



Summary of NHSBA Testimony to House Finance Committee In Opposition to Constitutional Amendment CACR 34

Wednesday, March 26, 2008

NHSBA appreciates this opportunity to share our opposition to CACR 34.

The New Hampshire School Boards Association supports the Claremont rulings and the language in this proposal does nothing to address the spirit and meaning of those decisions.

Over the past decade, NHSBA has addressed this issue annually at our Delegate Assembly of school board members from across the state. We have adopted several resolutions that are relevant to CACR 34.

In 2001 we adopted a resolution calling for a legislative solution that is fair and equitable, with any money raised being distributed to the school districts. We later adopted a resolution that actually anticipated the Londonderry decision, urging the legislature to define the curriculum for an adequate education, calculate the corresponding cost, and then develop a funding distribution formula "consistent with the spirit of the Claremont decisions." Two years ago we also adopted a resolution opposing any attempt to divert state costs and responsibilities to local districts. And this past January, after much review and debate, we adopted the following:

The NHSBA opposes any constitutional amendment that vacates the spirit and intent of the Claremont and Londonderry lawsuits and attempts in anyway to limit or redirect funding in a manner that is contrary to the New Hampshire Supreme Court's ruling and present interpretation of the New Hampshire Constitution.

The language of CACR 34 does nothing to address the spirit and meaning of the Claremont rulings and actually limits the rights of some children by eliminating the obligation to all students. The proposed language allows the state to annually choose a funding level and ignore some of our state's communities and children.

The message I would like to leave with you comes from the state's school board members – locally elected officials who struggle daily with the oversight of implementing local education programs for the overwhelming majority of our children who attend public schools. While school districts have experienced extensive variation and swings in state support to education, the bottom line is that local property taxes remain the major source of revenue that funds our schools.

Phone: (603) 228-2061
or (800) 272-0653
Fax: (603) 228-2351

<http://www.nhsba.org>

Board of Directors

Susan D. Allen
President, Gifford

Clinton Hanson
1st Vice-President, Pembroke

Jon Steiner
2nd Vice-President, Kearsarge

Cindy Chagnon
Immediate Past President, Bedford

Executive Director

Dr. Theodore E. Comstock
sklesq@aol.com

NH School Boards Association
25 Triangle Park Drive, Suite 101
Concord, NH 03301

Much discussion and attention has been focused on the need to “target” state aid, often at the expense of other, less “needy”, communities. While a few outliers of towns in our state may be given as examples of high income and/or low property taxes, the simple fact is that the bulk of our communities are not wealthy towns. Different measures of wealth (property wealth, income wealth, percent of students at-risk, etc.) simply result in different rankings: it is only a relative position on a continuum.

Many of our middle tier communities have been here before, and know very well the uncertainty that can result from not knowing one year to the next whether they “fall off” the funding continuum or remain as a receiver of needed state aid. The reality is that the majority of districts in our state rely on state funding to help implement the educational programs offered within their schools.

In closing, I would like to add that New Hampshire had a targeted aid equalization program for many years: it was called Foundation Aid. In the 1970’s and early 80’s, it distributed \$3.6 million to approximately 25 towns. There ensued a significant statewide effort to re-define the formula and make it sensitive to more variables: property wealth, income wealth and tax effort. And in 1985, with strong support for the revisions and goals of the change, it was adopted and became known as the Augenblick Formula. That formula had a goal to fund the average district at 8%, with higher amounts for below average towns, and lower amounts for above average towns. Approximately \$200 - \$250 million was needed to fully fund the program, but at its best, only \$60-\$70 million was ever appropriated. Full funding never happened, and our average districts received little or no financial support. And then we had Claremont. Our school districts cannot afford to return to that scenario.