

Education

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts



By Frank Waterous, Ph.D.

Issue Brief No. 5

Aug. 10, 2006

(revised Sept. 20, 2006)

The Bell Policy Center
1801 Broadway, Suite 280
Denver, Colorado 80202

(303) 297-0456 metro Denver
(866) 283-8051 toll-free in Colorado

www.thebell.org

The Bell Policy Center

Research • Advocacy • Opportunity



Bell Policy Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

Executive summary

In the November election, Colorado voters will be asked to decide on two ballot questions — an initiative and a referendum — that would require all school districts to spend at least 65 percent of their operating funds on staff and services for classroom instruction and student achievement.

- The “65 Percent Solution” citizens’ initiative, Amendment 39, would amend the state constitution to require school districts to spend at least 65 percent of their operating funds on classroom instruction, as defined in the initiative.
- Referendum J, referred to the ballot by the state Legislature, would change state statutes to require school districts to spend at least 65 percent of their operating funds on services that directly affect student achievement, including instructional and other activities as defined in the referendum.¹

These proposals are simplistic gimmicks that impose a state mandate on school districts. They impede local control without any solid evidence that the spending requirement will do any good.

Research shows that mandatory percentage spending plans have no effect on increasing student achievement. A Standard & Poor’s analysis of school district spending and student achievement in 34 states, including Colorado, shows no significant correlation between the percentage spent on instruction and student proficiency rates.

At the same time, research proves that school staff and services applied inside and outside the classroom make a positive difference in student learning. Teachers are key, but counselors, principals and professional development for teachers also bolster student achievement.

Based on the evidence, both Amendment 39 and Referendum J are ill-conceived, ill-advised and unsupported education policy measures. The Bell Policy Center opposes both measures, and recommends that voters vote no on these questions in November.

Amendment 39 would be particularly damaging. Its narrow focus would require many districts to cut “outside the classroom” services, in clear contradiction to the research on what helps students achieve.

Referendum J, with its more broad definitions of instruction spending, would have little effect on school spending practices. It does, however, recognize that gains in student achievement do not depend only on narrowly defined classroom spending, and can benefit from school staff and services working outside the classroom.

Referendum J would also be less detrimental than Amendment 39 because it would amend state statutes rather than the state constitution. It could be adjusted in the future by legislative action, should adverse consequences arise, while Amendment 39 would require a statewide vote to be changed.



Bell Policy
Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

□ Introduction and Amendment 39

Introduction

Coloradans will be asked in November to vote on a citizens' initiative that would amend the state constitution to require all school districts in the state to spend at least 65 percent of their operating funds on activities and materials "directly related to classroom instruction."

Proponents of the initiative, Amendment 39, say the rationale for requiring this level of funding is to increase student achievement and school accountability.

The November ballot will include a second similar measure referred through legislation by the state's General Assembly. It would change state law to mandate that school districts in the state spend at least 65 percent of their operating funds on "services that directly affect student achievement."

Referendum J came to the ballot via House Bill 06-1283, sponsored by Rep. Mike Merrifield, D-Manitou Springs, and Sen. Sue Windels, D-Arvada. It includes a broader range of staff and services both inside and outside the classroom within the mandated 65 percent percentage. Referendum J evolved as a reaction against, and alternative to, the Amendment 39 proposal.

This issue brief examines whether these mandatory percentage spending plans are supported by evidence from research, and the implications of the definitions they contain for school services and student achievement.

Amendment 39 would focus spending on "classroom instruction"

Amendment 39 would require all school districts in Colorado to spend at least 65 percent of their operating funds on classroom instruction, as defined in the initiative.

A school district spending less than the 65 percent would be required to increase its classroom instruction expenditures by 2 percent per year until it reached the 65 percent level. If a school board decided it could not meet these

requirements, it could request a renewable one-year waiver from the governor.

Amendment 39 is based on the "65 Percent Solution," a concept promoted nationwide by First Class Education, a Washington, D.C.-based organization whose goal is to enact the plan in all 50 states and the District of Columbia by the end of 2008.

