

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SB55)

Received: 06/01/2001

Received By: grantpr

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau 6-9917

By/Representing: Merrifield

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: grantpr

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Education - miscellaneous

Extra Copies: MJL

Submit via email: NO

Requester's email:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Merrifield -

Topic:

Delete Board on Education Evaluation and Accountability

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	grantpr 06/01/2001	hhagen 06/04/2001		_____			
/1			haugca 06/04/2001	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/04/2001		
/2	grantpr 06/08/2001	hhagen 06/08/2001	rschluet 06/09/2001	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/09/2001		

Vers. Drafted Reviewed Typed Proofed Submitted Jacketed Required

FE Sent For:

<END>

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SB55)

Received: **06/01/2001**

Received By: **grantpr**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau 6-9917**

By/Representing: **Merrifield**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **grantpr**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Education - miscellaneous**

Extra Copies: **MJL**

Submit via email: **NO**

Requester's email:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Merrifield -

Topic:

Delete Board on Education Evaluation and Accountability

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	grantpr 06/01/2001	hhagen 06/04/2001		_____			
/1		<i>12 hmb</i> 06/18/01	haugca 06/04/2001	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/04/2001		

FE Sent For:

6-9-1 *6-4-01*

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SB55)

Received: 06/01/2001

Received By: grantpr

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau 6-9917

By/Representing: Merrifield

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: grantpr

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Education - miscellaneous

Extra Copies: MJL

Submit via email: NO

Requester's email:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Merrifield -

Topic:

Delete Board on Education Evaluation and Accountability

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
1?	grantpr	11 hmb 6/1/01	CH 6-d	CH pb			

FE Sent For:

<END>



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 23, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #145

Board on Education Evaluation and Accountability (DOA -- Attached Programs and DPI -- Assessments and Licensing)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 74, #2 and Page 549, #4]

CURRENT LAW

Current law requires all school districts to annually administer the Wisconsin reading comprehension test (WRCT), a standardized reading test developed by DPI for 3rd grade pupils. Districts are also required to annually administer 4th, 8th and 10th grade Wisconsin knowledge and concepts exams (WKCE). A school board may choose to develop its own exam for 4th and 8th grades, and if it chooses to do so, it is required to notify DPI and provide the State Superintendent with statistical correlations of those exams with the exams adopted or approved by the State Superintendent. A school board must provide a pupil with at least two opportunities to take the 4th and 8th grade exams.

Each school district that operates a high school is required to adopt a written policy by September 1, 2002, specifying criteria for granting a high school diploma, and beginning in 2002-03, that criteria must include a high school graduation test (HSGT). The test may be administered only in grades 11 and 12, and must be offered twice each year. Beginning September 1, 2003, a high school diploma cannot be granted to any pupil unless the pupil has satisfied the school board's criteria.

A school board may determine not to administer an examination to a pupil enrolled in a special education program or a limited-English speaking pupil, and a school board may modify the format and administration of an examination for these pupils or permit a pupil to be examined in his or her native language. Additionally, school boards are required to excuse a pupil from taking the 4th, 8th or 10th grade exams or the high school graduation exam upon the request of the pupil's parent or guardian. School boards are required to establish alternative

criteria upon which to determine qualification for high school graduation if a pupil has been excused from the exam.

These provisions apply to charter schools as well.

DPI pays for printing, distributing, scoring and reporting the results of the exams. In 2000-01, DPI expected to expend approximately \$6.0 million in GPR and federal monies for printing, scoring, reporting and development costs of the exams, as well as for program operations, supplies and services associated with pupil assessment.

The State Superintendent develops and distributes a school performance report annually and arranges for an annual evaluation of the SAGE program annually.

GOVERNOR

Create a Board on Education Evaluation and Accountability (Board), attached to DOA and consisting of five members appointed for four-year terms. The members of the Board would be appointed by the Governor; Senate confirmation would not be required. Require that at least one member be experienced in education evaluation and assessment. Require that two of the initial members of the Board serve for terms expiring on May 1, 2003, and three of the initial members serve for terms expiring on May 1, 2005. Require the Board to appoint an executive director, assigned to statutory executive salary group 3, to serve at its pleasure. Specify that the executive director be part of the unclassified civil service.

