

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **12/29/2006**

Received By: **tkuczens**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Administration-Budget 266-5468**

By/Representing: **Fath**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **tkuczens**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Education - school finance**

Extra Copies: **PG**

Submit via email: **NO**

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 -

Topic:

Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	tkuczens 01/02/2007	jdyer 01/04/2007		_____			S&L
/P1	tkuczens 01/16/2007	jdyer 01/16/2007	pgreensl 01/04/2007	_____	mbarman 01/04/2007		S&L
/P2	tkuczens 01/24/2007	lkunkel 01/24/2007	rschluet 01/16/2007	_____	mbarman 01/16/2007		S&L
/P3	tkuczens 01/26/2007	kfollett 01/26/2007	nmatzke 01/24/2007	_____	cduerst 01/24/2007		S&L
/1			jfrantze 01/26/2007	_____	sbasford 01/26/2007		

Vers. Drafted Reviewed Typed Proofed Submitted Jacketed Required

FE Sent For:

<END>

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: 12/29/2006

Received By: tkuczens

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Administration-Budget 266-5468

By/Representing: Fath

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: tkuczens

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Education - school finance

Extra Copies: PG

Submit via email: NO

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 -

Topic:

Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	tkuczens 01/02/2007	jdyer 01/04/2007		_____			S&L
/P1	tkuczens 01/16/2007	jdyer 01/16/2007	pgreensl 01/04/2007	_____	mbarman 01/04/2007		S&L
/P2	tkuczens 01/24/2007	lkunkel 01/24/2007	rschluet 01/16/2007	_____	mbarman 01/16/2007		S&L
/P3		11kjf 1/26	nmatzke 01/24/2007	_____	cduerst 01/24/2007		

FE Sent For:

Handwritten signatures and dates:
1/24, 1/26

<END>

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: 12/29/2006

Received By: tkuczens

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Administration-Budget 266-5468

By/Representing: Fath

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: tkuczens

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Education - school finance

Extra Copies: PG

Submit via email: NO

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 -

Topic:

Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	tkuczens 01/02/2007	jdyer 01/04/2007		_____			S&L
/P1	tkuczens 01/16/2007	jdyer 01/16/2007	pgreensl 01/04/2007	_____	mbarman 01/04/2007		S&L
/P2			rschluet 01/16/2007	_____	mbarman 01/16/2007		

FE Sent For:

/p3/mk/1/24 *nwn* *nwn/pg*
1/24 *1/2*
<END>

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: 12/29/2006

Received By: tkuczens

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Administration-Budget 266-5468

By/Representing: Fath

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: tkuczens

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Education - school finance

Extra Copies: PG

Submit via email: NO

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 -

Topic:

Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	tkuczens 01/02/2007	jdye 01/04/2007		_____			S&L
/P1		P2 / 10 jld	pgreensl 01/04/2007	_____	mbarman 01/04/2007		

FE Sent For:

1167
<END>

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: 12/29/2006

Received By: tkuczens

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Administration-Budget 266-5468

By/Representing: Fath

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: tkuczens

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Education - school finance

Extra Copies: PG

Submit via email: NO

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 -

Topic:

Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits *je*

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	tkuczens	<i>P1 3/4</i>	<i>1/4 PG</i>	<i>1/4</i>			

FE Sent For:

<END>

2007-09 Budget Bill Statutory Language Drafting Request

- Topic: Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits
- Tracking Code: BB0271
- SBO team: Education
- SBO analyst: Erin Fath
 - Phone: 266-5468
 - Email: erin.fath@wisconsin.gov
- Agency acronym: DPI
- Agency number: 255
- Priority (Low, Medium, High): Medium

Date: 12/29/06
To: Steve Miller
From: Erin Fath
Subject: Statutory Language Request

Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

- Under s. 121.91, create an exemption from school revenue limits for property taxes levied for the purpose of paying for school safety expenses.
- Eligible school safety expenses would be defined by DPI by rule (require DPI to promulgate rules for this purpose).
- Make the exemption first effective for the revenue limit calculation for the 2008-09 school year.

