

AGENCY: DPI -- Assessments and Licensing

ISSUE: High School Graduation Test (Paper 760)

ALTERNATIVE: 3

Gard - 4

SUMMARY:

This option delete funding for test administration and continued development. Frees up nearly \$14 million. (this would cost MPS roughly \$300,000, for what it's worth).

WEAC supports spending this money, and protecting the six positions. But this is not considered a litmus test...

At a time when we cannot afford to fully fund SAGE, others, we simply cannot afford to do this.

If committee locks up and takes no action, this would leave the DPI required to administer the test, but with no money. Might need to change language in current law.

BY: Bob

... 180 ...

Page 1

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

Alt 3 - consensus

delay is ok

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

... 180 ...

...



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 #760

High School Graduation Test (DPI -- Assessments and Licensing)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 548, #1]

CURRENT LAW

Under 1999 Act 9, by September 1, 2002, school boards operating high schools must adopt a written policy for granting a high school diploma. The criteria must include: (a) the pupil's score on a high school graduation test (HSGT) adopted by the board; (b) the pupil's academic performance; and (c) the recommendations of teachers. These criteria are in addition to credit requirements.

A school board must adopt a high school graduation exam that measures whether pupils meet pupil academic standards adopted by the board. If the board adopts the statewide standards in mathematics, science, social studies and English language arts as issued and adopted under executive order 326, the board could adopt the HSGT developed by DPI. If a school board develops and adopts its own high school graduation exam, it is required to notify DPI.

Beginning in 2002-03, a high school diploma cannot be granted to any pupil unless the pupil has satisfied the school board's written criteria. The test may be administered only in grades 11 and 12, and must be offered twice each year. In addition, a board must excuse a pupil from the exam upon the request of a parent or guardian.

These provisions apply to charter schools operating high schools as well.

Act 9 also specifically provided 2.0 permanent positions beginning in 1999-00 and 4.0 two-year project positions beginning January 1, 2000, for DPI's development and administration of the HSGT. The project positions are scheduled to expire at the end of December 2001.

In 2000-01, \$2.5 million is provided for administration and development of the HSGT.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$4,599,800 GPR in 2001-02 and \$4,651,700 GPR in 2002-03 above a base level of \$2,500,000 GPR for development and administration of a high school graduation test. Of the total, \$24,000 in 2002-03 is attributable to allowing schools participating in the Milwaukee parental choice program to administer the test to students attending school under the program. Although the Governor's proposal did not provide nonstatutory provisions to extend the project positions for another two years, funding was provided for these positions, and DOA officials indicate that it was the Governor's intent to extend and fund these positions.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under 1997 Act 27, DPI was required to design a state high school graduation test that local school districts could use if they adopted the model academic standards of executive order 326. Act 27 provided that, starting September 1, 2002, a pupil would be required to pass either the state HSGT or an alternative test adopted by the school board to be granted a high school diploma. Act 9 changed the HSGT law to make a passing score on the test one criterion for graduation, rather than a requirement. Act 9 also specified that the test could be administered only in grades 11 and 12, and must be offered at least twice each year. Finally, Act 9 applied the requirements to charter schools.

2. The Department requested \$4,623,800 GPR in 2001-02 and \$4,651,800 GPR in 2002-03 above the base level of \$2,500,000 GPR, as well as the extension of the 4.0 project positions for another two years. The Governor's bill provides \$4,599,800 GPR in 2001-02 and \$4,651,700 GPR in 2002-03. Although the Governor's proposal did not include a specific nonstatutory provision to extend the 4.0 positions, funding was provided for these positions in each year. DOA officials indicate that it was the Governor's intent to extend these positions for another two years. In addition, DPI requested \$24,000 GPR in each year for the estimated cost of administering the HSGT to MPCP pupils. The Governor included this funding only in 2002-03.

3. Proponents of the HSGT have contended that in order for Wisconsin to remain competitive in the 21st century, Wisconsin high school graduates must be able to demonstrate their knowledge and skills based on high standards across core academic subjects. A high school graduation exam would establish that a Wisconsin high school diploma would ensure a high quality graduate that is prepared for higher education, a competitive job market or community service.

4. Opponents of a high-stakes high school examination requirement argue that such an exam is expensive to develop and would provide little specific information about the skills or knowledge of a high school graduate in Wisconsin. Further, they contend that a high-stakes examination may encourage marginal pupils to drop out of high school, rather than fail an examination and be denied a high school diploma. In addition, opponents argue that the decision to award a high school diploma should not be focused on one type of performance measure, but rather include a broad array of pupil performance indicators.

5. Officials from DPI have testified that while they believe that all students should be expected to meet, at a reasonable level, appropriate academic standards as a precondition of grade advancement and graduation, a determination of whether or not a student meets the standards should not be based solely on the results of one test.

