

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

REPORT
to
THE ONE HUNDRED AND SECOND LEGISLATURE

GENERAL PURPOSE AID SUBSIDIES
TO EDUCATION

by
Interim Joint Committee
of the 101st Legislature

January 1965

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the provisions of a House Order, the Senate concurring, dated June 21, 1963, an Interim Joint Committee of the 101st Maine Legislature herewith submits to the 102nd Maine Legislature a report of its study of the General Purpose Aid Subsidies to education. The Committee held eleven meetings and a public hearing during the period beginning September 30, 1963, and ending January 4, 1965. The study has been made and the report prepared at a total cost of approximately \$2,600, as compared with an appropriation of \$5,000 for this purpose. The report consists of four sections, as follows:

- I. A summary of Committee procedures and deliberations as recorded in the minutes of meetings.
- II. A condensation of testimony given at a public hearing.
- III. A concise presentation of suggestions and recommendations made to the Committee by its employed consultant.
- IV. Recommendations of the Committee.

I. COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

The first meeting of the Committee was held in Augusta on the 30th of September 1963, with all members present: Senators Clyde A. Hichborn, Carlton D. Reed, and Frederick W. Whittaker; Representatives Raymond H. Bradeen, Kenneth P. MacLeod, Alan C. Pease, and Edwin R. Smith.

Senator Whittaker was elected Senate Chairman and Representative MacLeod was elected House Chairman. In February, 1964, Representative MacLeod resigned from the Committee. He was replaced by Representative Carlton F. Scott, who attended his first meeting at the public hearing on April 13, 1964. Senator Whittaker has presided at all meetings of the Committee.

Mr. Frederick W. Kneeland, Legislative Finance Officer, has attended Committee meetings, has served as a resource person on statistics and research, and has kept the financial records of the Committee. Mrs. Frederick M. Bartlett, the former Miss Elizabeth Faulkner, secretary to the Legislative Finance Officer, has been the Committee's recording and corresponding secretary.

The joint order creating the Committee directed that the study should include the administration and tabulation of General Purpose Aid Subsidies, the educational subsidy law in Maine as compared with programs in other states, a determination of the educational needs on both the State and local level, the projected cost of the present educational subsidy law, the present and future economic impact of the subsidy law on both the State and the towns and cities, and an estimate of the taxpayers' ability to pay for present and future commitments under the law. All of these factors were taken into consideration by the Committee, although some were studied in greater depth than others. Basic information concerning the administration and tabulation of

subsidies was taken from the brochure prepared by the State Department of Education entitled, "Maine School Statistics", the latest report being dated January, 1964. Significant statistics concerning past, present, and future costs were provided by the Legislative Finance Office in a document on "State Educational Aid, 1952 - 1972", a copy of which is attached as Appendix "A". Other data was gathered from statements prepared by officials of the State Department of Education, from testimony given at the public hearing, and from the findings of the Committee's educational consultant.

During the course of its study the Committee examined up-to-date figures on enrollments in the public school system, and it considered in some detail both the procedures and the results in the allocation of subsidies by the state to the various towns and cities. It reviewed the origins and the application of the so-called "Sinclair Act", and it used as a reference the 1957 report of the Legislative Research Committee on "School Finances and Needs", prepared by J.L. Jacobs & Company. Another useful resource for supplying comparative figures was the "New England Business Review" of September, 1963, on "State Aid for Education in New England", together with its technical supplement entitled "Stimulative versus Substitutive Effects of State School Aid", both published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Also included on the Committee's study bibliography was a group paper dated the 7th of December, 1962, prepared under the direction of Professor Raymond Ostrander on the subject "The State Educational Aid Plan for Maine and Its Relationship to Quality Education with Recommendations for Improvements". Legislation introduced into the 101st Maine Legislature was closely scrutinized by committee members; this was particularly true of L.D. #1532, as later amended by L.D. #1598, the so-called "Mendes-Cram" bill, and the "Uniform Local Effort", bill L.D. 1159.

After careful deliberation, the Committee voted at its meeting of January 6, 1964, to seek the professional services of Dr. Charles S. Benson as an educational consultant in the preparation of this report. Dr. Benson was then serving as a lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Education; he is a graduate of Columbia University and had previously taught in the Department of Economics at Bowdoin College; he has studied programs of state aid to education in several places and has been an educational consultant to the states of New York and California. On February 13, 1964, Dr. Benson spent several hours with the Committee in Augusta, during which there was a mutual exchange of opinions concerning the educational problems facing the State of Maine and ways of solving them. Dr. Benson later agreed to make a carefully defined study of the educational subsidy program in Maine and to submit a report embodying his analysis and his recommendations. The report was completed in August, 1964, and copies were made available to each member of the Committee prior to a full discussion of Dr. Benson's findings and recommendations at a meeting on September 10, 1964. Major excerpts from the Benson report are reproduced in section III of this document and copies of the report itself are on file in the State Library and in the Legislative Finance Office.

Two other significant procedures were adopted by the Committee before it began to prepare its formal report. On April 13, 1964, a widely advertised public hearing was held before the full Committee in the State House at Augusta. For almost three hours testimony was given on various aspects of the educational subsidy program in Maine. Twenty-three witnesses spoke to the Committee and a stenographic record was kept. Communications were received from several other interested persons who could not be at the hearing. A resume of the opinions expressed at the public hearing is presented in

section II of this report, and the complete record of testimony given is on file in the State Library and in the Legislative Finance Office. In further preparation for the issuance of its findings and recommendations the Committee agreed that individual members should prepare "position papers" based upon independent study of all the data and testimony which has been made available to the Committee. These papers were presented and discussed at a meeting on June 22, 1964; a consensus of the conclusions reached is reflected in the recommendations contained in section IV of this report.

II. PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

Twenty-three witnesses appeared before the Interim Joint Committee at a well-attended public hearing in the State House on April 13, 1964. They included several interested citizens who spoke only for themselves, superintendents of schools, members of local school committees, selectmen, mayors, a city manager, officials of the State Department of Education, and representatives of such organizations as the Association of State School Boards, the Association of Maine School Superintendents, and the Maine Congress of Parents and Teachers. Four dominant themes were expressed in the testimony, namely: (1) The local property tax has reached its limit and can no longer be increased to pay for expanding educational costs. (2) The State should assume a larger proportion of the cost of education. (3) The uniform local effort principle should be a part of the formula under which the State provides financial assistance to local education; one-third of the witnesses emphasized this point. (4) Continued efforts should be made to accelerate the formation of school administrative districts. Reported below are some of the facts and some of the opinions presented to the Committee on these four themes.

In the fiscal year 1962-63 approximately \$75,000,000 was spent in Maine

to support public elementary and secondary education; of this amount nearly \$55,000,000, or 73.2%, was supplied locally, which is far above the national average of 54%. Said one witness, "These figures show very clearly that education is mainly dependent on the local property tax. The property tax has been a stable source of income over the years. It has been the mainstay of school support, but it has limitations. It is reaching the point in many municipalities of being inadequate as the major source of school support. Municipalities differ greatly in ability to pay taxes other municipal affairs are necessarily reduced to a near starvation level in places which have little wealth but many children." Speaking in the same vein, another official pointed out that between 55% and 60% of all tax dollars raised at the local level is spent on schools; further, on the average the poor communities must tax themselves twice as much as the wealthier communities per mill rate on evaluation in order to get the same amount for educational purposes. A town selectman acknowledged that additional educational costs are inevitable but expressed opposition to an increase in the tax on the property owner, saying, "It is at its limit. This present trend has stifled any town improvement whatsoever. Our roads are still the same as they were when we built the new school." A representative of Maine's largest city stated the same thesis with these words: "Education has received a constantly increasing proportion of all local revenues, while other local services have been receiving less and less What shall it profit our citizens if they shall gain an education and lose their communities to the jungle? The property tax as a base for local financing no longer can meet the demands being imposed upon it. This horse and buggy tax is completely inadequate in the space age."

The only available alternative to a continuing increase in local property taxes for the support of education is an upward adjustment in the amount

of financial assistance granted by the State. This was the opinion of a majority of those who testified at the public hearing. The national average of state support was reported as 40.8% as compared with 23.3% in Maine. Even to maintain this relatively low percentage, a State Department of Education official estimated, will require an appropriation of about \$8,000,000 more State funds for the two years 1965-1967 than has been allocated for the biennium 1963-1965. The largest share of this amount is needed to adjust upward the per pupil allowances used in determining the so-called "foundation program" under the present subsidy law; unless this adjustment is made to compensate for increasing local costs of education the State's share will fall below the 23.3% figure. Beyond this, however, there is considerable public demand for raising the percentage figure at least a step closer to the national average (40.8%) of state support. A representative of the Maine School Superintendents Association told the Committee that his organization has "supported consistently an increase in the percentage of school costs that come from state funds". Another witness described the increasing school enrollments and the rising costs of education; then he clearly stated the prevailing situation in these realistic terms: "The children are here. We are educating them. It is either a case of more money from the property tax or more money out of the state tax."

As to sources of additional state revenue from which to pay higher educational subsidies, suggestions were made by only two or three of the witnesses; one favored the assessment of a state income tax, another reluctantly agreed with this suggestion, and a third strongly urged the adoption of a state lottery. There was greater agreement with regard to a method which would increase the total amount of state aid and at the same time effect a more equitable distribution of educational funds in accordance with the needs

and the financial capabilities of the various communities; eight of the twenty-three persons who testified voluntarily advocated adoption of the so-called "uniform tax effort" principle. At the request of the Committee, this principle was explained by an official of the State Department of Education, as follows: (1) The State prescribes a "foundation program" or level of education, expressed in terms of a dollar cost per pupil, which seeks to guarantee an equal program of education for all children throughout the State. (2) The State requires each local unit to make a fixed and reasonable tax effort toward support of the foundation program based upon a designated mill rate (17 to 20 mills is the range suggested) on State valuation of local property. (3) The State then grants a subsidy to each community in a dollar amount representing the difference between the local assessment resulting from the stated mill rate and the cost of the foundation program in the community. This procedure reverses the subsidy plan now in effect whereby the State contributes a specified percentage of the cost of the foundation program and the local unit must make up the difference. The advantages of the uniform effort principle, especially for the smaller and poorer communities, were dramatized by the presentation of statistics indicating that some towns in Maine must tax themselves at the rate of 49 mills in order to provide the same foundation program for education which wealthier communities can achieve through a tax rate of one mill. Resolutions in support of the uniform effort principle were presented at the public hearing by representatives of the State School Boards Association, the Maine Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Maine School Superintendents Association. Other witnesses, including a member of a local school committee, also spoke in favor of this proposal.

Several witnesses spoke of the importance of forming more school administrative districts in Maine. The State School Boards Association, through

its representative, recommended that the State study the advisability of dividing the more than 400 school districts "into a lesser number" of more efficient size, the study to determine the amount of dollar savings, if any, to be realized by such a reapportionment. A taxpayer expressed the opinion that the formation of school administrative districts should be made mandatory through legislation, that small high schools should be abolished, and that willingness to join prescribed districts should be a prerequisite for the receiving of state educational subsidies. In support of a state-wide study for the purpose of determining an equitable plan for the formation of compulsory school administrative districts, testimony was given by another person in these words: "If the State will make the study and say to us - this is the district into which you should go - we will be glad to go into that district. On the other hand, there was also some opposition to the concept of compulsory school districts.