The national average for spending on instruction is about 61 percent. Colorado's public schools spend an average of about 57 percent, but there's a wide variety by district.²

For example, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports the Aspen 1 school district in Pitkin County spends about 70 percent, Denver County 1 spends about 54 percent, and Vilas RE-5 in Baca County spends about 46 percent on instructional staff and services.³

First Class Education's statements in support of its proposal have changed over the last several months. In February, its web site included statements such as, "Classroom education is the only activity that can possibly increase test scores and benefit our students," and "No amount of money spent outside the class has any opportunity to help classroom achievement." These statements are no longer posted.

As of this writing, the web site acknowledges that staff and services outside the classroom are important for an effective education, but that 35 percent of operating funds should be sufficient to cover these costs.

First Class Education also claims its 65 percent plan would mean most states would add hundreds of millions of dollars each year to the classroom without a tax increase.⁴ This would not be new money. Funds already in the education system would be shifted to instruction from other areas, such as student and instructional staff support services and other "outside the classroom" expenditures.

Several states have signed on to the 65 Percent concept. Texas Gov. Rick Perry implemented it by executive order, the Kansas Legislature adopted it as a policy goal, and the Louisiana Legislature



Bell Policy Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

☐ Amendment 39 and the 65 Percent Solution in other states

passed a resolution urging that 65 Percent become a statewide standard.⁵ In February 2006, the Georgia Legislature passed a bill based on the 65 Percent Solution, and Gov. Sonny Perdue signed it into law in April.⁶

In spite of this support, the 65 Percent Solution and Colorado’s Amendment 39 have two key problems.

- There is no hard evidence that spending at least 65 percent on instruction improves student achievement.
- Based on how this measure defines spending for instruction, many important school services and activities that support student achievement would have to be cut.

Research: No proof 65 percent spending improves student performance

The bond rating agency Standard & Poor’s analyzed school district spending and student achievement data in nine states considering the 65 percent classroom spending mandate at the time of their study, including Colorado.⁷ The data used by S&P for analysis were reported by the districts to the U.S. Census Bureau and NCES.

The findings from S&P’s research show that the 65 Percent Solution is not based on the facts.

- S&P researchers found “student performance does not noticeably or consistently increase at 65 percent, or any other percentage spent on instruction.”
- S&P’s analysis determined that some of the highest-performing districts spend less than 65 percent, while some of the lowest-performing districts spend more than 65 percent, on instruction.
- The S&P analysis concluded, “There is presently a lack of empirical evidence for mandating a uniform percentage spending threshold across all districts to raise student achievement.” In fact, S&P researchers said there might be legitimate reasons to vary the percentage from one district to another.⁸

The 65 Percent Solution meets success and failure across the country

Approved

Georgia: Passed by legislature, April 2006

Kansas: Passed by legislature in a modified version, July 2005

Texas: Executive order, August 2005

Initiative petitions withdrawn

Arizona: Lack of funding, June 2006

Oregon: Not certified for ballot, signatures not submitted by July 2006 deadline

Washington: Lack of funding, March 2006

Defeated

Florida: Rejected by legislature, April 28, 2006

Illinois: Died in legislative committee, Feb. 17, 2006

Louisiana: Legislature referred to State Board of Education, which rejected 65 Percent but required 70 percent spending on instructional services, 2005

Minnesota: 70 percent proposal died in House of Representatives, March 8, 2006

Mississippi: Rejected by legislature, Jan. 31, 2006

Missouri: 66.6 Percent proposal died following public hearing, March 7, 2006

S. Carolina: Died in legislature, 2005 session

Tennessee: Rejected by legislature, April 4, 2006

Utah: Defeated in legislature, March 1, 2006

Virginia: Died in legislative committee, Feb. 15, 2006

Wisconsin: Defeated in legislature, May 11, 2006

Pending

Colorado: Amendment 39 and Referendum J on the Nov. 7 ballot

Oklahoma: Failed to meet deadline for Nov. ballot due to protest pending in state Supreme Court

(This listing revised Sept. 20, 2006.)