6. The Committee could consider repealing current statutory provisions that allow a parent or guardian to excuse a pupil from taking the HSGT, as DPI proposed in its agency budget request. One could argue that if the intent of a HSGT is to ensure all students are meeting a certain achievement level prior to high school graduation, then the parental opt-out provision should be removed. By eliminating the opt-out provision, the current flexibility of parents to take into account their child's unique circumstances in determining whether the child should take the exam would be eliminated. However, one could argue that the HSGT would be a standard measurement of pupil achievement and provide information for comparing students and school districts. If lower-achieving pupils are permitted to opt out of the test, one could argue that the HSGT's results would be skewed and thus a less accurate indicator of aggregate student achievement in Wisconsin. The test currently cannot be the sole reason why a child would not receive diploma, and students are permitted four opportunities over two school years to pass the exam. The test is not "high stakes," and therefore, one could argue that there is no significant need for a parental opt-out provision.

7. Further, if the goal of the pupil academic standards and high school graduation exam is to ensure a high level of achievement across the state of Wisconsin and to establish that a high school diploma is a valuable indicator of graduate skills and knowledge, it may be beneficial to require all students take the high school graduation exam in order to provide an accurate measurement of pupil knowledge. This might benefit institutions of higher education and potential employers when considering high school graduates.

8. The Committee could also consider modifying current law to require a pupil to pass the HSGT before the pupil could be granted a diploma. One could argue that the expenditure of nearly \$14.3 million GPR over the biennium warrants an assurance that the test will be utilized to the fullest extent possible. Elimination of the parental opt-out, as well as requiring pupils to pass the exam in order to receive a diploma, would restore the exam's original "high stakes" nature. Arguably, if it is a valid exam and measures student performance accurately and fairly, then pupils should not be allowed to graduate until they can demonstrate their competence on the exam. One could argue that it is unfair to require some pupils to pass the exam, while others are allowed to fail the exam but demonstrate their competence through academic performance, teacher recommendations, or other criteria set by school boards. If the exam is a valid measure worthy of ongoing state investment, then arguably it should be applied evenly to all pupils.

9. Alternatively, one could argue that it would be inappropriate for the exam to be "high stakes." Some have argued that some pupils cannot be expected to pass the HSGT, and furthermore that for every pupil, it must be left to an individual parent's discretion to determine whether the exam is an appropriate measure of that pupil's ability. If the exemption of certain students and the parental opt-out are deemed necessary, then one could call into question the exam's value as an accurate indicator of aggregate student performance or for any individual pupil. If even

after implementation of the HSGT, alternate criteria must still be used for some pupils, one could argue that the HSGT would not be a prudent investment of state funds during a fiscally challenging budget process. Traditionally it has been left to local school officials to judge a pupil's competence for graduation, and that would still be the case under current law, since the HSGT would be only one factor among many that may be considered even for pupils who take the exam. While it may be desirable to provide school officials the luxury of one more measure by which to judge a pupil's performance, in the context of a state budget with limited GPR resources, the Committee could consider whether this GPR funding might be better invested in more essential state functions. Additionally, if school boards found a HSGT to be a desirable criterion for graduation, individual districts could develop their own assessments to be used in this capacity. If the HSGT were to be eliminated, \$500,000 would be needed in 2001-02 to buy-out the contracts relating to test development.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to increase funding for the HSGT by \$4,599,800 in 2001-02 and \$4,627,700 in 2002-03 above a base level of \$2,500,000 GPR. The second year funding amount reflects a reduction of \$24,000 related to the deletion from the bill of assessments for the Milwaukee parental choice program. Clarify that the 4.0 HSGT project positions would be extended until December 2003.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$9,227,500
[Change to Bill]	- \$24,000]

2. Approve provisions of Alternative 1 with one or both of the following modifications:

- a. eliminate the current parental opt out for the HSGT; or
- b. require pupils to pass the HSGT in order to receive a high school diploma.

3. Delete \$6,599,800 GPR in 2001-02 and \$7,151,700 GPR in 2002-03 and 6.0 GPR positions as well as the related current law requirement that DPI develop and administer an HSGT and that school board criteria for granting a diploma include a pupil's score on a state HSGT.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	-\$4,500,000
[Change to Bill]	-\$13,751,500]
2001-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	- 6.00
[Change to Bill]	- 6.00]

4. Take no action.

Alternative 4	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$9,251,500]

Prepared by: Layla Merrifield

MO# Alt 3

2	BURKE	Y	N	A
1	DECKER	Y	N	A
	MOORE	Y	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
	PLACHE	Y	N	A
	WIRCH	Y	N	A
	DARLING	Y	N	A
	WELCH	Y	N	A
	<i>Freeman</i>			
	GARD	Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	Y	N	A
	ALBERS	Y	N	A
	DUFF	Y	N	A
	WARD	Y	N	A
	HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
	HUBER	Y	N	A
	COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

AGENCY: DPI -- Assessments and Licensing

ISSUE: Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations and Reading Comprehension Test (Paper 761)

ALTERNATIVE: support modification

SUMMARY:

Simple modification.