Create an appropriation under DOA to fund the program operations of the Board. Transfer \$11,811,500 and 15.60 positions from DPI to DOA for this purpose in 2002-03. Of this funding, \$826,600 would be transferred from DPI's largest general program operations appropriation, \$10,859,900 from DPI's assessment appropriation and \$125,000 from the primary SAGE appropriation.

Require the Board to administer the pupil assessment program, currently administered by DPI. Require the Board, rather than DPI, to adopt or approve a 3rd grade reading test, 4th, 8th, and 10th grade knowledge and concepts exams and a high school graduation exam. Require a school board or charter school operator that chooses to develop and adopt its own 4th or 8th grade exams to notify the Board, rather than DPI, or for its own high school graduation exam, to notify the Board, rather than DPI, annually by October 1 that it intends to administer the examination in the following school year.

Require the Board to compile a school performance report. Require the Board to publish and distribute a summary of the school performance reports to the Legislature annually.

Authorize the Board to conduct a longitudinal study of the Milwaukee parental choice program if the Board receives sufficient funds from private sources to do so. If the Board conducts such a study, require that it report the results to the Legislature and the Governor.

Require the Board to take over the duties of the State Superintendent related to identifying schools that are low in performance, making recommendations regarding how the programs and operations of the schools can be improved and periodically assessing school district implementation of the plans. Require the Board, rather than the State Superintendent, to publish and distribute a list of the schools identified as low in performance to the Governor and Legislature annually.

Require the Board, rather than the State Superintendent as under current law, to study the utility of administering technology-based performance assessments to pupils.

Modify a current law requirement statistical correlation reporting requirement for the 4th and 8th grade exams to refer to the Board rather than the State Superintendent.

Transfer the responsibility to arrange for an annual evaluation of the SAGE program to the Board, and require the Board to allocate \$125,000 for that purpose from its appropriation, rather than from the SAGE appropriation.

Establish a nonstatutory provision governing the transfer of functions from DPI to the Board. Specify that this provision would apply to the following items, if they would be primarily related to the school performance report, pupil assessments, SAGE program evaluation and the 3rd grade reading test, as determined by the Secretary of DOA: (a) the assets and liabilities of DPI would become the assets and liabilities of the Board; (b) all incumbent employees holding positions in DPI would be transferred to the Board; (c) such employees would have all the statutory rights and the same status in the Board that they enjoyed in DPI immediately before the transfer and no employee transferred who has attained permanent status in class would be required to serve a probationary period; (d) all tangible personal property, including records, of DPI would be transferred to the Board; (e) all contracts entered into by DPI in effect on the effective date of this provision would remain in effect and would be transferred to the Board, which would carry out any obligations under such a contract; (f) all rules promulgated by DPI that are in effect on the effective date of this provision would be transferred to the Board and would remain in effect until amended or repealed by the Board and all orders issued by DPI that are in effect on the effective date of this provision would be transferred to the Board and would remain in effect until their specified expiration date or until modified or rescinded by the Board; and (g) any matter pending with DPI on the effective date of this provision would be transferred to the Board and all materials submitted to or actions taken by DPI with respect to the pending matter would be considered as having been submitted to or taken by the Board.

The Board's powers and duties and the transfer of functions to the Board would take effect on July 1, 2002.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Wisconsin pupil assessment system is administered and coordinated by the Office of Educational Accountability within DPI. The WRCT was first given in the 1988-89 school

year. The WKCE was first administered in 1992-93 to 8th and 10th grade pupils, and to 4th grade pupils in 1995-96. The HSGT is currently being developed by DPI and will be administered to 11th and 12th grade pupils beginning in 2002-03.