If you have any questions, please call me at 6-5468, or send me an email at erin.fath@wisconsin.gov

Thank you.



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

LRB-1290/2

TKK:.....

RNR jld

LPS-Fix
request sheet 1/2

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 - Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

EDUCATION ← head
Primary and secondary education ← subhead
CS

don't gen

1

AN ACT ...; relating to: the budget.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

Current law generally limits the increase in the total amount of revenue per pupil that a school district may receive from general school aids and property taxes in a school year to the amount of revenue increase allowed per pupil in the previous school year increased by the percentage change in the consumer price index. Several exceptions are provided. For example, if a school district increases the services that it provides by adding responsibility for providing a service transferred to it from another governmental unit, its revenue limit is increased by the cost of that service.

This bill provides that, beginning in the 2008-09 school year, a school district's revenue limit in any school year is increased by the amount of property taxes levied for that school year for the purpose of improving the safety of pupils and staff. The department of public instruction is required to promulgate rules to establish the safety measures eligible for the revenue limit adjustment.

For further information see the *state and local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

2

SECTION 1. 121.91 (4) (L) of the statutes is created to read:

DPT ==

Kuczenski, Tracy

From: Grant, Peter
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2007 11:14 AM
To: Kuczenski, Tracy
Subject: FW: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P1 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits
Attachments: 07-1290/P1

I think Erin meant to send this to you.

From: Fath, Erin - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2007 11:05 AM
To: Grant, Peter
Subject: FW: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P1 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Peter, please change the initial applicability for this provision to the 2007-08 school year. I will likely have a few other changes to the draft to be more specific in the language as to what will qualify for an eligible expense for exemption, but that make take a few days to work out.

Thanks,

Erin Fath

From: Greenslet, Patty [mailto:Patty.Greenslet@legis.wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2007 12:49 PM
To: Fath, Erin - DOA
Cc: Hanle, Bob - DOA; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Palchik, Laurie A - DOA
Subject: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P1 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Following is the PDF version of draft 07-1290/P1.



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

LRB-1290/P1 ^{P2}
TKK:jld:pg
RMNR

in 1/16/07

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 - Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

don't gen

1 AN ACT ...; relating to: the budget.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

EDUCATION

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Current law generally limits the increase in the total amount of revenue per pupil that a school district may receive from general school aids and property taxes in a school year to the amount of revenue increase allowed per pupil in the previous school year increased by the percentage change in the consumer price index. Several exceptions are provided. For example, if a school district increases the services that it provides by adding responsibility for providing a service transferred to it from another governmental unit, its revenue limit is increased by the cost of that service.

✓ 2007-08

This bill provides that, beginning in the ~~2008-09~~ school year, a school district's revenue limit in any school year is increased by the amount of property taxes levied for that school year for the purpose of improving the safety of pupils and staff. DPI is required to promulgate rules to establish the safety measures eligible for the revenue limit adjustment.

For further information see the *state and local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

Kuczenski, Tracy

From: Fath, Erin - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2007 11:53 AM
To: Kuczenski, Tracy
Subject: LRB draft 1290/P2 revisions

Tracy,

We are looking to make the school safety revenue limit exemption more specific. Please make the following changes to LRB draft 1290/P2:

1. Specify that in order for a school district to exempt school safety related expenditures from its calculated revenue limit, the school district must 1) work in partnership with a local law enforcement agency (could be municipal or county level law enforcement agency) to develop a school safety plan, and 2) the school district must submit the school safety plan to the Department of Public Instruction by November 1st of the school year in which the exemption would first be applied (i.e., school districts that want to take advantage of the exemption in the 2008-09 school year would have to have this plan on file with DPI by November 1, 2008. See last point below about changing the effective date of the provision).