But.....

Watch for motions from Senators Moore and Decker that would expand testing, requiring choice school students to take the same tests that public schools offer.

BY: Bob

Modification

Moore motion - require choice schools to take same tests

Star motion (Sinicki bill)



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 #761

Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations and Reading Comprehension Test (DPI -- Assessments and Licensing)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 549, #2 and #3]

CURRENT LAW

The Wisconsin knowledge and concepts examinations are currently administered in the 4th, 8th, and 10th grades in all public and charter schools in the state, to evaluate the level of knowledge attained by pupils in the areas of mathematics, science, social studies, reading and language arts/writing.

The Wisconsin reading comprehension test is administered to 3rd grade pupils in all public and charter schools in order to identify marginal readers who may need remediation, provide comparative performance data for schools, allow districts to evaluate their reading programs, and provide data for meeting federal and state requirements regarding pupil assessments.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$40,500 GPR in 2002-03 attributable to allowing schools participating in the Milwaukee parental choice program (MPCP) to administer these tests and examinations to students attending school under the program.

MODIFICATION TO BASE

Delete \$40,500 GPR in 2002-03 from pupil assessment as a change to the bill.

Explanation: The section of the bill that required each school participating in MPCP to provide notification whether it would administer the state's pupil assessments was

removed from the bill to be introduced as separate legislation. Therefore, the funding associated with this provision should also be removed.

Modification	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$40,500]

Prepared by: Layla Merrifield

MO# modification

2	BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DARLING	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WELCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	<i>Freight</i>			
1	GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION -- ASSESSMENTS AND LICENSING

Place Assessment Funding in JCF Reserve

Motion:

Move to transfer \$1,559,600 GPR in 2001-02 and \$1,610,800 GPR in 2002-03 for the Wisconsin knowledge and concepts exams and Wisconsin reading comprehension test to the Committee's s. 20.865(4)(a) reserve appropriation. Require DPI to submit a plan annually for use of federal monies for pupil assessment. If no federal monies for assessment become available, require DPI to submit a request to the Committee under s. 13.10 of the statutes for release of the funds to administer the assessments each year.

Note:

The motion would place funding for contract costs associated with the knowledge and concepts exams and reading comprehension test in the Committee's reserve, but allow DPI to retain administrative funding, in order to ensure that the tests are administered each year.

[Change to Bill: -\$3,170,400 GPR]

[Change to Base: -\$2,570,400 GPR]

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
2 DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
<i>Fitzgerald</i>			
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Assessments and Licensing

Base Agency

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #	Title
6	Modify Assessment Appropriations
7	4 th and 8 th Grade Pupil Assessment Modifications

LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation

Item #	Title
5	Milwaukee Parental Choice Program Pupil Assessment
8	Access to Statewide Examinations
9	Exceptions to Teacher Licensing Education Requirements
10	Establish Different Levels of Teacher Licensure
11	Recognize Out-of-State Teacher Licenses
12	Teacher Background Checks and License Suspension
13	Waiver for Teacher Licenses Allowed

MO# _____

2	BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DARLING	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WELCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	<i>McGrath</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

Decker motion - school performance report - post it on the web, provide only if requested.

AYE 11 NO 0 ABS _____

AGENCY: DPI- School District Operations

ISSUE: Referenda Scheduling (Paper 765)

ALTERNATIVE: 3 (maintain current law)

SUMMARY:

The chart on page 4, interestingly, undercuts the notion that districts gain some advantage by manipulating referenda scheduling.

Let's have some local control here.

*Dem motion
for 3*

By: Bob

Handwritten notes in the top left corner, possibly including a date or reference number.

1998-1999 Annual Report

1998-1999 Annual Report

1998-1999 Annual Report

1998-1999 Annual Report

The chart on page 10, titled "Intelligence and the Nation", shows that while some countries are leading in intelligence gathering, others are lagging.

The chart on page 10, titled "Intelligence and the Nation", shows that while some countries are leading in intelligence gathering, others are lagging.

Att 3 - OK



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 #765

School District Referenda Scheduling (DPI -- School District Operations)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 557, #3]

CURRENT LAW

Referendum to Exceed Revenue Limit. In submitting a resolution to exceed the school district revenue limit to voters, a school board may call a special referendum, or a referendum at the next succeeding spring primary or election or September primary or general election, if such election is to be held not sooner than 42 days after the filing of the resolution of the school board.

School District Borrowing. In submitting a resolution to the voters for the purpose of borrowing, the school board is required to direct the school district clerk to call a special election for the purpose of submitting the resolution to the electors for approval or rejection or to submit the resolution at the next regularly scheduled primary or election to be held not earlier than 45 days after the adoption of the resolution.

