

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

Ad Hoc Committee on Education Cost Sharing and Choice Funding

**Draft Minutes
(Subject to Change)
Monday, January 24, 2011
9:30 a.m.
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 307A
Hartford, Connecticut**

Committee members present: Joseph Brennan, Joseph Cirsuolo, George Coleman, Sherri DiNello, James Finley, Alex Johnston, Patrice McCarthy, Sharon Palmer, Allan Taylor, Dudley Williams, John Yrchik

Committee members absent: Vincent Candelora, Kathy Guay, Deborah Heinrich, Douglas McCrory, Fred McKinney

I. Call to Order, Welcome, Greetings

Chairman Allan Taylor called the meeting to order at 9:50 a.m.

II. Approval of Minutes of January 10, 2011, Committee Meeting

Mr. Cirsuolo moved, Ms. DiNello seconded, to approve the minutes of the January 10, 2011, Committee meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

III. Consensus on Recommendations to Submit to State Board of Education: Core Values and Design Principles for a Public Education Funding System

Design principles 3, 5, and 7, as follows, were considered as consensus statements by the Work Group which met on January 20, 2011:

3. While serving programmatic goals, school districts must have flexibility to deploy categorical and other funding in ways that respond to student need and to develop incentives to economize.
5. Any funding system must ensure that the state provides at least 50% of non-federal funding for education statewide. Given that all children must receive an equal opportunity for a free public education, the proportion of state funding must be related to the wealth and need of a community, but all communities must receive a minimum amount of state funding regardless of wealth.
7. The transition to any new system should be phased in to give the state, local districts and choice options an opportunity to adjust.

Vote – Design Principle 3:

In Favor: Brennan, Cirsuolo, DiNello, Finley, Johnston, McCarthy, Palmer, Taylor, Williams, Yrchik

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

Vote – Design Principle 5:

In Favor: Cirusuolo, DiNello, Finley, Johnston, McCarthy, Palmer, Taylor, Williams, Yrchik
Opposed: Brennan
Abstained: 0

Vote – Design Principle 7:

In Favor: Brennan, Cirusuolo, DiNello, Finley, Johnston, McCarthy, Palmer, Taylor, Williams, Yrchik
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 0

Committee members were given the option of design principle statements 1A and 1B:

- 1A. The system must be student based and transparent with both the need factors of students and the income, the property wealth and property tax burden of the communities in which the students reside consistently included as significant factors.
- 1B. The formula must be student based and transparent with both the need factors of students and the income, the property wealth and property tax burden of the communities in which the students reside consistently included as significant factors.

Vote – Design Principle 1A:

In Favor: Brennan, Cirusuolo, DiNello, Finley, Johnston, McCarthy, Taylor, Williams
Opposed: Palmer, Yrchik
Abstained: 0

Vote – Design Principle 1B:

In Favor: Palmer, Yrchik
Opposed: Brennan, Cirusuolo, DiNello, Finley, Johnston, McCarthy, Taylor, Williams
Abstained: 0

Design principle 2 was considered by the Committee:

- 2. When a parent enrolls a child in a public school outside of their school district, the funding calculations for that child must be scaled to reflect actual savings and costs.

After discussion, members voted on an amended version:

- 2. When children are enrolled in a public school outside of their school district, the funding calculations for those children must be scaled to reflect actual savings and costs.

Vote – Design Principle 2 (as amended):

In Favor: Brennan, Cirusuolo, DiNello, Finley, Johnston, McCarthy, Taylor, Williams
Opposed: Palmer, Yrchik
Abstained: 0

Committee members were given the option of design principle statements 4A and 4B:

- 4A. Given that increasing access to choice options is in the interest of the state, then the state must accept responsibility for the additional associated costs and provide a greater portion of school funding statewide.
- 4B. Given that access to choice options is in the interest of the state, then the state must accept responsibility for the additional associated costs and provide a greater portion of school funding statewide.

Vote – Design Principle 4A:

In Favor: Brennan, Johnston, Taylor, Williams
Opposed: DiNello, Finley, McCarthy, Palmer, Yrchik
Abstained: Cirsuolo

Vote – Design Principle 4B:

In Favor: DiNello, Finley, McCarthy, Palmer, Yrchik
Opposed: Brennan, Johnston, Taylor, Williams
Abstained: Cirsuolo

Committee members were given the option of design principle statements 6A and 6B:

- 6A. Variables in any funding formula, including the foundation amount, weights for student need, and share ratios, should be based on a rigorous analysis that considers effective spending patterns and promising student outcomes to determine the appropriate level of state aid.
- 6B. Variables in any funding formula, including the foundation amount, weights for student need, and share ratios, should be based on a rigorous analysis that considers effective spending patterns and promising student outcomes to determine the appropriate level of state aid, ensuring that students will be funded at least at the level the formula dictates at whatever public school they attend.

Vote – Design Principle 6A:

In Favor: Finley, McCarthy, Palmer, Yrchik
Opposed: Brennan, Cirsuolo, DiNello, Johnston, Taylor, Williams
Abstained: 0

Vote – Design Principle 6B:

In Favor: Brennan, Cirsuolo, DiNello, Johnston, Taylor, Williams
Opposed: Finley, McCarthy, Palmer, Yrchik
Abstained: 0

IV. Other

With the final voting, the Committee's work has been completed. Mr. Taylor thanked all members for their work on this Ad Hoc Committee and for taking the time to participate in the meetings. A report with the Committee's recommendations will now be prepared for presentation to the State Board of Education.

V. The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Ad Hoc Committee on Education Cost Sharing and Choice Funding

January 24, 2011

Design Principle Statements

The Committee reached consensus on the following statements:

- 1A. The system must be student based and transparent with both the need factors of students and the income, the property wealth and property tax burden of the communities in which the students reside consistently included as significant factors.
2. When children are enrolled in a public school outside of their school district, the funding calculations for those children must be scaled to reflect actual savings and costs.
3. While serving programmatic goals, school districts must have flexibility to deploy categorical and other funding in ways that respond to student need and to develop incentives to economize.
- 4B. Given that access to choice options is in the interest of the state, then the state must accept responsibility for the additional associated costs and provide a greater portion of school funding statewide.
5. Any funding system must ensure that the state provides at least 50% of non-federal funding for education statewide. Given that all children must receive an equal opportunity for a free public education, the proportion of state funding must be related to the wealth and need of a community, but all communities must receive a minimum amount of state funding regardless of wealth.
- 6B. Variables in any funding formula, including the foundation amount, weights for student need, and share ratios, should be based on a rigorous analysis that considers effective spending patterns and promising student outcomes to determine the appropriate level of state aid, ensuring that students will be funded at least at the level the formula dictates at whatever public school they attend.
7. The transition to any new system should be phased in to give the state, local districts and choice options an opportunity to adjust.