NOTE: please do not specify that the school safety plan must first be approved by DPI in order for the district to use the exemption; we just want to indicate that a plan must be on file with DPI that shows the school district has worked with local law enforcement on safety planning. Also, we do not want to put anything in the language about updating the school safety plan, nor do we want to require school districts to submit a new plan each year. Once a plan is on file, they can use the exemption on an ongoing basis (for the time being, anyway). ✓

2. The exemption would apply to a specific type of school safety expenditures: the compensation costs (salary and fringe) for on-site school building security officers, and only for those costs in which there is a 50%/50% cost-sharing agreement between the school district and the local law enforcement agency with which it partnered to make a school safety plan. That is, the school district and local law enforcement are each expected to pay 50% of the costs of the security officers (up to \$50,000 per security officer total).
3. The amount that a school district may exempt from its revenue limit would be no greater than \$25,000 per security officer (50% of costs up to the \$50,000 limit), and only up to 1 security officer for every 500 pupils enrolled in the 9th through 12th grades in the district, except that every school district with pupils enrolled in the 9th through 12th grades would eligible to exempt the costs associated with at least one security officer. [That is, every district with high school pupils would get the exemption for at least one security officer, even if their total grade 9-12 enrollment is less than 500.]
4. At this time, there is no intent to exclude the local law enforcement agency's costs associated with the security officers from any state imposed revenue or expenditures limits on municipalities, etc. [I know that seems inconsistent, but that's where it stand right now].
5. Change in effective date: should be first effective with the calculation of a school district's revenue limit for the 2008-09, rather than the 2007-08, school year.

Thanks! Call me with any questions you have.

Erin K. Fath

Wisconsin State Budget Office
 (608) 266-5468
 erin.fath@wisconsin.gov

1/23/2007



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

P3
LRB-1290/P2
TKK:jld:rs
Imk
d-note
insert

in 1/24/07

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 - Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

DO NOT GEN

1 AN ACT ...; relating to: the budget. ✓

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau
EDUCATION

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Current law generally limits the increase in the total amount of revenue per pupil that a school district may receive from general school aids and property taxes in a school year to the amount of revenue increase allowed per pupil in the previous school year increased by the percentage change in the consumer price index. Several exceptions are provided. For example, if a school district increases the services that it provides by adding responsibility for providing a service transferred to it from another governmental unit, its revenue limit is increased by the cost of that service.

This bill provides that, beginning in the 2007-08 school year, a school district's revenue limit in any school year is increased by the amount of property taxes levied for that school year for the purpose of improving the safety of pupils and staff. DPI is required to promulgate rules to establish the safety measures eligible for the revenue limit adjustment.

For further information see the *state and local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

Insert Analysis
insert analysis line

INRA 2-1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

SECTION 1. 121.91 (4) (L) of the statutes is created to read:

121.91 (4) (L) The limit otherwise applicable to a school district under sub. (2m) in any school year is increased by an amount equal to the amount of property taxes levied for that school year for the purpose of implementing measures designed to improve the safety of pupils and staff. The state superintendent shall promulgate rules specifying the safety measures that are eligible for a revenue limit adjustment under this paragraph.

115
821 →

SECTION 9337. Initial applicability; Public Instruction.

(1) SCHOOL SAFETY MEASURES; REVENUE LIMIT ADJUSTMENT. The treatment of section 121.91 (4) (L) of the statutes first applies to the calculation of a school district's revenue limit for the 2007-08 school year.

(END)

2007-2008 DRAFTING INSERT
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRB-1290/P2ins
TKK:jld:rs

Insert Analysis, page 1

This bill provides that, beginning in the 2008-09 school year, a school district may exceed its revenue limit in any school year by the amount spent in that school year to provide security officers on the premises of schools with 9th through 12th grade pupils. ✓

The revenue limit exception applies to the costs of providing one security officer for every school having 1 to 500 pupils enrolled in the 9th through 12th grades, and one additional security officer for every 500 additional 9th through 12th grade pupils.