State Trust Fund and Long-Term Loans. If any municipality, including a school district, is not empowered by law to incur indebtedness for a particular purpose without first submitting the question to its electors, the application for a state trust fund loan for that purpose would be required to be approved and authorized by a majority vote of the electors at a special election. The special election must be called, noticed and held in the manner provided for other special elections. The notice must state the amount of the proposed loan and the purpose for which it would be used. Every application for a long-term loan by a unified school district, the required repayment of which exceeds ten years, must be approved by a majority vote of the electors of the school district at a special election.

Milwaukee Public Schools. If the MPS School Board deems it necessary to exceed the statutory 0.6 mill levy rate for purposes of a school construction fund, it may by a two-thirds vote of the members-elect include a communication to the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee as part of the budget transmitted to the Council. Upon receipt of the communication,

the Council is required to cause the question of exceeding the levy rate to be submitted to the voters of the City at the September election or at a special election.

If the MPS School Board deems it necessary to construct buildings or additions to buildings, to remodel buildings or to purchase school sites or to provide funds for any such purpose as a participant in an intergovernmental contract, it may by a two-thirds vote of the members-elect send a communication to the Council requesting that the Council submit a question to the voters to issue school bonds. Upon the receipt of the communication, the Council is required to cause the question of issuing such school bonds in the stated amount and for the stated school purposes to be submitted to the voters at the next election held in the city.

GOVERNOR

Require that the following referenda and elections be held only at spring elections or general elections or at a special elections held on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in an odd-numbered year, within the current law requirements for calling and noticing such referenda or elections: (a) any referendum held by a school district to exceed the district's revenue limit; (b) any election held by a school district for borrowing, for the application for a state trust fund loan and for certain joint contracts; and (c) any election held by MPS to exceed the statutory 0.6 mill levy rate for purposes of a school construction fund or to issue bonds for school construction or remodeling.

Provide that these modifications would first apply with respect to referenda called on or after the effective date of the bill.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Based on data collected by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), since the imposition of school district revenue limits in 1993-94, school districts have offered a total of nearly 1,400 referenda. Of these referenda, 40.5% have been subject to a vote at an annual spring election or a November general election date or the equivalent Tuesday in an odd-numbered year, 20.9% have been put to voters during a spring or September primary election or the equivalent Tuesday in an odd-numbered year and 38.6% have been offered during a special election on another date. Table 1 provides a further breakdown of school district referenda vote scheduling, including referenda held through the 2001 spring general election.

TABLE 1

**Number of School District Referenda Offered
By Timing of Election Date**

<u>Election Date</u>	<u>Referenda Offered</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Spring General	339	24.4%
November General	223	16.1
Spring Primary	141	10.1
September Primary	150	10.8
Other Dates	<u>536</u>	<u>38.6</u>
Total	1,389	100.0%

2. Under the Governor's proposal, school districts could hold referenda two days per year, during the annual spring election, or the November general election in even-numbered years or the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in odd-numbered years. Administration staff indicate that the proposed limit on the number of days that school districts may hold a referendum vote is intended to encourage higher voter turnout for such referenda, and as such will provide a more accurate representation of the will of the voters in a school district on the question being posed in the referendum.

3. Generally, the best guarantee for higher voter turnout is citizen interest in an issue or race. While there is no central data source through which to analyze voter turnout for local school district referenda questions, voter turnout is normally highest during the November general election, generally followed by spring election dates and September primary elections. Local voter turnout figures likely vary significantly across the state, and cannot be predicted for special elections.

4. Proponents of the proposal believe that some school districts may be scheduling referenda during odd special election dates in an effort to suppress voter turnout and increase the likelihood of passage of their building or revenue limit referendum. Proponents also feel that, especially because of the enhanced financial benefits of a successful referendum due to both revenue limits and, for some districts, increased state equalization aid funding, school districts may have an increased incentive for scheduling referenda during a time when voter turnout is not at its peak.

5. Opponents of the Governor's proposal assert that school districts generally schedule referenda during times when they feel they can attract the greatest local turnout and therefore, support. Because voter turnout is dependent on voter interest in a race, local school district questions may be able to garner significant voter turnout due to the importance of the referendum for local school programs and property tax levels, regardless of the date of the vote.

6. Table 2 provides an outline of referenda success rates by election date since the imposition of revenue limits in 1993-94. The table shows the total number and funding amount of referenda offered for spring and September primaries, spring regular elections, November general elections or the equivalent Tuesdays in odd-numbered years and all other dates, as well as approval rates based on the number of referenda and total funding requested. School district referenda have generally been approved at the highest rates when they have been before voters on the regular spring or fall election dates. Referenda that have been offered on special election dates have the next highest approval rates, followed by those that have been offered during a primary election.

