

Legislative Council on the Oregon Quality Education Model

-

March 3, 1999 4:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hearing Room 357

Tapes 13 - 16

Rep. Lynn Lundquist, Chair

Rep. Randall Edwards

Rep. Ken Strobeck

Rep. Ben Wesflund

Boyd Applegarth

Pat Burk

Tim Carman

David Conley

Gary Conkling

Sale Coxé

Stephen Greer

Jonathan Hill

Jim Jamieson

Peggy Lynch

Frank McNamara

James Minturn

Ozzie Rose

Vern Ryles

Duncan Wyse

STAFF PRESENT:

Margie Hunt, Administrator

Nora Carlson, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:

Review Draft of final Report of the Council

Review and Approval of Plans for Presentation of Report to the Education Sub Committee

Review Final Approval of the Model and Costs

-

TAPE# Speaker Comments

TAPE 13, A

001 Chair Lundquist Calls meeting to order at 4:20 p.m.

003 Chair Lundquist Provides update on the current developments and discussion on the model.

040 Chair Lundquist Continues with discussion on the question of how many dollars should be put into the state school fund.

070 Margie Hunt Asks council members to submit a quote that will be included in the final report. Distributes Facts page on the model and Press Advisory Release **[EXHIBIT A]**.

079 Peggy Lynch Provides comment on the council's work around policy issues.

093 Chair Lundquist Comments on the council's presentation to the sub-committee; adds that the work of the council has just begun.

REVIEW DRAFT OF FINAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

107 David Conley Presents discussion on the meaning of the model and the vision for a quality education.

127 Conley Continues with discussion on the work of the model.

157 Conley Distributes draft review report on the Quality Education Model to council members **[EXHIBIT B]**.

186 Conley Continues with report on equalization.

207 Conley Continues with report on school district budgets.

240 Conley Continues with report on health care.

267 Conley Continues with report on content goals.

307 Conley Continues with report on correlational data.

322 Conley Continues with report on the components of the model.

342 Conley Continues with report on the developmental goals of the state.

401 Conley Continues with report on the prototype school approach.

450 Conley Continues with report on the approach used to determine costs for programs.

TAPE 14, A

015 Conley Continues with report on assumptions used in developing prototype schools.

040 Conley Continues with report on intangible elements.

060 Conley Continues with report on characteristics of the prototype school.

078 Conley Refers to page 10 of handout and continues with report on program elements and components.

100 Conley Continues with report on data used in calculating costs for K- 12 education in Oregon.

127 Conley Continues with report on special education assumptions.

138 Chair Lundquist Invites members to ask about the assumptions used in allocating special education costs.

143 Lynch Asks about the percentage of total special education students used in the calculation.

145 Conley Identifies approximately three percent.

153 Gary Conkling Comments on how special education is currently funded and suggests a different approach on special education assumptions.

169 Conley Concurs with suggestion.

171 Conley Continues with report on calculating costs for education.

174 Frank McNamara Concurs with Mr. Conkling's suggestion.

181 Conley Continues with discussion on the school funding formula: ADMR (Average Daily Membership Resident) and the weighting formula.

222 Duncan Wyse Comments on the built in cost of services in the model school.

240 Conley States that a special component will need to be created to include high cost special education students.

258 Conley Continues with discussion on how to define the current service levels in schools.

304 Conley Continues with report on phased implementation.

312 Chair Lundquist Comments on the how the model is the first step and inexact proportions.

335 Conley Comments on the debate on what it costs for education.

352 Conley Refers to page 12 of the handout, which outlines the vision of the model.

375 Conley Continues with report on the full implementation elements of the model.

420 Conley Continues with report on the phased implementation of the model.

480 Conley Continues with report on funding grades.

TAPE 13, B

035 Conley Continues with discussion on the key concepts of phased implementation.

037 Conley Concludes report on review draft.

040 Chair Lundquist Calls meeting to recess at 5:17 p.m.

042 Chair Lundquist Reconvenes meeting at 5:40 p.m.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PLANS FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT TO THE EDUCATION SUB COMMITTEE

045 Conley Distributes draft report on the Full Implementation and Phased Implementation of the Quality Education Model categorized by high school, middle school and elementary school [EXHIBIT C].