2. In recent years, pupil assessment has become the focus of broader educational reforms nationwide. Pupil assessments evaluate the quality and level of pupil achievement and indicate areas for improvement, provide accountability for public investment in education, and provide information to be used by teachers and pupils in decisions relating to remediation, program placement, career paths and ranking.

3. The Governor's proposal would remove from DPI responsibility for monitoring and reporting the quality of instruction offered by public, charter and MPCP schools, as well as the results of the SAGE program, and transfer that responsibility to an independent Board, created for that purpose and attached to DOA for administrative support services.

4. Proponents of the proposal argue that pupil assessment should be the responsibility of a neutral, independent body in order to ensure that no bias enters the testing and reporting process. They suggest that DPI may not be a neutral body because the Department also serves as an advocate for schools and local educational agencies, especially within the state budget process. Monitoring these entities as well as doing advocacy work for them may cause an appearance of partiality.

5. Opponents of this proposal argue that if the policy goal of this proposal truly is to establish an independent entity to safeguard the integrity of the state's assessments, the Governor's budget proposal is open to criticism. They indicate that it is unclear to what extent the proposed five-person board could be viewed as independent, since all five members would be appointed by the Governor. These appointments further would be made without Senate confirmation. In addition, the proposed attachment of the Board for limited purposes to the Department of Administration, which is one of the agencies of state government that works most closely with the Governor, could further diminish any appearance of independence of this Board.

6. Opponents of the proposal have also argued that DPI should retain administrative and development authority over the pupil assessment system because assessments are closely tied to the creation of curriculum and academic standards. DPI staff produces curriculum guides for school districts with the goal of helping students achieve statewide academic standards. DPI staff crafted these standards in large part, with input from education professionals and other interested parties. In turn, assessments have been developed by DPI to measure pupil attainment of those standards, and curriculum is adjusted accordingly based on those results. One could argue that DPI should continue to develop curriculum, standards, and assessments in order to ensure substantive consistency of content.

7. The State Superintendent has raised concerns that this provision of the bill may be unconstitutional because it would grant supervisory power over public instruction to state officers that are not subordinate to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In *Thompson v. Craney*

(1996), a unanimous state Supreme Court ruled a portion of 1995 Act 27 unconstitutional. The Court determined that the state constitution vests sole authority over public instruction with the office of State Superintendent. Without a constitutional amendment, the opinion found, the Legislature could create officers with supervisory power over public instruction only if those officers were ultimately subordinate to the State Superintendent.

8. On the other hand, proponents of this provision of the bill point to a concurring opinion to *Thompson* filed by Justice Wilcox and joined by Justice Steinmetz. That concurring opinion argued that under the constitution the Legislature is granted "the innovative flexibility to identify and address issues involving reform." The concurring opinion also pointed to a precedent for creation by the Legislature of state officers that were not subordinate to the State Superintendent but that were granted some supervisory authority over public instruction. In *Burton v. State Appeal Board* (1968), the Legislature had created a board, appointed by the State Superintendent, to hear appeals of school district reorganization orders from agency school committees. The Court found that, once appointed, the Board was subordinate to no one, including the State Superintendent. The concurring opinion in *Thompson* argues that this precedent should be read to affirm the constitutionality of the Legislature's granting of supervisory power over public instruction to state officers other than, and not subordinate to, the State Superintendent. Given the history of litigation surrounding the vesting of authority in officers other than the State Superintendent, it is possible that if enacted into law this provision would come under similar judicial review to determine its constitutionality.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to create a Board on Education Evaluation and Accountability, appointed by the Governor and attached to DOA, to administer the state's pupil assessment program, arrange for an annual SAGE evaluation, and compile an annual school performance report. Create an appropriation under DOA to fund the program operations of the Board. Transfer \$11,811,500 and 15.60 positions from DPI to DOA for this purpose in 2002-03. Of this funding, \$826,600 would be transferred from DPI's largest general program operations appropriation, \$10,859,900 from DPI's assessment appropriation and \$125,000 from the primary SAGE appropriation.

