Adequacy model for school funding

Guy Banicki
Illinois State University

Gregg Murphy
Illinois State University

ABSTRACT

This study considers the effectiveness of the Evidence-Based Adequacy model of school funding. In looking at the Evidence-Based Adequacy model for school funding, one researcher has been centrally associated with the development and study of this model. Allen Odden is currently a professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison and has partnered with various researchers to develop the targets that are the basis of the Evidence-Based Adequacy model (Odden, 2008). Work that preceded his focus on the Evidence-Based Adequacy model included an analysis of the relative successfulness of school districts in implementing standards based curriculum in the mid-to-late 1990s (Odden & Clune, 1998). In this analysis, Odden and Clune noted that funding systems lack a logical tie to educational goals. They saw the level of state funding for education based upon supply and not demand. Availability of fiscal resources became the driving force guiding the funding of education when they argued that it should be logical, defendable targets.

Keywords: school funding, adequacy, equity, evidenced based, equalized spending

INTRODUCTION

The shifts in school finance policies nationally have had an effect on the policies in place in Illinois (Fritts, 2010). The evolution of the concept of *fair* is one that is important to understand if the goal is to improve the current funding system and move to a system that can better address the needs of the students of Illinois. As policymakers and educators alike look toward future reforms, it is imperative to understand the pressures and triggers that have brought us to the current system. Understanding the pressures that precipitated systemic change, as well as looking at the intended and unintended outcomes of that change, gives a more balanced view of the educational funding system in Illinois. To that end, this literature review highlights the events and conditions associated with times where macro-policy changes have been observed. The review begins by analyzing the efforts in the early and mid 1900s that move the educational funding system from one that was available only to the privileged children to one that would be available to all students (Cubberley, 2005). The review continues to tract the changes in the concept of fair as it evolves to one of equity of resources, a shift that is guided by research and litigation (Hickrod, 1985; Odden & Picus, 2000). The evolving concept of *fair* addresses the systems where strict adherence to an equity model may be met, yet funding for students continues to be related to relative property value within a district (Fritts, 2010). In these instances policymakers look to improve the definition of *fair* which leads to systems which address adequacy as well as equity (Clune, 1994). Systems of adequacy address more than student spending by coupling school funding and student achievement (Clune, 1994; Odden & Picus, 2000).

As the understanding of *fair* evolved, it has also become more complex. Early attempts were to make available a certain sum of money to support educational programs. Later an equalization of the funds was seen as necessary to be fair. Finally as the focus turns to adequacy of educational opportunities, the policies include both inputs and outputs. The latest concept of fair educational funding system begins to link the funding made available to school to the ability of students to meet identified performance targets (Odden & Picus, 2000).

The review of literature is assembled to initially show the evolution of policy from a historical perspective followed by an explanation of four adequacy models currently being employed to produce fair statewide school funding systems. The final section of the literature review provides a more extensive explanation of the adequacy model being proposed in the most recent EFAB report (2011). In this section the Evidence-Based Adequacy model and the targets proposed by in the model are presented. Together these sections inform why Illinois is currently considering a different educational funding model.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF SCHOOL FUNDING - THE EVOLUTION OF FAIR FUNDING

Fair school funding initiatives date back to the turn of the twentieth century. Cubberley (1905) began to find fault with established system which relied upon the rate bill system to fund education. The rate bill system treated education as a service and those who could afford the service would have access and those less fortunate did not have the same opportunities. Rate bills or tuition were paid by the child's parents for the educational services provided (Goldin & Katz, 2003). In the early years of the United States, families would pay the rate bill in cash or with in-kind payments such as room or board. Cubberley recognized the inequity inherent to this

system and proposed a property tax as a mechanism to fund public education in a more equitable manner (Cubberley, 1905). This was an early attempt to equalize funding and allow all children to have access to an education. The desire was to provide for a minimum funding level to ensure that educational opportunities were available to all children, not just those of families with financial means. Support for a fair system of funding grew and the 1920s saw a shift in the vision of fair as an available educational experience for all regardless of social class (Dahncke, 1990; Verstegen, 1990). As desire for a more equitable system grew, efforts of Updegraph (Dahncke, 1990) as well as Strayer and Haig (Berke, 1976) helped to develop formulas that provided state funding as a reward for local effort in the funding of educational systems. Updegraff's desire was to encourage and reward local effort in funding education by matching the locally generated funds with state funds (Dahncke, 1990). This idea was incorporated into the Strayer and Haig (Berke & Moskowitz, 1976) model forming a foundation equation that was adopted for use in Illinois in 1927 (Hoffman, 1981).

The Strayer-Haig formula represents an initial attempt to increase fairness in funding of education. The act of Illinois adopting the Strayer-Haig formula to distribute funds represents a macro-policy change in school funding. Cobb and Elder offer insight into such a policy change with their identification of initiators and triggers. Here, initiator would be seen as knowledge of the inequity of the current funding system and a desire to change the policy. The trigger is represented by the new technical knowledge, the Strayer-Haig formula, which can be used to mitigate the inequity. The evolution of the concept progresses from one of expecting some money for all students to one of expecting a greater degree of equity. Equity of an educational funding system can be viewed from two different vantage points. The equity can be from the perspective of the tax payer or the student (Baker & Green, 2008; Brimley & Garfield, 2005). In all discussions within this literature review and study, the view of equity and fairness is taken form the point of view of the student. This initial macro-policy change would not be repeated in Illinois until the 1970s, but precursors to the next transition can be seen in legislative as well judicial actions.

One of the pivotal events that moved the focus of education funding to equity of resources was Brown v. Board of education (1954). The decision in this case provided that African American students were entitled to the same educational opportunities as their white counterparts (Brimley & Garfield, 2005). Additionally the work by Coleman (1966) brought attention to the inequalities in opportunities among different races of students. The 1950s and 1960s were a time of policy reform that resulted in a policy change giving equal protections for the economic disadvantaged as well as children of different races (Odden & Picus, 2000). It was in this environment of change that the concept of fairness rapidly evolved and became focused on equal spending of all students (Baker & Green, 2008).

During the 1960s, constitutional challenges were mounted to test the fairness of state education funding systems. Building upon a successful argument in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), where the plaintiff was able to show that race could be considered a suspect class, similar cases sought to define another suspect class in schools (Brimley et al., 2012). The first cases included McInnis v. Shapiro (1968), in Illinois, and Burris v. Wilkerson (1969), in Virginia. These cases formed arguments similar to those in Brown. Where as in Brown race was shown to be the suspect class, in these education focused case, economic status was argued as a suspect class. That being the case, individuals classified by their economic status should be afforded the equal protection under the United States Constitution (Brimley et al., 2012). The basis of the argument stemmed from the disproportionate distribution of funding as compared to

the student's educational needs. The disproportionate distribution of funds was a direct result of the reliance on property taxes being used to fund educational systems.

When considering this case, the federal judges heard arguments that the varied educational spending in the state resulted in discrimination against the economically disadvantaged. Therefore, the constitution provided equal protection for all and this unequal treatment violated the United States Constitution. When deciding this case, the court also considered the Illinois Constitution as well as state statute enacted by the Illinois Legislature. As the court considered the arguments, they recognized that the state legislature had created a system of decentralized control, allowing local boards of education to have some level of direct control over school funding (McInnis v. Shapiro, 1968).

The decision in McInnis was neither an endorsement of the current system nor a declaration that the current system was without limitations. Instead, in the decision the court indicated that the issue needed its remedy through legislation rather than litigation. For the court to rule in favor of McInnis would require an equity test to be used to determine which systems were equitable and which were not. The plaintiffs argued that an efficient funding system would be based upon the educational needs of the student. They failed, however, to offer a test that could be used to objectively measure educational need. For that reason the only substitution the court could imagine was equal dollars per student, regardless of educational need. Acknowledging that this alternative was as flawed as the current system, the court chose not act in this case. In the opinion it was noted that unequal spending among schools does not automatically equate to discrimination. Instead the court would demand, and found present, a system that was based upon some rationale (McInnis v. Shapiro, 1968).

