

# Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

November 11, 2008 Update

This packet contains a summary of proposals submitted by members of the Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force. Five proposals from the following sources are described:

- 1) Terry Bergeson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction;
- 2) Representative Ross Hunter, Representative Pat Sullivan, Representative Fred Jarrett, Representative Glenn Anderson, Representative Skip Priest, and Senator Rodney Tom;
- 3) The Full Funding Coalition (made up of the Washington Education Association, Washington State School Directors' Association, Washington Association of School Administrators, Association of Washington School Principals, and Public School Employees of Washington), sponsored by Bette Hyde, Superintendent of Bremerton School District, Jim Kowalkowski, Superintendent of Davenport School District, and Cheryl Chow, President of the Seattle School Board;
- 4) The League of Education Voters Foundation, sponsored by Representatives Pat Sullivan and Skip Priest; and
- 5) Dan Grimm, Task Force Chair.

This summary was prepared by staff and should be considered a preliminary document for Task Force consideration. Proposal components will be added or modified as necessary during Task Force discussion and deliberation. Cost estimates for each component will be calculated by staff as proposal details are refined.

The summary is formatted as a table; each row represents a separate policy or finance component, and each column summarizes the details of each proposal. The column at the far right is provided for members to make notes and indicate their preferred proposal for each component. The Chair requests that members use this space to record their initial preference and submit the information to staff via email, mail, or in person at the November 10, 2008, meeting.

The summary is organized as follows:

- Definition of Basic Education: Outcomes, p. 3
- Definition of Basic Education: Inputs (time and staffing levels), p. 5
- School Employee Compensation, p. 8
- Other Operating Costs, p. 13
- Programs for Special Populations, p. 14
- Teacher Certification and Training, p. 18
- Finance, p. 20
- Oversight, p. 23

Staff will review this summary at the start of the November 10, 2008, Task Force meeting. Copies of the proposals are available online at <http://www.leg.wa.gov/Joint/Committees/BEF/>.

# Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

## **Chair Recommendations for Task Force Process and Decision-making:**

Seven meeting days in November, and two in December, have been allocated for Task Force deliberations. If decisions are reached early, subsequent meetings will be cancelled. Members are welcome to propose that meetings in early November be extended beyond 5 o'clock as a way of streamlining the process.

As a starting point, Task Force deliberations will be organized around the summary of comprehensive proposals sponsored by Task Force members. The Chair will request that members express their preferences regarding the options identified in the table. This preference vote will allow the group to identify items that can be taken off the table and/or reserved for further discussion. Members will not be bound by their decisions at this stage.

The majority of those voting will prevail in determining Task Force recommendations, unless there is objection or a vote to the contrary. Alternate members are encouraged to participate fully in the discussion, but will be non-voting members.

The initial votes may concern topics that are drafted in concept form, whereas other topics may have legislative bill language. For topics drafted in concept form, they will be drafted in bill language at a later point and members will have an opportunity to review and vote on those items again.

The final report of the Task Force, and the statutory language, will be brought back to the Task Force for final consideration and vote. The December 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> dates may be used for that purpose.

Everyone can submit separate recommendations as a minority report. These will not be part of the Task Force recommendations but will be included in the final report. Such recommendations can be signed by individual members in whole or in part—but they must be signed by at least one member to be included in the report.

For more information about the Task Force visit <http://www.leg.wa.gov/Joint/Committees/BEF/>.

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Outcomes: Basic Education Definition</b>							
<b>Goals</b>  <i>Should the definition of basic education be revised?</i>	RCW 28A.150.210 (Basic Education Act goals)		Basic education is defined as sufficient instructional time to provide students with opportunity to meet credit expectations of the State Board of Education (SBE) Core 24 high school graduation requirements.  <i>"All students will make at least one year of progress toward being prepared to graduate on time in every calendar year."</i>	Re-states RCW 28A.150.210 and applies the <a href="#">Basic Education Act</a> goals to schools as well as districts.	Basic education is defined as providing every student with <a href="#">reasonable</a> opportunities to meet the state's high school graduation standards.	Basic education is defined as instructional programs sufficient to provide students with a reasonable opportunity to meet college admission standards.	Leg: 5 FFC: 1; 1 no LEV: 1 G: 1 Yes generally: 1 Discuss: 2 Link definition to funding Include "reasonable opportunity" language
<b>Student Outcomes</b>							
<b>Testing</b>  <i>Should state testing requirements be revised?</i>			Implement a common diagnostic assessment system.			The Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) should be replaced with a national or international testing system that maintains state standards.	Leg: 5 G: 3 Discuss: 1 No: 1

