Spectrum May 22, 1981 Karen Jensen

Reductions in Funding Public Education Alarming!

There is a flury of excitement and horror now with the loss of funding to our

elementary and secondary schools. First we learned that MMXXXXX President Reagan's budget intends to cut over \$103 million earmarked for our Illinois

school districts. This means we'll receive 25% less than our school districts

had expected. It appears the big losers will be disadvantaged and handicapped

children. Congress still has the chance to adjust this budget and we can

hope they will not sacrifice the nation's children in the budget cut-backs.

Now, coupled with the real possibility of federal school aid cut-backs, comes Governor Thompson's proposal to reduce state funding for elementary and secondary schools and to eliminate all statutory mandates and sumpend all rules and regulations. Serious questions must be raised in Illinois. What children will be served with these reduced resources? What accountability will there be for providing the services required by PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Act? Without laws, rules and regulations — all the result of evidence that without them many children were not receiving an adequate education — how can we be sure that the constitutional mandate that "A fundamental goal of the People of the State is the educational develop-

Locally we'll be hard hit by these cuts. Title VI which provides desegregation services with be cut back severly & we won't be providing a special program. We've had five strategists working with 250 students and the program has been very successful. The fate of this program will be known soon.

Title I, compensatory education, won't have as many reading teachers as it has had. We all want "Johnny to learn to read" and yet -- without the teachers ... how will it happen? That program faces a 20% reduction in funding here.

Special education will lose even more, 25%. Impact Aid, a program that funds

ment of all persons to the limits of their capacities" will be met?

the hiring of teacher's aids for children with learning difficulties, is lost totally. A local member of the Parents Action for the Handicapped told me recently that it's doubly ironic to be lossing programs and funding for handicapped children here in Decatur during the International Year of the Disabled. While it appears to me that the poor, the black, and the handicapped child will be most hurt locally by proposed state and federal school money cuts, Mr. Turner at the Kiel Building reminds me that the cuts will "affect some facet of all programs".

It is a grim picture -- our schools faced with such cuts -- but we are not powerless, we are not citizens of El Salvador, we can tell our legislators that the quality of education in our state is of paramount importance and we oppose further reductions in school aid.

Time for Action

5/22/81

May 7, 1981

Spectrum " (2 min) WSOY AM & FM

TO:

Local League and ILO Presidents

School Finance Chairs

Action Chairs

FROM:

Susan Thomas, School Finance Chair

Dorothy O'Neill, President

RE:

Governor's reductions in funding for elementary and secondary schools, and

his proposal to eliminate all statutory mandates and suspend all rules and

regulations.

League Positions

The Fiscal Policies position supports adequate funding for public education. The School Finance position calls for regular review and revision of state entitlements, taking into account increases in the cost-of-living, professional estimates of the costs of quality educational programs, and regional differences in the costs of providing the same or similar services. The League believes the state should increase its support for the total costs of all mandated programs.

Impact of the Reductions

The latest reductions announced by the Governor will have a devastating impact on local school districts, especially in combination with the expected reductions from federal sources. School districts have been falling further and further behind in trying to keep up with increased costs, while state aid has not kept up with the rate of inflation. Failure to pass local tax referenda prevent many from increasing local resources to compensate for inadequate state aid, reduced further in many cases by declining enrollment. The latest round of reductions comes at a time when plans for the 1982 school year have already been made and many staff contractural agreements are final.

The Governor's proposal to eliminate all mandates, suspend rules and regulations for the 1982 year, and to combine all categorical aid into a block grant put school administrators into a quandry. What children will be served with these reduced resources? What accountability will there be for providing the services required by PL 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Act? Without laws, rules and regulations - all the result of evidence that without them many children were not receiving an adequate education - how can we be sure that the constitutional mandate that "A fundamental goal of the People of the State is the educational development of all persons to the limits of their capacities" will be met?

What Can You Do?

Contact your legislators now and tell them you oppose further reductions in school aid. Use information from your local school districts to illustrate the impact of these reductions in your legislative district. It is not too late to also contact your Member of Congress and oppose federal reductions for education. Each Illinois

rschool district has received a printout showing the reductions that would result from the proposed federal administration budget. Talk to your local superintendent or business manager to get this information, if you do not already have it.