III. THE BENSON REPORT

Dr. Charles S. Benson of the Harvard Graduate School of Education served as consultant for the Committee and prepared a 38-page "informal" document entitled, "Report on The Finance of Education in the State of Maine". The paper covered the following topics: a description of the existing sources of financial support for public elementary and secondary schools in Maine; a critical analysis of the existing educational subsidies, based on current thinking about school aid policies; the possible desired directions of change in state-local financial and administrative relations; and short-term recommendations for modifications of educational subsidies and related matters. A selected and annotated bibliography was included at the end of

the document. The Committee records in this section the major conclusions and recommendations set forth by its consultant.

The present system of school finance in Maine, according to Dr. Benson, "is failing to achieve the objective of equalization, either with respect to provision of services or with respect to local tax rates". He points out that the current program "allows quite wide differences in expenditure per pupil to exist, with the poorer places being in the unfortunate position of having the combination of meagerly supported schools and high tax rates". The following are some of the factors involved in this undesirable situation: (1) There is no stated minimum expenditure per pupil; thus approximately two-thirds of Maine's school units spend less than the foundation program, even though the foundation program is itself low by national standards. (2) The range of state valuation per pupil within classifications is too wide; in Class 21, for example, it runs from less than \$13,000 to over \$600,000, but all the towns and districts in this category, which includes about a quarter of the State's enrollment, receive aid at the same ratio of 18%. (3) The computation of subsidies under the present law may require a richer town to make a smaller tax effort than a poorer town; this condition is further aggravated when the poorer town is also a small town which supports a secondary school.

Other inequities in the current subsidy program were noted by Dr. Benson as follows: (1) Little consideration is given to the cost increase caused by growth in enrollment, except to provide construction aid, with the result that the price for educating the additional pupils must be paid primarily by the local government. (2) The progress of school consolidation in Maine is slow because newly-formed administrative districts may receive less subsidy than the member towns would have received as separate school units; this is

particularly true if a prosperous community joins with several poorer towns, despite the fact that a 10% bonus for consolidation is granted. (3) The school subsidy law as written expresses the intention of the Legislature to revise the amount of state subsidies each biennium in order to keep pace with the educational expenditures of the various school units; however, it is Dr. Benson's view that this provision "appears to place the Legislature in too passive a role with regard to school expenditure - and, hence, with regard to educational policy".

The first and "most important revision" of the Maine school subsidy program, in the opinion of Dr. Benson, should be "the establishment of a uniform effort plan". To put this plan into effect he recommends two changes in the "State of Maine Laws Relating to Public Schools", namely; (1) Raise the foundation program allowance by increasing the per pupil values in Table I, Sec. 3722, Title 20, M.R.S.A.; specifically, the figure for elementary school units size 801 and over should be increased to \$275 and the figure for secondary school units size 801 and over should be raised to \$385, with corresponding adjustments in the other categories of Table I. (2) Guarantee payment by the State of educational subsidies to the local school units in a dollar amount representing the difference between the cost of the foundation program allowance and the yield of a 20 mill local tax levy based on state valuation. Under this proposal Dr. Benson suggests the following stipulations: "In order to receive any general purpose state aid toward schools, I believe the local authorities should meet two conditions. First, the local authorities must levy a school tax to yield the equivalent sum of a 20 mill levy on state valuation. Second, the local authorities must certify that they have spent at least the sums per pupil of Table I on their elementary schools." In some prosperous school units the 20 mill assessment will pro-

duce more than the amount of the foundation program allowance, thus making such units ineligible for any state subsidy; this situation can be remedied, if desired, by the adoption of a "save harmless" clause under which all units are guaranteed as a minimum subsidy the total amount received in the last year of operation of the present plan.

The Benson Report contains several other suggestions, two of which have to do with a downward revision of state valuation for school tax and subsidy measurement purposes. One is to remove industrial properties from local taxation for schools and, instead, subject these properties to a uniform rate of school taxation by the state, with the funds being redistributed equitably to all school units under the overall general purposes subsidy program. This proposal is justified by the contention that "industry has a stake in the progress of education in the State as a whole but not necessarily in the progress of some particular town's schools" and by the belief that "local differences in school costs fall primarily on the households of the towns". Secondly, Dr. Benson notes that in the cities of Maine a large proportion of children are educated at private expense, a factor which is not taken into account in measuring the fiscal abilities of the cities; therefore, he advocates an adjustment in state valuation for school subsidy purposes in accordance with this formula: Multiply the number of private and parochial students of the administrative unit by the dollar amount of state average expenditure in public schools in the last year, divide the product by 20 mills, and deduct the value so obtained from the state valuation of the administrative unit.