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<p><b>Diplomas</b></p> <p><i>Should state graduation standards be revised?</i></p>			<p>Adopt SBE Core 24 high school graduation requirements recommendation.</p>		<p>High school graduation standards mean all graduates are ready for college, job training or work.</p>	<p>Establish four high school graduation standards:</p> <p>Certificate of Academic Mastery. Pass a test aligned with college admission standards. Test passage waives all other course requirements and guarantees admission to one of the state 4-year colleges/universities.</p> <p>Certificate of Academic Achievement. Complete course requirements and pass a standardized test aligned with 10<sup>th</sup> grade learning standards.</p> <p>Certificate of Academic Completion. Complete course requirements. Applies to students who pass alternative assessment options.</p> <p>Certificate of Individual Achievement. Applies to eligible students in accordance with existing special education policy.</p>	<p>Leg: 5 G: 1, 1 no Discuss: 1</p>

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Inputs: Time</b>							
<b>Instructional Time</b>  <i>Should the amount of instructional time considered basic education be changed?</i>  <i>How much time should be allocated for teacher planning time?</i>	Kindergarten: 450 hours/year. Voluntary full-day kindergarten: 1000 hours/year.  Grades 1-12: 1,000 hrs/yr (district wide average across grades)  Minimum 180 days/year.	Staffing recommendations assume 1,080 hours, 180 days: 6 hours of instruction per day, including 1 hour of teacher planning time.	Grades K-6: 1,000 hours/year all grades (not averaged across grade levels)  Grades 7-12: 1,155 instructional hours (7 55-minute periods per day, including time for teacher planning and professional development).  Minimum 180 days/year.	No change to current policy.  Kindergarten: 450 hours/year. If full-day kindergarten provided, 1,000 hours/year.  Grades 1-12: 1,000 hours/year (district-wide average across grade levels)  Minimum 180 days/year.	<a href="#">K-12 Expenditure Forecast Council specifies allocations in the K-12 Resource Model.</a>	Basic education statute: 900 hours/year with 5 hours/day based on college admissions standards: 4 English credits, 3 math, 2 science, 3 social studies, 2 foreign language, and 1 art, plus 5 credits for CTE, AP/IB, fine arts, health and fitness, and other courses of instruction.  Funded time: 7 hours/ day (includes time for SBE's Core 24 proposal, enhanced instructional programs, and 1 hour teacher preparation/ planning time). Total time = 1,260 hours.  No minimum days.  SBE and OSPI prohibited from waiving time.	Bergeson: 1 Leg: 6  Plus 1 yes for prohibition on waiving time  G: 1 (fund more than definition)  Discuss: 3
<b>Full-Day Kindergarten</b>  <i>Should FDK be considered part of basic education?</i>  <i>Should school districts be required/funded to provide FDK?</i>	Voluntary phase-in starting with high poverty schools in 2007-08. Not considered basic education.	Voluntary <a href="#">for parents</a> , phased-in at schools with the highest percentage of free-and-reduced-price meal eligible students. Considered a part of basic education.	Fund full-day kindergarten in all schools as part of basic education. (Non-consensus item; possibly target to most at-risk schools in coordination with early learning programs).	Voluntary, phased-in at schools with the highest percentage of free-and reduced-price meal eligible students, fully phased in by 2012-13, and considered a part of basic education.	Eliminate separate full-day kindergarten funding and include in basic education apportionment.		Bergeson: 3 (1 vote for all 4)  Leg: 2  Discuss: 1

If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<p><b>State-funded Contract Days</b></p> <p><i>Should learning improvement days (LIDs) be considered part of basic education?</i></p> <p><i>Should the number of LIDs be modified?</i></p>	<p>180 instructional days plus 2 LIDs for school-wide staff professional development.</p> <p>182 total days.</p> <p>LIDs are non-basic education.</p>	<p>180 instructional days plus 10 LIDs.</p> <p>190 total days.</p>	<p>180 instructional days plus 10 LIDs</p> <p>190 total days.</p>	<p>When fully phased-in 180 instructional days, plus 10 LIDs.</p> <p>Amends Basic Education definition to include 3.2 LIDs in 2009-10 (183.2 total days) and 4.3 LID/year in 2010-11 (184.3 total days)</p>		<p>No set number of days.</p>	<p>Berg/Leg/LEV: 7, 1 no</p> <p>G: 1</p> <p>Provide support for new teachers before adding PD days for all</p>
<b>Inputs: Staffing</b>							
<p><b>Class Size/ Instructional Staff Ratios</b></p> <p><i>Should certified instructional staff (CIS) to student ratios (or class sizes) be modified?</i></p>	<p>Staff to student ratio: 46 CIS/ 1,000 students.</p> <p>(K-4 enhancement of 7 CIS/1,000 students is not basic education.)</p> <p>Ratio of students per classroom teacher in grades K-3 should not exceed ratio for grades 4 and above.</p>	<p>Decrease students per teacher in all grades for small class sizes to match national average:</p> <p>Grades K-5: 21.2 students/class.</p> <p>Grades 6-12: 25.5 students/class.</p>	<p>Grades K-3: 15 students/class .</p> <p>Grades 4-6: 25 students/class.</p> <p>Grades 7-12: 25 students/class (average across the school).</p> <p>CTE, lab science, and AP/IB: 15 students/class.</p>	<p>Grades K-3, 17 students/class. Makes current K-3 enhancement part of basic education.</p> <p>Grades 4-5: 21 students/class</p> <p>Grades 6-8: 23 students/class</p> <p>Grades 9-12: 21 students/class</p> <p>Apportionment formula expires at end of 2010-11 school year. In December 2010, Commission for Quality Education in Washington (CQEW) recommends formula changes, legislature adopts new funding formulas for 2011-13.</p>	<p>Initial reduction in class size for grades K and 1.</p> <p>Add K-4 staffing enhancements to basic education.</p> <p>Other reductions to be specified by the K-12 Resource Model.</p>	<p>Grades K-5: 21.2 students/class.</p> <p>Grades 6-12: 25.5 students/class.</p>	<p>Bergeson: 1</p> <p>Leg: 4</p> <p>Use leg model with Berg. #s: 1</p> <p>G: 1</p> <p>Discuss: 2</p> <p>Explain cost of limiting class size</p> <p>Add K4 enhancements to BE</p>