2. Maintain current law.
Adopted

Prepared by: Layla Merrifield

MO#	Y	N
Burke	Y	N
Decker	Y	N
Moore	Y	N
Shibilski	Y	N
Plache	Y	N
Wirch	Y	N
Darling	Y	N
Welch	Y	N
Gard	X	N
Kaufert	X	N
Albers	X	N
Duff	X	N
Ward	X	N
Huebsch	X	N
Huber	X	N
Coggs	Y	N

16-0
 passes



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 29, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #751

State Aid for Summer Classes for Milwaukee Charter Schools (DPI -- Choice, Charter and Open Enrollment)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 547, #7]

CURRENT LAW

State aid for summer classes is paid to school districts and county children with disabilities education boards (CCDEBs). Any school board may elect to offer summer classes or to permit pupils to attend summer classes operated by another school district on a tuition basis if the school district of operation will accept them. School districts may not charge tuition for summer classes for pupils who are residents of the school district if the school board receives state aid for the classes. The school board may establish and collect reasonable fees for social, recreational or extracurricular summer classes and programs that are neither credited toward graduation nor aided by the state. Aid is paid for those academic summer classes or laboratory periods that are for necessary academic purposes, as defined by the State Superintendent by rule. The summer average daily membership equivalent is added to a district's total membership for the purpose of calculating state aid.

Summer enrollment is also taken into account when calculating a district's revenue limit. A three-year rolling average enrollment is used to calculate a school district's revenue limit. For 2000-01, the summer average daily membership equivalent was included in the total enrollment at a rate of 20% in 1998 and 1999 and 40% in 2000 and thereafter. The summer average daily membership equivalent is the total number of minutes in which pupils are enrolled in academic summer classes or laboratory periods, as defined by the State Superintendent, divided by 48,600.

Beginning in the 1999-00 school year, state aid was also paid to private schools participating in the Milwaukee parental choice program (MPCP), in addition to the school term per pupil payments. Aid for summer classes is paid in an amount equal to the result of

multiplying the total school term payment received by the school by the summer average daily membership divided by total number of school term pupils.

State aid is not currently paid for summer school classes offered by schools under the Milwaukee charter school program (MCSP).

GOVERNOR

Require state aid to be paid to charter schools sponsored by the City of Milwaukee, UW-Milwaukee, and Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC) be calculated to include payment for the summer average daily membership equivalent for the summer of the previous school year, beginning with payments made for summer classes held in 2001. Specify that these charter schools would receive payment for their membership, which would be defined as the sum of the number of pupils attending the charter school in the current school year and the summer average daily membership equivalent, as calculated under current law, for the summer of the previous school year.

Provide \$1,762,600 in 2001-02 and \$7,057,400 in 2002-03 over the base year funding of \$11,666,000 for the Milwaukee charter school program. Under the bill, \$13,428,600 in 2001-02 and \$18,723,400 in 2002-03 would be appropriated for the program. Of these amounts, an estimated \$416,100 in 2002-03 would be attributable to the proposal to pay aid for summer classes beginning in 2001.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Summer instruction provides pupils with remedial or additional instruction as needed. School districts, charter schools operated by school districts, and CCDEBs all receive state aid for summer instruction. Summer enrollment for charter schools operated by school districts is currently included the district's membership count for state aid purposes.

2. Prior to 1997 Act 27, summer school enrollment was not included in revenue limit calculations for school districts. Act 27 required that 20% of summer enrollment be included in the number of pupils enrolled used to calculate a district's revenue limit. Under 1999 Act 9, the percentage was changed to 40% beginning with 2000, although because revenue limits are calculated on a three-year rolling average, schools will not receive the full 40% rate for summer enrollment until 2002-03. Under a separate budget provision, the Governor's recommendations would reduce the rate at which summer school enrollment would be counted for revenue limits to 25% beginning with 2001.