052 Conkling Asks about the timeline for members to discuss report recommendations.

059 Conley States that his goal is to provide overview on the three models followed with a period for raising issues.

067 Conley Continues with report on elementary school resources.

092 Conley Continues with report on instructional improvement.

126 Hunt Asks for clarification on the recommended length of summer school.

130 Conley Clarifies that the length of time has changed. Continues with report on centralized support costs.

155 Conley Continues with report on per pupil costs.

159 Boyd Applegarth Comments that the total pupil cost will be a very important part on how the public interprets the data.

182 Ozzie Rose Comments on how easy it will be for the media to interpret the data.

183 Lynch Refers to page 1, program element and suggests change in language on program staff.

187 Conley Explains that the data suggests that this is a needed position.

195 Applegarth Agrees with Ms. Lynch and suggests that the statement be omitted.

214 Conley Comments on the time constraints they are facing.

221 Hunt Invites members to share concerns.

230 Conley Continues with report on phased implementation.

238 Lynch Refers to handout and asks about the averages.

241 Conley Explains that the reason the numbers appear lower are due to smaller class ratios in outlying districts.

257 Pat Burk Asks about wording that was cut off on page I of phased implementation (instructional support staff element).

262 Conley Clarifies "...as it deems most effective."

290 Conley Continues with report on additional core staffing.

330 Conley Continues with discussion on professional training and development.

357 Lynch Asks about, the difference in the total number of students cited in Exhibit B compared to those in Exhibit C.

358 Conley Clarifies 500 as the correct number.

370 Conley Concludes report on the elementary school category.

379 Applegarth Asks if the report includes a distinction between class size and pupil teacher ratios.

380 Conley Clarifies that it is more class size than teacher-pupil ratio.

392 Hunt States that the distinction will be included in the final report.

394 Conley Continues with report on full implementation: high school category.

420 Conley Continues with report on additional core staffing.

480 Conley Continues with report on phased implement: high school category.

TAPE 14, B

020 Conley Continues with report on centralized support costs.

025 Conley Concludes report on phased implementation: high school category.

040 Wyse Asks Mr. Conley to repeat closing statement.

042 Conley Reviews closing statement.

045 Stephen Greer Applauds the report, but suggests that per pupil language be eliminated.

048 Conley Concurs.

053 Chair Lundquist Agrees that the numbers may be misleading.

054 Applegarth Refers to the numbers reported and suggests that the members should "do the math" and explain how it does not apply.

062 Greer Asks if it would be helpful to do a statewide roll up.

065 Applegarth States that the council should raise the issue, and "say what it is and what it is not."

068 Chair Lundquist Agrees that this is the right direction to move toward.

072 Greer Suggests that the numbers be used on a different sheet.

074 Applegarth Concur.

075 Vern Ryles Suggests adding a qualifier on the sheet.

078 Burk Refers to the middle school category and asks for clarification on the English as a Second Language [ESL] numbers.

093 Conley Provides that there are some glitches in the report in that time did not allow for exactness.

095 Conley Comments on the importance to stand behind the report and acknowledge that it is a draft document.

106 Burk Asks about the FTE (full time equivalent) budget.

109 Conley States that the answer reflects the approximate differences in salaries in the state.

112 Lynch Provides agreement with Mr. Greer's statement on the bottom line numbers.

127 Conley Agrees that the numbers were not comparable. Adds that his calculations were for tracking the spending relationships between categories.

130 Rose Suggests that numbers could have a disqualifier beside it: stating that it is not an allocation number.

138 Rose Observes that the phase in numbers show the high school being less on a per pupil basis than the middle school.

145 Conley Explains that it does not.

160 Conley Explains that when numbers are adjusted for rolling - it is higher. Adds that the high school loses students throughout the year and the middle school does not.

162 Rose Comments that in the full model it goes up.

165 Conley Explains that most of the money is put in class size reduction at the elementary school level.

190 Conkling Comments on the reports presented and costing variables.

228 Conkling Continues with discussion on costing variables.

245 Conkling Continues with discussion on identifying real costs.

266 Chair Lundquist Comments on the need to have clarification on costs.

319 Conkling States that we are all guilty of funding categories of activity as opposed to performance outcomes.

350 Nancy Heiligman Oregon Department of Education, states that they did not address major capital costs that are bondable, and explains how data was collected.

382 Jonathan Hill Refers to California's Proposition 13 and the damaged that incurred. Suggests that an effort be made to produce the numbers in a timely fashion and produce something more specific.

420 Hill Continues with discussion on the need for specific direction.

450 Rose Supports Mr. Conkling's statement on buying performance and comments on the need to determine total capital needs.

TAPE 15, A

030 Burk States that the model does not explain everything that will happen over time and provides example with Portland School's purchase of a computer: cost savings due to the expansion of technology.

053 Burk Comments on how difficult it is to find a standards-based funding formula: costs for specific types of interventions.

075 Chair Lundquist Comments on buying performance and that quality should be a part of the process.

083 Wyse Refers to Page 3 of Exhibit B: Composition of the model, and comments on the question of what we expect from our schools.

095 Chair Lundquist Comments on the importance to have the total picture.

103 James Minturn Suggests that the transportation component should be treated the same as the high cost special education component.

113 Conley States that he sees these components as being allocation issues.

129 Heiligman Comments that their assumption was that the state's school funding formula handles transportation and reimburses it at 70 percent.

132 Conley States that they are moving toward an issue of equity and distribution.

138 Lunch Asks for clarification on the total cost of student transportation.

145 Heiligman Clarifies that the \$230 is the total costs averaged across the state.

151 Lynch Refers to the Subcommittee on Special Education's discussion on the three percent high cost category asks to explain the change in numbers.

180 McNamara Explains how they arrived at the numbers. Adds that they did take into account higher expenditures in the general maintenance activities, but the bondable items are not dealt with in the report.

200 McNamara Continues discussion on determining total state costs to get students toward the Certificate of Initial Mastery [CIM] standards.

219 Conkling Comments on state costs and state school formulas.

230 McNamara States that his distinction was that the model is trying to get us to a number and a distribution formula does something different.

244 Conkling States that current language does not provide the distinction.

254 Rep. Strobeck Comments on reality based budgeting.

270 Rep. Strobeck Asks about the concern voiced on the numbers.

271 Conley Explains that the concern was around the per pupil cost language.

285 Rep. Strobeck Asks why can't the number be used as a target number.

290 Conley Suggests that number language could be changed to reflect concerns being raised.

295 Lynch Comments on the cost assumptions.

311 Ryles States that it is important to remember it is not an allocation number.

316 Rep. Strobeck Reiterates the need to come up with some global numbers and suggested guidelines.

340 Rep. Strobeck Continues with discussion on the numbers.

348 Chair Lundquist Describes an example concept.

360 Rep. Strobeck Asks about the expectations of the numbers.

370 McNamara Explains that council is struggling with trying not to present too many numbers. Presents an example formula that could be used in the model.

398 McNamara Continues with description of example formula.

440 Chair Lundquist Announces that a slide presentation will be given, which will be used in their presentation to the House Education Subcommittee.

480 Rose Clarifies Rep. Strobeck's question on the current level of appropriations.

005 Rep. Strobeck States that his questions were on: what was missing, the weights and where was the rest of the story.

009 Conley States that as soon as you start weighting students; you pull money away from other students, which results in less money.

020 Rep. Strobeck Comments on the various staffing levels assigned to the model.

030 Conkling Comments on the difference in the weights and factors.

032 Conley Adds that the model is more expensive because more money was put into the elementary schools.

046 McNamara Describes an example formula.

060 Hunt Introduces the slide presentation that will be shown and also presented to the Education Subcommittee.

REVIEW FINAL APPROVAL OF THE MODEL AND COSTS

103 Conkling Distributes report and presents slide review and [EXHIBIT D] (*portions of testimony were not recorded*).

117 Conkling Continues with slide presentation (*portions of testimony were not recorded*).

127 Hill Voices concern about language on "...forcing schools to use best educational practices." Suggests that language be changed to read that it doesn't force schools to use "specific" educational practices.

128 Lynch Agrees that "specific" should be used.

130 Conkling Continues with slide presentation on meeting high academic standards.

141 Sal Coxe Suggests language be added to include arts education.

179 Hunt States that when the committee first began, members had agreement on the components of a quality education model; adds that this does not appear to be clarified in the slide presentation.

182 Conkling *Portions of presentation did not record.*

188 Lynch States that they did not choose a model: they developed a model.

190 Hunt Reviews the three sentences that describe how the model was developed.

195 Committee Discussion on amendment language. *Portions of discussion did not record.*

214 Conkling Continues with slide presentation on supporting the high academic standards.

219 Committee *Portions of presentation did not record*

234 Conkling Continues with slide presentation on fundamental operating units.

252 Hill Comments on language "we chose schools because they are more alike statewide than any other unit."

258 Chair Lundquist States that they chose the school unit rather than an individual student or district wide

260 Applegarth Asks where do the slides fit into the presentation to the subcommittee

262 Hunt Explains that the slide will be used at the start of the presentation.

274 Applegarth Voices concern on the audience being able to focus on both a slide presentation and a narrative.

280 Conkling Continues with slide presentation on using prototype schools.

315 Conkling Continues with slide presentation on school characteristics.

340 Conkling *Portions of presentation did not record.*

354 Wyse Comments on the issue of small rural schools.

356 Hunt Clarifies that the next slide will address the issue.

366 Committee Discussion on grammar.

378 Conkling Continues with slide presentation on prototype schools.

385 Committee Discussion on adjustment language.

420 Wyse Comments on the adjustment language.

450 Lynch Reads amendment language "...the model reflects average costs, not allocation of funds to reflect special circumstances."

480 Committee Discussion on amendment language.

TAPE 15, B

005 Committee Continues discussion on amendment language.

026 Applegarth Asks how would you address a question that may be raised by someone from Powell Butte

033 Conley Comments that schools as a whole are not dramatically different until you get down to a small size.

039 Applegarth Comments that an explanation will have to be given.

044 Lynch Comments on the "highest cost" of special education language.

049 Committee *Discussions did not record.*

058 Committee Discussion on capital costs.

063 Lynch Asks if language should read "capital additions are not included."

068 Applegarth States that language should be cleaned up.

074 Hunt States that language is an attempt to try and get at the capital issue.

073 Lynch Asks if language should read "the model assumes that the state covers maintenance cost for school buildings."

080 Committee Discussion on capital cost language.

090 Conkling Continues with slide presentation on elements and components.

093 Committee Discussion on language.

098 Chair Lundquist Announces that meeting will be adjourned, but invites members to remain in order to work on amendment language.

102 Chair Lundquist Adjourns meeting at 7:32 p.m.

Chair Lundquist Adjourns work session at 8:45 p.m.

Submitted By,

Administrative Support

Nora Carlson

Reported By,

Margie Hunt

Administrator

A - Description on Quality Education Model and Press Advisory, Margie Hunt, 2pp

B - Review Draft on the Quality Education Model, David Conley, 17pp

C - Full Implementation and Phase Implementation Tables, David Conley, 22pp

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words, For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.