$25.00)

League of Women Voters of _____ Date: _____

Name of person requesting _____ Portfolio _____

Requests a cash advance of \$ _____, plus postage and handling charge, if any, for purchase of LWVMNEF publication ordered above.

(For use by LWVMNEF office only)

Approved on _____ by _____ Cash (\$ _____) advanced on _____ by _____
(date) (amount) (date)Publication sent _____ by _____ Billed by invoice # _____ on _____ by _____
(date) (date)

Local League account reduced by \$ _____; Balance in Local League account \$ _____

PROJECT REQUEST TO PURCHASE LWVMNEF PUBLICATIONS

Form A-4

Send to: LWVMNEF, above address (612)224-5445

DATE: _____

FROM: Name _____ Phone _____

League of Women Voters of _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Project request to purchase: _____
(name of LWVMNEF publication)

Distribution Plan:

Minimum Order: \$25.00

LWVMNEF PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

All publications will be mailed 3rd Class unless you check one of the following boxes:

☐ Will pick up at the office ☐ Mail First Class ☐ Other _____
The Office will determine the mailing charge and add a 50¢ handling fee.

QUANTITY	LWVMNEF PUB #	TITLE	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
Publication(s) cost				
Postage & handling (to be added by office)				
TOTAL (to be billed to local League)				

REQUEST FOR CASH ADVANCE FROM LOCAL LEAGUE EDUCATION FUND ACCOUNT

(Local League must have money in LWVMNEF account before requesting an advance.)

(Minimum Order: \$25.00)

League of Women Voters of _____ Date: _____

Name of person requesting _____ Portfolio _____

Requests a cash advance of \$ _____, plus postage and handling charge, if any, for purchase of LWVMNEF publication ordered above.

(For use by LWVMNEF office only)

Approved on _____ by _____ Cash (\$ _____) advanced on _____ by _____
(date) (amount) (date)

Publication sent _____ by _____ Billed by invoice # _____ on _____ by _____
(date) (date)

Local League account reduced by \$ _____; Balance in Local League account \$ _____

LWVMN Education Fund, 550 Rice Street, St. Paul, MN 55103

FOCUS ON FINANCING EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA

RESERVATION FORM

diff

The Focus on Financing Education in Minnesota, entitled "Are Miracles
Foretold?" is available for presentations and unit meetings. It
includes a video of Part 1 of the April, 1990 meeting (35 minutes)
and an audio of Part 2, lawsuit discussion (about 50 minutes).

To secure your reservation, please enclose a \$25 deposit, which will be
returned to you when your League returns the video tape. If the videotape
is mailed to you, your League will be billed for postage and handling, or
you may pick up the tape from the LWVMNEF office. Plan to return the tape
within 10 days.

LWV of _____ would like to

reserve the Focus on Financing Education in Minnesota video tape
for _____, 1990.

_____ LL will pick up videotape at office.

_____ Please mail videotape to:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Contact person: _____

Phone #: _____

LWVMN Education Fund, 550 Rice Street, St. Paul, MN 55103

FOCUS ON FINANCING EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA

VIDEOTAPE RESERVATION FORM

The Focus on Financing Education in Minnesota, entitled "Are Miracles Forever?" is ready to use for presentations and unit meetings. It includes an edited video of Part 1 of the April, 1990 meeting (35 minutes) and an unedited Part 2, lawsuit discussion (about 50 minutes).

To secure your reservation, please enclose a \$25 deposit, which will be returned to you when your League returns the video tape. If the videotape is mailed to you, your League will be billed for postage and handling, or you may pick up the tape from the LWVMNEF office. Plan to return the tape within 10 days.

LWV of _____ would like to

reserve the Focus on Financing Education in Minnesota video tape for _____, 1990.

_____ LL will pick up videotape at office.

_____ Please mail videotape to:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Contact person: _____

Phone #: _____

FINANCING EDUCATION

LWVMN Position: All Minnesota children should have equal access to a good public education. State funding for education should be at a level that makes programs of comparable substance and quality available to all. A student's access to a good education should not depend on the wealth of his or her school district.

Details

Support of:

- . the concept of the foundation formula program (general education revenue). Any revisions in the current school finance law should support:
 - provision of adequate funding to meet the real cost of education (1983); until the State of Minnesota can ensure consistent and adequate funding of education throughout the state, the LWVMN supports the continuation of local excess referendum levies to raise additional money from property taxes. (1991)
 - state funding of the following cost differences between students - pupil unit weighting, poverty, special education for various handicapping conditions, gifted, and language differences (ESL and LEP). (1991)
 - state funding of the following cost differences between school districts - sparsity, training and experience, desegregation and transportation. (1991)
 - using the income tax as the mainstay of school funding (1983);
 - encouragement of financial efficiencies (1983);
 - requiring school districts to raise money from property taxes for building construction and debt service with local bond referendum levies. Such expenditures must be approved by the State Department of Education. (1991)
 - allowing local districts to raise a limited amount of additional funds for supplemental programs through local levies, to maintain local choice and ensure local accountability (1983);
 - the gradual phasing out of supplemental revenue. (1991)
 - reorganization of school districts with extremely low enrollments (1983);
 - maintaining most social and recreational services now offered at schools but seeking alternative funding sources for many (1983).

Opposition to:

- continuation of the current Minnesota private school tuition tax deduction. (1983)
- state funding of cost of living differences between districts. (1991)