3. Under 1997 Act 27, the City of Milwaukee, the UW-M and the MATC are authorized to establish by charter and operate, or contract with a group or individual to operate, a charter school. The first schools under this provision were established in 1998-99. Each school must be located within MPS and pupils residing within the MPS district may attend the charter

school. Currently four schools are operating under the City's chartering authority: (a) Downtown Montessori Academy; (b) Khamit Institute; (c) YW Global Career Academy; and (d) Central City Cyberschool. UW-M established one charter school (Milwaukee Academy of Science) beginning in 2000-01.

4. Under provisions of 1999 Act 9, DPI is required to pay the operators of these charter schools an amount equal to the sum of the amount paid per pupil in the previous school year and the amount of revenue increase per pupil allowed under revenue limits, multiplied by the number of charter school pupils attending the school. The per pupil payment amount was \$6,494 in 2000-01 and these schools received an aggregate payment of approximately \$10.0 million in 2000-01. Total funding under the bill would be \$13.4 million in 2001-02 and \$18.7 million in 2002-03. These payments are made from a separate GPR sum sufficient appropriation established for that purpose, which is statutorily excluded from the definitions of state school aids and partial school revenues for purposes of calculating two-thirds funding. The cost of the payments from the appropriation is offset by a reduction in aid payments from the general school aid appropriation, with the savings deposited to the general fund in an amount equal to estimated payments under the program. A school district's revenue limit calculation is not affected by the MCSP reduction. Thus, a school district can increase its property tax levy to offset any aid reduction made related to the MCSP. Because this property tax is included in partial school revenues under the two-thirds funding calculation, total funding for general school aids is increased by two-thirds of the amount of the MCSP lapse, which partially offsets the statewide reduction amount.

5. Under current law, summer school membership is treated three different ways for school finance, depending on the type of school. For private schools participating in the Milwaukee parental choice program, summer school FTE membership receives 100% of the state per pupil payment for pupils at that school; in 2000-01, that payment is the lesser of \$5,326 or the private school's operating and debt service cost per pupil related to educational programming. For public school districts, 100% of summer school FTE membership is counted for aid purposes, but only 40% under revenue limits, which directly affect the resources available to the school district to operate summer school. On average, counting 40% of summer school FTE membership would have generated an estimated \$2,940 per pupil for purposes of revenue limits in 2000-01, if the 40% factor had been fully effective in that year. Finally, while MCSP schools receive a per pupil payment in 2000-01 of \$6,494, which exceeds the per pupil payment received by Milwaukee parental choice program schools by \$1,168, they currently receive nothing for summer school FTE membership.

6. Under the Governor's budget recommendations, summer school membership would be treated two different ways for school finance. For schools participating in the MCSP or in the Milwaukee parental choice program, summer school FTE membership would receive 100% of the state per pupil payment for pupils at that school. For public school districts, 100% of summer school FTE membership would be counted for aid purposes, but only 25% would be counted under revenue limits that directly affect the resources available to the school district to operate summer school.

7. Milwaukee charter schools have not yet provided summer classes for their pupils

because they would not receive state aid for those classes. According to DOA officials, because summer classes are not currently offered and due to the uncertainty over whether this provision will be included in the final budget, Milwaukee charter schools are not expected to offer summer classes in the summer of 2001. Therefore, payments for summer school aid would most likely need to be made in 2002-03, for the summer of 2002. Although it is difficult to estimate how many pupils might participate in summer school since no classes are currently offered, based on summer school participation rates under the Milwaukee parental choice program, it is estimated that if summer instruction were aided for 2002, approximately 60 FTE would likely be added to the total Milwaukee charter school membership. Under the Governor's budget recommendations, the per pupil payment amount would be \$6,935 in 2002-03, so the total Milwaukee charter school payment would be increased by an estimated \$416,100 by this proposal and a corresponding reduction in general school aids would occur. Because of this projected increase in MCSP payments and the associated general school aids reduction and school property tax increase, general school aids funding in the budget bill includes an additional \$277,400 in 2002-03 in order to maintain two-thirds funding of partial school revenues.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's proposal to pay state aid for summer classes to charter schools sponsored by the City of Milwaukee, UW-Milwaukee and the Milwaukee Area Technical College. Specify that these charter schools would receive payment for their membership, which would be defined as the sum of the number of pupils attending the charter school in the current school year and the summer average daily membership equivalent, as calculated under current law, for the summer of the previous school year, beginning with payments made for summer classes held in 2001. Provide \$416,100 in 2002-03 to fund the costs of this modification, which would result in an offsetting reduction in general school aids (GPR-Lapse) of \$416,100 and a corresponding increase in school property taxes. Provide \$277,400 in general school aids to maintain state two-thirds funding of partial school revenues.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>GPR-Lapse</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$693,500	\$416,100
[Change to Bill]	\$0	\$0