While this early equity case ultimately failed, the decision would be useful in future cases. These opinions also helped to focus policy discussions as Illinois moved closer to a significant school funding reform. As different courts offered opinions in the area of equitable school funding, attorneys were better able to form arguments. The concept of equity being developed in the 1960s would become know as horizontal equity or equal treatment of equals (Baker & Green, 2008; Brimley & Garfield, 2005; Odden & Picus, 2000; Toutkoushian, 2007). The legal arguments that would ensue along these lines referenced the Equal Protections clauses in both the federal and state constitutions (Baker & Green, 2008). The events that eventually resulted in educational funding reform were rooted in the evolving view of fairness and an increased emphasis on equal protections. A system of funding that placed a significant dependence on property taxes as a funding system could not be shown to provide equal opportunity or resources to students across the state (Odden & Picus, 2000).

During this transition time of the 1950s and 1960s the Strayer-Haig formula continued to be used in Illinois. With an unfavorable ruling for the plaintiffs in McInnis (1968), the transition to a more equitable system lacked a sufficient initiator. The concept of equity of educational opportunities, however, was not new and can be traced back to even the time of the Strayer-Haig's original adoption in Illinois (Berke & Moskowitz, 1976). In 1973 the state legislature was presented a sufficient triggering mechanism that compelled them to act to change the status quo. This trigger was marked by the intersection of an increased knowledge of the Strayer Haig formula and court decisions that further define a fair education for students. The funding formula being used in Illinois was perpetuating unequal treatment of children as a result of their address (Hickrod, 1985; Odden & Picus, 2000). Further study of the Strayer-Haig system showed that expenditures per student were most closely correlated to property wealth of a district (Hickrod, 1967, 1971). One of the early strengths of the system was to promote local effort as a

means to vest local residents in the education of the young people in their communities (Cubberley, 1905). This was accomplished through the use of property tax as property was a fair measure of wealth in the early 1900s (Odden & Picus, 2000). The result, however, was that school districts with high property wealth were more able to raise the local funds. Districts with low property wealth did not have the same mechanism to raise the local share and could only do so by taxing residents at a higher tax rate. The Strayer-Haig formula was disproportionately rewarding property rich districts over property poor districts (Dahncke, 1990; Hickrod, 1967).

The events leading to the 1973 reform help to fully illuminate the triggers and initiators present that ultimately would bring about the first major reform following the 1927 adoption of the Strayer-Haig formula (Hickrod, 1985). In the 1960s and early 1970s, the knowledge of the inequities was not a sufficient trigger to bring about change in school finance. In fact, the legislators in Illinois were unwilling to vote on school funding reform bills until they were presented results of a simulation showing the revenues that would flow to their districts (Hickrod, 1967). The added incentive came in the form of legal decisions being handed down at both the federal and state levels. As court decisions focused increasingly on equitable treatment of all students, several state school finance systems were found to be unconstitutional (Levitton v. Nyquest, 1970; Robinson v. Cahil, 1972; Serrano v. Priest, 1971). The unfair advantage experienced by property wealthy school districts was simultaneously being analyzed by multiple courts.

Serrano v. Priest (1971) represents the early case that declared the California educational funding system unconstitutional by successfully arguing wealth as a suspect class. The argument of suspect class is modeled after that for race in Brown v. Board of Education (1954). The Serrano case builds on the unsuccessful efforts in McInnis v. Shapiro (1968) in Illinois. In Illinois, the plaintiffs failed to successfully argue that wealth was a suspect class and thus afford protection by the Equal Protections Clause of the constitution. The shortfall in McInnis was the plaintiff's reliance on *educational need* as the metric. The court ultimately ruled that there was no measure of educational need and thus no means to test if the actions of the state were meeting the educational needs of all students. In Serrano the metric moved to wealth neutrality and required that the relative property wealth of a district not be correlated to educational spending in a particular district (Brimley, Verstegen & Garfield, 2012).

When analyzing the arguments in the Serrano case, the court accepted that wealth was a suspect class and that the discrimination or variance in educational opportunities was directly related to the state's educational funding system. The court went on to state that education is a fundamental interest as all future opportunities of a child are impacted by the quality and completeness of that child's educational experiences. The court further rejected the defense argument that variance in educational spending was the choice of local governments and school districts. This argument fell short in that the amount of money for education that was provided by the state was insignificant when compared to the reliance on a property tax base (Serrano v. Priest, 1971).

The early cases focused on equalizing spending as was seen in Serrano v. Priest (1971). The court decisions promoted systems that ensured horizontal equity. The Serrano case represented one of the first decisions to define a fair educational system as one that equalized spending among students and becomes a trigger in Illinois to reform the educational funding system (Hickrod, 1985). The Serrano case also represented the basis of arguments to achieve horizontal equity. The decision in Serrano clearly supports the equal treatment of equals (Baker & Green, 2008).

As courts throughout the country considered the fair funding question, the pendulum would continue to swing between upholding current funding systems and finding that they were overly preferential to a single segment of society. Challenges were launched successfully in New Jersey (Robinson v. Cahil, 1972) and New York (Levitton v. Nyquest, 1970) to show the unfair treatment of certain individuals by the state funding system. These cases allowed the courts to further develop a definition of fair stating that comparable funds should be available to all students regardless of where they reside within a state. With the courts' vacillation as to the constitutionality of funding systems, San Antonio v. Rodriguez (1973) marked a definitive decision as to jurisdiction of the question.

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez (1973) became the case that stopped all future filings of federal challenges to the constitutionality of school funding systems (Underwood, 1995; Odden & Picus, 2000: Brimley et al., 2012; Koski & Hahnel, 2008). As with other cases, the plaintiffs sought to argue "poor" persons as a suspect class. In its decision, the court defined a suspect class as "saddled with disabilities, or subjected to a history of purposeful unequal treatment, or relegated to such a position of political powerlessness command extraordinary protection from the majoritarian political process" (San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 1973, p. 2).

When considering the argument of the presence of a suspect class, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the plaintiffs had not adequately identified a suspect class of poor students as the disadvantaged unit was in fact the school district and not the student. In the Rodriguez (1973) case, the arguments were such that the deprived class was actually property poor school districts where, it was conceivable that wealthy individuals could reside. Without a suspect class defined in the case, it was not possible to argue the Equal Protection Clause of the U. S. constitution. Equal protection is offered to protected classes of individuals against discriminatory acts.

The decision of the Supreme Court continued to indicate that in addition to poor students not being a protected class of individuals, neither was education a fundamental right guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution. In their opinions, the justices were careful to indicate that education is an important function for society, just that it is not protected by the U.S. Constitution (San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 1973).

In an dissenting opinion, Justice Marshall indicated that the "Court today decides, in effect, that a State may constitutionally vary the quality of education which it offers its children in accordance with the amount of taxable wealth located in the school districts within which they reside" (San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 1973, p. 51). Marshall saw this decision as a shift in the stance of the court, ruling against a commitment to the equity of educational opportunities. He went on to state that the actions of the court in Rodriguez could have the effect of limiting children's ability to reach their highest potential.

Even with the McInnis decision not favoring funding reform in Illinois, the general assembly was aware and effected by legal challenges in other states (Hickrod, 1985). It was this environment that presented the Illinois legislature a sufficient initiator and triggering mechanism to alter the funding of public school in Illinois. The initiator came in the form of an added revenue stream with the passage of a new income tax in Illinois (PA 76-261, 1969). The triggering mechanisms included the work of the Governor's Commission of Schools (Hickrod, 1972) and the work of the State Legislature (PA 78-215, 1973). The commission informed legislators and those legislators then crafted an act that addressed many of the shortcomings of the previous Strayer-Haig system. The commission proposed a three tiered system that would alter the funding structure across the state. No longer would local effort the deciding factor that

was used to establish funding levels of schools. Instead a new formula considered property wealth, as well as level of poverty and needs of students. Much of the momentum that brought about this proposal was the potential for litigation in Illinois similar to that in California, New York and New Jersey where their funding systems were found to be a violation of the respective state constitutions (Levitton v. Nyquest, 1970; Robinson v. Cahil, 1973; Serrano v. Priest, 1967). Also, with the enactment of a new personal income tax in 1969, the mechanism to fund a reform was presented to legislators (Johnson, 1989).