A school district must work in partnership with a local law enforcement agency to develop a school safety plan and must submit the plan to DPI. ✓ A school district may exempt from its revenue limit up to \$25,000 per security officer, provided the school district has entered into a cost-sharing agreement with the local law enforcement agency under which the school district and the local law enforcement agency each agree to contribute 50 percent of the costs. ✓

Insert 2-1, Page 2, line 1

SECTION 1. 121.91 (4) (L) of the statutes is created to read:

121.91 (4) (L) 1. In this paragraph, "local law enforcement agency" means a governmental unit of one or more persons employed full time by a city, town, village, or county in the state for the purpose of preventing and detecting crime and enforcing state laws or local ordinances, employees of which unit are authorized to make arrests for crimes while acting within the scope of their authority. ✓

2. If a school district satisfies all of the following, the limit otherwise applicable to the school district under sub. (2m) in any school year is increased by the amount necessary to cover up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs associated with providing one security officer on the premises of each school having up to 500 pupils enrolled in grades 9 to 12, and up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs for each additional security officer provided per school per 500 additional pupils enrolled in grades 9 to 12:

(usc 3x) ninth
(usc 3x) twelfth

a. The school board and a local law enforcement agency jointly develop a school safety plan that covers each school in the school district that operates grades 9 to 12 and the school board submits the plan to the state superintendent no later than November 1 of the first school year in which the revenue limit is increased under this paragraph. ✓

b. The school board enters into an agreement with the local law enforcement agency that requires the school district and the local law enforcement agency to equally share the costs of compensating the security officers.

provided under this paragraph

DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRB-1290/P2dn

TKK:jld:rs

lmk

(date)

Hi Erin:

A couple of questions about this request: ✓

1. The request referred to "local law enforcement officers" and, more specifically, municipal or county level law enforcement agencies, but made no reference to a law enforcement agency of the state or a political subdivision of the state. ✓ Are you comfortable with the definition provided at proposed section 121.91 (4) (L) 1.? ✓ In contrast, the definition at section 165.83 (1) (b), includes a law enforcement agency of the state or a political subdivision of the state. ✓

2. Who will employ the security officers? Are they full-time employees of the local law enforcement agency? Part-time employees of the school district? ✓

3. Is a separate school safety plan required for each school in the district with high school pupils, or may a school district prepare one school safety plan that covers the entire district? As drafted, the school district may prepare one plan that covers all the schools in the district. ✓

4. Did the department intend for the school district to retain one security officer for every school with high school pupils, or one security officer for every 500 pupils regardless of where those pupils are located? (That is, if a school district has 500 enrolled high school pupils, but those pupils are distributed across three different high schools, would the district be eligible to retain ⊖ and exempt from its revenue limit the costs associated with ⊖ one security officer or three security officers? As drafted, each school gets one security officer. em

Let me know if you have any questions or wish to make any changes to this draft. em

Tracy K. Kuczenski
Legislative Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-8967
E-mail: tracy.kuczenski@legis.wisconsin.gov

DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRB-1290/P3dn
TKK:lmk:nwn

January 24, 2007

Hi Erin:

A couple of questions about this request:

1. The request referred to "local law enforcement officers" and, more specifically, municipal or county level law enforcement agencies, but made no reference to a law enforcement agency of the state or a political subdivision of the state. Are you comfortable with the definition provided at proposed section 121.91 (4) (L) 1.? In contrast, the definition at section 165.83 (1) (b), includes a law enforcement agency of the state or a political subdivision of the state.
2. Who will employ the security officers? Are they full-time employees of the local law enforcement agency? Part-time employees of the school district?
3. Is a separate school safety plan required for each school in the district with high school pupils, or may a school district prepare one school safety plan that covers the entire district? As drafted, the school district may prepare one plan that covers all the schools in the district.
4. Did the department intend for the school district to retain one security officer for every school with high school pupils, or one security officer for every 500 pupils regardless of where those pupils are located? That is, if a school district has 500 enrolled high school pupils, but those pupils are distributed across three different high schools, would the district be eligible to retain — and exempt from its revenue limit the costs associated with — one security officer or three security officers? As drafted, each school gets one security officer.

Let me know if you have any questions or wish to make any changes to this draft.