TABLE 2
School District Referenda Approval Rates by Election Date
(\$ in Millions)

	<u>Spring Primary</u>	<u>Fall Primary</u>	<u>Spring General</u>	<u>Fall General</u>	<u>Other Dates</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Debt Referenda</u>						
Number Proposed	114	107	214	172	406	1,013
Number Passed	53	55	130	115	222	575
Percent of Referenda Passed	46.5%	51.4%	60.7%	66.9%	54.7%	56.8%
Bonding Proposed	\$992.3	\$808.1	\$1,486.2	\$1,475.7	\$3,164.6	\$7,926.9
Bonding Passed	\$509.8	\$345.0	\$803.9	\$840.6	\$1,606.0	\$4,105.2
Percent of Bonding Passed	51.4%	42.7%	54.1%	57.0%	50.8%	51.8%
<u>Referenda to Exceed Revenue Limit</u>						
Number Proposed	27	43	125	51	130	376
Number Passed	11	16	60	20	57	164
Percent of Referenda Passed	40.7%	37.2%	48.0%	39.2%	43.8%	43.6%
Funding Proposed	\$26.4	\$22.9	\$62.4	\$19.5	\$59.9	\$191.1
Funding Passed	\$11.4	\$6.6	\$23.9	\$6.2	\$26.6	\$74.7
Percent of Funding Passed	43.1%	28.6%	38.4%	32.0%	44.5%	39.1%

7. Based on this data, it appears that school district referenda are most likely to pass during elections that traditionally have higher voter turnout. However, it is difficult to speculate what the passage rate for all school district referenda would have been had they been scheduled during either the November general election or spring election, as proposed under the budget bill. Because it appears that higher voter turnout is beneficial for the passage of school district referenda, the overall approval rate may have been higher had all of the school district referenda been voted on during spring regular or November general elections. However, because school districts may currently schedule referenda during times when they believe they are most likely to pass, overall passage rates may be lower under the Governor's proposal.

8. Proponents of the Governor's proposal argue that because the outcome of a local school district referendum affects the amount of funding that is required to meet the state's two-thirds funding commitment, the state should be able to limit the dates upon which school districts are allowed to offer a referendum to voters. School districts would still have the ability to reallocate

resources within the revenue limits to respond to unanticipated situations, and districts may be covered by insurance for emergencies. Additionally, because the cost of administering a referendum vote is more expensive during a special election than during an active primary, spring or general election, because school districts are not able to share the costs with another municipality, referenda dates should be limited to times during which other elections are likely to occur.

9. Opponents assert that local school boards should maintain the authority to decide when a school district referendum is proposed to voters and that the Governor's proposal hinders the tradition of local control of school district policies and finances. Limiting referenda dates could also hinder a district's ability to respond to certain emergency situations. In addition, opponents argue that the imposition of revenue limits and the state's commitment to fund two-thirds of partial school revenues were predicated on the ability of local voters to increase local school revenues, if desired. They believe that limiting the number of dates on which local citizens can vote on a school district referendum diminishes both the state's commitment to two-thirds funding and local control of school district business.

10. Arguably, reducing the number of dates on which a school district may schedule a referendum from virtually any day of the year to two dates per year may be too restrictive. In order to provide school districts with more flexibility, the Committee may wish to extend the number of dates that school districts could schedule a referendum to include the spring primary, held in most election districts in each year, the September primary, held in even-numbered years, and the second Tuesday in September in odd-numbered years. Under this alternative, school districts would be provided four dates per year upon which they could schedule referenda. These dates covered 61.4% of all referenda scheduled since 1993-94.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to generally require that school district referenda and elections be held only at spring elections, general elections or special elections held on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in an odd-numbered year.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation to also permit school districts to schedule referenda on the spring primary, the September primary and the second Tuesday in September in odd-numbered years.

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Russ Kava

MO# Att. 3

1	BURKE	Y	N	A
2	DECKER	Y	N	A
	MOORE	Y	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
	PLACHE	Y	N	A
	WIRCH	Y	N	A
	DARLING	Y	N	A
	WELCH	Y	N	A
	<i>WELCH</i>			
	GARD	Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	Y	N	A
	ALBERS	Y	N	A
	DUFF	Y	N	A
	WARD	Y	N	A
	HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
	HUBER	Y	N	A
	COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

of votes for each candidate
of votes for each candidate
of votes for each candidate

Faint, mostly illegible text, possibly a list of names or a document header.

Faint text at the bottom of the page, possibly a signature or date.

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION -- SCHOOL DISTRICT OPERATIONS

Remove School Start Date Opt-out

Motion:

Move to delete current law that allows a school board to commence the school term before September 1 in any school year if it holds a public hearing on the issue and adopts a resolution to that effect in that school year.

Note:

Under current law, beginning in 2000-01, no public school may commence the school term until September 1, unless a school board holds a public hearing on the issue and adopts a resolution to that effect in that school year. School boards are not prohibited from holding athletic contests or practices or from scheduling in-service days or workdays before September 1, or from holding school year-round.