Other miscellaneous recommendations made by Dr. Benson are these: (1) In the formation of School Administrative Districts no set of towns should lose subsidy because of the fact that they have consolidated their schools; there

might be a time limit of 5 years established on this "save harmless from consolidation" feature, after which the special aid would be tapered off at 20% a year. (2) Effective retraining of teachers calls for a full-time period of study and this process should be encouraged through reimbursement to the local units of 100% of the cost of sabbaticals granted under Sec. 473 (9) Title 20, M.R.S.A. of the "Laws Relating to Public Schools"; however, the aggregate cost of such reimbursement should be "pooled" and redistributed among the local units by deducting the aggregate cost from the State general aid subsidy, pro-rated among the local units on the basis of enrollment. (3) Subsidies should be based on estimates of current enrollment or membership for all towns and districts in order to deal with "the problem of the lag in state subsidies behind the needs of districts with rising enrollments". (4) The State should continue its policy of establishing technical and vocational schools, and at least some schools should "be designed to provide instruction for students as young as 15 years". (5) The distribution of construction aid should be governed by the percentages of Table II of Sec. 3723 even though use of the percentages is discontinued in connection with the regular general purpose subsidies.

Dr. Benson includes a section entitled "Some Long Range Views on Educational Finance", and a few of these "unpopular notions", as he calls them, are described herein for the information of readers of this report. (1) The "comprehensive high school", with its "traditionally inevitable bias toward the generalized preparation of students for the four-year liberal arts college, cannot adequately serve students who have a keen interest in scientific, technical or artistic pursuits". Therefore, Dr. Benson advocates the establishment of a number of "specialized secondary institutions" to meet the needs and the interests of students with a scientific, technical or artistic bent. He notes that the cost of such schools will provide a powerful impetus

for the formation of much larger school districts, thus at the same time having the desirable effect of reducing the "variability in local fiscal capacity". (2) Eventually the administration of school services should be merged with the administration of other local services under the legislative control of one locally elected government agency. In support of this proposal, Dr. Benson points out that such problems as housing, health, welfare, youth activities, industrial training, and cultural development are closely related; consequently, "the separateness of school government leads to a placing on the schools of a burden for social change that can only distract the schools from their primary educational function". (3) State governments should be granted increasing regulatory powers over such factors as the geographical distribution of educational resources and the setting of uniform standards for all local units in matters related to school staffing, salaries, and housing. (4) Individual school principals should have greater autonomy and power in making substantive recommendations about their own budgets, while at the same time assuming responsibility for showing results from innovations undertaken. (5) There should be an end to "separateness" among the careers of school teachers, college professors, and industrial training personnel "with the view of re-establishing contact between our schools and the academic community, and of creating an effective contact between schools and industry".

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Interim Joint Committee to the 102nd Maine Legislature are based upon conclusions reached after careful study of the data described in the first three sections of this report. The conclusions

are three in number, namely; (1) The education of its youth should have priority in the expenditure of public funds in Maine; modern school facilities and competent teachers in adequate numbers constitute a corporate asset which will uniquely enhance the cultural, industrial, and recreational life of the commonwealth; failure to assess and to invest the funds necessary for this purpose is false economy which will lead only to poverty in all the major areas of public and private experience. (2) The State should immediately assume a larger share of the responsibility for financing public elementary and secondary education; there is a general consensus that the local property tax is supporting an unreasonably high proportion of educational costs; statistics indicate that general purpose aid subsidies in Maine are below the national average of state participation. (3) The subsidization of public elementary and secondary education in Maine is a complex problem which should be further analyzed in depth by independent qualified educational consultants under legislative supervision.

Therefore, the Interim Joint Committee makes three major recommendations, as follows:

1. That the 102nd Maine Legislature amend the present educational subsidy law by establishing the so-called "uniform tax effort principle", thereby guaranteeing payment by the State of educational subsidies to local school units in a dollar amount representing the difference between the cost of the foundation program allowance (Table I, Sec. 3722) and the yield of a 20 mill local tax levy based on state valuation. Under this amended law the local authorities should be required to levy a school tax sufficient to yield the equivalent sum of a 20 mill levy on state valuation, and they should be required to certify that they have spent at least the sums per pupil in their elementary schools designated in Table I, Sec. 3722. The amended law should

include a provision that all school units will receive as a minimum subsidy the total amount received in the last year of operation of the present subsidy plan; this "save harmless" clause will protect those school units in which a 20 mill assessment will produce more than the amount of the foundation program allowance. Attached to this report as Appendix "B" is a document showing the amount of subsidy to be received annually by each school unit in Maine under the 20 mill uniform effort plan as compared with the subsidy provided under the present law. It is estimated that the proposal outlined in this recommendation would transfer from local communities to the State approximately \$3,000,000 of educational costs during the second year of the current biennium.

2. That the 102nd Maine Legislature authorize a professional study in depth of the "State of Maine Laws Relating to Public Schools" as they pertain to general purpose aid subsidies. The present laws are based upon such a study, the so-called Jacobs Report, made in 1957 at a cost of \$25,000, and there is need for another such analysis at this time. This project should be supervised by a legislative committee but should be carried on by experts in the field of public school education. This study in depth should examine, among others, the following factors: (1) The provisions in the present law concerning such matters as foundation program content and allowances, bonuses for school administrative districts, and other criteria related to the formation of such districts. (2) The various suggestions made by Dr. Charles S. Benson, educational consultant, in his report to this Committee, especially those outlined in section III of the Committee's report.

3. That the Legislature appropriate a sum sufficient to implement the proposed study.

In submitting its report, the Interim Joint Committee expresses special appreciation to Mr. Frederick W. Kneeland, Legislative Finance Officer, and to Mrs. Elizabeth Bartlett, Secretary to Mr. Kneeland, for the valuable assistance which they have freely and graciously given to the Committee. The Committee is also grateful to Dr. Charles S. Benson, to various officials of the State Department of Education, and to the witnesses who testified at the Committee's public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

INTERIM JOINT COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PURPOSE
AID SUBSIDIES, 101st MAINE LEGISLATURE

Senator Frederick W. Whittaker, Chairman
Senator Carlton D. Reed, Jr.
Senator Clyde A. Hichborn
Representative Raymond H. Bradeen
Representative Alan C. Pease
Representative Carlton F. Scott
Representative Edwin R. Smith

January 6, 1965

Legislative Finance Office
May 1964Revision No. 2
S T A T E E D U C A T I O N A L A I D
1 9 5 2 - 1 9 7 2

(Projected figures subject to fluctuation in state valuations)

YEAR	MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES	ENROLLMENT (April 1st Resident)		% OF AID	GENERAL PURPOSE AID		
		Elem.	Sec.		FOUNDATION PROGRAM PLUS BONUS	CONSTRUC- TION	TOTAL GEN. PURPOSE AID
1952-3	28,458,864	167,024		21.0	5,965,125		5,965,125
1953-4	31,360,203	168,225		20.7	6,506,885		6,506,885
1954-5	33,906,749	173,209		21.4	7,256,068		7,256,068
1955-6	36,351,847	176,944		20.3	7,390,600		7,390,600
1956-7	42,255,619	179,207		18.1	7,639,866		7,639,866
1957-8	44,865,062	184,608		23.1	10,343,898		10,343,898
1958-9	50,038,203	143,795	45,650	20.8	10,364,217	63,875	10,428,092
1959-0	54,821,572	148,704	46,356	23.0	12,567,724	59,545	12,627,269
1960-1	61,276,271	154,483	47,442	20.3	12,308,706	113,976	12,422,682
1961-2	66,130,727	156,992	49,485	22.5	14,388,555	470,629	14,859,184
1962-3	73,376,072	157,055	55,216	22.6	15,678,326	876,557	16,554,883
Actual		Projected					
1963-4	83,578,939	160,041	62,583	23.2	18,124,643	1,258,250	19,382,893
1964-5	93,690,795	164,276	67,000	21.6	18,963,963	1,245,800	20,209,763
					Actual	Projected	
1965-6	102,223,487	168,158	67,300	23.2	22,240,000	1,500,000	23,740,000
1966-7	111,043,511	171,379	67,301	21.5	22,375,000	1,500,000	23,875,000
1967-8	121,035,656	174,610	67,904	23.5	26,693,379	1,750,000	28,443,379
1968-9	132,459,573	176,712	69,899	21.5	26,728,808	1,750,000	28,478,808
1969-0	144,310,970	177,530	71,890	23.5	31,878,170	2,000,000	33,878,170
1970-1	157,410,545	177,652	74,501	21.5	31,878,170	2,000,000	33,878,170
1971-2	176,741,414	178,273	76,884	23.5	38,295,941	2,000,000	40,295,941
1972-3	187,128,610	178,753	79,124	21.5	38,295,941	2,000,000	40,295,941

(Dept. of Education Statistics)

E D U C A T I O N A L G E N E R A L P U R P O S E A I D
1 9 6 5 - 6 6 a n d 1 9 6 6 - 6 7

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Acton -----	\$ 9,156	\$ 8,045
Addison -----	32,990	27,486
Albion -----	53,835	47,566
Alenander -----	12,089	9,111
Alfred -----	44,214	35,333
Alna -----	11,015	8,754
Alton -----	16,069	13,314
Amherst -----	11,238	8,967
Amity -----	11,140	8,572
Andover -----	27,780	22,201
Anson -----	135,500	107,929
Appleton -----	31,707	27,486
Arrowsic -----	7,989	6,279
Arundel -----	39,652	34,105
Athens -----	26,952	23,008
Atkinson -----	17,587	14,140
Auburn -----	372,566	372,566
Augusta -----	206,108	182,816
Aurora -----	2,123	936
Avon -----	24,063	20,848
Baileyville -----	29,031	24,971
Baldwin -----	34,529	25,536
Bancroft -----	4,885	3,794
Bangor -----	410,938	410,938
Bar Harbor -----	49,868	43,802
Baring Plantation -----	6,339	5,388
Barnard Plantation -----	286	250
Bath -----	159,887	159,887
Beals -----	22,613	18,996
Beddington -----	148	125
Belgrade -----	24,446	24,306
Belmont -----	16,936	13,771
Benedicta -----	14,906	13,099
Benton -----	63,219	51,593
Berwick -----	96,270	94,666
Bethel -----	170,249	136,956
Biddeford -----	89,748	80,773
Blaine -----	49,900	41,283
Blanchard -----	495	439
Blue Hill -----	18,165	16,210
Boothbay -----	32,152	24,873
Boothbay Harbor -----	28,693	25,824
Bowdoin -----	46,026	36,510

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Bowdoinham -----	\$ 61,259	\$ 49,169
Bowerbank -----	358	319
Bradford -----	52,414	41,113
Bradley -----	52,340	44,626
Bremen -----	11,102	7,506
Brewer -----	116,963	104,724
Bridgewater -----	45,767	40,834
Bridgton -----	58,989	58,989
Brighton Plantation -----	3,198	1,448
Bristol -----	18,593	16,694
Brooklin -----	6,545	5,752
Brooksville -----	7,902	6,983
Brownfield -----	36,246	27,301
Brownville -----	65,241	58,545
Brunswick -----	221,242	221,242
Buckfield -----	50,647	41,374
Bucksport -----	55,568	50,012
Burnham -----	36,446	29,084
Byron -----	6,093	4,630
Calais -----	101,082	93,780
Canaan -----	39,134	32,466
Canton -----	40,327	34,491
Cape Elizabeth -----	132,460	132,460
Caribou -----	252,179	252,179
Carroll Plantation -----	8,711	6,434
Cary Plantation -----	15,574	12,149
Casco -----	15,620	15,620
Castine -----	7,425	6,559
Caswell Plantation -----	35,022	27,346
Centerville -----	2,011	907
Charleston -----	42,199	34,004
Charlotte -----	9,964	7,252
Chelsea -----	61,156	50,672
Cherryfield -----	30,157	24,140
Chester -----	19,847	15,231
China -----	53,862	44,937
Clifton -----	9,336	7,549
Clinton -----	40,001	36,559
Codyville Plantation -----	824	735
Columbia -----	7,611	5,241
Columbia Falls -----	13,241	11,714
Cooper -----	1,831	1,831
Coplin Plantation -----	849	731
Corinna -----	56,199	51,059
Corinth -----	66,700	55,992
Cornish -----	38,303	30,561
Cornville -----	35,974	28,827
Cranberry Isles -----	2,372	2,077
Crawford -----	2,838	1,611

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFCRT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Crystal -----	\$ 17,376	\$ 12,930
Cumberland -----	53,821	53,821
Cushing -----	24,001	17,642
Cutler -----	27,192	21,739
Dallas Plantation -----	1,243	1,107
Damariscotta -----	16,558	14,902
Dayton -----	7,177	6,458
Deblois -----	354	312
Dedham -----	14,724	10,672
Deer Isle -----	30,258	26,640
Denmark -----	8,673	6,468
Dennistown Plantation -----	312	275
Dennysville -----	19,329	15,099
Detroit -----	27,009	21,457
Dexter -----	164,355	145,465
Dixmont -----	41,264	32,018
Dover-Foxcroft -----	187,214	164,328
Dresden -----	19,818	19,228
Drew Plantation -----	1,577	864
Durham -----	52,925	43,001
Dyer Brook -----	12,072	9,835
E. Plantation -----	84	73
East Machias -----	58,238	48,442
East Millinocket -----	40,757	35,378
Easton -----	42,283	41,113
Eastport -----	72,831	69,780
Eddington -----	52,291	43,026
Edgecomb -----	8,811	5,550
Edinburg -----	269	236
Elliottsville Plantation -----	166	142
Ellsworth -----	60,488	54,389
Embden -----	6,669	5,994
Etna -----	32,490	24,978
Eustis -----	29,932	24,434
Exeter -----	45,851	36,766
Fairfield -----	110,500	100,004
Falmouth -----	121,612	121,612
Fayette -----	21,752	16,292
Frankfort -----	40,641	32,825
Franklin -----	37,455	29,118
Freeport -----	93,018	91,117
Friendship -----	22,133	16,755
Fryeburg -----	72,253	52,383
Garland -----	38,129	28,811
Georgetown -----	5,348	4,739
Gilead -----	2,354	2,109

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Glenburn -----	\$ 68,153	\$ 53,593
Glenwood Plantation -----	464	407
Gorham -----	248,457	220,057
Gouldsboro -----	32,029	24,483
Grand Falls Plantation -----	10	4
Grand Lake Stream Plantation -----	10,303	3,727
Greenbush -----	44,606	32,607
Greene -----	47,956	38,336
Greenfield -----	4,065	1,985
Greenwood -----	19,981	15,779
Hancock -----	21,243	16,535
Hanover -----	18,047	11,722
Harmony -----	34,945	29,802
Harpswell -----	42,891	35,770
Harrington -----	27,473	24,689
Harrison -----	35,346	26,163
Hartford -----	18,903	14,307
Hartland -----	61,541	55,514
Haynesville -----	11,735	9,034
Hebron -----	20,386	17,354
Hermon -----	90,640	79,282
Hersey -----	3,934	2,264
Highland Plantation -----	539	475
Hiram -----	31,510	19,266
Hodgdon -----	50,029	42,557
Holden -----	68,038	57,781
Hope -----	25,916	21,621
Hudson -----	31,850	25,825
Island Falls -----	42,027	38,670
Isle Au Haut -----	2,008	1,280
Islesboro -----	7,928	6,883
Jay -----	42,136	37,453
Jefferson -----	28,623	21,711
Jonesboro -----	11,237	10,017
Jonesport -----	47,889	44,168
Kenduskeag -----	35,680	29,525
Kennebunk -----	93,111	93,111
Kennebunkport -----	28,512	25,265
Kingfield -----	37,780	34,213
Kingsbury Plantation -----	13	6
Kittery -----	251,255	251,255
Lagrange -----	24,116	19,335
Lake View Plantation -----	200	192
Lakeville Plantation -----	270	236
Lamoine -----	24,613	19,866

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Lebanon -----	\$ 77,266	\$ 65,163
Leeds -----	53,381	45,280
Lewiston -----	271,439	244,294
Limerick -----	36,766	32,674
Limestone -----	66,581	66,581
Lincoln -----	66,515	59,862
Lincoln Plantation -----	2,396	2,059
Lincolnvile -----	22,498	17,770
Linneus -----	33,837	26,815
Lisbon -----	127,005	116,278
Litchfield -----	39,943	32,099
Livermore -----	82,094	67,713
Livermore Falls -----	71,998	71,998
Long Island Plantation -----	3,349	933
Lovell -----	12,081	10,873
Ludlow -----	17,602	14,103
Lyman -----	17,619	12,507
Machias -----	47,036	43,940
Machiasport -----	38,591	31,861
Macwahoc Plantation -----	11,926	9,427
Madawaska -----	134,538	134,538
Madison -----	126,089	110,986
Madrid -----	2,330	2,288
Magalloway Plantation -----	5,040	1,860
Manchester -----	54,883	44,022
Mariaville -----	8,696	5,948
Marshfield -----	21,595	17,450
Mars Hill -----	69,728	66,297
Masardis -----	19,906	15,052
Matinicus Isle Plantation -----	5,634	3,302
Mattawamkeag -----	20,517	20,517
Mechanic Falls -----	78,746	73,528
Meddybemps -----	2,921	1,290
Medway -----	109,210	86,845
Mercer -----	15,555	12,859
Merrill -----	26,244	20,500
Mexico -----	208,346	173,892
Milbridge -----	48,450	42,446
Milford -----	78,197	68,537
Millinocket -----	109,635	96,471
Milo -----	107,342	99,820
Minot -----	38,642	32,152
Monhegan Plantation -----	1,471	1,304
Monmouth -----	71,954	55,675
Monson -----	39,248	32,783
Moro Plantation -----	897	802
Morrill -----	22,768	18,952
Mt. Desert -----	24,911	20,918
Mt. Vernon -----	30,783	25,479