If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<p><b>Other Building-Level Certificated Staff</b></p> <p><i>Should other certificated staff allocations be made by type of staff?</i></p> <p><i>Should these allocations be revised?</i></p>	Staffing levels not broken out by employee category.	<p>1 librarian/500 students and \$25/student for library materials. 1 library aide/500 elementary, 750 middle school, and 1,000 high school students.</p> <p>1 nurse/750 students, ESD-based School Nurse Corps, coordinated school health grants (\$6 per student).</p> <p>1 guidance counselor/350 middle/high school students, 1 other pupil support to 500 elementary.</p> <p>1 instructional coach/1,000 students.</p>	<p>Allocation by type of staff varies by school. Example from prototype high school with 600 students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 principal</li> <li>• 2 librarians/ information technology</li> <li>• 2 counselors</li> <li>• 2 nurse/social worker.</li> </ul>	<p>Allocation by type of staff varies by school. Example from prototype high school with 1312 students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 principal and 2 assistant principals</li> <li>• 2.03 librarians/ information technology (1:645 students)</li> <li>• 5.25 counselors (1:250 students)</li> <li>• 1 nurse (1:1312)</li> <li>• 1 social worker (1:1312)</li> <li>• 5 other (1:265 students)</li> </ul>	K-12 Expenditure Forecast Council specifies allocations in the K-12 Resource Model.	<p>1 librarian/500 students.</p> <p>1 counselor/400 students.</p> <p>1 nurse/750 students.</p> <p>1 instructional coach/1,000 students.</p>	<p>Leg: 6</p> <p>Bergeson/Leg/G: 1</p> <p>Discuss: 2</p>
<p><b>Classified Staff</b></p> <p><i>Should non-teaching certificated staff allocations be made by type of staff?</i></p> <p><i>Should these allocations be revised?</i></p>	1 classified staff/58.75 student FTEs (equivalent to 17.02/1,000 student FTEs)	<p>Separate staff into categories and increase to 24.7/1,000 student FTEs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.6 aides</li> <li>• 4 secretaries</li> <li>• 1.1 service workers</li> <li>• 0.8 safety</li> <li>• 0.9 technology</li> <li>• 0.3 graduation advisor</li> <li>• 1.8 facility maintenance</li> <li>• 1.6 grounds keepers</li> <li>• 5.1 custodians</li> <li>• 4.5 central office</li> </ul>	<p>Allocation varies by school. Example from prototype high school with 600 students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 non-instructional aides</li> <li>• 3 school secretaries</li> <li>• 1 student &amp; staff safety person</li> <li>• 2 custodians.</li> </ul>	<p>Allocation varies by school. Example from prototype high school with 1323 students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13.81 aides (1:95)</li> <li>• 4.56 office clerical (1:288)</li> <li>• 5.88 professional (1:223)</li> <li>• 1 technical (1:1323)</li> <li>• 1.62 other (1:817,</li> <li>• 1 per building</li> </ul>	K-12 Expenditure Forecast Council specifies allocations in the K-12 Resource Model.	<p>Separate staff into categories and increase to 16.2/1,000 student FTEs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.6 aides</li> <li>• 4 secretaries</li> <li>• 1.1 service workers</li> <li>• 0.8 safety</li> <li>• 0.9 technology</li> <li>• 0.3 graduation advisor</li> <li>• 4.5 central office</li> </ul> <p>(facilities maintenance staff are funded separately under "other operating costs"; combined = 24.7/1,000).</p>	<p>Leg: 5</p> <p>Discuss: 3</p>

