

KNOW THE PROPOSALS:

K-16 School Funding Proposal

Proposal on November 7, 2006 ballot: Educational Funding Guarantee:

Initiative petition approved as to form December 7, 2005; signatures filed February 21, 2006; petition determined sufficient June 5, 2006; proposal presented to State Legislature for consideration June 5, 2006; no action taken by State Legislature during 40-day consideration period.

Purpose:

Legislative initiative to amend the State School Aid Act to ensure that the legislature establish and appropriate minimum funding levels for Michigan's public elementary and secondary schools, intermediate school districts, community colleges, public universities and independent nonprofit colleges or universities. The proposal would provide for minimum funding increases for education by an amount not less than the General Price level.

Contact: Citizens for Education, P.O. Box 2573, East Lansing, MI 48826-2573.

Ken MacGregor (517) 282-6129

Ken@MichiganK16.org.

Source: Michigan Secretary of State Elections website, http://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,1607,7-127-1633_8716_8735—,00.html

The proposed law (Proposal 06-5) would:

- Increase current funding by approximately \$565 million and require State to provide annual funding increases equal to the rate of inflation for public schools, intermediate school districts, community colleges, and higher education (includes state universities and financial aid/grant programs).
- Require State to fund any deficiencies from General Fund.
- Base funding for school districts with a declining enrollment on three-year student enrollment average.
- Reduce and cap retirement fund contribution paid by public schools, community colleges and state universities; shift remaining portion to State.
- Reduce funding gap between school districts receiving basic per-pupil foundation allowance and those receiving maximum foundation allowance.

Source: K-16 Coalition for Michigan's Future

PRO statements:

- The proposal guarantees funding for education, providing annual funding increases equal to inflation for K-16 public schools, community colleges and universities.
- When you factor additional costs passed on by the state to local districts, schools have netted less than an inflationary increase since the passage of Proposal A. This includes retiree health care and retiree pensions, to name a few.
- This proposal will grow Michigan's economy. A well-

funded public education system means Michigan's children will enter tomorrow's workforce ready to face any challenge and compete for good-paying jobs.

- This proposal will create jobs. By making a steady investment in education now, this proposal will lay the foundation for economic growth and job creation and help Michigan compete globally for high tech and other jobs.
- This proposal lays the foundation for increased student achievement. Well-funded districts are better equipped to provide maximum opportunity for student achievement.
- This proposal is based on the belief that we can invest in our public education systems now or pay much more later with a dwindling economy, low-paying jobs, declining state services and infrastructure, and a continuing downward spiral. K-16 public education is the key to Michigan's future success.

Source: K-16 Coalition for Michigan's Future

CON statements:

- Very few Michigan citizens would disagree that adequate funding for education is important. But what if funding education came at the expense of significant cuts to police and fire protection or substantial tax increases on individuals and job providers? That is exactly what the K-16 plan will do.
- State budget spending priorities should be based on results, and require balancing many public demands. It is simply bad public policy to allow one special interest group to circumvent the legislative appropriations process and have their funding put on auto-pilot.
- Proponents of the K-16 spending mandate would like the public to believe that education spending has been "cut to the bone." The reality is that education spending accounts for 1/3 of the total state budget! K-12 spending, for example, went up 42% between 1994 and 2004 while spending on revenue sharing for local governments went up by just 11% in that same time period. Taxpayers, the Legislature, and the Governor have been generous with education spending.
- This proposal is about salary and benefits for Michigan's teacher unions and allowing education interests to circumvent the legislative process.
- The K-16 Coalition claims that the Legislature could simply change the automatic, guaranteed funding increases, if necessary, since it's not a Constitutional amendment. What they aren't telling you is that it would require a majority vote of both the House and Senate to do so.

Source: Stop the K-16 Spending Mandate

Websites for more information:

PRO - <http://www.michigank16.org/>

CON - <http://www.stopthespendingmandate.com/>

Revised August 29, 2006