The Public Act that was enacted in 1973, PA 78-215, achieved many of the goals of the governor's commission. Debate in the general assembly of Representative Hoffman's bill was significant. By third reading in the house, ten amendments had been attached to the bill. The most significant of these amendments was attached by Representative Berman as a means to substantively change the bill. Berman saw a flaw in the language that would reward districts that increased property tax rates. His amendment would have removed this incentive. Ultimately Berman's amendment failed to pass and the bill would be passed substantially as written. In response to opponents of the bill Representative Hoffman continued to raise the point that this new plan would give districts an option, and if the district so chose, it could stay on the same formula that was currently in place (House Debate HB 1448).

Debate of the language occurred in the Senate as well with supporters emphasizing that this was the first significant change to school funding in many years and noting the benefits of the resource equalizer in the formula. Senator Glass went on during the debate to explain the inequity of the current Strayer-Haig funding model as a system that penalized property poor districts. These sentiments had been echoed in testimony given during the drafting of the bill as well (Hickrod, 1985). Glass also noted the work that the Governor's Commission had put into the drafting of the legislation. Opponents in the Senate saw the language as penalizing Chicago and the surrounding counties. Ultimately the bill passed the Senate and with the governor's signature became Public Act 78-215 (Senate Debate HB1448).

The final language replaced the single Strayer-Haig formula with three formulas where districts would choose the formula that provided them the greatest resources (Johnson, 1989). The first formula yielded a flat grant for districts with a high student allocation (PA 78-215, 1973). This portion of the formula would be utilized by districts with the greatest local resources available. The second formula was the standard Strayer-Haig formula. Here, local effort was rewarded with state resources to provide the combined revenue for educational services. The third option was a resource equalizer or power equalizer. This third formula was designed to provide additional state resources to districts that did not have the same ability to raise local funds (Johnson, 1989).

As the reform was passed, legislators believed that the act would bring about property tax relief (Hickrod, 1985). Instead, the mechanisms contained within the bill rewarded local effort with additional state aid. The initial reform language and added provisions for high poverty schools benefited the district in suburban and urban areas (Hickrod, 1985). In 1976 the property tax rollback provision initially planned was repealed, an act that rewarded those property wealthy districts. By 1984, the negative impact of reward for effort component was clearly visible and resulted in its removal, returning the state to a Strayer-Haig funding formula (Hickrod, 2004). The previous formula resulted in property tax increases beyond a point that would be tolerable to the residents of Illinois (Hickrod, 1985).

As a reaction to the rapid increases in property taxes, property tax continued to gain the attention of policymakers leading to the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL)

passage in 1990 (Hickrod, 2004). Initially designed to control the growth of property tax, PTELL limits the increase in the extension of tax dollars to a district by the Consumer Price Index (Fritts, 2010). The effect is limiting the growth in local revenues which in Illinois account for the majority of school funding. This legislation can be enacted by individual counties through a referendum and currently is in place in thirty-nine counties.

Eefforts in the legislature were in motion to address questions of equity, poverty and property taxes (Fritts, 2010). As the question of education as a fundamental right was deemed a state constitutional question (San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 1973), efforts were in place to amend the Illinois Constitution to include language detailing an adequate education as a fundamental right protected and prescribed by the constitution (Hickrod, 2004). This amendment narrowly failed in 1992 (Center for Tax and Budget Accountability, 2006a).

The decision in Committee v. Edgar (1994) was delivered following a failed attempt to amend the Illinois Constitution to include language declaring education as a fundamental right (Center for Tax and Budget Accountability, 2006). This case argued that the current school funding system in Illinois violated the Education Article and the Equal Protection Clause of the Illinois Constitution. The plaintiff argued that the funding system was such that "educational resources were unavailable in poorer school districts, or inferior to those in wealthier districts" (Committee v. Edgar, 1994). Following the success in Serrano v. Priest (1971) the plaintiff argued that the system was not fiscally neutral and thus benefitted students who lived in property wealthy districts.

In its decision, the court acknowledged the disparities among school districts within the state, but noted that it was but only a goal to eliminate these differences. The court went on to point out that the plaintiffs had not shown that the current system was inadequate, but was only differentiated. The court disagreed with the plaintiff's assertion that equal educational opportunities were protected by the state constitution. Instead the system must be based upon a rational mechanism to distribute funds among the schools in the state. The Court found that such rationale did exist and did meet the mandate of the constitution. Here the Illinois Supreme Court stated that education was not a fundamental right and that the court saw this question as a legislative issue more than a judicial issue (Center for Tax and Budget Accountability, 2006a; Hickrod, 2004).

The most recent Illinois case to be concerning the constitutionality of school finance was Lewis v. Spagnolo (1999). In this case, the stance of the Illinois Supreme Court was reaffirmed when the court echoed its previous decision denying that education as a fundamental right and placing the responsibility back with the legislature. As the court interpretation does not guarantee education as a fundamental right, Illinois is positioned differently than other states where an adequate education was guaranteed in their respective state constitutions (Brimley et al., 2012; Koski & Hahnel, 2008). Without constitutional language asserting a right to an equitable or adequate education, cases in Illinois are not likely to prevail in favor of the plaintiff and will force focus back to the legislature (Johnston, 1996). This judicial interpretation removes one of the common triggers, legal challenges, present in system reforms (Cobb & Elder, 1972).

In Lewis v. Spagnolo (1999) the plaintiffs argued that the school buildings in their district were unsafe and that the educational programs were inadequate. Both of these claims were attributed to the educational funding system in Illinois and the reliance on property taxes to fund education. When considering the question, the court took the stance that the questions raised were only appropriate for the legislature to consider and not the courts. Specifically when

considering the inadequate educational programs, the court stated "that what constitutes a 'high quality' education cannot be ascertained by any judicially discoverable or manageable standards provides no principled basis for a judicial definition of 'high quality'" (p. 6).

Justice Freeman added an opinion in opposition to this decision. He felt that the stance of the court disregarded its duty to interpret statutory language by declaring the jurisdiction of the question in the legislature. His opinion stated that the court clearly should offer clarification of constitutional language to guide the actions of the legislative branch.

Since the reform of 1973, the system that sought to produce equitable and adequate school funding in Illinois, has instead come under attack and been labeled as failing to achieve wealth neutrality (Hightower, 2010). The inadequate foundation level and continued reliance upon property tax as a major funding source for education has resulted in a system that continues to benefit property wealthy districts (Fritts, 2010). Alterations to the GSA formula have also not improved the equity of funding across the state. Recent modifications to the formula include the inclusion of a poverty grant as well as a property tax extension limitation law adjustment which now consume 36% of the total GSA funds (Fritts, 2010). These funds are therefore not available to all schools throughout the state but instead direct additional funds only to high poverty or districts subject to property tax limitation laws, while ignoring others that do not meet these criteria.

In an effort to inform legislators in the area of school funding, Public Act 90-548 created the Illinois Education Funding Advisory Board (EFAB). After its creation in 1997, the board issued reports to the legislature informing budget creation for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 (EFAB, 2011; Fritts, 2010). The board was not then called to convene until 2009 after Governor Quinn took office. In the most recent report (2011) the EFAB offers a critique of the current funding system and analysis of a system that could provide an adequate education for Illinois students (EFAB 2011). A key limitation that was noted was the setting of the foundation level significantly below the median cost to educate a student in Illinois. In doing so the effect of the insufficient foundation level is to create a system that can meet narrow measures of equity but not provide for an adequate program (Clune, 1994; Fritts, 2010).

In the EFAB criticisms of the current funding system in Illinois, much of the early belief that increased local support would provide a more equitable system came into question. As states considered the early benefit of encouraging increased educational demand, it was found that the end result was greater inequity among districts (Hickrod, 1967). State funding systems for education relied upon local demand coupled with state legislatures funding commitments. These funding levels set by the state, however, were less often based on defendable targets and more likely arbitrarily set as a function of the state economic climate (Odden & Clune, 1998). In the end the educational demand of a district was correlated to the percent of the district population that was college educated and actually decreased equity among students (Hickrod, 1967). This realization became the trigger that would begin to move states from an equity model to an adequacy model.