Background

January. The State Board of Education (SBOE) announced its proposed F82 budget, calling for an overall increase of 8.1%. The \$214 million in "new money" represented less than what the Board believed schools needed with inflation running at an annual rate of 13%, but was a larger percentage increase than in recent years and was believed to be responsive to the fiscal condition of the state.

The major breakdown of funds with their percentage increase is shown below.

*General State Aid	\$108.0 million	+7.2%
**Mandated Programs with Statutory Formulas (special education, transportation, e.g.)	45.5	+10.8
Non-formula Programs and SBOE Initiatives		
(Bilingual Education, Free Textbooks, Gifted, Truant Alternatives)	13.0	+16.5

*The SBOE made a policy decision to begin the reversal of a situation in which increasing claims for mandated programs were taking a larger and larger share of total education dollars at the expense of equalizing general state aid.

**Even though funding for mandated programs increased significantly, it was still impossible with this budget to fully reimburse school districts for their claims. Only two programs were recommended for full funding: Special Education Orphanage and Private School Tuition. Prorations would range from 76% for Summer School to 98% for Special Education Personnel Reimbursements (the most costly program). This budget category also includes \$19 million for Teachers Retirement and Education Service Region Salaries and Expenses, items over which the SBOE has no control. These funds remain constant despite adjustments in the total budget.

February. The Working Draft of the Reagan budget, if passed by Congress, would mean a loss of over \$103 million to Illinois schools, plus another \$1.8 million in technical aid to school districts and other funds not channelled through the SBOE. Recissions, that is, reductions in the current budget would amount to 25% less than school districts have expected to receive this September. Plans for F83 include 20% cuts in federal spending for education, distributed in block grants. Because there were few details about the actual distribution of the cuts, and even fewer on the elimination of mandates and rules, the actual situation changes almost daily. One fact is clear, the big losers will be disadvantaged and handicapped children. Congress still has the opportunity to adjust this budget, and advocacy groups have been lobbying hard to save these programs, but with limited success. Check with your local schools to see what these federal reductions will mean to their programs.

March. Governor Thompson announced that his F82 budget contained only \$87 million in new money for the schools, less than half the SB0E's request. This would be an increase of only 3.9% over the current year, and (with the maintenance of the \$19 million for Teachers Retirement and Educational Service Regions) only \$68 million to be distributed among the 1,012 school districts. At the Governor's request, the SB0E developed an allocation plan at that appropriation level. The highlights (or lowlights) of that plan call for a reduction of \$30.5 million in General State Aid, and the

proration of all formula mandates at 91%, with the exception of full funding for Orphanages. The Board evaluated the other programs individually, rolling some back to F81 appropriation levels (gifted education and adult education, e.g.); reducing some below F81 levels (Free Textbooks, Truant Alternatives, e.g.) and maintaining some at their original budget request levels (Transitional Bilingual Education, e.g.); because the appropriations have never been adequate to fill the needs.

April. On the 22nd Governor Thompson announced that cuts of \$200 million would have to be made in his March budget due to declining revenue and the demands of welfare recipients. He proposes a 24% reduction for elementary and secondary education amounting to \$21 million below his March figure. In addition he has proposed that statutory mandates be eliminated, rules and regulations suspended, and that categorical grants be replaced with a block grant for the 1981-82 school year.

Meeting the next day, the SBOE unanimously adopted the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED

That the State Board of Education is in firm opposition to the continued disproportionate reductions in funding for elementary and secondary education recommended by the Governor on April 22, 1981, and will continue to use all persuasive power at its disposal to resist their adoption by the General Assembly, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That although the Board believes in and has supported a deliberative review of state mandates, it cannot support an indiscriminate and precipitous removal of legal and regulatory requirements because of its concern for avoiding chaotic conditions in local school districts and their potential violation of applicable federal statutes, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That consistent with the Board's adoption of a major study of school finance and to avoid the probability of gross inequities in the distribution of funds, the Board recommends the careful study of the potential effects of block granting prior to the introduction of such a change in statutory funding mechanisms.

#

The LWVIL state board now believes it is fruitless to continue to support the SBOE's original budget proposal, even though it is convinced that the funds are needed in local school districts. These latest reductions, however, can only bring chaos to education in Illinois. Because of the complexity of the General State Aid formula, and variations in district needs, these reductions will fall unevenly on local districts. It is important that you learn as quickly as possible what the effects will be in your districts. Specific pieces of legislation have not been drawn, but the plan is to amend downward current bills. Traditionally, appropriations for education are among the last to be passed by the General Assembly, but the public is generally closed out of the deliberations that occur in conference committees at unannounced times and in unspecified rooms. You must make your positions known now, and keep reinforcing them with information as it develops in local school districts.