Tracy K. Kuczenski
Legislative Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-8967
E-mail: tracy.kuczenski@legis.wisconsin.gov

Kuczenski, Tracy

From: Fath, Erin - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2007 11:39 AM
To: Kuczenski, Tracy
Subject: FW: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P3 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits
Attachments: 07-1290/P3; 07-1290/P3dn

Regarding your question #1 – the way you've drafted it meets our intent. No need to make any changes on that point.

Thanks

Erin Fath

From: Fath, Erin - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2007 9:22 AM
To: Kuczenski, Tracy - LEGIS
Subject: FW: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P3 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Tracy, in response to your questions on 1290/p3:

1. I believe the definition you've included in the draft is fine; the emphasis so far has been on working with *local* law enforcement. However, I'm going to check in with my supervisor on this, because we may want to provide more flexibility for districts that have fewer options in working with municipal/county level LEA's. Please leave as drafted for now.
2. I think we had assumed that the security officers would be employed by the school districts, but I suppose it could easily be the LEA; it may vary around the state. Do you think we need to specify in statute who the employer would be? Can we just leave it open?
3. The way you have drafted it is what we intended – no changes.
4. The intention was the later – to retain one security officer for every 500 pupils regardless of where those pupils are located. This is because when we were doing our estimates (as to the \$ potential impact of allowing districts to exceed revenue limits for this purpose), we had to use district data (we were not able to get data that indicated how many pupils in each grade by discrete school building). Practically speaking, it means some districts will be in the position of spreading out their allowable security officer(s) between buildings, which may be addressed by having part time SO's in each building. Keep in mind that the proposal is intended to help offset school districts' security related costs; not necessarily to fully fund the entire cost of providing security in each and every building.

I'll get back to you on #1 if there are any changes (my supervisor is currently wrapped up in some other budget crisis at the moment).

Erin Fath

From: Natzke, Noah [mailto:Noah.Natzke@legis.wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2007 5:00 PM
To: Fath, Erin - DOA
Cc: Hanle, Bob - DOA; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Palchik, Laurie A - DOA
Subject: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P3 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Kuczenski, Tracy

From: Fath, Erin - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2007 9:22 AM
To: Kuczenski, Tracy
Subject: FW: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P3 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits
Attachments: 07-1290/P3; 07-1290/P3dn

Tracy, in response to your questions on 1290/p3:

1. I believe the definition you've included in the draft is fine; the emphasis so far has been on working with *local* law enforcement. However, I'm going to check in with my supervisor on this, because we may want to provide more flexibility for districts that have fewer options in working with municipal/county level LEA's. Please leave as drafted for now.
2. I think we had assumed that the security officers would be employed by the school districts, but I suppose it could easily be the LEA; it may vary around the state. Do you think we need to specify in statute who the employer would be? Can we just leave it open?
3. The way you have drafted it is what we intended – no changes.
4. The intention was the later – to retain one security officer for every 500 pupils regardless of where those pupils are located. This is because when we were doing our estimates (as to the \$ potential impact of allowing districts to exceed revenue limits for this purpose), we had to use district data (we were not able to get data that indicated how many pupils in each grade by discrete school building). Practically speaking, it means some districts will be in the position of spreading out their allowable security officer(s) between buildings, which may be addressed by having part time SO's in each building. Keep in mind that the proposal is intended to help offset school districts' security related costs; not necessarily to fully fund the entire cost of providing security in each and every building.

I'll get back to you on #1 if there are any changes (my supervisor is currently wrapped up in some other budget crisis at the moment).

Erin Fath

From: Natzke, Noah [mailto:Noah.Natzke@legis.wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2007 5:00 PM
To: Fath, Erin - DOA
Cc: Hanle, Bob - DOA; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Palchik, Laurie A - DOA
Subject: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P3 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Following is the PDF version of draft 07-1290/P3.

Kuczenski, Tracy

From: Hanle, Bob - DOA
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2007 5:34 PM
To: Kuczenski, Tracy
Cc: Fath, Erin - DOA; Palchik, Laurie A - DOA; Grant, Peter
Subject: RE: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P3 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

I don't know if Erin called you to amend this draft to also include a 1% exemption to the revenue limits for school safety equipment. If she has, the amendment has been amended. The draft should be amended to allow districts to use their \$25,000 share (or whatever the share is based on the number of students) for a security officer(s) and/or to purchase school safety equipment. Eligible school safety equipment would be defined by the State Superintendent in rule.