As attention is again drawn to the school funding system in Illinois by the current EFAB report, legislators and others are faced with information that advocates for adequacy above equity (EFAB, 2010). The report questions the ability of the current system to provide adequately for students and coupled with the judicial tenor outside of Illinois, the EFAB is exploring benefits of two adequacy models for funding education.

A RATIONALE FOR THE SHIFT TO ADEQUACY

With a pattern of reform equated to the swing of a pendulum, reform initiatives were shown to be guided by the current court decisions. This is the case as there is a shift from equity to adequacy of educational opportunities. The transition, however, has been gradual. An intermediate step from horizontal equity to adequacy was one of vertical equity. A system representing vertical equity changes the focus from equal treatment of equals to unequal treatment of unequals (Berne & Stiefel, 1984; Downes & Stiefel, 2008; Toutkoushian, 2007). A system of vertical equity acknowledges that students with certain disadvantages can require more resources to achieve the same educational outcomes (Garms, 1970). Questions of vertical equity were not supported by the Equal Protections Clause and thus seek other basis for the arguments (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). Constitutional and statutory language can be found in the Individuals with disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Equal Education Opportunity Act (EEOA) and Education Clauses in the respective state's constitution. An important limitation of both the IDEA and EEOA language is the need for the argument to center on a protect class, such as race, religion, sex, or national origin. Decisions in these cases therefore apply specifically to the students within those argued protected class. In light of this limitation, most cases addressing vertical equity for all students within a state rest upon arguments using that state's education clause. Without such an education clause in the state constitution, Illinois schools have largely been isolated from these shifts to increased vertical equity.

Vertical equity required a system where students with similar disabilities or challenges would have equal opportunity to succeed without regard for the location of his or her school (Toutkoushian, 2007). Measurement of vertical equity provides a challenge for policy makers where one solution was to institute similar academic performance standards for all students (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). The challenge for the policy maker was to then fund an educational funding system that would allow each of the students to attain the defined goals. As Underwood (1995) considered such a system, she was unable to distinguish between a system that achieved vertical equity and one that achieved adequacy. Illinois is situated in a position where the current concept of fairness directs additional resources to the neediest students as a means to provide an adequate educational experience for all students (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). The shift to a model of adequacy is one that increases the complexity of the funding model. Adequacy models seek to find the link between inputs and outputs, that is, a link between funding level and student performance (Clune, 1994; Conley & Picus, 2003).

As policymakers are placed in a position to continue the status quo or enact a policy change, they consider the success of the current policy. In Illinois, policymakers find a system that through is heavy reliance on property tax has been unable to create a fiscally neutral funding environment (Hightower, 2010). Property wealth continues to be the leading indicator of per pupil expenditures within a district (Fritts, 2010) and continues to benefit disproportionately that reside in property wealthy districts. Equity efforts have been largely ineffective in creating a fair environment for all students in Illinois. This lack of equity has caused the EFAB to evaluate alternative funding systems and that board has shifted focus to a system of adequacy (EFAB, 2010).

To consider a shift from an equity model to an adequacy mode, the triggers that lead to this shift included the continued reliance of equity systems on property taxes as a funding source (Odden, 2003) as well as the increased focus on student performance brought on by the No Child Left Behind legislation (Odden, Picus & Goetz, 2010). As the states set academic targets to

show adequate yearly progress, teachers, legislators and families began to focus more on the educational outputs of schools. This in essences was a driven by a need to see a positive return on an educational investment.

Additionally, more recent court decisions have displayed the shift on the part of the courts from favorable views of equity to an adequacy focus. Successful challenges resulting in court ordered adequacy of education have occurred in Kentucky, Texas, Montana and New Jersey (Brimley, Verstegen & Garfield, 2012). In these cases the relative opportunities for low income and minority students are carefully considered in decisions prescribing statewide adequacy models to be instituted (Brimley, Verstegen & Garfield, 2012; Clune, 1994). Unlike in Illinois where the courts simply returned responsibility to the legislature (Committee v. Edgar, 1994; Lewis E. v. Spagnolo,1999), decisions in New York and Kentucky have returned rulings that prescribe reforms to be instituted by the respective legislature (Brimley, Verstegen & Garfield, 2012; Odden & Picus, 2000).

Another example of a successful challenge of a state's educational funding system occurred in Wyoming when, in 1997, the state block grant system was deemed unconstitutional (Picus et al., 2008). In the Campbell County v. State (1997) decision, the Wyoming Supreme Court tasked the legislature to define a proper education in that state. The decision required adequacy in educational experiences across the state and in response the legislature adopted an adequacy model which was subsequently tested in State v. Campbell County School District (2001) where the court found that the model of adequacy was sufficient in the state.

Much as was the case in the late 1960s following the Serrano decision, states are again considering school funding reform as a means to address the new definition of fair in school funding (Fritts, 2010). As states look toward adequacy models of education funding and the systems are placed into four categories: Economic Cost Functions, Generalization from Cost, Professional Judgment and Effective School Wide Programs models (Brimley, Verstegen & Garfield, 2012; Conley & Picus, 2003). Other researchers will vary in the title of the model being applied but these groupings are sufficient to describe and group the funding systems.

ECONOMIC COST FUNCTION MODEL

The first of these adequacy models to be discussed is the Economic Cost Function model. As many policymakers were looking to improve horizontal equity Garms and Smith (1970) were developing the model to calculate the funding level of an adequate education and was an early attempt to address the question of how much money would be required to have students meet a particular achievement target. This early work began to form the concept that translated between fiscal inputs and educational outcomes. In this work Garms and Smith noted that "equity of educational opportunity exists when the average achievement of groups is roughly equal. This definition recognized a duty of the public schools, as servants of society, to attempt to overcome environmental deficiencies that are not the fault of the individual students" (p. 305). Equity of educational outcomes forces the question as to which outcomes will be used to assess the equity. More recently the answer to this question, norm-referenced test scores became the tool to measure the equity (Baker & Green, 2008). This was further established as the measure with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 2001 that would become known as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). In this reauthorization, the success of a state's educational system was measured by performance of students as measured by state adopted, norm referenced tests.

Of all the adequacy models, this would be the simplest in concept. This model largely represents a statistical approach to adequacy where student performance is treated as an independent variable and spending the dependent variable (Conley & Picus, 2003; Garms & Smith, 2008). Through regression analysis, performance levels are analyzed to determine a level of funding level associated with adequate student performance. In this model the funding level is varied to produce a change in student achievement. The incremental change in student achievement per dollar increase is used to predict an adequacy level. Once the performance target is established, the analysis will yield the predicted spending level necessary to meet the target. This is a model that has been used in varying degrees in the state of Washington (Odden & Picus, 2000).

With the simplicity of the model comes significant limitation. The Economic Cost Function model is silent as to the use of the funding increase. The model does not dictate or even suggest the types of activities that are more likely to improve student performance (Conley & Picus, 2003). Additionally the model is designed to predict success of an average student in an average school, thus ignoring the unique needs of low income and urban students (Conley & Picus, 2003; Odden & Picus, 2000). Once these additional factors are considered, the model increase in complexity and is less understandable to policymakers (Conley & Picus, 2003). An additional limitation of the Economic Cost Function model is the reliance on high quality data to develop the equations that ultimately will be used to determine the funding level (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). An example of this limitation is seen when making predictions and drawing conclusions related to the socioeconomic status of the students. If socioeconomic status of students is determined by the number of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch and to qualify for free and reduced lunches students must complete an application for this program, then students who feel that they will be singled out or identified by their peers are less likely to self report their low income status. The result will be underreported data in the equations limiting the predictions from the equations.