65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

Amendment 39

Subsequently, S&P expanded its analysis on the relationship between student performance and school district spending in 25 other states. The analysis corroborated the original conclusion that there is no significant correlation between the percentage spent on instruction and student proficiency rates.⁹

While one research study from the Education Policy Studies Laboratory at Arizona State University has pointed out some weaknesses in S&P’s analysis, it too noted that “the data clearly shows that those districts currently spending more do not have higher achievement levels than those districts that spend less.”¹⁰

For Colorado, as with all the states analyzed by S&P, there was a noticeable range in performance among districts at any given spending level. In other words, there was no statistically significant relationship between percentage of spending on instruction and student performance.¹¹

Only six of the 156 districts in Colorado that reported useable data to NCES spent at least 65 percent of their operating funds on instruction.¹² Of these six districts, three showed levels of student performance above average and three showed levels of student performance below the average for that spending threshold, as shown in

Table 1. Student proficiency levels for Colorado school districts spending at least 65 percent on instruction

School district and county	Percent classroom spending	Percent of student proficiency in reading and math
Aspen 1 (Pitkin)	69.7	93.8
Branson RE-82 (Las Animas)	65.9	66.4
Cripple Creek-Victor Re-1 (Teller)	65.8	82.6
Granada RE-1 (Prowers)	67.8	76.7
Greeley 6 (Weld)	65.5	69.5
Holyoke RE-1 (Phillips)	66.0	83.0

Source: Standard & Poor’s ¹³

Table 1. The proficiency level for the average district in the state was 80 percent.

Colorado also had 19 districts that spent less than 65 percent on instruction but showed levels of student proficiency above 90 percent, as shown in Table 2. These were small and large districts, rural and urban districts, and districts with high and low percentages of students from low-income families.

Table 2. Colorado school districts spending less than 65 percent on instruction with student proficiency levels above 90 percent

School district and county	Percent classroom spending	Percent of student proficiency in reading and math
Academy 20 (El Paso)	61.0	92.9
Buffalo RE-4 (Logan)	63.2	91.0
Cheyenne Mountain 12 (El Paso)	60.6	94.0
Douglas County RE-1 (Douglas)	57.9	92.2
East Grand 2 (Grand)	60.8	90.9
Julesburg RE-1 (Sedgwick)	58.8	91.9
La Veta RE-2 (Huerfano)	58.1	90.9
Lewis-Palmer 38 (El Paso)	58.7	94.0
Manitou Springs 14 (El Paso)	60.8	92.8
Mountain Valley RE-1 (Saguache)	53.7	91.0
Otis R-3 (Washington)	58.5	100.0
Ouray R-1 (Ouray)	63.4	90.5
Plateau RE-5 (Logan)	60.0	97.0
Platte Canyon 1 (Park)	52.4	91.3
Steamboat Springs RE-2 (Routt)	56.2	94.4
Stratton R-4 (Kit Carson)	56.5	90.7
Swink 33 (Otero)	63.4	94.3
Telluride R-1 (San Miguel)	61.0	94.5
Wiley RE-13 JT (Prowers)	53.7	91.5

Source: Standard & Poor’s ¹⁴



Bell Policy
Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

□ Amendment 39: “inside” and “outside” the classroom

Amendment 39’s definition of instruction excludes important school services and activities shown to improve achievement

Proponents of the 65 Percent Solution generally rely on NCES for definitions of instruction and other spending, but NCES has no category specifically called “classroom instruction.” The closest NCES category is entitled “Instruction.”¹⁵

Based on the items contained in the NCES categories, Standard & Poor’s and First Class Education identify the following expenditures as “in the classroom” or “outside the classroom” for the purposes of the 65 Percent Solution:

“In the classroom” expenditures

- Teacher and instructional aide salaries
- Instruction supplies
- Co-curricular activities such as field trips, music, arts and athletics
- Tuition paid to out-of-state districts
- Payments for special needs students

“Outside the classroom” expenditures

- Teacher training
- Instruction and curriculum development
- Library and media services¹⁶
- Guidance counselors, nurses and social workers
- School and district administration
- Operations and maintenance
- Food services
- Transportation¹⁷

