



10

## CENTRAL INTERMEDIATE UNIT

R. D. 1 BOX 18 RADIO PARK  
PHILIPSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 16866

(814) 342-0884

### CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

We want to extend our appreciation to the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee for providing the money and personnel to make possible this study of the Intermediate Units. We, also, thank you for the opportunity to testify concerning this report.

We are the Central Intermediate Unit composed of twelve school districts located in Centre, Clearfield and Clinton Counties. Our area covers 3,061 square miles - three times the size of Rhode Island. There are approximately 42,000 public school students and 1,059 non-public school students. There are also over 2,000 teachers in our service area.

It is our feeling that this study by the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee is a very detailed and carefully done report. It shows that Intermediate Units are being well accepted by the school districts of Pennsylvania and they are providing quality services in an economical manner.

74% of Superintendents rated Intermediate Unit Services good.  
19% of Superintendents rated Intermediate Unit Services average.  
4% of Superintendents rated Intermediate Unit Services bad.  
When 93% of the Superintendents rated the Intermediate Unit Services average and good and 82% said Intermediate Units were responsive to the needs of local districts, it shows the success of the Intermediate Units. They are responsive to the needs of local districts and are doing a good job.

In answer to a question concerning how responsive Intermediate Units are to local school districts, 82% of the Superintendents responded "Yes", 11% responded "No". This, again, gives a healthy rating to Intermediate Units.

We would like to present several areas of concern:

#### 1. Local Control

Many people feel that the Intermediate Unit is State controlled. We do not agree.

The Intermediate Unit Board of Directors is elected by the school directors of the member districts. They have the same responsibility for operating the Intermediate Unit that the local school board has in the local school district.

The Advisory Council, composed of local School Superintendents, has almost complete control over what services are to be offered. Budget approval is very definitely local control.

The seven (7) broad areas of services which were established by law are all under local control of the Intermediate Unit Board.

The Non-Public School Act 89 is not full local control. This act, by the General Assembly, mandates that the certain service shall be provided non-public schools. In addition, Special Education is largely not local control. The Commonwealth, as well as the Courts, have set down many guidelines, policies and demands concerning the Special Education operation. Outside of these exceptions the Department of Education does not mandate nor control Intermediate Units. Many times they have asked us to do certain things. Requesting is not controlling. A good example was the energy crisis when they asked us to gather information so they could develop guidelines.

We strongly feel that the Intermediate Units should never become an arm of the Pennsylvania Department of Education but should always be under the local control of the Intermediate Unit Board of Directors.

## 2. Variety of Programs

One of the strengths of the Intermediate Unit is the flexibility to offer the programs desired by the member districts. All areas of the State do not desire the same services. This could be caused by density of population, geographic features, size of school districts and wealth of the local community, as well as some other possible reasons.

The General Assembly, in its wisdom back in 1970, determined this responsiveness of Intermediate Units to the local needs. If every Intermediate Unit was mandated to provide the same services, there would be little local control left.

## 3. Financing

The basic subsidy for Intermediate Units' General Administrative Budget has remained relatively the same for six (6) years. We are rapidly running into financial difficulty in this area.

The increased State dollars which we have received have been in Special Education and Non-Public Schools. Requirements in these areas have been mandated by the General Assembly, the State Board and by the courts.

In our case, we have also received more federal money for a variety of programs.

In 1968 the Administrative cost of the three County Superintendent Offices was \$153,000. Today, 1976-77 the comparative Administrative cost is \$120,000. This is due to consolidating three offices into one. In addition, far more services are being provided today.

4. Ownership of Property

Since it is felt that certain property cannot be owned by the Intermediate Unit, we must pay rent. This is an expensive item. In most instances, it seems to be more economical to own vehicles and office buildings than to rent them.

5. Budget Approval

No other governmental body seems to have the complicated budget approval procedure that has been imposed upon the Intermediate Units. This is very cumbersome and time consuming.

6. Data Processing

One of the most important Management Services we provide is Data Processing. It is also our most rapid growing service. To date, the Commonwealth has not supported (financially) our Data Processing Service though this is not the case in all Intermediate Units.

