

**Task Force for Improving Education
Structural Change and Technology Subcommittee
May 17, 2013**

Present: Bob Lokken, Rep. DeMordaunt (had to leave early), Mike Lanza, Anne Ritter, Ken Edmunds, Penni Cyr, Alan Millar, Tom Luna, Cindy Wilson, Roger Brown, Corrine Mantle-Bromley

The Structural Change Subcommittee and the Fiscal Stability Subcommittee first met jointly with Vice-Chairman Bob Lokken leading the discussion.

The subcommittees began by discussing a statement of support for the Idaho Core standards. Members shared their ideas on what should be included in the statement. Common themes suggested for the statement included:

- Higher standards help achieve the goal of 60% of Idaho's population having some form of post-secondary degree or certificate
- Proper implementation of the standards is critical
- Concerns from the public hearings were taken into consideration
- It is the role of the state, not the federal government, to adopt and implement standards

The group then moved on to discussing the areas of overlap between the two groups, including funding models (enrollment vs. average daily attendance), salary schedule, funding adequacy, and educational service agencies. There are structural changes that could address fiscal stability, but there are also structural changes that focus on achieving the group's 60% goal. The group discussed and considered merging the Structural Change Subcommittee with the Fiscal Stability Subcommittee, but decided not to make a decision until after the lunch break.

When the subcommittees reconvened shortly after 1:00 p.m., Paul Headlee, the Deputy Division Manager for the Legislative Services Office, presented on public school funding. Public schools received 47% of the FY 2014 General Fund appropriation. Public schools averaged 48.2% of the annual General Fund appropriation over the past 22 years. There are four main factors that make up salary-based apportionment: support units, staff allowance, base salaries, and the statewide experience and education index. Mr. Headlee showed the group the salary multiplier table ("salary grid").

He then gave a brief history of public school funding in Idaho. Single salary schedules have been common in districts since the 1950s. State funding based on weighted average daily attendance (ADA) and state average cost per student began in the 1960s and 1970s. State funding to districts based on support units began in the 1980s. Prior to 1990, there was no statewide salary schedule. In 1994, Senate Bill 1560 created a new funding formula using a statewide salary grid, base salaries, and staff allowances. It established base salaries, and required \$90 million more funding for public schools in order to be established. In Fiscal Year 2007, House Bill 1 removed a .3% maintenance and operation (M&O) local levy and increased sales tax by one cent. Recent years have seen a recession and different reform efforts. In closing, Mr. Headlee presented factors for consideration when recommending changes to the funding model. A list of the factors for consideration and the full presentation can be found at: http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/board_initiatives/education_improvement_taskforce/05-17-13/K-12%20Public%20School%20Funding.pdf.

Next, Dr. Corrine Mantle-Bromley presented on educational service agencies (ESA). She drew from a presentation prepared by Dr. Brian Talbott, Executive Director Emeritus of the Association of

Educational Service Agencies. There is currently one ESA in Idaho—COSSA. ESAs are a way to consolidate services without consolidating districts. In order to qualify as an ESA, there have to be at least two shared services, and one of those services is usually professional development. The role of an ESA is to equalize educational opportunity, improve student learning, maximize operational and fiscal efficiencies, and provide technical assistance to local school districts. There are three broad categories of shared services: academic, business, and commodities. Funding for the ESA differs from state to state, but includes local, state, federal, cooperative, and foundation funding. ESAs have existed in some states for a very long time. In Washington, they're the vehicle for delivery of professional development. In the past, the Idaho Legislature commissioned a study around the viability of ESAs in the state. Superintendents were perceived as being leery of ESAs, because they view them as a step towards consolidation. However, Ms. Mantle-Bromley said Dr. Talbott think ESAs are actually a way to keep consolidation at bay.

After Ms. Mantle-Bromley's presentation on ESAs, the group returned to the discussion of a statement of support on the Idaho Core Standards. They reviewed a statement the Effective Teachers and Leaders Subcommittee had reviewed. After discussion and revision, the present subcommittee revised and submitted the following statement for the Chairman's consideration:

"After an analysis of the adoption and methodology behind the Common Core and ensuring the state has maintained its independence in its ability to create and adopt standards, curriculum, and assessment, the Task Force for Improving Education strongly endorses Idaho's decision to raise academic standards for all students by implementing Idaho's Core Standards in mathematics and English language arts. Proper implementation of the Idaho Core Standards is an essential component to preparing Idaho's students to meet the Task Force goal. The goal of the Task Force is for 60% of Idaho's 25-34 year old population to earn a post-secondary degree or certificate by the year 2020. For more information on the Idaho Core Standards, their adoption and implementation, please visit www.sde.idaho.gov/site/ics."

The final topic of discussion before the two groups separated to finish their work for the day was whether the two subcommittees should merge for the long-term. After discussion, the group agreed to work independently until a specified time later in the summer and then reconcile overlapping issues.

The two subcommittees then split to plan their presentation schedules for interim meetings through the summer.

Mr. Lokken told the group it was Chairman DeMordaunt's expectation that the Structural Change Subcommittee would meet every 2-3 weeks for 60-90 minutes at a time via video conferencing or conference calling. Mr. Lokken told the group he'd like to meet about a week before the August 23rd meeting of the full Task Force to vote on the subcommittee's final recommendation. The subcommittee should plan to present 3-4 recommendations to the full Task Force. Mr. Lokken and Chairman DeMordaunt will work to put together a draft calendar of meeting dates for the subcommittee to review and topics for presentations based on previous subcommittee discussions. The subcommittee should submit suggestions for possible presenters/presentations.

The group also agreed they'd like a way to communicate thoughts and ideas between summer meetings. Most members of the group agreed email strings were overwhelming and preferred an electronic message board or collaboration site of some sort. Staff will look into options and work to set something up.

As its last item of business, the subcommittee decided to meet again on Friday, June 7th from 10:00-11:00 am/MT to review the list of topics for presentations and presenters and to finalize dates for the rest of the summer meetings.