

Chad Magendanz

From: Chad Magendanz
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 11:32 PM
To: Mary Jane Glaser; Tami Henkel; Bill Clausmeyer; Didem Pierson; Val Paganelli
Subject: Sources for McCleary funding increases
Attachments: Eastside McCleary Comparison.xlsx; K-12 funding as Percentage of NGF.JPG

Chair Glaser and members of the TSD school board:

While I'm on record on a couple of online forums saying "both the district and taxpayers come out ahead" with Tahoma's current Enrichment Levy proposal and I was clear that I wasn't opposing it, I believe many of the McCleary state funding numbers I provided were being used by the opposition to justify a No vote. I also heard from several sources that the district was disputing those numbers, so I wanted to follow up here with links to sources. My plan originally was to be available at the meeting tomorrow, but I'll unfortunately be headed to California to attend a family wedding.

You probably noticed that there was a Seattle Times editorial a couple of weeks ago that got a lot of traction on the Eastside:

<https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/editorials/districts-explain-their-school-levy-requests/>

One recurring theme that I was hearing from this was, "But how much new funding are they receiving for McCleary?"

Fortunately, that's publicly available from non-partisan state budget staff [here](#):

K-12 Proposal (6/29/2017)

- [Statewide Summary](#)
- [Per Pupil Funding](#)
- [Total Funding](#)
- [Tax Rates](#)

And of course, actual funding levels (also broken down by district) are available on the LEAP budget site [here](#) and from OSPI [here](#).

Here are a few highlights from the attached Eastside spreadsheet (sources cited):

Net increase in state and local funding over the last 4 years:

- Bellevue: 43% (28% per-pupil)
- Lake Washington: 43% (20% per-pupil)
- Issaquah: 43% (23% per-pupil)
- Snoqualmie Valley: 44% (24% per-pupil)
- Tahoma: 31% (21% per-pupil)
- Kent: 37% (31% per-pupil)

Budgeted increase in state and local funding for the next 4 years:

- Bellevue: 35% (30% per-pupil)
- Lake Washington: 47% (42% per-pupil)
- Issaquah: 44% (39% per-pupil)
- Snoqualmie Valley: 39% (34% per-pupil)

- Tahoma: 31% (27% per-pupil)
- Kent: 29% (24% per-pupil)

Combined increase in state and local funding for McCleary:

- Bellevue: **93%** (66% per-pupil)
- Lake Washington: **110%** (70% per-pupil)
- Issaquah: **106%** (72% per-pupil)
- Snoqualmie Valley: **101%** (66% per-pupil)
- Tahoma: **72%** (54% per-pupil)
- Kent: **76%** (63% per-pupil)

As you can see, many school districts have **DOUBLED** their net state and local funding with the McCleary remedy, and Tahoma is receiving a healthy 72% increase (54% per-pupil). And yes, the net includes the lost local levy revenue from the new \$1.50 per \$1000AV or \$2,500 per-pupil limit. In Tahoma and Kent’s cases, the deal is even more compelling because even after bumping the state’s Common Schools Levy to \$2.70, your net levy rates will decrease. Like I said many times online, “both the district and taxpayers come out ahead.”

In light of how Tahoma answered the “What will you do with the extra dollars?” question with “monitor the level of state funding and what is necessary from the levy to maintain current education programs and staffing”, I was concerned. As a lead McCleary negotiator who personally spent much of the last 5 years fighting to achieve a 105% increase in state K-12 funding (see attached graph), I don’t want to see our efforts squandered. This is a once-in-a-lifetime investment in our public schools, and I’d like to see an equal commitment at the district level to convert these new resources to measurably improved student outcomes.

Now, you also expressed concern in the article that the new McCleary funding would not actually come through, saying that the district would “assess changes in state funding as they take place.” Setting aside the fact that TSD has already received a 31% increase over the past 4 years, that new funding for the next 4 years is signed into law and part of the "maintenance level" budget. Any effort to pass a bill to change it would be a non-starter, as the Supreme Court would immediately rule it unconstitutional. It's as good a guarantee that you'll ever get in politics.

In [the Supreme Court's own words](#), "The court is satisfied that the new salary model established by EHB 2242 provides for full state funding of basic education salaries sufficient to recruit and retain competent teachers, administrators, and staff. This is consistent with the standards established for constitutional compliance." And, “In sum, with respect to the components of basic education addressed above, the State has satisfied the court’s mandate to fully fund the program of basic education established by ESHB 2261 in accordance with the formulas and benchmarks set forth in SHB 2276 and this court’s orders.”

Yes, we should have completed the remedy a year earlier, but this funding is now constitutionally committed. You can count on it!

So, my advice going forward would be to ask for the full \$1.50 per \$1000 levy authority again, but tie it to bold and specific local enrichments that will clearly benefit Tahoma students and their families. Most everything TSD has cited to date for Prop 1 was being provided in 2013, before McCleary increased net per-pupil funding by 54%, so your goal cannot be to simply maintain the status quo. People wouldn’t expect you to run a Capital Levy without showing what capital projects are funded, and so you can imagine that they’d have trouble supporting an Enrichment Levy that would simply go to backfilling state funding obligations, something that is specifically no longer allowed because the Court ruled it unconstitutional. They need to know how the restored local funding will benefit local kids above and beyond what was being provided in 2013.

- Chad