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Naples -----	\$ 12,025	\$ 10,778
Nashville Plantation -----	230	202
Newcastle -----	34,658	23,852
Newfield -----	5,366	4,579
New Limerick -----	11,677	7,911
Newport -----	58,044	54,173
New Portland -----	34,377	29,576
Newry -----	18,621	13,738
New Sharon -----	37,849	32,393
New Sweden -----	27,811	23,948
New Vineyard -----	19,350	14,569
Nobleboro -----	26,243	19,238
Norridgewock -----	87,991	73,742
North Berwick -----	57,685	55,116
Northfield -----	2,432	1,603
North Yarmouth -----	78,316	64,651
No. 14 Plantation -----	1,538	1,111
No. 21 Plantation -----	1,021	913
No. 33 Plantation -----	2,870	1,640
Oakfield -----	39,607	33,924
Oakland -----	83,407	83,407
Old Orchard Beach -----	59,541	53,041
Old Town -----	122,407	122,407
Orient -----	3,814	2,969
Orland -----	71,579	58,951
Orono -----	83,764	83,764
Orrington -----	137,093	116,192
Osborn Plantation -----	621	559
Otis -----	1,521	1,354
Otisfield -----	19,508	13,056
Oxbow Plantation -----	6,508	4,811
Oxford -----	66,585	58,778
Palermo -----	23,256	18,484
Palmyra -----	61,625	49,822
Parsonsfield -----	34,567	25,147
Pembroke -----	33,621	28,684
Penobscot -----	34,975	29,371
Perham -----	29,152	22,503
Perry -----	25,414	19,887
Peru -----	62,181	48,705
Phillips -----	48,429	41,076
Phippsburg -----	42,974	30,832
Pittsfield -----	185,983	151,570
Pleasant Ridge Plantation -----	7,446	6,488
Plymouth -----	37,010	28,484
Poland -----	37,806	35,278
Porter -----	30,260	28,138
Portland -----	727,283	636,294

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Pownal -----	\$ 45,177	\$ 36,349
Princeton -----	32,733	29,679
Rangeley -----	17,391	15,652
Rangeley Plantation -----	757	665
Raymond -----	14,667	13,167
Readfield -----	50,941	40,387
Reed Plantation -----	24,523	18,778
Richmond -----	73,127	66,811
Ripley -----	21,978	17,604
Robbinston -----	15,880	12,144
Rome -----	6,429	5,781
Roque Bluffs -----	7,125	5,709
Roxbury -----	16,181	8,730
Rumford -----	110,411	95,577
Saco -----	198,888	191,362
St. Albans -----	63,104	50,364
St. George -----	36,014	36,014
St. John Plantation -----	28,060	20,970
Sandy River Plantation -----	797	705
Sanford -----	158,051	158,051
Scarborough -----	155,288	163,252
Searsport -----	34,549	34,549
Sebago -----	8,409	7,357
Sebec -----	24,613	19,663
Sedgwick -----	25,431	18,839
Shapleigh -----	8,467	7,507
Sidney -----	46,515	38,414
Skowhegan -----	209,301	194,112
Smithfield -----	17,403	13,535
Smyrna -----	28,112	21,679
Solon -----	15,957	14,737
Somerville Plantation -----	11,252	8,869
Sorrento -----	5,901	5,901
South Bristol -----	9,514	8,379
Southport -----	6,406	5,602
South Portland -----	405,460	405,460
Southwest Harbor -----	19,309	17,027
Starks -----	18,283	14,032
Stetson -----	23,832	18,677
Steuben -----	35,600	28,200
Stockholm -----	24,673	20,740
Stockton Springs -----	21,057	20,846
Stoneham -----	9,126	5,969
Stonington -----	48,542	46,824
Stow -----	9,261	6,301
Strong -----	41,955	39,169
Sullivan -----	29,563	25,902
Sumner -----	36,794	29,513