Regardless of these categories, there is considerable evidence that services and staff that the 65 Percent Solution ranks as “outside the classroom” directly aid student achievement. For example:

- **Counselors.** Extensive research proves the positive effects of school counseling on the personal and academic success of students,

from elementary school through high school. Preventive counseling reduces the risk of students dropping out,¹⁸ and guidance counselors play an influential role in helping students prepare for and even consider higher education.¹⁹

- **Principals.** According to a Wallace Foundation report, school leadership “is second only to teaching among school-related factors in its impact on student learning.” Further, strong principals have the most impact in schools where student learning needs are most pronounced.²⁰ The Colorado Closing the Achievement Gap Commission noted that education specialists point to the importance of principal leadership in reaching achievement goals.²¹ Studies show principals play an important role in creating strong ties with families, promote community partnerships in support of student achievement, and increasingly serve as instructional leaders in their schools.²²
- **Teacher training and professional development.** Research has shown that teacher quality is the most significant factor affecting student achievement.²³ Ongoing professional development is key to helping good teachers become better. Again, the Colorado Closing the Achievement Gap Commission noted, “It is imperative that schools increase time for teachers to have professional development opportunities. Teachers can serve students better if they have time to learn new techniques, plan lessons, review assessments, discuss instructional approaches and develop interventions for struggling students.”²⁴
- **Nurses.** Research on the academic achievement gap shows untreated health and medical problems can hamper school attendance and performance. For example, low-income students have more vision, hearing, dental and nutrition problems than their higher-income peers.²⁵ School nurses play a critical role in supporting student success by identifying and treating illness and injury, and by screening for health problems that can limit student learning.²⁶



Bell Policy
Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

Referendum J

- **Social workers.** Research shows student achievement is affected by the school environment and by social and cultural conditions faced by students outside of school. Barriers to academic success can be social, emotional, behavioral and familial. School social workers are often an important link for students and families to community support services. They provide many services within the school that are proven to improve attendance and classroom behavior, decrease violence, and help students at risk of dropping out stay in school.²⁷
- **Librarians.** The results of a study by Colorado's Library Research Service indicate that students at schools with strong media centers scored significantly higher on Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP) tests than students at schools with less well-equipped and staffed libraries. The results of the study confirmed earlier studies in Colorado, Pennsylvania and Alaska.²⁸

States don't have to follow the NCES categories in implementing 65 Percent measures, and can develop their own definitions of what would or would not be considered "classroom instruction." In fact, First Class Education's web site now notes, "librarians and libraries are important and have a direct impact on classroom instruction." First Class has added these items as inside the classroom expenses on state ballot measures on which they have some control over specific language.²⁹

Colorado's Amendment 39 is a case in point. Along with listing items consistent with the NCES instruction categories, the Colorado initiative includes libraries, librarians, tutors and "multi-disciplinary learning" as classroom instruction expenditures. But First Class Education is not including other positions and activities, such as counselors, principals and teacher training.³⁰

A broad range of organizations across the country oppose the 65 Percent Solution, in part because of its narrow definition of instruction expenditures and the exclusion of important school services and functions that help student achievement.

In stating its opposition to the 65 Percent Solution, the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) concluded the idea "is fatally flawed and will hinder, not help, our nation's schools in accomplishing the goal of providing every child with a well-rounded, high-quality education."³¹

Frederick Hess of the conservative American Enterprise Institute, in speaking against the proposal, noted that "the 65 Percent Solution focuses attention on dubious input measures and is an invitation to creative accounting. Most troubling, though, is the manner in which it embraces heavy-handed, autocratic management – under the guise of 'decentralization' – and endorses one-size-fits-all guidelines."³²

Finally, Gerald W. Bracey, an independent researcher who prepared a study of 65 Percent Solution proposals for the Education Policy Studies Laboratory at Arizona State University, observed, "Given the stated desire of [the federal No Child Left Behind Act] to staff classrooms only with 'highly qualified' teachers, it seems odd that a proposal offered in 2005 would likely deny money for teacher training or professional development to improve qualifications."³³

Referendum J is not supported by research as a spending mandate

In response to Amendment 39, the Colorado General Assembly referred a measure through legislation for the November ballot. House Bill 06-1283 was sponsored by Rep. Mike Merrifield, D-Manitou Springs, and Sen. Sue Windels, D-Arvada. It would change state statutes to require school districts to spend at least 65 percent of their operational funds on a more broad range of both instructional and non-instructional "services that directly affect student achievement."