The provision should be drafted in a way that also allows school districts to do both. For example, if a school district has 1,000 students in grades 9-12 and is eligible for \$50,000, it could hire one security officer for \$25,000 (provided the cost is matched on a \$ for \$ basis by the local LEA) and use the other \$25,000 on safety equipment. If the school safety officer costs the district only \$20,000, it could use \$30,000 on safety equipment. Contact Erin or me (6-1037) if you have any questions. Thanks.

From: Natzke, Noah [mailto:Noah.Natzke@legis.wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2007 5:00 PM
To: Fath, Erin - DOA
Cc: Hanle, Bob - DOA; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Palchik, Laurie A - DOA
Subject: LRB Draft: 07-1290/P3 Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

Following is the PDF version of draft 07-1290/P3.



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

LRB-1290/P3
TKK:jld/elmk:nwn

in 1/26/07

insert kjf

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 - Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

Don't Gen

1 AN ACT ...; relating to: the budget.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

EDUCATION

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Current law generally limits the increase in the total amount of revenue per pupil that a school district may receive from general school aids and property taxes in a school year to the amount of revenue increase allowed per pupil in the previous school year increased by the percentage change in the consumer price index. Several exceptions are provided. For example, if a school district increases the services that it provides by adding responsibility for providing a service transferred to it from another governmental unit, its revenue limit is increased by the cost of that service.

This bill provides that, beginning in the 2008-09 school year, a school district may exceed its revenue limit in any school year by the amount spent in that school year to provide security officers on the premises of schools with ninth through twelfth grade pupils.

The revenue limit exception applies to the costs of providing one security officer for every school having one to 500 pupils enrolled in the ninth through twelfth grades, and one additional security officer for every 500 additional ninth through twelfth grade pupils.

A school district must work in partnership with a local law enforcement agency to develop a school safety plan and must submit the plan to DPI. A school district

Insert Analysis

may exempt from its revenue limit up to \$25,000 per security officer, provided the school district has entered into a cost-sharing agreement with the local law enforcement agency under which the school district and the local law enforcement agency each agree to contribute 50 percent of the costs.

For further information see the *state and local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

1 **SECTION 1.** 121.91 (4) (L) of the statutes is created to read:

2 121.91 (4) (L) 1. In this paragraph, "local law enforcement agency" means a
3 governmental unit of one or more persons employed full time by a city, town, village
4 or county in the state for the purpose of preventing and detecting crime and enforcing
5 state laws or local ordinances, employees of which unit are authorized to make
6 arrests for crimes while acting within the scope of their authority.

7 2. If a school district satisfies all of the following, the limit otherwise applicable
8 to the school district under sub. (2m) in any school year is increased by the amount
9 necessary to cover up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs associated with providing
10 one security officer on the premises of each school having up to 500 pupils enrolled
11 in grades 9 to 12, and up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs for each additional
12 security officer provided per school per 500 additional pupils enrolled in grades 9 to
13 12:

14 a. The school board and a local law enforcement agency jointly develop a school
15 safety plan that covers each school in the school district that operates grades 9 to 12
16 and the school board submits the plan to the state superintendent no later than
17 November 1 of the first school year in which the revenue limit is increased under this
18 paragraph.

Insert 2-7
→

2007-2008 DRAFTING INSERT
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRB-1290/P3ins
TKK:jld&lmk:nwn

Insert Analysis

Simple
spect
analysis

This bill provides that, beginning in the 2008-09 school year, a school district may exceed its revenue limit in any school year by \$25,000 for up to 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12 and by an additional \$25,000 for each additional 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12. A school district must work in partnership with a local law enforcement agency to develop a school safety plan and must submit the plan to DPI.