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Surry -----	\$ 14,377	\$ 10,930
Swans Island -----	27,757	21,841
Sweden -----	3,051	1,996
Talmdage -----	572	509
Temple -----	14,818	10,720
Thomaston -----	46,433	46,433
Topsfield -----	14,181	11,393
Topsham -----	101,622	95,292
Tremont -----	35,693	33,128
Trenton -----	12,635	9,803
Turner -----	111,903	87,901
Union -----	44,888	39,797
Upton -----	2,128	1,717
Vanceboro -----	17,705	14,742
Vassalboro -----	123,962	105,600
Veazie -----	17,888	15,905
Vienna -----	5,430	3,580
Wade -----	11,556	10,198
Waite -----	3,893	2,057
Waldoboro -----	67,408	60,904
Wales -----	24,472	20,710
Warren -----	69,879	58,324
Washburn -----	74,098	66,923
Washington -----	32,888	26,923
Waterboro -----	36,983	28,204
Waterford -----	30,360	21,119
Waterville -----	167,106	149,792
Wayne -----	14,772	13,012
Webster -----	47,171	44,228
Weld -----	4,536	4,004
Wells -----	45,216	39,492
Wesley -----	4,652	2,868
West Bath -----	19,926	15,306
Westbrook -----	169,582	150,027
Westmanland Plantation -----	867	775
West Paris -----	40,721	35,890
Westport -----	2,622	2,339
Whitefield -----	44,555	37,278
Whiting -----	17,644	13,014
Whitneyville -----	8,382	6,285
Willimantic -----	2,508	1,786
Wilton -----	146,670	116,657
Windham -----	171,799	150,323
Windsor -----	35,424	30,662
Winslow -----	65,739	59,164
Winter Harbor -----	16,911	16,911

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
Winterport -----	\$ 83,183	\$ 76,316
Winterville Plantation -----	11,281	9,424
Winthrop -----	113,907	101,313
Wiscasset -----	27,420	23,885
Woodland -----	53,144	46,257
Woodstock -----	36,412	32,497
Woodville -----	1,347	1,212
Woolwich -----	66,812	54,356
Yarmouth -----	60,033	51,572
York -----	63,801	57,172
School Administrative District #1 ----- (Castle Hill, Chapman, Mapleton, Presque Isle, and Westfield)	391,521	391,521
School Administrative District #2 ----- (Greenville and Shirley)	116,637	96,071
School Administrative District #3 ----- (Brooks, Freedom, Jackson, Knox, Liberty, Monroe, Montville, Thorndike, Troy, Unity, and Waldo)	382,825	318,408
School Administrative District #4 ----- (Abbot, Cambridge, Guilford, Parkman, Sangerville and Wellington)	271,571	230,696
School Administrative District #5 ----- (Owls Head, Rockland, and So. Thomaston)	282,285	269,936
School Administrative District #6 ----- (Buxton, Hollis, Limington and Standish)	201,225	176,414
School Administrative District #7 ----- (North Haven)	7,494	6,686
School Administrative District #8 ----- (Vinalhaven)	42,825	34,425
School Administrative District #9 ----- (Chesterville, Farmington and Industry)	217,886	191,562
School Administrative District #10 ----- (Allagash Plantation)	52,448	41,698
School Administrative District #11 ----- (Gardiner, Pittston, Randolph and W. Gardiner)	472,480	426,230
School Administrative District #12 ----- (Jackman, Moose River Plantation)	16,750	14,371

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
School Administrative District #13 ----- (Bingham, Caratunk, Moscow, The Forks Plantation, and West Forks Plantation)	\$ 35,436	\$ 31,622
School Administrative District #14 ----- (Danforth and Weston)	71,467	56,443
School Administrative District #15 ----- (Gray and New Gloucester)	201,743	166,527
School Administrative District #16 ----- (Farmingdale and Hallowell)	224,818	202,413
School Administrative District #17 ----- (Norway and Paris)	209,320	193,204
School Administrative District #18 ----- (Prospect and Verona)	57,389	45,890
School Administrative District #19 ----- (Lubec)	105,427	85,426
School Administrative District #20 ----- (Fort Fairfield)	224,846	202,257
School Administrative District #21 ----- (Carthage and Dixfield)	153,980	128,243
School Administrative District #22 ----- (Hampden and Newburg)	274,422	233,498
School Administrative District #23 ----- (Carmel and Levant)	162,373	126,582
School Administrative District #24 ----- (Cyr Plantation, Grand Isle, Van Buren, and Hamlin Plantation)	377,644	317,916
School Administrative District #25 ----- (Mt. Chase Plantation, Patten, Sherman, and Stacyville)	191,914	160,818
School Administrative District #26 ----- (Eastbrook and Waltham)	16,681	12,856
School Administrative District #27 ----- (Eagle Lake, Fort Kent, New Canada Plantation, St. Francis Plantation and Wallagrass Plantation)	574,333	484,183

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	UNIFORM EFFORT 20 MILLS	PRESENT LAW
School Administrative District #28 ----- (Camden and Rockport)	\$ 80,734	\$ 72,509
School Administrative District #29 ----- (Hammond Plantation, Houlton, Littleton, and Monticello)	259,032	246,755
School Administrative District #30 ----- (Lee, Prentiss Plantation, Springfield, Webster Plantation, Winn)	135,981	109,089
School Administrative District #31 ----- (Burlington, Enfield, Howland, Lowell, Maxfield, Passadumkeag, and Seboeis Plantation)	211,101	178,941
School Administrative District #32 ----- (Ashland, Garfield Plantation, and Portage Lake)	157,460	135,527
School Administrative District #33 ----- (Frenchville and St. Agatha)	241,947	199,614
School Administrative District #34 ----- (Belfast, Northport, Searsmont, and Swanville)	351,173	296,945
School Administrative District #35 ----- (Eliot and South Berwick)	199,233	193,614
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL FOUNDATION PROGRAM	\$24,309,594	\$21,362,161
TOTAL S.A.D. BONUS	<u>631,260</u>	<u>552,625</u>
GRAND TOTAL	\$24,940,854	\$21,914,786
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRESENT LAW and UNIFORM EFFORT AT 20 MILLS -----		<hr/> \$3,026,068

**The hearing transcript for this report is available in print at
the Law and Legislative Reference Library.
Item call number- KF4137 .Z99 M211 1965**