MO# *No Vote*

Burke Y N
 Decker Y N
 Moore Y N
 Shibilski Y N
 Plache Y N
 Wirch Y N
 Darling Y N
 Welch Y N
 Gard Y N
 Kaufert Y N
 Albers Y N
 Duff Y N
 Ward Y N
 Huebsch Y N
 Huber Y N
 Coggs Y N

Adopted (2.)

Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>GPR-Lapse</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0	\$0
[Change to Bill]	-\$693,500	-\$416,100

Prepared by: Layla Merrifield

2001

Date (time) needed Soon

LRB b 0540 1/1

LFB BUDGET AMENDMENT
[ONLY FOR LFB]

PG: hwh

See form AMENDMENTS — COMPONENTS & ITEMS.

LFB AMENDMENT
TO 2001 ASSEMBLY BILL 144 AND 2001 SENATE BILL 55

>>FOR JT. FIN. SUB. — NOT FOR INTRODUCTION<<

At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

- Sec 140
15.05 (2)* #. Page 196, line 6: delete lines 6 to 11.
- Sec 124
16.043* #. Page 256, line 7: delete lines 7 to 22.
- Sec 215
20.25 (1) (d2)* #. Page 498, line 17: delete lines 17 and 18.
- ? #. Page 499, line 4: delete "~~and the program evaluation~~"
and substitute "and the program evaluation".
- Sec 241
20.505 (4) (c)* #. Page 567, line 18: delete lines 18 to 21.
- Sec 287
20.923
(4) (c) 2* #. Page 597, line 11: delete lines 11 to 13.

504
115.38 (2) m

Page 1119, line 15: delete the material

2440
115.38 (1g)

beginning with that line and ending with
page 1120, line 18.

Page 1120, line 17: delete that line and substitute
"state superintendent under sub. (i)."

~~material and restore the struck material.~~

2442
115.38 (3)

Page 1120, line 18: delete lines 18 to 21.

2644
115.38 (4)

Page 1121, line 7: delete lines 7 to 16.

2644
115.38 (5)

Page 1121, line 21: delete ~~the material~~

~~beginning with that line and ending with~~

~~page 1122, line 21 to 25.~~

2644
115.38 (6)

Page 1138, line 15: delete the material

118.30 (1b)
118.30 (1c)

beginning with that line and ending with

page 1139, line 21.

2703
118.30 (1d)

Page 1140, line 10: delete lines 10 to 15.

2703
118.30 (1e) (am.)

Page 1141, line 4: delete lines 4 to 9.

2705 (1)
118.30 (2) (a)

Page 1141, line 22: delete the material beginning with that line and ending with page 1142, line 3.

2701 (1)
118.30 (2) (a)

Page 1142, line 16: delete lines 16 to 20.

Page 1142, line 23: substitute "department" for "board".

Page 1143, line 1: (on lines 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 17, substitute "department" for "board".

Page 1143, line 6: (on lines 6, 9, 12 and 17, substitute "(1)" for "(1d)".

Page 1144, line 4: substitute "state superintendent" for ~~the state superintendent~~ material.

Page 1144, line 5: delete "board".

2703 (1)
118.30 (2) (a)

Page 1144 line 23: delete the material beginning with that line and ending with page 1145, line 5.