MO#			
	BURKE	Y	(N) A
	DECKER	Y	(N) A
	MOORE	Y	(N) A
	SHIBILSKI	(Y)	(N) A
	PLACHE	Y	(N) A
	WIRCH	Y	(N) A
	DARLING	Y	(N) A
	WELCH	(Y)	(N) A
1	GARD	(Y)	(N) A
2	KAUFERT	(Y)	(N) A
	ALBERS	(Y)	(N) A
	DUFF	Y	(N) A
	WARD	Y	(N) A
	HUEBSCH	(Y)	(N) A
	HUBER	Y	(N) A
	COGGS	Y	(N) A

Motion #877

AYE 60 NO 10 ABS _____

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

School District Operations

Bill Agency

LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation

Item #	Title
1	Expand Current MPS School Closing Authority Statewide
2	Expand Current MPS Private School Contracting Authority Statewide
4	School Start Date
5	Layoff or Reassignment of Employees in Consolidated School Districts
6	Low Performance Schools
7	Prohibit Waivers for School Performance Reports

Shibilski - enviro ed
consultant
- Books for success
program

AGENCY: DPI- Administrative and other funding

ISSUE: National Teacher Certification (Paper 770)

ALTERNATIVE: A2 and B1

SUMMARY:

Grant probably OK

These motions provide funding for grant awards for newly certified teachers, and also residency requirements are waived, which apparently helps a teacher living in Iowa.

Wirch might have motion to add \$500,000 to grants.

By: Bob

... ..

... ..

Handwritten notes:
... ..
... ..

Handwritten notes:
... ..
... ..

... ..

... ..

A-1 OK
B-1



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 #770

National Teacher Certification Reestimate (DPI -- Administrative and Other Funding)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 562, #4]

CURRENT LAW

DPI is required to award a grant to any person who does all of the following: (a) is certified by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS); (b) is licensed as a teacher by the State Superintendent or employed as a teacher in a private school; (c) is a resident of this state; (d) is employed as a teacher in this state. The grant must equal the costs of obtaining certification, not to exceed \$2,000, in the school year in which the person is certified, or if not a resident at the time of certification, in the first school year in which the person meets the requirements. In addition, the grant recipient receives \$2,500 in each of the nine school years following the school year in which he or she received the initial grant if the person does all of the following: (a) maintains national certification; (b) maintains state license or employment in a private school; (c) remains a resident of this state; and (d) remains employed as a teacher in this state. In 2000-01 \$85,000 GPR is provided for the program, which is paid from a sum sufficient appropriation established for this purpose.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$130,000 in 2001-02 and \$255,000 in 2002-03 to fully fund awards for teachers earning certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Modify the current grant program for national certification in the following manner: (a) delete the requirement that a person be a resident of this state; and (b) clarify the language governing the dispersal of subsequent annual \$2,500 grants. A person would still have to satisfy the other current requirements in order to receive an initial grant and subsequent grants.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Created in 1987, the NBPTS is an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization governed by a 63-member board of directors. The mission of the NBPTS is to: (a) establish rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do; (b) develop and operate a national, voluntary system to assess and certify teachers who meet these standards; and (c) advance related educational reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in American schools.

2. Two Wisconsin teachers were certified by the NBPTS in 1998-99 and 10 in 1999-00. For 2000-01, however, only nine teachers are continuing in the program. Also, 23 were newly certified for 2000-01. While 50 teachers are in the certification program currently, DPI estimates that only 25 to 30 will likely be certified for 2001-02 and that 50 more teachers will be certified in 2002-03. It is estimated that the NBPTS will reimburse newly certified teachers \$700 each, making the state's payment \$1,300 annually for newly certified teachers.

3. For 2001-02, it is estimated that DPI will pay \$2,500 to each of the 32 continuing teachers and \$1,300 to a projected 30 teachers gaining certification for that year, for a total of \$119,000 to fully fund awards in 2001-02. For 2002-03, assuming 50 teachers are newly certified, a total of \$220,000 would be necessary to fully fund awards for teachers earning national certification.

4. DPI's recent changes to teacher licensing rules include the acquisition of NBPTS certification as a possible way to obtain certification at the master teacher level. DPI expects this further incentive to continue to increase the number of applicants for this grant.

5. The Governor recommends deleting the requirement that a person be a resident of the state in order to receive a grant, so that persons employed in Wisconsin schools but residing in another state would be eligible if they meet the other requirements for the program. Since the person would have to teach in Wisconsin in order to qualify for grants, Wisconsin pupils would benefit from their employment regardless of their state of residence.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Estimated Funding

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$130,000 in 2001-02 and \$255,000 in 2002-03 above the base level of \$85,000 for national certification grants.

Alternative A1	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$385,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide \$34,000 in 2001-02 and \$135,000 in 2002-03 above the base level of \$85,000 to fully fund national certification grants.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$169,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$216,000]

B. Delete State Resident Requirement

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to delete the requirement that a person be a resident of this state in order to receive a grant.
2. Take no action.