We are told that the education computers in Pennsylvania could handle ten times more work. The Commonwealth has located a computer in each State College. We have been informed that the original intent was for these computers to be used by the State Colleges, the Intermediate Units and School Districts. State-wide this has not worked. However, we do have a cooperative working arrangement with Lock Haven State College located within our Intermediate Unit boundary. Several months ago, we were told that the Lock Haven computer would be phased out in a general reorganization.

Regardless of this, it seems of vital importance that Commonwealth Computers which are used for education should be tied together in a network and made available to both the Intermediate Units and the school districts. Our experience shows that keeping our business affairs on a computer is more economical, and accurate, and faster than doing them by hand.

7. Special Education

The Commonwealth has consented to follow out the Federal Court Decision on the PARC Case which gives due process to mentally retarded individuals. This has been extended to all exceptionalities.

We are mandated to provide service for all exceptionalities if not otherwise provided. This is only reasonable since most of these can be provided more reasonably on a regional basis.

However, Intermediate Unit Special Education Programs are affected by inflation. Teachers' salaries are rising 8-10% a year.

This year our new Special Education Allotment will not cover the increase in Special Education Teachers' salaries. As a result we will not be able to provide all the mandated special education services during 1976-77.

In summary, we would like to recommend the following:

1. A study be made on the ownership of vehicles and buildings and corrective legislation be enacted if the study so warrants.
2. That legislative action be taken on simplifying the budget approval procedure.
3. That a more systematic method be initiated for determining the basic subsidy for Intermediate Units.
4. That the General Assembly does nothing to remove local control of Intermediate Units.
5. A study be made and legislation as a result of the study be enacted to establish a network of computers for education purposes to be made available for all public educational agencies for data processing. We believe this could be done without increasing the number of computers which are in present operation.
6. We urge that the Commonwealth fully fund all commitments made by the State in the area of Special Education.

In closing, we again thank you for both this opportunity to appear before you and for the Study itself.

  
Edward B. Reighard  
Executive Director

Statement  
Concerning Intermediate Unit Legislation

by

Executive Director, Intermediate Unit #28

Act 102 of 1970 commonly known as the Intermediate Unit Law is, in our mind, one of the most significant pieces of educational legislation enacted in the last twenty-five years. The Intermediate Unit potential, as a service agency, formed on a regional basis and designed to provide specified services to school districts has the promise to fulfill a need established originally by the legislature more than sixty-five years ago.

We look upon the formation of the Intermediate Unit as another attempt by the legislature to consolidate, coordinate and encourage cooperation between the communities represented by school districts, the state department of education and the state legislature. The school consolidation legislation of 1911, the union or merger law of 1930, the jointure law of 1947, the reorganization acts of 1963 and 1969 were, as we see it, previous attempts that encouraged districts to plan and operate cooperative programs for youth. Though these laws had some impact on school reorganization and program development they never really had the effect that we think the legislature intended.

In our own experience, we were aware of a plan to revamp the county superintendents office as far back as 1951. After twenty years of discussion, planning and compromise the Intermediate Unit became a reality in 1971. Since that time, few agencies created by the legislature have been so thoroughly dissected, examined, criticized, praised and misunderstood. In addition to an annual survey

by the Intermediate Unit association, we have been examined by the Department of Education for the legislature, by the graduate school of the University of Pennsylvania, by our staff with outside consultants and by the legislative and budget committee of the State Assembly.