As with Amendment 39, if a school district doesn't meet the spending requirement, it would be required to increase its relevant expenditures by 2 percent each fiscal year until it reached the 65 percent level. Additionally, Referendum J would allow the district to annually apply for a waiver from the State Board of Education until the requirement is met.



Bell Policy
Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

☐ Referendum J

The measure also allows voters in a school district to permanently exempt the district from meeting the 65 percent requirement.³⁴

As with Amendment 39, research regarding mandatory spending requirements does not support Referendum J, even with the broader definition of included services and activities. Once again, S&P's conclusion applies; that is, there is currently no evidence proving that a mandated level of spending across all districts will raise student achievement.

Referendum J includes instructional and other services that do support student achievement

While research doesn't support Referendum J as a spending mandate, the question does at least include many of the non-instructional services and staff that can boost student achievement that Amendment 39 excludes.

The referendum's definition of services that support student achievement include:

- Salaries and benefits for licensed or certified school staff, including principals, assistant principals, academic or disciplinary deans, teachers, substitute teachers, school librarians and media specialists, school counselors, school nurses, school psychologists and school social workers.
- Salaries and benefits for unlicensed or uncertified school staff, including paraprofessionals, bus drivers, food service employees, school support staff and athletic coaches.
- Supplies, materials, equipment and technology for instruction.
- Instructional services purchased by a school district from people or groups outside the school district.
- Instructional services provided through enterprise programs including preschool, full-day kindergarten, before- and after-school programs, tutoring and extended-day programs.
- Extracurricular student activities, including athletics.

- Certain support services provided at the school level, including:
 - Teacher training and professional development, curriculum development and student testing.
 - Student support such as college placement services, student health care and medical services, nutritional services and student record-keeping.
 - Food services for students.
 - Transportation for students.

Not included in the Referendum J definition of services directly affecting student achievement are:

- Central school district office and business services including accounting, budgeting, payroll, receiving, purchasing, planning, recruiting, human resources administration, risk management administration and communications.
- General school district administration, including salaries and benefits for school district superintendents, assistant superintendents and other staff
- Administrative functions such as school district directors, legal matters, audits, fees paid to the county treasurer and elections.
- Facilities operations and maintenance, including property insurance, building maintenance and repair, grounds, ventilation systems, equipment, security alarms and the salaries and benefits of custodial, maintenance and grounds staff.



Bell Policy
Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

Referendum J

In 2003-04, all but one of Colorado's school districts already met Referendum J's spending requirements

Opponents of Referendum J point out the proposal's definition of "services that support student achievement" is extremely broad, including virtually all school-level functions.

An analysis of 2003-04 school data prepared by the Colorado General Assembly's Legislative Council staff during legislative debate on HB06-1283 found that all but one of the 178 school districts in the state already spent at least 65 percent on the identified services. Only the Briggsdale school district in Weld County spent less, with 58 percent.³⁵

A more recent draft analysis by the Legislative Council of 2004-05 school data indicates three districts did not meet the spending requirement during that year: West End RE-2 in Montrose County, East Grand 2 in Grand County and Silverton 1 in San Juan County.³⁶

If Referendum J were to pass, these districts could adjust their spending to meet the mandatory percentage, apply for a waiver, or district voters could exempt the district from the requirement.

The fact that almost all Colorado school districts already meet the referendum's 65 percent requirement has led some critics to question whether the proposal represents a genuine effort to reform how districts expend funds, or only perpetuates the educational status quo. As a result, critics suggest the proposal will not enhance student achievement or school accountability.

Proponents of the referendum acknowledge that its impact on current spending practices is minimal, but suggest that — especially when compared to Amendment 39 — the measure will at least do no harm to the school districts' ability to generally allocate spending as they have historically seen fit.

The legislation underlying Referendum J did not originally propose a 65 percent spending requirement. As introduced, the legislation specified 75 percent of school districts' operating budgets would be spent on services that directly affect student achievement.

The change to 65 percent can best be understood as an effort to make the referred measure a more direct alternative to Amendment 39.

Nevertheless, the fact that the referred measure's mandated spending percentage changed, while the definition of services covered under the requirement did not, reinforces the point that the 65 percent threshold is not based on any research evidence indicating that percentage is tied to improved student achievement.



Bell Policy
Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

□ Conclusion

Getting more money into classrooms is an important goal in helping to increase student achievement. However, as Standard & Poor's notes, how money is spent in the classroom is just as important as what percentage is spent on instruction.

Further, it is clear from the research that not all activities that support and enhance student achievement take place in the classroom, and funding these activities is important for closing achievement gaps and helping students to succeed.

Research does not support the effectiveness of mandatory percentage spending plans as a strategy for increasing student achievement.

Regardless of what definitions are used, the evidence does not support requiring school districts to spend any specific percent of operating funds to improved student performance. This is particularly true with Amendment 39, which defines instructional expenditures in a very narrow way, in contradiction to the research on what helps students succeed.

Referendum J is similarly not supported by the research evidence as a spending mandate. Additionally, it would do little to change current spending practices in the state's school districts.

However, research does show that many of the services and activities both inside and outside of the classroom incorporated in the referendum's definitions are important to increasing student achievement, and thus should be included when determining where to apply school funding most effectively.

Along with their focus on student achievement, both measures also have school accountability as an underlying theme. The belief seems to be that by imposing spending mandates, the public will have greater assurance that their tax dollars are being wisely and effectively spent.

Based on the research evidence, however, such an approach to student achievement or school accountability is ill-conceived, ill-advised and undesirable.

Amendment 39 would do more harm than good for our schools, and would be difficult to change if it were made part of the state constitution. Referendum J would be less detrimental because it amends state statutes rather than the state constitution, so adjustments could more easily be made in the future by legislative action should the need arise.

Further, Referendum J at least acknowledges that student achievement gains are not simply the result of instructional expenditures, but are also deeply affected by the efforts of a broad range of school personnel and services working for the benefit of students both inside and outside the classroom.

The Bell Policy Center opposes both of Colorado's 65 percent ballot measures, and recommends that voters reject both questions in November.



65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

□ End Notes

¹ Along with including different items under their 65 percent spending requirements, Amendment 39 and Referendum J define operating expenditures differently.

Amendment 39 defines “operational expenditures” as all school district expenditures other than those for capital construction or debt or bond payments, including payment of interest on debt or bonds.

Referendum J defines “operational expenditures” as all school district expenditures except:

- Moneys set aside for capital reserve and risk-management funding, operating reserve, and emergency reserve;
- Moneys received for capital construction, or as a mill levy override unrelated to services directly affecting student achievement;
- Moneys transferred to a district charter school;
- Local revenues received through local bond elections, including interest earnings and specific ownership taxes related to bond redemption funds;
- Bond redemption funds;
- Local, state, federal, and private funds received for a designated purpose unrelated to services directly affecting student achievement;
- Enterprise funds from programs unrelated to services directly affecting student achievement;
- Trust and agency funds received for a designated purpose
- Internal service funds, with the exception of property tax revenues or allocations attributable to the general fund, as well as the expenditure of such taxes or allocations.

² *Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education: School Year 2002-03*, E.D. TAB, National Center for Education Statistics, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005353.pdf>

³ District-level data from the National Center for Education Statistics, Core of Common Data. Information on expenditures for individual school districts online: <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch/>

⁴ First Class Education web site, <http://www.firstclasseducation.org/faqs.asp#goals>

⁵ *The Issues and Implications of the “65 Percent Solution,”* SchoolMatters, A service of Standard & Poor’s, Fall 2005, http://www.schoolmatters.com/pdf/65_paper_school_matters.pdf

and Alan Finder, “Here’s an Idea: Put 65% of the Money Into Classrooms,” *The New York Times*, Jan. 4, 2006.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/01/04/education/04solution.html?ex=1294030800&en=f9929a0e4f22a78b&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>

⁶ Bridget Gutierrez and Sonji Jacobs, “65% Solution passes Legislature,” *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, Feb. 24, 2006.

and “Classrooms First for Georgia Act Becomes Law,” Gov. Sonny Perdue, press release, April 5, 2006.

<http://www.gov.state.ga.us/press/2006/press1101.shtml>

⁷ Standard & Poor’s used 2003-04 student performance data and 2002-03 instructional spending data in developing their analysis.

⁸ SchoolMatters, A Service of Standard & Poor’s, Fall 2005.

⁹ “The Issues and Implications of the ‘65 Percent Solution — Addendum,” SchoolMatters, A Service of Standard & Poor’s, Winter 2006.

http://www.schoolmatters.com/app/content/q/mtype=65_percent_addendum.shtml/mlvl=1/stid=-1/lid=-1/stlid=-1/locid=-1/site=pes

¹⁰ Gerald W. Bracey, *A Policy Maker’s Guide to “The 65% Solution” Proposals*, Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University, April 2006.

<http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/l/EPRU/documents/EPSL-0603-122-EPRU.pdf>

Bracey points out that S&P’s analysis did not examine the impact of total dollars spent vs. percent of budget spent, and that it correlated expenditures with level of achievement rather than changes in achievement.

¹¹ “The Issues and Implications of the 65 Percent Solution — Addendum,” Colorado Data Tables, SchoolMatters, A Service of Standard & Poor’s, Winter 2006,

http://www.schoolmatters.com/pdf/addendum_report/colorado65addendum.pdf

S&P notes that some of the smallest districts in Colorado are not represented in their analysis because those districts are prohibited from publicly reporting student performance data due to student privacy issues.

¹² According to a recent draft analysis of 2004-05 school data by the Colorado General Assembly’s Legislative Council, 12 of the state’s 178 school



65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

□ End Notes

- districts now spend at least 65 percent on instruction. See “Amendment 39 and Referendum J School District Spending Requirements,” 3rd Draft. [http://www.leg.state.co.us/lcs/0506initrefr.nsf/89fb842d0401c52087256cbc00650696/d35caec1adcb56ae8725713e0058cb10/\\$FILE/2005-2006%2046v3.pdf](http://www.leg.state.co.us/lcs/0506initrefr.nsf/89fb842d0401c52087256cbc00650696/d35caec1adcb56ae8725713e0058cb10/$FILE/2005-2006%2046v3.pdf)
- ¹³ “Implications of the 65 Percent Solution—Addendum,” Colorado Data Tables, SchoolMatters, A Service of Standard & Poor’s, Winter 2006. http://www.schoolmatters.com/pdf/addendum_report/colorado65addendum.pdf
- ¹⁴ Ibid. Complete data on Colorado districts’ instructional spending and student achievement levels is available from S&P’s SchoolMatters at http://www.schoolmatters.com/pdf/addendum_report/colorado65addendum.pdf Additionally, spending data for individual districts may be obtained via NCES at <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch/>
- ¹⁵ *Financial Accounting for Local and State School Systems, 2003 Edition*, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, November 2003. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004318.pdf> and SchoolMatters, A Service of Standard & Poor’s, Fall 2005.
- ¹⁶ Colorado’s Amendment 39 includes libraries and librarians as classroom instruction expenditures.
- ¹⁷ First Class Education web site and SchoolMatters, A Service of Standard & Poor’s, Fall 2005.
- ¹⁸ *Research on School Counseling Effectiveness*, California Department of Education. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/cg/rh/counseffective.asp> *Effectiveness of School Counseling*, American Counseling Association, Resources for Counselors. <http://www.counseling.org/PublicPolicy/TP/ResourcesForSchoolCounselors/CT2.aspx?> Christopher Sink and Heather Stroh, *Improving Academic Achievement in Primary Students Through a Systemic Approach to Guidance and Counseling*, Research Report No. 4, April 2003, Washington School Research Center. <http://www.spu.edu/orgs/research/WSRC%20Report%20CGCP%202003.pdf>
- G. Brigman and C. Campbell, *Does Implementing a Research-Based School Counseling Curriculum Enhance Student Achievement?* School Counseling Research Brief 2.3, April 15, 2004, Center for School Counseling Outcome Research. <http://www.umass.edu/schoolcounseling/PDFs/ResearchBrief2.3.pdf>
- ¹⁹ Colorado Closing the Achievement Gap Commission, Interim Report, November 1, 2004, Colorado Department of Education. http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdecare/clg_download/Interim_Final_CTAG_Report.pdf
- ²⁰ Kenneth Leithwood, et.al., *Executive summary: How leadership influences student learning*, Learning from Leadership Project, The Wallace Foundation, 2004. <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/NR/rdonlyres/E3BCCFA5-A88B-45D3-8E27-B973732283C9/0/ReviewofResearchLearningFromLeadership.pdf>
- ²¹ Colorado Closing the Achievement Gap Commission Interim Report.
- ²² Chris Cunningham, *Engaging the Community to Support Student Achievement*. ERIC Digest, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, ERIC Identifier: ED464395, 2002. <http://www.ericdigests.org/2003-1/student.htm> NCSL Taskforce on School Leadership, *The Role of School Leadership in Improving Student Achievement*, National Conference of State Legislatures, 2002. <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/leaderoverview.pdf>
- ²³ *Teacher Quality: Research*, National Conference of State Legislatures. <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/Research.htm>
- ²⁴ Colorado Closing the Achievement Gap Commission Interim Report.
- ²⁵ Richard Rothstein, *Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic, and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap*, Economic Policy Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University, 2004.
- ²⁶ “Career Info: School Nurse,” Nurses for a Healthier Tomorrow.



Bell Policy
Center

65 Percent Solution spending plans for Colorado school districts

End Notes

<http://www.nursesource.org/school.html>

“NYSNA Position Statements: School Health Nursing,” New York State Nurses Association, 2004.

http://www.nysna.org/programs/nai/practice/position/s/position20_04.htm

²⁷ School Social Work Association of America Resolutions on “Helping Students Stay in School,” “School Social Work Services,” and “School Social Worker Staffing Needs.”

<http://www.sswaa.org/publications.html>

Nic Dibble, “Outcome Evaluation of School Social Work Services,” Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, September 1999.

<http://dpi.wi.gov/sspw/pdf/outcmeval999.pdf>

²⁸ “Strong Libraries Improve Student Achievement,” *Education World*.

http://www.educationworld.com/a_admin/admin/adminin178.shtml

²⁹ First Class Education web site.

<http://www.firstclasseducation.org/faqs.asp#goals>

³⁰ *Colorado Ballot Analysis, Amendment 39, School District Expenditures for Instruction*,

<http://www.leg.state.co.us/lcs/0506initrefr.nsf/89fb842d0401c52087256cbc00650696/d35caec1adcb56ae8725713e0058cb10?OpenDocument>

³¹ National Parent Teacher Association position, “65 Percent Solution – Education Funding.”

http://www.pta.org/ia_pta_positions_1138312705671.html

³² Frederick Hess, Director of Education Policy Studies, American Enterprise Institute, “The 65 percent solution,” guest op-ed, *The Washington Times*, Feb 22, 2006.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/op-ed/20060221-091158-1703r.htm>

³³ Bracey, A Policy Maker’s Guide to “The 65% Solution” Proposals, April 2006.

³⁴ House Bill 06-1283, Public School Expenditures Accountability Act.

http://www.leg.state.co.us/clics2006a/csl.nsf/fsbillcont3/627AF3E860CE5FE1872570DE007CBF64?open&file=1283_enr.pdf

³⁵ Colorado Legislative Council Staff, “Estimated Impact of School District Expenditure Requirement in House Bill 06-1283 on FY 2003-04 Expenditures.”

³⁶ Colorado Legislative Council, “Amendment 39 and Referendum J School District Spending Requirements,” 3rd Draft. (End Note No. 12)