GENERALIZATION FOR COST MODEL OR SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS MODEL

A second adequacy model is the Generalization for Cost model. This is the model that has currently been adopted in Illinois and titled the Successful Schools model. In this model, the underlying assumption is that schools that are currently meeting state defined performance targets must be spending sufficient funds to provide an adequate education (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). In this model efficiency is the goal and the state begins by identifying districts that meet certain performance targets. Next, efficiency factors that consider property value as well as teacher to student ratio are added to the calculation of efficient schools (EFAB, 2011). There is also the ability to measure success by including components such as attendance rate, graduation rate and dropout rate in addition to performance on standardized tests (Taylor, Baker & Vedlitz, 2005). Once the model is used to identify schools that meet academic performance targets as well as other efficiency measures, this subset of school is analyzed to determine the mean spending per student. The adequate level of funding is then established by determining an average spending of these efficient schools (EFAB, 2011; Taylor, Baker & Vedlitz, 2005).

A significant limitation with the Successful Schools model is the lack of focus on successful school improvement techniques. The model focuses on efficient use of limited resources without giving guidance in the area of effective system change or improvement (Conley & Picus, 2003; Taylor, Baker & Vedlitz, 2005). In doing so it rewards school with high

academic achievement and low per student expenditure. Another technique that draws concern with the model is the frequent removal of large city and small rural schools from the analysis (Conely & Picus, 2003). As the districts are identified, it is not uncommon for the selected districts to have demographic characteristics that are dissimilar to the state as a whole (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). The result is an analysis that more heavily weights the spending patterns of mid-sized heterogeneous districts (Conely & Picus, 2003). These districts also are districts that often spend below the state calculated median level.

PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT MODEL

A third, and yet different model for adequacy is the Professional Judgment model (Conley & Picus, 2003). The professional Judgment model is currently being utilized in Maine, Oregon and Wyoming (Conley & Picus, 2003; Odden & Picus, 2000). This model utilizes educational experts to identify resources necessary to provide an adequate education (Downes & Stiefel, 2008; Odden & Picus, 2000). The resource selection is based on the panel's knowledge of effective educational strategies and their collective educational expertise (Conley & Picus, 2003). The outcomes of the analysis have much to do with the makeup of the panel of professionals that are assembled. The cost of recommend resources is then determined and used as to mark the adequacy level of spending.

Concerns associated with the Professional Judgment model reside the fact that the reform relies upon professional judgment over researched practices (Conley & Picus, 2003; Downes & Stiefel, 2008). It is possible, therefore, for the recommendations from this model to lack grounding in research supported techniques or that any research summaries that are given to the panel to guide discussions could in fact inject a bias or agenda into the panel's work (Downes & Stiefel, 2008).

Even with this limitation of the model, successful implementations have resulted including that which occurred in Wyoming. The circumstances that brought this model to Wyoming were the result of a case heard by the Wyoming Supreme Court, Campbell County v. State (1997). In this case the state educational funding system was found to be unconstitutional and the court ordered reforming the system. After the implementation of the Professional Judgment model for funding, the new model was tested in court (State v. Campbell County, 2001) and was found to meet the intent of the Wyoming Constitution (Picus, et al., 2008).

EFFECTIVE SCHOOL WIDE PROGRAMS MODEL OR EVIDENCE-BASED ADEQUACY MODEL

The final model discussed in classified as Effective School Wide Programs model (Conley & Picus, 2003) or the Evidence-Based Adequacy model (EFAB, 2011). The Evidence-Based Adequacy model was analyzed in the latest report by the EFAB (2011) and there it was suggested that this funding model could be superior to the current Successful Schools model. A key difference with this funding model is that it focuses first on school reform research and secondly on funding by recommending particular interventions and determining the funding needed to support the intervention (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). The effect is a model that is grounded in research that supports and sustains effective pedagogical practices leading to improved student achievement (Odden et al., 2007). After identifying key practices, the resources needed for a prototypical school are determined. Then the cost to provide these

programs is established and used to determine the adequacy level for school funding (Conley & Picus, 2003). Another feature that sets this model apart is that identifies reform efforts and programs to be implemented at the school level (Conley & Picus, 2003) and sets targets that are defendable in educational research (Odden, 2003).

One key concern of this model was noted in Odden's work (Odden, Picus, & Goetz, 2010) when he found that less than half of the states in the United States currently contribute sufficient funds to their respective education budgets to support this funding model. Another limitation of the Evidence-Based model was that it neither benefits nor penalizes a school on the basis of student performance (Taylor, Baker, & Vedlitz, 2005). Other concerns that surround this model include the limited experimental study that has occurred to test claims of various school wide reforms (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). Additionally, the analysis that has been performed has been highly selective, resulting in a sample that would be dissimilar to the demographic make of the state as a whole (Downes & Stiefel, 2008). While these limitation can be seen as significant by policymakers that are focused on a positive return on investment with any funding model the components of the model continue to be supported by research and will require comprehensive analysis. It is the focus on the pedagogical practices that research predicts will result in higher student achievement in the long run.

COMMONALITIES OF MODELS

Each of these models varies in complexity and component, but seeks to create a system that couples funding to student performance and opportunity (Clune, 2004). Each model has also been used as a reaction to a court decision that has declared or cause policymakers to believe that a state's educational funding system was in need of improvement (Brimley, Verstegen, & Garfield, 2012). Even in Illinois where the state supreme court has upheld the current funding system, the EFAB has been moved to consider other funding options to improve equity as well as adequacy within this state.

EVIDENCE-BASED ADEQUACY MODEL: A CLOSER LOOK

As policymakers begin to look to reform the educational funding model in Illinois, attention has been given to the inequities of the current system in terms of the equity argument showing disproportionately benefitting students who live in property wealthy districts (Fritts, 2010; Odden & Picus, 2000). Key to the view of adequacy, however, is the understanding that to reform is to change. No longer will policymakers send money and hope for higher performance. Instead the money will be tied to initiatives that have the promise in resulting in improved teaching and learning (Clune, 1994). The adequacy argument adds to this consideration of educational outputs, namely the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores that have shown little to no improvement from 1970 – 1996 (Hasushek, 1999). A cursory explanation would be that the educational reforms were unsuccessful in the United States. Upon closer examination, however, isolated schools have successfully improved educational systems. The improvements are truly present where the educational system becomes the focus, moving away from a belief that isolated initiatives will have the effect of improving education (Cohen, 2001). The system changes must be grounded in practice and linked to professional development that truly develops teachers as professionals. In this sense of system reform, isolated successes have been brought to scale (Borman, et al., 2003), and the Evidence-Based Adequacy model promotes such systemic change. The components, school size, class size, full

day Kindergarten, preschool programs and professional development are addressed in with the Evidence-Based Adequacy model of school funding. In essence the model sets a funding point that can support programs that promote behaviors and activities shown to improve student achievement.

The Evidence-Based Adequacy model focuses on educational research to identify policies, procedures and programs present in a hypothetical prototype school (Odden, 2003). The recommendations supported by educational research are then itemized to determine the cost to implement in that school. This becomes a flexible funding model that can accommodate the unique characteristics of districts across the state (Odden et al., 2007). When the principles of the prototypical school are used and applied to other schools, the diversity of the school ultimately determines the funding that would be required in that environment. The model is flexible to accommodate the unique needs of the schools to which it is applied (EFAB, 2011). For example, the Evidence-Base Adequacy model has recommendations in terms of staffing requirements based upon a set number of special education eligible children. If in a particular school, however, there is a larger population of special education eligible children, the proposed ratio of special education teachers to special education eligible students is applied to the actual population at the school, thus modifying the funding available for that school. A significant advantage of this model is that schools are not treated as equals, looking only at state averages. Instead there is the ability for the funding model to consider and address the unique qualities of each school. In Illinois, the EFAB began considering the Evidence-Based Adequacy model of school funding as a model to improve the current educational funding structure (EFAB, 2011). To this end, a study was completed utilizing input from a subcommittee identified by the EFAB. As the subcommittee looked for a model that promoted both an efficient and effective use of funds, they relied heavily upon the work of Odden and others (2007) in selecting targets for the prototypical school for Illinois. For that reason, the Evidence-Based Adequacy model targets proposed by Odden et al. (2007) are the focus of this section of the literature review.

