

## SCHOOL FUNDING

Adopted by Convention Delegates May 7, 1981

*Reviewed by Board of Managers March 2012*

- WHEREAS,** School districts usually do not know total funding levels until after the start of the school year thus entailing massive teacher and classroom changes after school is in session; and
- WHEREAS,** School districts cannot make responsible budget decisions for either cutting or augmenting their programs under the current system; and
- WHEREAS,** The built-in uncertainties in the current system contribute to low teacher morale and inadequate opportunities for teacher preparation; and
- WHEREAS,** Stability, consistency and responsible fiscal planning are necessary for a quality educational system; therefore be it
- RESOLVED,** That the California State PTA seek and support legislation which shall require the state Legislature to appropriate funds for educational needs prior to the budgetary decision-making deadlines of local school districts; and be it further
- RESOLVED,** That the California State PTA seek and support legislation which shall be designed to enable school districts to plan priorities for spending and programming on more than a year-to-year basis; and be it further
- RESOLVED,** That the California State PTA urge its units, councils and districts to study, support and encourage the education of the parents, teachers and community regarding the financing of their school districts.

###

### BACKGROUND SUMMARY

State law dealing with school finance is frequently passed after the start of the school district's new fiscal year. For example, AB 65 passed in September 1977 after school started. AB 8 was passed in July 1979, and AB 2196 passed in August 1980. As a result, teachers are laid off each spring, budget planning is haphazard, and unsettling changes are necessary after the start of the school year.

In addition, current funding is based on revenue limits established in 1972 with annual allowance for inflation. Our current rate of inflation was not foreseen, and as a result, funding levels do not come close to compensating districts for their net loss in purchasing power.

This creates extreme problems for districts because it precludes responsible fiscal planning. The resulting instability lowers the quality of education and produces severe morale problems for teachers and students.