~~2715~~
~~118.30~~ (3)(b)
cr.

Page 1145, line 11: delete the material

~~2716~~
~~118.30~~ (4)

~~2717~~
~~118.30~~ (6)

beginning with that line and ending with page
1146, line 3.

Page 1146, line 5: or lines 5, 7, 9, ¹⁰ and 11,

substitute "department" for "board".

~~2720~~
~~118.30~~ (8)

Page 1146, line 16: delete lines 16 and 17.

~~2731~~
~~118.30~~ (1)

Page 1153, line 25: delete the material

beginning with that line and ending with page
1154, line 5.

~~2761~~
~~121.02~~ (1)(r)

Page 1162, line 7: delete lines 7 to 11.

~~3085~~
~~230.00~~ (2)(m)

Page 1411, line 8: delete lines 8 to 10.

Page 1737, line 8: delete lines 8 to 12.

Page 1760, line 20: delete the material

beginning with that line and ending with
page 1762, line 22.

Page 1823, line 3: ~~delete the material beginning~~
~~with~~ ~~delete~~ "BOARD ON" ~~EDUCATION EVALUATION~~
~~AND ACCOUNTABILITY~~ and ending with "ACCOUNTABILITY" on
line 4.

Page 1823, line 4: ~~on line 4 and 5,~~
~~delete~~ "16.963, 20.255 (1) (dew) (by SECTION 545)"
→ delete "16.963,"

Page 1823, line 5: ~~delete~~ "(1)(dew) (by
SECTION 545) and"; and ~~delete~~ "20.923(a)(1)(c),"
delete that line and substitute "(2)(ccx),"

Page 1824, line 6: ~~delete~~ ~~that~~ lines 6 and 7.

Page 1824, line 8: ~~delete~~ that line and
substitute "118.35 (1s), (2)(b) 1., 2., and 5.,"

Page 1824, line 9: ~~delete~~ ~~that~~ lines ^{9 and 10} and
substitute "and (7) of the statute takes effect
on July 1,"

Page 1823, line 5: delete line 5
to 10 and substitute →
" (2)(cc) (and
118.35(15), (2)(b)1,2, and
of the statutes
5, and (7) take effect on July 1, "

(End)



State of Wisconsin
2001 - 2002 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0540/1

PG:hph:ch

stays

LFB:.....Merrifield - Delete Board on Education Evaluation and
Accountability

FOR 2001-03 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 2001 SENATE BILL 55 AND 2001 ASSEMBLY BILL 144

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 **1.** Page 196, line 6: delete lines 6 to 11.

3 **2.** Page 256, line 7: delete lines 7 to 22.

4 **3.** Page 498, line 17: delete lines 17 and 18.

5 **4.** Page 499, line 4: delete "~~and the program evaluation~~" and substitute "and
6 the program evaluation".

7 **5.** Page 567, line 18: delete lines 18 to 21.

8 **6.** Page 597, line 11: delete lines 11 to 13.

9 **7.** Page 1119, line 15: delete the material beginning with that line and ending
10 with page 1120, line 10.

INSERT →

- 1 **8.** Page 1120, line 17: delete that line and substitute “state superintendent
2 under sub. (1).”.
- 3 **9.** Page 1120, line 18: delete lines 18 to 21.
- 4 **10.** Page 1121, line 7: delete lines 7 to 16.
- 5 **11.** Page 1121, line 21: delete lines 21 to 25.
- 6 **12.** Page 1138, line 15: delete the material beginning with that line and
7 ending with page 1139, line 21.
- 8 **13.** Page 1140, line 10: delete lines 10 to 15.
- 9 **14.** Page 1141, line 4: delete lines 4 to 9.
- 10 **15.** Page 1141, line 22: delete the material beginning with that line and
11 ending with page 1142, line 3.
- 12 **16.** Page 1142, line 16: delete lines 16 to 20.
- 13 **17.** Page 1142, line 23: substitute “department” for “board”.
- 14 **18.** Page 1143, line 1: on lines 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 17, substitute “department”
15 for “board”.
- 16 **19.** Page 1143, line 6: on lines 6, 9, 12 and 17, substitute “(1)” for “(1d)”.
- 17 **20.** Page 1144, line 4: substitute “state superintendent” for “state
18 superintendent”.
- 19 **21.** Page 1144, line 5: delete “board”.
- 20 **22.** Page 1144, line 23: delete the material beginning with that line and
21 ending with page 1145, line 5.