The remaining explanation of the Evidence-Based Adequacy model will consist of components of the model with research on those components and a, associated target recommend by the model.

SCHOOL SIZE

The question of school size is not a simple question as there are competing forces at play. The small schools versus large school question must be defined in terms of the desired outcomes. As many policymakers focus on efficient operations, a larger school size lends itself to accommodate an economy of scale (Lee, 1997). There is, however, more to the question than efficient use of funds. The Evidence-Based Adequacy model has a dual focus on both the use of funds and student achievement. In terms of efficient use of funds, there is a plateau in the effect when schools reach sizes of 600 and 1000 for elementary and high schools respectively (Monk, 1987; Riew, 1986). Lee (1997) echoed this finding in his study using National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) data showing an optimal range between 600 and 900 students.

As the focus expands from funding to include academic achievement, there are additional indicators that nationally the median size of 1200 (Lee, 1997) should be reduced. Student performance has been shown to be higher in smaller schools (Lee, 1997; Raywig, 1997; Sher & Tompkins, 1977). The pertinent findings of Lee (1997) are that students learned less in larger schools and that school size had greater predictive power of student success than did other

demographic characteristics of the school. A caveat in the findings included that as school size dropped below 600 students, so too did the gains in student achievement.

The "larger is better" notion should be reconsidered as policymakers look to school and district consolidation is one technique to capitalize on the financial efficiency, In a study of consolidations showed that student performance suffered after smaller schools were consolidated into more efficient districts (Coeyman, 1998). This argument is often countered with the belief that larger schools should be academically superior to the small school, but in research by Newmann and others (1996), it was found that broader course offering did not lead to increased student achievement. Instead a solid core curriculum was superior to one with many elective, in part explaining the findings and the benefit of the smaller school. When considering the larger question the most effective school size was found to be 400 – 500 enrollments for an elementary and 500 – 1000 students for a high school (O'Neill, 1996). Also included in these findings was the determination that a "school within a school" model could be used to continue to utilize a larger facility by implementing the recommendations supported by research (Lee & Smith, 1997).

Researchers attempt to explain the observation that smaller school size translates to greater academic achievement and in doing so begin to focus on the human connections within the school. In explaining the benefits, it was found that smaller schools function less as a bureaucracy and more as a community, leading to teachers functioning not solely as service providers but a individuals concerned for the needs of the student (Raywig, 1997). It is hypothesized that it is not the smaller school size itself, but rather that the small class size promotes other actions that have been shown as beneficial to improving student achievement. Raywig's findings also showed that at risk students benefited more from the reduced school size. A final note was of the long term benefits of smaller school size being increased college attendance and decreased use of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs.

Considering the research on the topic of school size, the Evidence-Based Adequacy model created the prototypical schools with enrollments of 432 students in an elementary school, 450 students in a middle school and 600 students in a high school.

CLASS SIZE

Beyond school size as a condition to improve academic performance, class size has also been found to contribute positively to academic performance of students (Achilles, 1999; American Ed Research Association, 2003; Gerber, Finn, Achilles & Boyd-Zaharias, 2001; Grissmer, 1999; Mishel & Rothstein, 2002; Molnar, 1999; Ney, Hedges & Konstantopoulos, 2002). Relying on data from longitudinal studies such as the Tennessee Student/Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR) project (Nye, Hedges, & Konstantopoulos, 1999) and the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) project in Wisconsin (American Ed Research Ass, 2003) have been used to quantify these benefits. The studies agree in that class sizes in early elementary of 13 – 17 students yield the greatest academic benefits (American Ed Research Association, 2003; Finn & Achilles, 1999; Nye, 1999). The studies also showed that the positive benefit of class size of fifteen or less diminishes beyond third grade (Hanushek, 1999; Nye, Hedges, & Konstantopoulos, 1999). These studies noted that the advantage of small class size was even greater for low income students as compared to their peers (Finn & Achilles, 1999; Hanushek, 1999).

As districts attempted to test variations on small class size, some have tried creating larger classes of twenty-five in the lower grades and adding a paraprofessional with the teacher. In these studies, the students in smaller classes out performed their conterparts in large classes with paraprofessionals (American Ed Research Association, 2003; Finn & Achilles, 1999; Gerber et al., 2001; Hanushek, 1999). Gerber et al. (2001) continued to analyze the finding by looking at the use of the paraprofessional by the certified teacher. He found that the teacher aides spent a considerable amount of time, 40%, performing menial tasks.

Another investigation of the extent of the impact that smaller class size was having on student achievement tracked the progress of students educated in the smaller settings for subsequent years. Specifically studying the student in the STAR project, it was found that Kindergarten students progressed approximately one month beyond their larger class size peers. The trend continued with two months grain at the end of first grade to five months gain after the students completed fifth grade (Finn & Achilles, 1999). Significant here because the small class sizes ceased in third grade, but the positive effects continue with the child. This is finding that is echoed by others considering the lasting effects of small class sizes (Hanushek, 1999; Nye, Hedges, & Konstantopoulos, 1999).

Again, as in the case of smaller school size, the class size itself does not appear to be the intervention that improves student achievement, instead it appears to support practices that promote improved academic performance (Grissmer, 1999). Class size was not signally sufficient to bring about the improvements in academic performance; instead class size reduction has bee yet only one component of a larger reform initiative (Graue, Hatch, Rao, & Oen, 2007; Grissmer, 1999; Hanushek, 1999). It was noted specifically that in the STAR program, smaller class size was coupled with extended day activities, an improved, rigorous curriculum and professional development (American Ed Research Association, 2003). In attempting to explain these findings, the studies showed that students displayed positive behaviors, such as increased participation and engagement and displayed negative behaviors less often (Finn & Achilles, 1999; Molnar, 1999). Other findings showed that the teachers had an increased knowledge of their students, additional instructional time and described changes in pedagogy as a result of the reform initiatives (Graue et al., 2007; Molnar, 1999). Finally the smaller class size created an environment where students were more likely to participate in their education as if describing a pressure to engage (Finn & Achilles, 1999).

The question of class size for grades four through twelve is less well researched (Odden, et al., 2007). As the benefits of the class size of fifteen were shown to wane in forth grade and beyond, larger class sizes seemed appropriate (Hanushek, 1999) For these grades, the model relies on national trends as well as recommendations from other comprehensive school reform models (Odden, et al., 2007). This data, while not based in educational research, each independently identifies a class size of twenty-five students as a goal. Clearly the effect of class size for grades beyond third is necessary to inform this aspect of the model.

With this research for early elementary and the trends present for higher grades, the target for Illinois' EBA model was class sizes of fifteen for Kindergarten through third grade and twenty-five beyond third grade.

FULL DAY KINDERGARTEN

The benefit of full day Kindergarten programs have also been documented in research (Cooper, Allen, Patall, & Dent, 2010; Denton, West, & Walston, 2003; Slavin, Karweit, &

Wasik, 1994), and have been identified as a component supported in the Evidence-Based Adequacy model. Nationally, however, only 56% of students attend a full day program (Denton et al., 2003) and Illinois the rate is at 74% (Illinois State Board of Education, 2011). The benefit of a full day kindergarten program, as noted by Cooper et al. (2010) when it was noted that the students performed .25 standard deviations above their peers attending a half day program and the benefits were seen in each reading, writing and math (Denton, West & Walston, 2003). As with any issue there is more to the debate than simply student achievement and here there is a clear short term cost savings in personnel with a half day model that needs to countered with academic benefits. Beyond improved student achievement, other benefits that have been noted are decreased rates of retention, decreases in the need for remedial classes and decreased special education referrals (Cooper et al., 2010; Slavin et al., 1994). In addition, students completing a full day kindergarten program were found to have better developed social skills and more positive self esteem (Cooper et al., 2010).