X
X
X

The excess revenue may be used to pay up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs of providing one security officer for the first one to 500 pupils enrolled in the ninth through twelfth grades, and up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs of providing one additional security officer for every additional 500 ninth through twelfth grade pupils. In order to use the excess revenue for this purpose, the school district must enter into a cost-sharing agreement with the local law enforcement agency under which the school district and the local law enforcement agency each agree to contribute 50 percent of the costs for each security officer.

Alternatively or in addition, a school district may use the excess revenue to purchase safety equipment. DPI must specify the safety equipment eligible for the revenue limit adjustment by rule.

Insert 2-7

2. The limit otherwise applicable to a school district under sub. (2m) in any school year is increased by \$25,000 for the first one to 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12 and by an additional \$25,000 for each additional 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12, if the school board and a local law

enforcement agency jointly develop a school safety plan that covers each school in the school district that operates grades 9 to 12 and the school board submits the school safety plan to the state superintendent no later than November 1 of the first school year in which the revenue limit is increased under this paragraph.

3. A school district may use the excess revenue allowed under subd. 2. to do any of the following:

a. Cover up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs associated with providing in the school district one security officer for the first one to 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12, and up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs for providing in the school district one additional security officer for each additional 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12. The school board shall enter into an agreement with the local law enforcement agency described in subd. 2. that requires the school district and the local law enforcement agency to equally share the costs of compensating the security officers.

b. Purchase safety equipment specified by the state superintendent by rule as eligible for the revenue limit adjustment under ~~this~~ subd. 3. b.

X

2



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

LRB-1290/1
TKK:jld/lmk/kjf:jf

DOA:.....Fath, BB0271 - Exempt school safety expenditures from school revenue limits

FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

1 AN ACT ...; relating to: the budget.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

EDUCATION

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Current law generally limits the increase in the total amount of revenue per pupil that a school district may receive from general school aids and property taxes in a school year to the amount of revenue increase allowed per pupil in the previous school year increased by the percentage change in the consumer price index. Several exceptions are provided. For example, if a school district increases the services that it provides by adding responsibility for providing a service transferred to it from another governmental unit, its revenue limit is increased by the cost of that service.

This bill provides that, beginning in the 2008-09 school year, a school district may exceed its revenue limit in any school year by \$25,000 for up to 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12 and by an additional \$25,000 for each additional 500 pupils enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12. A school district must work in partnership with a local law enforcement agency to develop a school safety plan and must submit the plan to DPI.

The excess revenue may be used to pay up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs of providing one security officer for the first one to 500 pupils enrolled in the 9th through 12th grades, and up to \$25,000 of the compensation costs of providing one

additional security officer for every additional 500 9th through 12th grade pupils. In order to use the excess revenue for this purpose, the school district must enter into a cost-sharing agreement with the local law enforcement agency under which the school district and the local law enforcement agency each agree to contribute 50 percent of the costs for each security officer.

Alternatively or in addition, a school district may use the excess revenue to purchase safety equipment. DPI must specify the safety equipment eligible for the revenue limit adjustment by rule.

For further information see the *state and local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

1 **SECTION 1.** 121.91 (4) (L) of the statutes is created to read:

2 121.91 (4) (L) 1. In this paragraph, "local law enforcement agency" means a
3 governmental unit of one or more persons employed full time by a city, town, village
4 or county in the state for the purpose of preventing and detecting crime and enforcing
5 state laws or local ordinances, employees of which unit are authorized to make
6 arrests for crimes while acting within the scope of their authority.

7 2. The limit otherwise applicable to a school district under sub. (2m) in any
8 school year is increased by \$25,000 for the first one to 500 pupils enrolled in the
9 district in grades 9 to 12 and by an additional \$25,000 for each additional 500 pupils
10 enrolled in the district in grades 9 to 12, if the school board and a local law
11 enforcement agency jointly develop a school safety plan that covers each school in the
12 school district that operates grades 9 to 12 and the school board submits the school
13 safety plan to the state superintendent no later than November 1 of the first school
14 year in which the revenue limit is increased under this paragraph.

15 3. A school district may use the excess revenue allowed under subd. 2. to do any
16 of the following:

