

NATIONAL INDIAN IMPACTED SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION

Condition of School facilities in Indian Country

The need for a Federal Investment

March - 2018

SUMMARY OF THE NIISA REQUEST FOR SCHOOL FACILITY FUNDING

Between 1950 and 1994 following the passage of P.L. 81-815 in 1950 (the school construction provision to provide funding to federally connected school districts) over a billion dollars in construction funds were provided to Indian land and military impacted districts. Today there is an annual appropriation of just over \$17 million. Knowing there is a need for a federal investment in schools serving children residing on Indian Trust & Treaty land and land claimed under the Alaska Claims Settlement Act, the National Indian Impacted Schools Association (NIISA) took on the task of compiling a data base to verify the need. The information that follows will identify the need as well as provide options that Congress should consider to meet the facility needs of schools in Indian country. The NIISA recommendations for Congressional action found on pages 13 - 15 are offered as options. They include direct grants as well as direct low interest loans and tax credits. NIISA also offers suggestions on inserting a “measurement of need” component when determining eligibility for direct grants. Low-interest loans and tax credits for districts would not be subject to a strict need component.

The NIISA survey that included 202 buildings in 65 school districts (Local Educational Agencies) shows the following as measured by condition of the facility: *The Survey Questionnaire can be found on page 7 and the listing of NIISA districts completing the survey can be found on page 10.*

56% of the buildings were in poor or fair condition;
33% of the buildings reported safety code violations;
44% of the buildings have capacity issues; and
40% of the buildings reported an internet capacity or connectivity issue.

The estimated cost projections as provided by the 65 districts submitting a cost impact totals just short of **\$750 million**.

The report also examines the ability of school districts to generate revenue from local and state sources to address their facility needs (see pages 11 - 13). The data shows that some states do provide funding for capital expenditures, but it falls short of the need as local property that is taxable on which districts generate funding through the issuance of bonds is insufficient to meet their facility needs. The Federal Government as in 1950, must become a partner in providing districts a source of funding to insure that school buildings serving children residing on non-taxable land provide a learning environment that will stimulate both teachers to be creative and students to want to learn – the correlation between the learning environment and effective learning is without question.

Research has demonstrated that the quality of teachers is the number one factor that impacts student learning – top-quality teachers want to be in a top-quality building and live in top-quality housing. The deterioration of public school district facilities in Indian Country must be addressed, if we are to move the learning outcomes of our Native American children toward proficiency.

BACKGROUND – YESTERDAY AND TODAY

YESTERDAY: To recognize the Federal commitment to provide facility funding to school districts impacted by the non-taxable status of Federal land, President Harry S Truman signed into law in 1950, P.L. 81-815 a program designed to provide funding for school facilities. Later that same year Truman signed what is called the Basic Impact Aid Program into law P.L. 81-874. It is important to note that at the time Congress thought of the *facilities* first, and then the operation of the schools.

Between 1951 and 1994 over \$1 billion was appropriated for the construction and expansion of school buildings impacted by a Federal presence, i.e. schools serving primarily children of military personnel and children residing on Indian lands. However, as budget restraints became more and more an issue, the funding level for 81-815 school construction dwindled away. In 1994 with the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act (ESEA reauthorization), both stand-a-lone laws P.L. 81-815 and P.L. 81-874 were repealed. The 1994 ESEA reauthorization moved Impact Aid both 815 and 874 formally into the ESEA as Title VIII. With passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) the school facilities provision remains law as Section 7007 of Title VII of ESSA.

TODAY: Funding levels for facilities as compared to the early years have all but dried up. Section 7007 has received an annual appropriation of \$17 million in each of the past ten years. Although Indian land districts have benefited by this provision, the funding level is grossly inadequate, leaving many Indian land districts without any real hope of accessing funding to modernize, expand or build new facilities. The formula provision which provides funding every other year to Indian land districts with a federal enrollment of 50% or more (Military districts are also eligible as the \$17 million is evenly divided between the two categories of districts) provides less than \$9 million for districts to use for capital improvements, although major construction projects are beyond reach as the dollar levels are so small. In FY 16 the most recent year in which formula dollars were distributed, 145 Indian land districts received a payment. The payments ranged from a high of \$737,325 to a low of \$1,715 with the average payment \$6,975.86. The dollars for the most have been used for health and safety projects such as roof repair, heating/air conditioning and in some cases expansion of an existing facility. In today's world of school construction \$17 million is about the cost of building just one small elementary school.

“THE PROBLEM” – THE NEED FOR A FACILITY INVESTMENT

THE PROBLEM: It is important to recognize that 81-815 began constructing schools in 1951. What that says is that the **first of these structures is about 68 years old**, which is pretty much at the far end of the service life of a public school building. Heating, lighting, roofing and structural integrity, despite maintenance, are pretty well inefficient and/or worn out respectively. This is not to mention the difference between today's schools and those built 68 years ago. The old buildings do not have the necessary infrastructure for electronic education (internet connectivity) as one example, as that didn't exist in 1950. To sum up, then, these schools are now in need of replacement. This isn't to say they *all* need replacing, *right now*, but it does indicate that there now exists and there will continue to exist over time, school buildings originally built with federal dollars that need replacing.

Do States accept any responsibility for school facility funding? The answer is yes, but the fact is it is far short of the need. Wyoming for example due to the *Campbell vs. Wyoming* series of lawsuits back in 2004 provided funding for capital needs, however the source of funds the State used to provide those monies and related major maintenance funds was coal lease bonus funding. That source of funding will cease in 2019, as there are currently no bidders for future coal leases, and there is currently no other source in place, thus schools in Wyoming will lose their only source of state funding for facility needs. There are states that do provide facility funding, but the amount falls short in meeting the need. One district responded to the NAFIS 2016 – 2017 facility survey when asked if the state provided funding for construction. The district responding: *“The state does provide construction funding, but it is less than half of the amount needed to build an elementary school (\$12 million), and the high school can garner only \$5 million from the state, which is 7% of the cost of building a new high school.”* However, most states leave the funding of school facilities to the local school districts. In short, issuance of bonded indebtedness, revenue anticipation bonds, and the accretion of cash reserves are used by school districts to enable construction of new facilities.

A majority of public schools serving children residing on Indian trust or treaty land have a limited or in extreme situations, no capability of replacing their school structures with the usual funding mechanisms. Impact Aid, remember, is based on federal property, upon which local taxes and bonding mechanisms will not generate any funding for facilities. Thus, Indian land public schools with a high concentration of federally connected students around the country have very limited mechanisms to generate facility replacement funds. As is also obvious, the higher the concentration of federally-connected students less facility replacement funding can be generated. There exists and will continue to exist a national need to fund facility construction for Impact Aid recipient schools. Further, the higher level of federal impactation, the

greater this need will be, simply due to the inability of high federal impacted school districts to internally generate their own funding from local sources

“IDENTIFYING TODAY’S NEED” FOR A FACILITY INVESTMENT

IDENTIFYING TODAY’S NEED: In December of 2015 the National Indian Impacted Schools Association Executive Board, recognizing that the condition of school buildings that many Indian students attend are in a condition that is not conducive for learning, initiated a facility study among its’ membership.

The study’s intent was to provide knowledge and insight into the current facility conditions of NIISA member schools and respectively Indian land children’s learning environments. Along with school facility questions, information surrounding the following topics was also included: Student Capacity (space for students), Internet capacity or connectivity, Teacher housing, and Condition of teacher housing.

The survey components were drafted by the NIISA membership and an on-line survey instrument was created. NIISA Executive Director Brent Gish distributed the survey link to the NIISA membership in the middle of February 2016, multiple reminder emails were sent to the membership following the initial contact.

Data Supports the Need to Modernize Our Nation’s Schools

The need to modernize our infrastructure including state and local school facility infrastructure is extensive. School infrastructure needs are beyond the capacity of state and local communities. In Indian Country the problem of infrastructure funding locally is even more of a problem because of low land/property assessments and the lack of property owners due to the presence of Indian Trust and Treaty Land and land covered under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

A 2013 Center for Green Schools “Report State of Our Schools” estimated that nationally schools face \$271 billion in deferred maintenance costs. The Report estimated a \$542 billion cost to bring schools into good repair over the next ten years. The American Society of Civil Engineers 2017 Infrastructure Report Card rated schools with a D+ **(this includes public schools in rural America)** Summarizing *“Every school day, nearly 50 million K-12 students and 6 million adults occupy close to 100,000 public school buildings, while state and local governments make significant investments in public K-12 schools infrastructure and schools play important civic, educational, and public safety roles in communities, the nation continues to underinvest in*

school facilities leaving an estimated \$38 billion annual gap. As a result 24% of public school buildings were rated as being fair or in poor condition.” As the reader will note below in those public school buildings enrolling Indian children **56.4%** were rated as being fair or in poor condition. **56.4% as compared to 24%** by itself spells out clearly the need for facility investment in schools enrolling Indian children. In FY 2017 591 Indian land local educational agencies eligible for Impact Aid funding enrolled just under 115,000 children. The National Association of Federally Impacted Schools conducted a facility needs survey of all its schools both military, Indian land and others this past year. 218 school districts responded. Their data supports the findings of the NIISA survey:

- 65% of NAFIS respondents indicated their buildings were in fair to poor condition
- 26% have buildings that are more than 80 years old (**NIISA addendum: One will find that in Indian country communities recognize that many of their buildings are old, but make do by repairing only the necessities in order to keep buildings open – they get along in many cases because there is no other option because of the lack of bonding capacity**)
- 53% responding to the NAFIS survey indicated they have no practical capacity to issue bonds.

In total the NAFIS survey identified a need of \$4.2 billion in projects as identified as most pressing, The NIISA survey of 65 districts resulted in a total cost of \$741,906,878.

Let's take a look at the NIISA Survey

Of the 127 NIISA member districts, 70 initially responded to the survey indicating they had a facility need. The survey then followed up with those 70 districts asking them to measure in more specific detail their need and estimated cost of identified projects. Projects varied from the need for new HVAC, gymnasium flooring, parking lot and school grounds repaving to renovation of existing facilities to address code violations and new construction to meet either a capacity issue or because the existing facility was in such condition that renovation in itself would be more costly than building a new facility. Internet connectivity was also a part of the survey. The survey at the request of the NIISA member districts also asked that the need for teacher housing replacement and/or renovation be included in the survey. Their concern for teaching housing underlined their need for teacher recruitment and retention. Due to the remoteness of many Indian lands districts and sparse living quarters availability in many of our districts, teachers either have to reside in district-provided housing (*it is not feasible for teachers to build or own their place of residence on site due to the presence of Federal land*) or commute long distances in all kinds of weather every day. In Alaska there is no community option; it's live at the district or nothing. This in turn affects the ability of districts to hire and retain 'the best and the brightest' as school administrators and staff can and do work for more municipal districts when openings come up – they leave for better working conditions.

The survey that was emailed to the NIISA membership and the results of the survey follow:

NIISA School Facility Survey

Name of the Local Educational Agency _____

Contact Person _____ Phone _____ E-mail _____

4 – Excellent 3 – Good 2 – Fair 1 – Poor

Please insert the number above that best describes the condition/capacity of each of your school buildings/and using a Yes/No note if there is a Code violation. If capacity either student capacity or wireless/internet hook-up is rated 3 or below, please describe in more detail below. **Please rate with Excellent (4) through Poor (1) for both student and wireless hookup**

<u>Name of Building</u>	<u>Physical Condition</u>	<u>Are there Code Issues that are in violation?</u>	<u>Capacity Students/wireless</u>
_____	_____	Yes ___ No ___	____/____
_____	_____	Yes ___ No ___	____/____
_____	_____	Yes ___ No ___	____/____
_____	_____	Yes ___ No ___	____/____
_____	_____	Yes ___ No ___	____/____
_____	_____	Yes ___ No ___	____/____

65 school districts completed the survey and those 65 districts reported on a total of 202 school buildings.

1 PHYSICAL CONDITION OF BUILDING

Of the 202 school buildings being reported:

- 41 (20.3%) 1-POOR
- 73 (36.1%) 2-FAIR
- 64 (31.7%) 3-GOOD
- 24 (11.9%) 4-EXCELLENT

Over 57% of buildings reported were in POOR – FAIR Condition

2 ARE THERE CODE VIOLATIONS?

Of the 202 school buildings being reported:

- 64 (32.7%) YES
- 138 (68.3%) NO

Nearly 33% of the buildings reported have safety code violations

3 ARE THERE CAPACITY ISSUES (SPACE FOR STUDENTS)?

Of the 202 school buildings being reported:

- 88 (43.6%) YES
- 114 (56.4%) NO

Nearly 44% of the buildings reported capacity issues

4 ARE THERE INTERNET CAPACITY OR CONNECTIVITY ISSUES?

- 83 (41%) YES
- 119 (59%) NO

41% of the 202 buildings reported internet capacity or connectivity issues

5 DOES YOUR DISTRICT HAVE TEACHER HOUSING?

- 26 (40%) YES
- 39 (60%) NO

Over 40% of the 65 reporting school districts reported to have teacher housing

6 (IF APPLICABLE) WHAT IS YOUR CONDITION OF TEACHER HOUSING?

- 10 (38.5%) 1-Poor
- 11 (42.3%) 2-Fair
- 4 (15.3%) 3-Good
- 1 (3.8%) 4-Excellent

Over 80.8% of the school districts reporting to have teacher housing indicated the condition was POOR-FAIR

Two districts reported the need for additional housing

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A body of research exists that demonstrates a significant correlation between school facility condition and student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and teacher retention.

In order to move the student achievement levels of our Indian Lands students forward, we must evaluate and address all areas of our educational systems – including facilities. Creating a positive learning environment that promotes student learning is one of the foundational aspects of increasing student learning outcomes. Positively impacting learning outcomes will not occur until school facilities, including district provided teacher housing, stimulate educator effectiveness.

Along with poor (20.3%) and unsafe (32.7%) facility conditions, access to high quality internet is an issue for many school districts (41%) within the NIISA membership. This lack of access to information impedes our Indian Lands children’s opportunity to acquire knowledge and find academic successes equivalent to their peers around the country to close the achievement gap and increase graduation.

Additionally research has demonstrated, the quality of teachers is the number one impact on student learning – top-quality teachers want to be in a top-quality building and live in top-quality housing. The deterioration of public school district facilities in Indian Country must be addressed, if we are to move the learning outcomes of our Native American children toward proficiency.

NIISA Member Districts Responding to the NIISA Facility Survey

Annette Island, AK
 Bristol Bay, AK
 Chinle, AZ
 Ganado, AZ
 Ft. Thomas, AZ
 Pinon, AZ
 Red Mesa, AZ
 Sacaton, AZ
 San Carlos, AZ
 Central Union, CA
 Klamath-Trinity, CA
 Loleta Union School District, CA
 Mt.. Empire USD, CA
 Royal Valley, Kansas
 Browning, MT
 Dodson, MT
 Hays – Lodge Poll, MT
 Lame Deer, MT
 Rocky Boy, MT
 Mahnomon, MN
 Naytahwasch. MN
 Pine Point,, MN
 Red Lake, MN
 Walker School District. MN
 Waubun, MN
 Santee, Neb
 Umonhon Nation, Neb
 Walthill, Neb
 Winnebago, Neb
 Zuni, NM
 Salamanca, NY
 Dunseith, ND
 Ft. Yates, ND
 New Town, ND
 Solon, ND
 Dahlongah School District, OK
 Jay School District, OK
 Kansas School District, OK
 Maryetta School District, OK

Rocky Mountain, SD, OK
 Smee, OK
 Tonkawa, OK
 Andes Central, SD
 Bennett County, SD
 Eagle Butte, SD
 Kadoka, SD
 McIntosh, SD
 McLaughlin, SD
 Oglala County, SD
 Smee School District, SD
 South Central School District, SD
 Timber Lake, SD
 Todd County, SD
 Wagner, SD
 Waubay, SD
 Winner, SD
 San Juan School District, Utah
 Columbia, WA
 Grand Coulee Dam, WA
 Granger, WA
 Inchelium, WA
 Mt. Adams, WA
 Queets-Clearwater, WA
 Wapato, WA
 Wellpinit, WA
 Black River Falls, WI
 Menominee, WI
 Wabeno, WI
 Fremont #14, WY
 Fremont #21, WY

SUMMARY

65 out of 70 Responded: 92.85%

Total Dollar Need: \$741,906,878.00

Data on lack of or minimum bonding capacity

NIISA looked at one district that responded to the facilities survey in each state that included a NIISA member school district requesting they provide information on their capacity to generate local funding for capital projects.

Questions:

- 1) What is your assessed valuation for purposes of securing a bond to address your capital needs? \$ _____

- 2) Have you ever tried to float a bond referendum to your voters? Yes _____ No _____

- 3) If yes did it pass? Yes _____ No _____

- 4) Did you try to pass a referendum multiple times? Yes _____ No _____
Were you ever successful? Yes _____ No _____

- 5) If you have been successful in passing a bond for a capital project – how long ago was it and what was the amount? _____ years \$ _____ Amount

- 6) If you answered yes to number 5 – are you still paying off the bond
Yes _____ No _____ and do you have a limited amount of bonding capacity remaining? Yes _____ No _____ If yes what amount of bonding capacity remains? \$ _____

- 7) Will you in the foreseeable future attempt to go to the voters to pass a bond referendum? Yes _____ No _____

- 8) Does your state provide a funding source for capital projects? Yes _____ No _____

Depending on the state where the district was located and the percentage of land within the district that was federal (Trust, Treaty and Alaska Claims Settlement) the ability to generate local revenue varied as did the assistance provided by their state: Examples of local and state support:

Salamanca School District, New York: Their voters did authorize a capital project of \$27,565,000 of which \$11,950,000 to be financed through revenue bonds. The balance will come from the State of New York and the use of Section 7003 Impact Aid Basic Support payments – which means that funding is diverted from the general fund to help with paying off capital projects. The district still has a balance from previous year’s capital projects of \$16.5 million of which \$14.8 is principal – the district has been forced to request the voters to allow the district to exceed their debt limit.

Mt. Adams School District, Washington: The district has a total assessed value of \$158,000,000 and they have been successful in getting the support of the voters in passing a bonding referendum. However the most they can bond for is \$8 million which would quadruple the tax bills of their residents who own property. The previous bond was a \$2,000,000 and was amortized over 35 years and is now paid off. The board just passed a resolution to have a bond and a levy placed on the ballot in April.

The state does provide construction funding, but it is less than half of the amount needed to build an elementary school (\$12 million), and the high school can garner only \$5 million from the state, which is 7% of the cost of building a new high school.

Wapato School District, Washington: The district has a total assessed value for capital projects of \$666,287,225. Their voters have passed a bonding referendum; the most recent is a 7-year amortized \$20,000,000 bond which is still being paid off. They also have based on their total bonding capacity just over \$15.5 million remaining and they plan on looking to asking the voters for approval at some point in the near future. They have had little facility funding support from the State.

Klamath-Trinity Joint School District, California: Their total assessed value for capital projects is \$8.5 million. Their voters did pass a bond referendum in 2016 for \$4 million. With virtually no remaining bonding a capacity there is no plans to go to the voters in the future. Klamath-Trinity is an example of a local and state partnership in meeting their facility needs, but nowhere has the Federal Government been heard from. They have under-took a 3 phase approach at meeting their facility needs of which there are many. In total the district has picked up 6% of the cost and the State of California 83%, leaving an 11% shortfall that cannot be absorbed locally as it would require borrowing beyond their capacity. The Federal Government should recognize a responsibility as 55% of the districts land is Federal and 90% of their population pays no California income tax. Their question is? Where is the Federal Government in meeting an obligation to provide assistance as first recognized in 1950 with the passage of P. L. 81-815?

Bristol Bay Borough Schools, Alaska: Their total assessed value for capital projects is \$425,550,600 which has allowed the district to pass a bond referendum. They did so in the spring of 2014 for \$15,000,000. The bond was initially based on the State of Alaska Debt Reimbursement program; however the program was put on a “retroactive moratorium” after the district’s bond passed. The bond was never pursued once the moratorium was put in place. This will force the district to consider seeking voter approval of a bond referendum in the future. The State of Alaska as noted was the source of funding to provide support for capital projects, but the State legislature has not allocated funding toward this program for several years. Example of a loss of State funding due to legislative action to drop the program more and likely as a result in a drop in state revenue.

Chinle Unified School District, Arizona: Their total assessed value for capital projects is \$3,321,384.00 which is able to generate \$664,277.00 for capital expenses; an amount that would be used principally for renovation and repair as it would not support a major construction project. 10 years ago the district did pass a \$1,150,000.00 bond which has been paid off; however the district has little bonding capacity still available due to the low assessed value of land that is taxable. The district is considering a bond referendum to present to the voters in the future that could be used for minor capital projects. The State of Arizona does not provide any state funding for capital projects.

San Carlos Unified School District, Arizona: San Carlos is an example of a school district with absolutely no bonding capacity. Their assessed valuation for securing a bond to address their facility needs is \$1,598.00. Yes that is “One thousand five hundred and ninety eight dollars”. What are you going to build with just over fifteen hundred dollars? Because of their low assessed value they have never attempted to pass a bond referendum, meaning their only option is through using Impact Aid as a revenue source to support the sale of bonds (see below “Impact Aid Revenue Bonds”) as the State of Arizona does not provide funding to support capital projects.. In 1950 Congress saw the need to support capital projects in districts impacted by a Federal presence by passing P.L. 81-815, it is time to do it again!!

Impact Aid Revenue Bonds: For Chinle, San Carlos and other Arizona districts the source of funding for capital projects can only be derived from local sources (limited as noted above) or through the use of Impact Aid as a revenue source to underwrite a bonding initiative which is allowable under Arizona law and does not conflict with the Impact Aid statute. The sale of bonds for capital projects using Impact Aid as revenue committed to paying off the bond is the only option to generate funds; however it impacts a district’s general fund as dollars are committed each year toward paying off the bond.

NIISA REQUEST – FOR A FEDERAL INVESTMENT

The Indian land districts recognize that a “need” component should be built into any kind of funding mechanism that would fund local educational agencies serving children residing on Indian land. It should be noted that there is a gradation of Impact Aid recipients from those of high federal impact down to much lower levels. This gradation is built in to the Impact Aid law (Title VII). Referred to as LOT (Learning Opportunity Threshold) it is a multiplier used in the calculation of Impact Aid payments to direct Impact Aid funds to those local educational agencies with a high dependence on Impact Aid dollars. This was built into the law in 1994 as Congress recognized that “full funding” of the program (currently funded at 55% of the required dollars to fully fund) was not a reality when considering Federal budget restraints. Thus a need component could easily be provided in any funding stream that would provide facility funding to schools serving children residing on Indian lands. Schools with a lower LOT percentage for example should have a much greater capability of generating facility funding from its non-federal property than would a school with a high LOT percentage. (This isn't to say there's absolutely *no* federally-caused reduction in facility replacement fund generation in a low LOT percentage district)

Infrastructure Funding Options

A. Direct Grants

- 1) **Eligibility** -- A local educational agency was eligible to receive a payment under sections 7002 or 7003 of the of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7702 and 7703) for fiscal year 2017 and
 - a. has a total taxable assessed value of real property that may be taxed for school purposes of less than \$100,000,000; or
 - b. an assessed value of real property per student that may be taxed for school purposes that is less than the average of the assessed value of real property per student that may be taxed for school purposes in the State in which the local educational agency is located.
- 2) **Bonding capacity:** Those with limited bonding capacity or no bonding capacity would be given a higher priority
- 3) **In awarding grants the Secretary shall consider the following criteria:**
 - a. In the case of an emergency grant whether the facility poses a health or safety threat to students and school personnel, including noncompliance with building codes and inaccessibility for persons with disabilities, or

- b. In the case of a modernization grant whether the existing building capacity meets the needs of the current/projected enrollment and supports the provision of comprehensive educational services including the agency's inability to utilize technology or offer a curriculum that meets current standards in the State in which the local educational agency is located.
- c. The extent to which the new design and proposed construction utilize energy efficient and recyclable materials.
- d. The extent to which the new design and proposed construction utilizes non-traditional or alternative methods to expedite construction and project completion and maximize cost efficiency.
- e. The extent to which the new design will improve the safety aspect of the building to ensure that students and faculty are not subject to visual contact from the outside, through the installation of overhead windows that provide natural lighting.
- f. The feasibility of project completion within a reasonable period of time.
- g. The availability of other resources for the proposed project including the use of in-kind contributions.

B. Loans

- 1. Congress would provide a one-time appropriations of \$1 billion to be used as a source of low-interest loans to school districts based on their inability to raise revenue due to the presence of Federal land – the loan fund would become a self-perpetuating revolving fund;

C. Tax Credits

- 1. Bonds providing tax credits to lenders – Qualified Zone Academy Bonds
- 2. Infrastructure Banks – institutions established for the purpose of providing low-interest loans to qualifying local education agencies.

A Federal Commitment to provide infrastructure funding to Indian Land Districts is not an expense it's an Investment

As reference earlier, a vast amount of research exists that demonstrates a significant correlation between school facility condition and student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and teacher retention. In order to move the student achievement levels of our Indian Lands students forward, we must evaluate and address all areas of our educational systems – including facilities. Creating a positive learning environment that promotes student learning

and attract quality people is one of the foundational aspects of increasing student learning outcomes. Positively impacting learning outcomes that stimulate educator effectiveness will not occur without the assurance that the retention of quality professional teachers and administrators is considered a priority in school facility design, including an assurance that teachers reside in safe and modern housing where housing is a necessity to retain quality staff. School facility funding should be a team effort between the local community – the state – and in the case of districts with non-taxable federal land – the Federal Government. Rather than a three-part partnership, to date it is primarily a two-part – it is time for the Federal Government to make a commitment as was the original purpose of P. L. 81-815 68 years ago.

NATIONAL INDIAN IMPACTED SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION MARCH, 2018

**Brent Gish, Executive Director
P.O. Box 30
Naytahwaush, Minnesota 56566
701-212-5209
gishbd@localnet.com**