All of the surveys arrive at similar conclusions (1) Intermediate Units are a viable method of serving the Commonwealth in providing programs on a regional basis for exceptional children. (2) Intermediate Units are a logical vehicle to provide specialized services to school districts. Usually these are services too costly for one district to operate, or, small districts will need to combine to secure such service. The best illustration of this situation is the Instructional Materials Service offered by all Intermediate Units. (3) Intermediate Units have an identity problem. Parents, students, teachers and for the most part the general public, have no conception of what an Intermediate Unit is and what it does. I fear that this lack of information extends too often to those to whom we look for understanding and support. (4) The financial base under each Intermediate Unit is so limited that it threatens survival. The present formula, for example, provides Intermediate Unit #28 with the same dollar amounts spent by the former county offices in 1968-69. We have received the same dollar allocation from the Commonwealth for six consecutive years. Even with passage of a new subsidy law that has been introduced, several Intermediate Units including #28, will not rise above the guarantee (our present allocation) for ten to fifteen years. (5) Intermediate Units should not become "field offices" or arms of the Department of Education, they should remain as the legislature intended "under local control".

Unfortunately, too many people and too many surveys equate "local control" of Intermediate Units with "school district control" of Intermediate Units. If all districts were the same size, had the same wealth and operated the same programs, supporting the Intermediate Unit would be a fact of life. Unfortunately, large or wealthy districts prefer to "go it alone" and often oppose programs and services they operate even though that service may be beneficial to smaller districts. The best example of the extreme to which "local control" can be carried is the budget approval process of the Intermediate Unit. The 1976-77 Intermediate Unit #28 budget, for example, was constructed in late November 1975. It was reviewed by the Intermediate Unit Board in December, the district superintendents in January, tentatively adopted by the Intermediate Unit Board in February, voted upon by each of eleven local district boards in March, adopted by the annual convention in April and forwarded to the Secretary by May 1. Six months of preparation, review and examination is a process that carries "local control" to the point of being detrimental to the Intermediate Unit. (6) A more clearly defined role for Intermediate Units that will not only define areas of responsibility, but will also avoid duplication of services by either the State or local school districts.

The six conclusions arrived at by the various surveys are an accurate finding of the status of Intermediate Units. The report of the legislative and budget committee under consideration by this sub-committee is well done and in our opinion constitutes a fair and reasonable assessment of the Intermediate Units.

We would recommend to this sub-committee that legislation

be prepared and introduced to amend the Intermediate Unit law in three respects:

- (1) fiscal support by the Commonwealth
- (2) broadening the concept of "local control"
- (3) defining the perimeters of Intermediate Unit responsibility

Fiscal support of Intermediate Units should be based on the same philosophy and technique long established for school districts. The formula should have three facets: (a) a per pupil dollar subsidy (b) the WADM (Weighted Average Daily Membership of the I. U. (c) the aid ratio of the Intermediate Unit (a measure of local wealth).

We would recommend the formula be based on 1% of the basic pupil subsidy (presently \$750.00) times the WADM, times the aid ratio. On a statewide basis the formula and the total cost could be estimated at:

$$\frac{1}{\$750} \times \frac{2,300,000}{1} \times \frac{50}{100} = \$8,625,000$$

Though the total dollars appropriated by this system is quite similar to present funding, the distribution of those dollars would be more fair, more reasonable and more appropriate to the need of the region. For Intermediate Unit #28, our anticipated revenue under this method would be:

$$\frac{1}{750} \times \frac{40,000}{1} \times \frac{.6838}{1.000} = \$205,140$$

as opposed to the current allocation of \$154,101.

Even more serious to the continued operation of Intermediate Unit programs for exceptional children, is the need for a basic formula for special education funding. We don't necessarily need more state money, we need a better method of distribution of existing funds. There appears to be an unequal opportunity for handicapped children in this Commonwealth by allocating funds on a



regional basis that has no relationship to size, need or local wealth. One would almost think the Department of Education has allocated funds on a "squeaking wheel" theory.

The matter of "local control" needs to be examined to see if we really don't have control by relatively few school directors and school administrators. Perhaps an amendment to Act 102 providing for appointment of "interested citizens" to a portion of the Intermediate Unit Board would better reflect the control that communities need to have over the educational system.

Intermediate Units could be strengthened further by a more definite mandate of its responsibilities. The present seven essential services are fine as far as they go. Intermediate Units need to be assigned, or authorized to provide, certain services that neither the school district nor the state should be permitted to duplicate.