Prepared by: Layla Merrifield

MO# A-2, B-1

2	BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
1	DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DARLING	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
	WELCH	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
	<i>Merrifield</i>			
	GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS _____

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION -- ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER FUNDING

National Teacher Certification Grant Increase (LFB Paper #770)

Motion:

Move to increase the amount of the grants a person receives annually for nine school years following the initial year of certification by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) from \$2,500 to \$5,000. Provide \$114,000 GPR in 2001-02 and \$290,000 GPR in 2002-03 for this purpose.

Note:

This motion would replace the estimated funding alternatives in LFB paper #770.

[Change to Bill: \$19,000 GPR]
 [Change to Base: \$404,000 GPR]

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 7 NO 9 ABS _____

AGENCY: DPI- Administrative and Other funding

ISSUE: Reorganization Plan (Paper 771)

ALTERNATIVE: 3 (no action)

*Gard 1 or 2
Duff?*

SUMMARY:

This is bad medicine, the administration trying to have its way. The new superintendent should be given the opportunity to pursue reorganization in her own way at her own pace.

This frees up \$700,000.

By: Bob

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1987 Report of the...

ATTENTION

1987

The above information is provided for your information and a full
description of the above information is given in the report of the
investigation. The above information is given for your information.

For further information...

Att. 3 AC



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 #771

Reorganization Plan (DPI -- Administrative and Other Funding)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 566, #18]

CURRENT LAW

Current law requires the State Superintendent to annually identify those school districts that are low in performance and those schools in which there are pupils enrolled who do not meet the state minimum performance standards on the statewide pupil assessments. The State Superintendent is required to make recommendations regarding how the programs and operations of the identified school districts and schools may be improved and periodically assess school district implementation of the recommendations.

The Division for Learning Support and Instructional Services (DLSIS) within the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) consists of eight teams that are responsible for a variety of programs and services. The services relate to general or regular education and include consultation with parents, administrators, teachers, lay public, and legislators about assessment, teacher preparation and licensing, professional development, career and lifework education, opportunities for minority students, issues related to urban education, advanced placement and the development and implementation of academic standards and curriculum materials in a variety of subject areas. The Division also administers state and federal funds supporting activities related to increased student achievement. Teams within the Division are the following: content and learning, education options, lifework education, office of educational accountability, office of urban education, teacher education and licensing teams, and the Wisconsin education opportunity programs team (WEOP).

The Division for Learning Support, Equity and Advocacy (DLSEA) in DPI consists of five teams, the Wisconsin School for the Deaf (WSD) and the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired (WCBVI). The Division provides technical assistance, leadership, advocacy, and staff development, training, and education to help meet the cultural, emotional, social, health, and educational needs of pupils. The Division, through WSD and WCBVI,

provides direct instruction to students and technical assistance through outreach to local educational agencies (LEAs), communities, and families statewide. The DLSEA includes the following teams: special education; student services, prevention and wellness; equity; Title I; WSD; WCBVI; and school improvement.

GOVERNOR

Require the State Superintendent, in consultation with the Secretary of Administration, to develop a plan for reorganizing the Division for Learning Support and Instructional Services in DPI in order to enhance DPI's ability to support the improvement of schools. Require the plan do all of the following: (a) establish a Bureau for School Improvement composed of staff in the Division for Learning Support and Instructional Services and federally funded staff in the Division for Learning Support, Equity, and Advocacy in DPI; (b) organize the Bureau into multidisciplinary school improvement teams to provide on-site technical assistance to schools and school districts, especially those that are identified as low-performance by the State Superintendent; and (c) include on each school improvement team at least one licensed teacher employed by a school district and temporarily assigned to DPI under agreements formed for this purpose. Require DPI to submit the reorganization plan to the Governor and to the Secretary of Administration by March 15, 2002.

Establish the Bureau statutorily including the requirements itemized in (b) and (c) under the plan. Specify that the provision creating the Bureau would not apply unless the Governor approves the plan for reorganization of DPI. The agreements temporarily assigning teachers to DPI would not be subject to approval by the Secretary of Employment Relations.

Provide \$700,000 GPR in 2002-03 in DPI's largest state operations appropriation and require DPI to allocate the funding to contract school districts for the services of teachers. Prohibit DPI from encumbering or expanding the money so allocated unless the Secretary of Administration determines that the reorganization plan has been implemented.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Teams within the DLSIS are responsible for a variety of programs. In general, the content and learning team works with schools to develop curriculum. The education options team administers such programs as youth options, the student achievement guarantee in education program (SAGE), charter schools, and Goals 2000. Programs under lifework education include vocational-technical education. The office of educational accountability currently handles the Wisconsin student assessment system, assessment results reporting, and the annual school performance reports. The office of urban education primarily assists schools in the areas of Beloit, Racine, Milwaukee, and Kenosha, and is located in Milwaukee. The teacher education and licensing teams work to ensure quality preparation and continuing professional development of educators, providing information about education programs for teachers and other educators, licensing requirements and procedures, and programs related to education careers. WEOP works to encourage pupils to go on to higher education and administers such programs as the minority precollege

scholarship program, the talent incentive program, and the early identification program.