Keep a newspaper file of information as it occurs, locally and statewide, and check with the League hotline for up-to-date developments.

tes at 91%, with the exception of full funding for ed the other programs individually, rolling some back ifted education and adult education, e.g.); reducing atbooks, Truent Alternatives, e.g.) and maintaining some at levels (Transitional Bilingual Education, e.g.); and maintaining some of the levels of the needs.

noril the 22nd of Independent of the country of \$200 million would have to be in the large of the country of the proposed and the demands of welfare excipted. He proposed 24% reduction for elementary and secondary education amount in to \$21 million of the harch figure. In addition he has proposed that statutor mandates be sliminated, rules and regulations suspended, and that categorical grants be replaced with a block grant for the 1951-82 school year.

Meeting the next day, the Sidt apartmounty adopted the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED

That the State Board of Education is in firm opposition to the continued disproportionate reductions in funding for elementary and secondary education recommended by the Governor on April 22, 1981, and will continue to use all persuasive power at its disposal to resist their adoption by the General Assembly, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That although the Board believes in and hes supported a deliberative review of state mandates, it cannot support an indiscriminate and precipitous removal of legal and regulatory requirements because of its concern for avoiding chaotic conditions in local school districts and their potential violation of applicable federal statutes.

SE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That consistent with the Board's adaption of a major study of school finance and to avoid the probability of gross inequities in the distribution of funds, the Board recommends the careful study of the potential effects of block granting prior to the introduction of such a change in statutory funding mechanisms.

東 京 市

The LWYLL state board now believes it is fruitless to continue to support the SBGE's original budget proposal, even though it is convinced that the funds are needed in local school districts. These latest reductions, however, can only bring chaos to education in Illinois. Because of the complexity of the General State Aid formula, and variations in district needs, these reductions will fall unevenly on local districts. It is important that you learn as quickly as possible what the effects will be in your districts. Specific pieces of legislation have not been drawn, but the plan is to amend downward current bills. Iraditionally, appropriations for education are among the last to be passed by the General Assembly, but the public is generally closed out of the deliberations that occur in conference committees at unannounced times and in unspecified rooms. You must make your positions known now, and keep reinforcing them with information as it develops in local school districts.

Keep a newspaper file of information as it occurs, locally and statewide, and check with the League hotline for up-to-date developments.

anchous can me 424

tran the peoples of administration bedset?

the Lesexuntion services

the War face of 1055

the work of the content of the people of the what kind of reductions can we 424-3000 federal administration bedget? Turne 1055 2010 reading)

1055 2010 reading)

1055 1055 Con

1055 1055 C

BORG-WARNER CORPORATION

Division Code		Budget Year
Submit in U.S. Currency Only	Division or Subsidiary	Budget Worksheet 8
Conversion Rate		Date Prepared
	1 4	(000's Omitted)

INVENTORY PROFITS

		Budget Year FIFO Value of Inventory			Current Year Estimate FIFO Value of Inventory		Prior Year Actual FIFO Value of Inventory			
		Subject to LIFO	Not Subject to LIFO	Total	Subject to LIFO	Not Subject to LIFO	Total	Subject to LIFO	Not Subject to LIFO	Total
1.	Inventory at current year costs.				6_	<u> </u>	A	5 2 8 - 1		
2.	Inventory at prior year costs.			<u></u>	6× 1	N C	7 X 7	9 / 6		
3.	Inventory Profits			<u></u>		<u> </u>	B	345	6 ()	В

Notes:

- A Agrees with Budget Form 3, Line 3
- B Agrees with Budget Form 2, Line 5

Internat year of the Disabled CHILD CARE and EDUCATION DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES Special Educ. Theoring 3-5 was 3-21 vislates of fide out to 5-17 Parents Petion For Hardi-Look of the ood of Speaker Cat night but of seal of South Cary South

Richland Community College
100 North Water Street
Decatur, Illinois 62523

Size of 4 the grade

Richard Community Colege 763 North Water Street December, Billings Billings