We thank this committee for the opportunity to express our feelings, attitudes and ideas about Intermediate Units. We sincerely appreciate the interest and the concern for improvement of the educational system as you have expressed by having these hearings.

C. E. Glendening  
Executive Director  
Intermediate Unit #28  
Armstrong-Indiana Counties

# MONEY TALKS

## The Dollars and Sense of ARIN

ARIN I.U.

December, 1974

Indiana, Pa. 15701

### FACT SHEET

1. The cost of operation of the County Schools' Office in Armstrong and Indiana Counties in 1968-69 was \$154,101.

The local school districts contributed \$16,000 of that amount. The bulk of the balance was paid directly by the State with a smaller portion contributed by county government in the form of office space, clerical help, equipment and office operation costs.

-----

2. Each year since July 1, 1971 the ARIN Intermediate Unit has received from the State \$154,101 for maintenance of the Intermediate Unit structure. To this day, we still are allocated the same amount that was spent seven years ago. This is true, even though we have experienced the greatest rate of inflation in modern times.

-----

3. Of the \$154,101 expended in 1968-69, not one cent was used for programs directly intended for teachers or pupils. This year (1974-75) \$71,011 of our state allocation (46%) will be diverted from administrative costs to program operation for local schools.

-----

4. In 1968-69 there were two county superintendents, four assistant county superintendents and two directors of special education, a total of eight professional administrative salaries, paid by this \$154,101. Today, one executive director and one assistant are paid from this allocation (\$41,715). The special education director is paid by the State. In reality, we have reduced our administrative staff from eight persons to three and reduced the cost by over \$100,000.

-----

5. Contributions to operation of the ARIN Intermediate Unit by local school districts has been reduced, year by year. This has been done in the face of the high rate of inflation and expanded programs. Looking back to 1968-69, the school districts then contributed in two ways to county office operation: (a) district contributions to salaries of the county superintendent and his assistants and (b) contributions to operation of a R.I.M.C., now called Instructional Materials Service.

Year by year figures are:

<u>Year</u>	<u>For County Office Staff</u>	<u>For R.I.M.C.</u>	<u>Total</u>
1968-69	\$16,000	\$36,783	\$52,783
1969-70	\$16,000	\$36,700	\$52,700
1970-71	\$19,000	\$36,700	\$55,700

	<u>For I. U. Staff</u>	<u>For I. M. S.</u>	<u>Total</u>
1971-72	\$ 0	\$39,530	\$39,530
1972-73	\$ 0	\$33,770	\$33,770
1973-74	\$ 0	\$33,450	\$33,450
1974-75	\$ 0	\$30,174	\$30,174

- - - - -

6. Since July 1, 1971, the I. M. S. program has been supported by the school districts to an ever decreasing level. The Intermediate Unit has contributed more and more to a program designed to be totally a benefit to the local schools. These facts are substantiated by the following:

I. M. S. Program

<u>Budget Year</u>	<u>I.M.S. Budget</u>	<u>School District Contribution</u>	<u>Intermediate Unit Contribution</u>
1971-72	\$72,020	\$39,530	\$32,490
1972-73	\$78,845	\$33,770	\$45,075
1973-74	\$82,845	\$33,450	\$49,126
1974-75	\$93,185	\$30,174	\$63,011

- - - - -

7. Rental of office space to house the Intermediate Unit is a similar story. In July 1971, we had negotiated an agreement with the county commissioners of both counties to retain the space formerly used by the County Schools' Offices.

In Armstrong county we agreed to pay \$6,000 per year for that courthouse space. Since all of the personnel assigned there were special education people, the \$6,000 became an expenditure from the special education budget. No part of this cost was assigned to local district contribution. The entire amount is paid by the State. The agreement included maintenance, equipment, and utilities, with the exception of telephone. Consumers Guide would rate this a "best buy".

In Indiana County we agreed to lease the courthouse space for \$12,024 per year. The special education budget was allocated \$4,024 of this amount and the Intermediate Unit administrative budget was allocated \$8,000. Of the \$8,000 paid from the Intermediate Unit budget, \$5,506 was reimbursed by the State as capital subsidy. The Indiana agreement

also included maintenance, equipment, and utilities, with the exception of telephone. Another "best buy".

For seven years we were permitted to use space on the Indiana University of Pennsylvania campus for the Instructional Materials Service Program. We paid nothing in the way of rent nor the cost of light and heat. We did pay for telephone service. Another "best buy".

The 524 square feet allocated to us by the University can no longer adequately serve our needs and there was no more space available there, especially at that cost. In October 1974 we leased a commercial property in Indiana to house the I. M. S. and Child Guidance programs. The lease cost is \$7,800 per year. I.M.S. will pay 50% of that amount and Child Guidance (Special Education) will pay 50%. Operational costs will be shared by both budgets in the same manner. At \$1.31 per square foot for this facility, we have another "best buy".

- - - - -

8. Speaking of "great buys" did you know that the administrators in the county office in 1968-69 "bought" the University Film Library to start our I.M.S. program? That library of over 2,000 films and other equipment had an assessed value in excess of \$180,000. We "bought" it for \$50,000 and didn't have one red cent to our name. We didn't ask local districts to "ante up" to make the purchase. Since then, we have paid off the \$50,000 and added over \$150,000 of new materials.

In 1968-69 we distributed over 11,000 instructional items to districts. Last year, the total was over 22,000, not including additional services in equipment repair, tape duplicating, microfilming, laminating, television programming, etc. The annual dollar value of these services is estimated to be in excess of \$200,000. The cost to local districts is just over \$30,000. Another "best buy".

9. The Special Education Story

<u>Budget Year</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Estimated Local District Cost</u>	<u>Estimated State Cost</u>
1971-72	\$ \$607,699	\$121,154	\$486,545
1972-73	\$ \$783,694	\$156,738	\$626,956
1973-74	\$ \$991,824	\$198,365	\$793,459
1974-75	\$1,041,828	\$202,837	\$838,991

As you can see, our special education budget has increased by \$434,129 since 1971-72; that is a lot of dollars. But....did you know that our service has grown and grown?? For instance....in 1971-72 we leased two classrooms in Armstrong County and two in Indiana County, serving 54 handicapped children. Today, we lease 12 rooms in Armstrong and 11 in Indiana and we serve 250 handicapped children in these classrooms. In 1970-71 other staff and programs were smaller or non-existent, such as:

	1971-72	1974-75
Speech Therapists	11	17
Hearing Therapists	1	2
Sight Therapists	2	3
Teachers of the Gifted	3	3
Profoundly Retarded	0	3
Learning Disabled	1	4
Pre-School Handicapped	0	2
Physically Handicapped	0	2
Social Workers	2	2
Psychiatrist	1	1
Psychologists	1	4
Socially/Emotionally Disturbed	0	1
Trainable Mentally Retarded	4	13
Educable Mentally Retarded: Vo Tech	1	2
Aides	4	19
Director	1	1
Supervisors	2	2

In addition to the 250 pupils we serve full time in our classrooms, we have approximately 2,250 pupils enrolled in itinerant programs, so you

see, our costs are up, but we now have so many more pupils being served by so many more staff members.

-----

10. Where do the dollars come from??

Every dollar that we spend comes from the pocket of the taxpayer. We get those dollars in a great variety of ways, but the source is always the same.

It seems to me that the question is not where the dollar comes from, but how it is spent. We have attempted to show in this report HOW that money is spent and what high regard we have of the taxpayer's hard earned dollar. We have attempted to show you that the educational dollar is buying more and more when in this day and age the dollar itself is weaker. What you get for the tax dollar is important, and you get much more than might be expected. This is true of our past and we expect it will be true in the future.

We hope you have gained something from this report -- and that it might prompt questions.

Future editions of "Money Talks" will be forthcoming when we see the need.

# MONEY TALKS

## The Dollars and Sense of ARIN

ARIN I. U.

January, 1975

Indiana, Pa. 15701

### FACT SHEET

The cost of administration for ARIN Intermediate Unit, as opposed to the cost of administration for the former county school office in Armstrong and Indiana counties, has shown a sharp decline during the past five years.