As researchers attempt to explain the mechanism in place that results in the improved student achievement, much is simply the added time (Denton et al., 2003). A time study showed that both half day and full day programs spent the same proportion of time on reading, but in the full day program allowed time to expand basic curriculum to include conversion of sounds to print as well as added work in vocabulary development. Much of the debate over full or half time kindergarten is rooted in whether policymakers believe that failure can be prevented (Slavin et al., 1994). Slavin's work has shown that early interventions programs can prevent future failure of students and even disadvantaged and low income students can keep pace with their peers in a system that offers early interventions. In addressing the costs differential of the full day program, Slavin points out that it is a choice on how money is spent. Districts can choose to institute early interventions for all students or institute targeted interventions later for students that fail to succeed. In his research, Slavin et al. (1994) found that these targeted interventions were more costly to districts as compared to early interventions.

Basing upon this research, the Illinois' Evidence-Based Adequacy model sets a target for full day kindergarten in its prototypical school.

PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

Seeing the benefits of an organized Kindergarten program, researchers have posed to question to determine the effectiveness of even earlier interventions, thus a discussion of preschool programs. In short, preschool programs have been shown to be effective in improving the academic performance of students (Karoly et al., 1998; Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, 2001; Slavin et al., 1994). Again the discussion surrounding preschool echoes many of the questions addressed in the Kindergarten discussion; do the benefits of a preschool justify the added expense to provide such a program? The benefits outlined in the studies include increased educational and social outcomes (Reynolds et al., 2001), decreased retention rates, special education referrals, drop out rates and delinquency (Slavin et al., 1994). Preschool programs, by their nature, focus significant efforts on the social and emotional development of students and have been effective in improving the emotional development of the child, particularly those children from disadvantaged homes (Karoly et al., 1998).

Recognizing the financial investment needed of such a program, research has also turned to look at the return on investment of preschool programs (Barnett, 2000; Karoly, 1998). These studies compare the short term expense of providing a preschool program to the long term

expense of providing interventions. Barnett (2000) found that, especially for disadvantaged youth, the initial investment was justified and yielded long term savings. Similar findings by Karoly et al. (2001) found that the return was between two to one and four to one on investments in preschool programs versus later remediation programs. In another, larger, multiple state study that considered the return on investment of preschool programs found that for every dollar spent on the program, the district saved the equivalent of eight dollars in potential future expense (Jacobson, 2003).

SUMMARY

The process of school reform since the early 1900s has focused on pressures that bring about policy change. The pressures have come from the courts as well as the public at large. Understanding the pressures or triggers can help to prepare for policy changes. As commissions and boards such as EFAB have been shown to be an effective initiator of change (Cobb & Elder, 1972), policymakers can be prepared to understand the possible plans being considered. Such is the case currently in Illinois. With the release of the most current EFAB report (EFAB, 2011), the proposal has been issued to move from the current funding model of Successive Schools to an Evidence-Based Adequacy model. This would be a change that will stretch far beyond the amount of money a local district receives. A model such as this includes multiple initiatives that promote school improvement and increased learning. It will be beneficial if policymakers first are able to understand the multiple initiatives and have concrete, local examples where these initiatives are having the intended impact proposed by the Evidence-Based Adequacy Model.

REFERENCES

Achilles, C. (1999). Let's put kids first, finally: Getting class size right. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

American Educational Research Association. (2003). Class size: Counting students can count. Research Points: Essential Information for Education Policy, 1(2).

Barnett, W.S. (2000). Economics of early childhood intervention. In J. Shonkoff & S. Meisels (Eds.), Handbook of early childhood intervention, 2nd edition (pp. 589-612). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berke, J. S., & Moskowitz, J. H. (1976). 8: Research in school finance: A concern with equity and equality. Review of Research in Education, 4(1), 309-335. doi:10.3102/0091732X004001309

Berne, R. & Stiefel, L. (1984). The measurement of equity in school Finance: Conceptual, methodological and empirical dimensions. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Birman, B. F., Desimone, L., Porter, A.C., & Garet, M.S.. (2000). Designing professional development that works. Educational Leadership, 57(8), 28-33.

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (2003). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T. & Brown, S., (20003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research 2003, 73, 125-230. doi:10.3102/00346543073002125

Brimley, V., Verstegen, D. A., Garfield, R. R., (2012). Financing education in a climate of change (11th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Burrup, P. E., Brimley, V., & Garfield, R. R. (1999). Financing education in a climate of change. (7th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Campbell County v. State, 1997

Center for Tax and Budget Accountability (2006a). School Funding Litigation. Retrieved from: http://www.ctbaonline.org/All%20Links%20to%20Press%20and%20Reports/Education/Litigation.pdf

Center for Tax and Budget Accountability (2006b). The Current Status of Public Education Funding in Illinois. Retrieved from: http://www.ctbaonline.org/All%20Links%20to%20Press%20and%20Reports/Education/Current%20status%20of%20education%20funding.pdf

Clune, W. H. (1994). The shift from equity to adequacy in school finance. Educational Policy, 8, 376-394. doi: 10.1177/0895904894008004002

Cobb, R. W., & Elder, C. D. (1972). Participation in American politics: The dynamics of agenda-building. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Coeyman, M. (November 24, 1998). Small-town schools: Changing times and budgets put the squeeze on. Christian Science Monitor, 90(252), 15.

Cohen, D.K., & Hill, H.C. (2001). Learning policy: When state education reform works. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Committee v. Edgar, 1994

Conley, D. T., & Picus, L. O. (2003). Oregon's quality education model: Linking adequacy and outcomes. Educational Policy, 17(5), 586-612. doi:10.1177/0895904803256790

Cooper, H., Allen, A. B., Patall, E. A., & Dent, A. L. (2010). Effects of full-day kindergarten on academic achievement and social development. Review of Educational Research, 80(1), 34-70. doi:10.3102/0034654309359185

Cubberley, E. P. (1905). School funds and their apportionment. New York.

Dahncke, T. J. (1990). An equity analysis of school finance in selected Illinois school districts (Ed.D. dissertation, Saint Louis University, United States – Missouri). Retrieved July 2, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9102899).

Denton, K., West, J., & Walston, J. (2003). Reading—Young children's achievement and classroom experiences: Findings from the Condition of Education 2003. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Desimone, L.M., Porter, A.C., Garet, M.S., Yoon, K.S., & Birman, B.F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 24(2), 81-112. doi:10.3102/01623737024002081

Educational Funding Advisory Board (2011). Illinois education funding recommendations: A report submitted to the Illinois general assembly. Retrieved from: http://www.isbe.net/efab/pdf/final_report_1-11.pdf

Elmore, R. (2004). School reform from the inside out Policy, practice and performance. Cambridge , Mass: Harvard Education Press.

Finn, J.D., & Achilles, C. M. (1999). Tennessee's class size study: Findings, implications and misconceptions. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21(2) 97. doi:10.3102/01623737021002097

Fitts, J.B. (2010). Essentials of Illinois school finance: A guide to techniques, issues and resources (5 ed.). Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Boards.

Garet, M. S. , Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective> Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915-945. doi:10.3102/00028312038004915

Garet, M.S., Birman, B., Porter, A., Desimone, L., & Herman, R. (1999). Designing effective professional development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Gerber, S., Finn, J., Achilles, C., & Boyd-Zaharias, J. (2001). Teacher aides and students' academic achievement. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 23(2), 123-143.

Goldin, C. and Katz, L.A. (2003). The "virtues" of the past: Education in the first hundred years of the new republic. Retrieved from: http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/katz/files/virtues_nber.pdf on June 26, 2011.

Graue, E., Hatch, K. Rao, K., & Oen, D. (2007). The wisdom of class-size reduction. American Educational Research Journal, 44(3), 670-700. doi:10.3102/0002831207306755

Grissmer, D. (1999). Class size: Issues and new findings. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21(2).