2. Teams within the DLSEA are generally responsible for programs addressing the special needs of pupils. The special education team administers IDEA grants, provides guidance to schools and parents about special education eligibility and rights, and monitors compliance. The student services, prevention and wellness team administers the alcohol and other drug abuse (AODA), safe and drug-free schools, school-aged parent, and youth violence prevention programs, among others. The equity team handles general equity concerns, including bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) education, gender equity, and minority student achievement. The Title I team is responsible for administration of the basic grants, as well as more focused program areas such as even start family literacy, migrant education, and neglected and delinquent youth. The WSD is a residential school for deaf and hard of hearing students ages 3 to 21 throughout the state. The WCBVI operates the Wisconsin School for the Visually Handicapped, a residential school for blind and visually impaired students, and through its campus/school and regional sites provides a wide array of statewide services, assessments, summer/weekend programs, resources, and professional opportunities.

3. In addition, under the DLSEA, the school improvement team provides support to schools identified as in need of improvement. The team coordinates the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) program, the Title II Eisenhower professional development program, and the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program. The team also coordinates the Title VI Innovative Education Program and facilitates federal initiatives including the Education Flexibility Partnership Act.

4. Proponents of the reorganization initiative argue that additional services are needed to help failing schools improve. This reorganization would focus the Department's attention on failing or low-performing schools. The level of on-site technical assistance provided to schools through such a reorganization might lead to improvement in failing schools or fewer schools being identified as low-performing in the future. For 2000-01, DPI identified 23 schools as low in performance, based on data for 1998-99 and 1999-00. There are approximately 2,080 individual schools in the state.

5. Some have argued that it is necessary to provide funds to pay for teacher input on school improvement teams since the revolving nature of teacher participation would result in the teachers having recently been employed in schools. Therefore, these teachers would be versed in the current issues and problems being addressed by their counterparts in low-performing schools. Some argue that successful teachers are a better resource to fellow teachers than state consultants who may not have recently worked in schools. Through the school improvement teams, these teachers could provide insight to both the consultants working for DPI and their counterparts in schools.

6. On the other hand, some argue that it would be undesirable to require a reorganization that adds costs to DPI's state operations. Although each teacher would work for the Department for a limited period of time, the costs of contracting for their services would be ongoing. Some might also note that a school improvement team is currently operating with resources available within the existing DPI staff and budget to meet the statutory requirements that

schools low in performance be identified and assisted.

7. A new State Superintendent will assume her duties in July of this year. It may be desirable to allow the new State Superintendent an opportunity to assess the current activities of DPI before statutorily reorganizing the Department. The State Superintendent could request a restructuring, if needed, as part of separate legislation or in the agency budget submission in the 2003-05 biennium. Alternatively, the State Superintendent could be required to develop a reorganization plan for submission to the Legislature as part of DPI's 2003-05 agency budget request.

8. One can question whether a new initiative, such as this proposal, should be funded in the 2001-03 budget given the limited resources available to the Legislature. New GPR may be better spent directly on school resources or existing programs.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to require the State Superintendent to develop a plan for reorganizing the Division for Learning Support and Instructional Services in DPI in order to enhance DPI's ability to support the improvement of schools. Require the plan do all of the following: (a) establish a Bureau for School Improvement composed of staff in the Division for Learning Support and Instructional Services and federally funded staff in the Division for Learning Support, Equity, and Advocacy in DPI; (b) organize the Bureau into multidisciplinary school improvement teams to provide on-site technical assistance to schools and school districts, especially those that are identified as low-performance by the State Superintendent; and (c) include on each school improvement team at least one licensed teacher employed by a school district and temporarily assigned to DPI under agreements formed for this purpose. Require DPI to submit the reorganization plan to the Governor and to the Secretary of Administration by March 15, 2002. Specify that the provision creating the Bureau would not apply unless the Governor approves the plan for reorganization of DPI. The agreements temporarily assigning teachers to DPI would not be subject to approval by the Secretary of Employment Relations. Provide \$700,000 GPR in 2002-03 in DPI's largest state operations appropriation and require DPI to allocate the funding to contract with school districts for the services of teachers.

Alternative 1	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$700,000
[Change to Bill	\$0]

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation and instead require the State Superintendent to develop a plan for reorganizing the Division for Learning Support and Instructional Services and Division for Learning Support, Equity, and Advocacy in DPI in order to enhance DPI's ability to support the improvement of schools. Require DPI to submit the reorganization plan as part of its agency request for the 2003-05 biennial budget.

Alternative 2	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$700,000]

3. Maintain current law.

Alternative 3	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$700,000]

Prepared by: Layla Merrifield

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____