Figures indicated below show that the per pupil cost of administration has been reduced from \$4.28 in 1970-71 to \$1.46 in 1974-75. The overall reduction in dollars is from \$156,857 in 1970-71 to \$51,815 in 1974-75. This \$105,042 saved in administration has been invested in program budgets for use by local school districts. In effect, the Intermediate Unit has used funds allocated by the state for support of the Intermediate Unit structure to cover costs of services to school districts. This contribution by the Intermediate Unit is more than three times the support offered by the local schools.

ARIN Intermediate Unit  
Per Pupil Expenditures  
General Administration

	Year	Cost Per Pupil	Enrollment	Expenditures
County Office	1970-71	\$4.28	36,611	\$156,857
ARIN	1971-72	2.61	36,402	95,055
ARIN	1972-73	2.62	37,660	98,556
ARIN	1973-74	1.67	35,960	60,199
ARIN	1974-75	1.46	35,555	51,815*

\*Budgeted figure, not actual expense



-----

While ARIN Intermediate Unit has shown, over the years, a consistent and conservative level of expenditures in practically all levels of the program, there is one exception. A study of expenditures for Instructional Materials Services across the state reflect some interesting facts.

ARIN in 1970-71 spent an average \$1.11 per pupil for the IMS program and ranked 12th of 18 existing service programs in the state. This per pupil cost of \$1.11 is compared to the statewide average of \$1.35 per pupil.

In 1971-72 ARIN increased expenditures to \$1.89 per pupil while the state average also climbed to \$2.26. We also improved our comparison position to 13th of 26 I. U.'s.

In 1972-73 we further improved our position by spending \$3.57 per pupil as compared to \$2.48 as the state average. Our rank was then 3rd of 27 I. U.'s.

We have achieved this high ranking while actually maintaining a small increase in the annual budget and decreasing the costs to local districts.

Increased expenditures have been realized through the receipt of unexpected state and federal funds and the long term lease-purchase of materials.

Per Pupil Expenditures  
Instructional Materials Services  
Intermediate Units

---

I.U.No.	1970-71	Rank	71-72	Rank	72-73	Rank
1	\$ .97	16	\$1.07	21	\$1.44	24
2	-	--	-	--	-	--
3	1.07	15	1.44	19	2.12	18
4	2.33	2	2.53	8	1.78	20
5	1.24	11	.85	24	1.15	27
6	1.34	10	3.86	3	3.24	8
7	1.42	6	1.96	12	2.20	17
8	1.10	13	.87	23	1.16	26
9	2.74	1	3.78	4	3.44	4
10	-	--	5.94	2	2.69	11
11	-	--	2.92	5	3.98	1
12	-	--	.64	26	2.96	9

I.U.No.	1970-71	Rank	71-72	Rank	72-73	Rank
13	\$ .70	17	\$1.85	14	\$2.45	16
14	1.38	9	1.77	15	2.51	13
15	-	--	-	--	3.95	2
16	-	--	1.67	18	1.52	22
17	1.48	5	2.89	6	3.40	5
18	.09	18	1.08	20	2.93	10
19	1.41	7	2.73	7	3.39	6
20	-	--	7.26	1	1.52	21
21	-	--	.80	25	1.35	25
22	1.41	7	1.69	17	3.28	7
23	1.81	3	2.09	10	2.47	15
24	1.10	13	1.97	11	2.49	14
25	-	--	2.50	9	1.81	19
26	-	--	-	--	-	--
27	1.67	4	1.74	16	2.63	12
28	1.11	12	1.89	13	3.57	3
29	-	--	1.06	22	1.47	23
ARIN #28		12 X 18		13 X 26		3 X 27

Range of Expenditures Per Pupil

Year	High	Low	Avg.	ARIN
1970-71	\$2.74	\$ .09	\$1.35	\$1.11
1971-72	7.26	.64	2.26	1.89
1972-73	3.98	1.15	2.48	3.57

The rising costs of special education across the state have become a major concern of citizens, the legislature and the department of education.