Hanushek, E. A., (1999). Some findings from an independent investigation of the Tennessee STAR experiment and from other investigations of class size effects. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21. 143-163. doi: 10.3102/01623737021002143

Hickrod, G. A. (1967). Ecological changes within a school district and expenditure for education. American Educational Research Journal, 4(3), 241-252. doi:10.3102/00028312004003241

Hickrod, G. A. (1971). Local demand for education: A critique of school finance and economic research CIRCA 1959–1969. Review of Educational Research, 41(1), 35-49. doi:10.3102/00346543041001035

Hickrod, G. A. (1972). A new design: Financing for effective education in Illinois. Final report. Governor's Commission of Schools, Springfield, IL

Hickrod, G. A. (1974). "No wealth discrimination". Education and Urban Society, 7(1), 88-95. doi:10.1177/001312457400700105

Hickrod, G. A., Chaudhari, R. B., Hubbard, B. C. (1985). The decline and fall of school finance reform in Illinois: A study of the politics fo school fiancé: 1973 to 1986. Illinois State University, Normal, IL: Center for the Study of Educational Finance.

Hickrod, G. A. (1993). Common sense: Plain talk to legislators about school finance. Illinois State University, Normal, IL: Center for the Study of Educational Finance.

Hickrod, G. A. (2004). Significant dates in Illinois School Finance. Center for Tax and Budget Accountability, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from: http://www.ctbaonline.org/All%20Links%20to%20Research%20Areas%20and%20Reports/Education/History%20of%20School%20Funding%20in%20Illinois.pdf

Hightower, A. M. (2010) State of the states: Holding all states to high standards. Education Week, 29(17), 33-35.

Hoffman, G. L. (1981). A description of the evolution of the general distributive fund formula in Illinois and an analysis of the changes to the formula following the enactment of the state income tax in 1969 (Educat.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, United States –

Illinois). Retrieved July 2, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 8122227).
Illinois Constitution, Article X, Section 1, 1970
Illinois State Board of Education (2007). Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved from: http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/publicsitefaq.doc
Illinois State Board of Education (2009). ESEA Approval Letter. Retrieved from: http://www.isbe.net/nclb/pdfs/accountability_workbook_letter09.pdf
Illinois State Board of Education (2010a1). 2010 Report Card Definitions and Sources of Data. Retrieved from http://www.isbe.net/research/pdfs/rc10_def.pdf
Illinois State Board of Education (2010a). Directory of Educational Entities. Retrieved from: http://www.isbe.state.il.us/research/htmls/directories.htm
Illinois State Board of Education (2010a2). Illinois Accountability Workbook. Retrieved from: http://www.isbe.net/nclb/pdfs/accountability_workbook10.pdf
Illinois State Board of Education (2010b1). Interpretive guide 2010: Illinois standards achievement test. Retrieved from http://www.isbe.net./assessment/pdfs/ISAT_Interpr_Guide_2010.pdf
Illinois State Board of Education (2010b) State Report Card. Retrieved from: http://iirc.niu.edu/State.aspx
Illinois State Board of Education (2011) Kindergarten program data. Retrieved from: http://www.isbe.net/research/xls/kindergarten_11.xls
Johnson, Wayne Paul (1989). The equity impact of alternate poverty measures in the Illinois state aid formula distribution of funds to Illinois public school districts (Ed.D. dissertation, Illinois State University, United States – Illinois). Retrieved July 2, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses @ Illinois State University.(Publication No. AAT 9014748).
Johnston, R.C. (1996). Ill. court delivers ultimate setback in school finance suit. Education Week, 16(9), 17.
Karoly, L., Greenwood, P., Everingham, S., Hoube, J., Kilburn, M.R.., Rydell, C.P., Sanders, M., & Chiesa, J. (1998). Investing in our children: What we know and don't know about the costs and benefits of early childhood interventions. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
Lee, V. E. & Smith, J. B. (1997). High school size: Which works best and for whom? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19, 205-227. doi:10.3102/01623737019003205
Levittown v. Nyquist, 317 N.Y. Super. 391, A.2d 287(1982) .
Lewis E. v. Spagnolo, 1999.
Mishel, Lawrence & Rothstein, R. (Eds.). (2002). The class size debate. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
McInnis v. Shapiro, 293 F.Supp. 327 (N.D. Ill. 1968),
Monk, D. (1987). Secondary school size and curriculum comprehensiveness. Economics of Education Review, 6(2), 137-150.
Molnar, Alex. (1999). Evaluating the SAGE program: A pilot program in targeted pupil-teacher reduction in Wisconsin, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21(2), 165-177.
Newmann, F., and Associates. (1996). Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newmann, F. M., Smith, B. A., Allensworth, & E., Bryk, A. S. (2001). Instructional program coherence: What it is and why it should guide school improvement policy. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 23(4), 297-321.

Ney, B., Hedges, L. V., & Konstantopoulos, S. (1999). The long-term effects of small classes: A five-year follow-up of the Tennessee class size experiment. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21(2), 127-142. doi:10.3102/01623737021002127

Nye, B., Hedges, L.V., & Konstantopoulos, S. (2002). Do low-achieving students benefit more from small classes? Evidence from the Tennessee class size experiment. Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis 24(3), 201-217.

O'Neill, G. Patrick. (1996). Restructuring education : Lessons from Chicago, Edmonton and Wellington. House 70(1), 30-31.

Odden, A. (2003). Equity and adequacy in school finance today. Phi Delta Kappan, 85(2), 120 – 125.

Odden, A. & Archibald, S. (2001). Reallocating resources: How schools can boost student achievement without asking for more. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Odden, A. R., Picus, L. O., & Goetz, M. E. (2010). A 50-state strategy to achieve school finance adequacy. Educational Policy, 24(4), 628-654. doi:10.1177/0895904809335107

Odden, A., & Clune, W. H. (1998). School finance systems: Aging structures in need of renovation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 20(3), 157-177. doi:10.3102/01623737020003157

Odden, A., & Picus, L. (2000). School finance: A policy perspective (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA.: McGraw-Hill.

Odden, A. R., & Picus, L. O. (2008). School finance: A policy perspective (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Odden, A., & Wohlstetter, P. (1992). The role of agenda setting in the politics of school finance: 1970-1990. Educational Policy, 6(4), 355-376. doi:10.1177/0895904892006004001

Odden, A., Picus, L. O., Archibald, S. Goetz, M., Mangan, M. T., Aportela, A. (2007). Moving from good to great in Wisconsin: Funding schools adequately and doubling student performance. Retrieved from: http://cpre.wceruw.org/finance/WI%20March%201%202007%20Adequacy%20Report1.pdf

Picus, L. O., Odden, A., Aportela, A., Mangan, M. T., Goetz, M. (2008). Implementing school finance adequacy: School level resource use in Wyoming following adequacy-oriented finance reform. Retrieved from: http://legisweb.state.wy.us/LSOWeb/SchoolFinance/Documents/Allocation.pdf

Public Act 76-261, 1969.

Public Act 78-215, 1973.

Public Act 90-548, 1997.

Raywid, M.A. (1997/1998). Synthesis of research: Small schools: A reform that works. Educational Leadership, 55(4), 34-39.

Reynolds, A.J., Temple, J.A., Robertson, D.L., & Mann, E.A. (2001). Long-term effects of an early childhood intervention on educational achievement and juvenile arrest: A 15-year follow-up of low-income children in public Schools. JAMA, 285(18), 2339-2346.

Riew, J. (1986). Scale economies, capacity utilization and school costs: A comparative analysis of secondary and elementary schools. Journal of Education Finance, 11(4), 433-446.

Robinson v. Cahill, 188 N. J. Super. 223, 287 A.2d187 (1972).

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez,411 u.S. 1, 93 S.Ct. 1287, rehearing denied, 411 U.S. 959, 93 S.Ct. 1919 (1973).
Serrano v. Priest, 5 Cal. 3d 584 P.2d 1241 (1971).
Sher, J., & Tompkins, R.B.. (1977). Economy, efficiency and equality: The myths of rural school and district consolidation." In J. P. Sher (Ed.), Education in rural America. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N., & Wasik, B. (1994). Preventing early school failure: Research policy and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Taylor, L. L., Baker, B. D. & Vedlitz, A. (2005). Measuring educational adequacy in public schools. The Bush School of Government & Public Service, Texas A&M University.
Verstegen, D. A. (1990). Invidiousness and inviolability in public education finance. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(3), 205-234. doi:10.1177/0013161X90026003002