1 **23.** Page 1145, line 11: delete the material beginning with that line and ending
2 with page 1146, line 3.

3 **24.** Page 1146, line 5: on lines 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11, substitute “department” for
4 “board”.

5 **25.** Page 1146, line 16: delete lines 16 and 17.

6 **26.** Page 1153, line 23: delete the material beginning with that line and
7 ending with page 1154, line 5.

8 **27.** Page 1162, line 7: delete lines 7 to 11.

9 **28.** Page 1411, line 8: delete lines 8 to 10.

10 **29.** Page 1737, line 8: delete lines 8 to 12.

11 **30.** Page 1760, line 20: delete the material beginning with that line and
12 ending with page 1762, line 22.

13 **31.** Page 1823, line 3: delete the material beginning with “, BOARD ON” and
14 ending with “ACCOUNTABILITY” on line 4.

15 **32.** Page 1823, line 4: delete “16.963,”.

16 **33.** Page 1823, line 5: delete lines 5 to 10 and substitute “(2) (cu) and 118.30
17 (1s), (2) (h) 1., 2., and 5., and (7) of the statutes take effect on July 1,”.

18

(END)

INSERT

Page 568, line 9: on line
9 and 10, delete, "the board" and ending with
administration "evaluation and
accountability, " on line 10

LFB:.....Merrifield – Delete Board on Education Evaluation and
Accountability

FOR 2001-03 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 2001 SENATE BILL 55 AND 2001 ASSEMBLY BILL 144

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 **1.** Page 196, line 6: delete lines 6 to 11.

3 **2.** Page 256, line 7: delete lines 7 to 22.

4 **3.** Page 498, line 17: delete lines 17 and 18.

5 **4.** Page 499, line 4: delete “~~and the program evaluation~~” and substitute “and
6 the program evaluation”.

7 **5.** Page 567, line 18: delete lines 18 to 21.

8 **6.** Page 568, line 9: on lines 9 and 10, delete the material beginning with “the
9 board” and ending with “evaluation and accountability,” on line 10.

10 **7.** Page 597, line 11: delete lines 11 to 13.

- 1 **8.** Page 1119, line 15: delete the material beginning with that line and ending
2 with page 1120, line 10.
- 3 **9.** Page 1120, line 17: delete that line and substitute “state superintendent
4 under sub. (1).”.
- 5 **10.** Page 1120, line 18: delete lines 18 to 21.
- 6 **11.** Page 1121, line 7: delete lines 7 to 16.
- 7 **12.** Page 1121, line 21: delete lines 21 to 25.
- 8 **13.** Page 1138, line 15: delete the material beginning with that line and
9 ending with page 1139, line 21.
- 10 **14.** Page 1140, line 10: delete lines 10 to 15.
- 11 **15.** Page 1141, line 4: delete lines 4 to 9.
- 12 **16.** Page 1141, line 22: delete the material beginning with that line and
13 ending with page 1142, line 3.
- 14 **17.** Page 1142, line 16: delete lines 16 to 20.
- 15 **18.** Page 1142, line 23: substitute “department” for “board”.
- 16 **19.** Page 1143, line 1: on lines 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 17, substitute “department”
17 for “board”.
- 18 **20.** Page 1143, line 6: on lines 6, 9, 12 and 17, substitute “(1)” for “(1d)”.
- 19 **21.** Page 1144, line 4: substitute “state superintendent” for “state
20 superintendent”.
- 21 **22.** Page 1144, line 5: delete “board”.