Costs have spiraled to almost ten times what they were only five short years ago. The Right to Education agreement has had something to do with the increased costs, but if ARIN is any measure, identifying and providing programs for more and more young people is the major factor. This has happened in all 29 I. U.'s, more or less to the same degree. It is safe to say that all of us are experiencing the same relative cost spiral.

Figures indicate that ARIN continually and again conservatively, maintains the same low level of per pupil cost.

In 1970-71 we ranked 25th of 26 units in our special education per pupil effort. We spent \$216.00 on each pupil while the other I. U.'s averaged \$401.00.

In 1971-72 we spent \$227.00, an increase of only \$9.00 over the prior year while the state average was \$475.00 or \$74.00 over the prior year.

In 1972-73 ARIN expended \$382.00 for an increase of \$155.00 while the state average jumped to \$591.00 for an increase of \$116.00.

What is really significant is the fact that the range of expenditures is so wide. The difference in the per pupil cost when compared to ARIN costs consistently shows us spending about \$500.00 less per pupil than the highest spending I.U. and \$200.00 less than the average.

This all sounds fine for the fiscal responsibility of ARIN, but what does it say for the others? More importantly, what does it do for future funding? The state has now adopted a procedure whereby I. U.'s will receive special education allocations based upon a percent of the prior years expenditures. The same percent will be given to all I. U.'s.

What will be the effect? "The rich get richer and the poor get poorer!" Our conservatism and respect for the dollar has led us down the primrose path to certain destruction. Next year, under this plan, one I. U. will get (using 10% as an example) based on the 1972-73 expenditures, over \$80 per pupil in new money. ARIN will get \$38.00. The average I. U. will get \$59.00, ARIN with its \$38.00 will slip further behind. It appears from this corner that what we have here is the compounding of a felony. We face the same need for expanded programs, higher salaries, new classrooms and spiraling costs of materials that all I. U.'s face and we face them to a greater degree than most.

We ranked 25th of 26 in 1970-71 --- 25th of 25 in 1971-72 and 25th of 27 in 1972-73 in dollars spent per pupil. If a better and more equitable method of funding isn't provided by the state, the handicapped pupil in ARIN will continue to get a shorter and shorter end of the stick.

The ARIN Board of Directors will find each year, more and more difficulty in caring for their responsibilities. As a matter of fact, 1975-76 fiscal year will, I fear, be the beginning of the end of our growth and improvement in this most important area of our educational effort.

Per Pupil Expenditures  
Special Education  
Intermediate Units

I.U. No.	1970-71	Rank	71-72	Rank	72-73	Rank
1	285	21	322	21	389	24
2	---	--	---	--	---	--
3	558	3	634	5	701	5
4	361	17	499	12	550	19
5	498	5	567	7	595	15
6	147	26	244	24	339	26
7	478	6	532	10	563	17
8	456	8	696	2	679	6
9	477	7	579	6	562	18
10	369	16	555	8	786	4
11	261	23	301	23	330	27
12	374	15	411	18	502	21
13	267	22	317	22	486	22
14	294	20	439	16	646	7
15	422	11	482	13	601	14
16	338	19	340	20	511	20
17	388	14	555	8	602	13
18	432	10	344	19	603	12
19	550	4	667	3	879	1
20	478	6	541	9	642	8
21	360	18	438	17	640	9
22	246	24	322	21	423	23
23	575	2	649	4	808	3
24	402	13	509	11	623	10
25	727	1	737	1	870	2
26	---	--	---	--	---	--
27	412	12	480	14	574	16
28	216	25	227	25	382	25
29	445	9	441	15	605	11
ARIN						
Summary Rank	25X26		25X25		25X27	

Range of Expenditures Per Pupil

<u>Year</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>ARIN</u>
1970-71	\$727.00	\$147.00	\$401.00	\$216.00
1971-72	\$737.00	\$227.00	\$475.00	\$227.00
1972-73	\$879.00	\$330.00	\$591.00	\$382.00