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Administrative Staff</b>  <i>Should these staff allocations be revised?</i>	4 certified administrative staff per 1,000 student FTEs.		Central district personnel are funded at 6% of total district budget.				Leg: 5 Discuss: 1
<b>Inputs: School Employee Compensation</b>							
<b>Teacher Compensation</b>  <i>Should teacher salaries be allocated according to education levels and/or experience?</i>	Minimum salaries set for teachers with 0 years experience & BA/MA.  Salary Allocation Model (SAM): Teacher's education (9 columns) and experience (17 rows) determine allocation amount. Average salary in district cannot exceed average salary as calculated on the schedule.	Modify the SAM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pay for experience consistent with growth curve, with more rows.</li> <li>• Pay for teacher educational levels with fewer columns.</li> <li>• Add three-level career ladder: entry, career, and leader.</li> </ul> Align the SAM with professional certification, clock hours, endorsement, and collective bargaining laws.  Actual average salaries in district cannot exceed average salaries as calculated on the schedule.  Existing teachers could remain in current system or opt into new salary allocation model.	Modify the SAM to eliminate salary increases based on credits or degrees. Instead, increase compensation as teachers reach 3 stages on a career ladder: entry, professional certification, and professional advancement. Determination of teachers' progression on the ladder to be based on a peer-review evaluation system that includes multiple measures of teacher performance, is overseen by the PESB, and is delivered through regional networks managed by ESDs.  Continue salary growth based on experience.	No change to SAM.  Provide additional cost of living adjustments above amounts required by I-732: 3% effective September 1, 2009 and 2% effective September 1, 2010.	Pilot an alternative salary schedule based on three levels of teacher responsibility and skill (entry, professional, and lead).  Increase base salaries using compensation survey.	Eliminate the salary allocation model. All compensation matters should be subject to collective bargaining.	Leg: 4 (1 "no" to peer review) FFC: 1 no G: 2; 1 no Discuss: 2 No: 1 (do not allocate by educ/exp)

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Comparable Wage Surveys</b>  <i>Should salary levels be established by comparisons with other occupations and/or similar occupations in other industries?</i>		Increase base and top salaries using comparable wage index.	Starting wages and upper end of salary school set to be competitive in the labor market.	Increase base and top salaries using comparable wage index (CQEW oversees).	Increase base salaries using compensation survey.	Conduct salary surveys to compare occupational wages and set salary levels. Salary surveys for teachers should identify different teaching qualifications and duties by subject area, grade level, and regional labor markets.	Yes to general idea: 7  (in different combinations)
<b>Regional Cost of Living Adjustments</b>  <i>Should salary levels be adjusted for regional cost of living?</i>			Adjust salaries by regional cost of living.	CQEW required to apply regional cost adjustments to prototype schools.	Adjustments to be informed by compensation survey; harder-to-staff positions would receive higher compensation.	As noted above, salary surveys would measure differences in regional labor markets and just salaries accordingly.	Leg/G: 6
<b>Salary Equalization</b>  <i>Should teacher salary allocations be equalized?</i>		Equalize salary allocations across districts.	Eliminate higher salaries in districts with higher allocations based on history by slowing the rate of increase in salary allocations for those districts over four years while other districts catch up.	All districts equalized upon implementation of comparable wage index.	Addressed in new compensation system.	Increase teacher salary allocations to the base salary of the Everett School District in accordance with the Judge Heavey decision.	Leg: 4 Bergeson: 2 G: 2  Depends on phase in; equalize then adjust by region?

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<p><b>Pay for Performance, Knowledge, and Skills</b></p> <p><i>Should the state continue the NBPTS and high-poverty schools bonuses?</i></p> <p><i>Should other forms of incentive pay be implemented? If so, on a statewide or pilot basis?</i></p>	<p>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) bonus: \$5,000 annually, adjusted for inflation in 2009 and beyond. Additional \$5,000 for NBPTS teachers in high-poverty schools.</p>	<p>Continue NBPTS and challenging schools bonuses. Align bonus amounts with the I-732 COLA.</p> <p>School-wide bonus of \$20-\$50 per student FTE for all school staff if school meets student outcome growth targets.</p>	<p>Continue current NBPTS bonuses.</p> <p>Implement a building-based bonus for achieving annual student learning goals using a statewide diagnostic assessment.</p> <p>Provide bonuses, including entry bonuses, for highly-qualified teachers in hard-to-serve areas.</p>	<p>Continue NBPTS and challenging schools bonuses.</p>	<p>Continue NBPTS bonuses.</p> <p>Offer higher pay for hard-to-staff positions, subject areas (math, science, special education), and certain schools (high poverty, high cost urban, and remote rural).</p> <p>Implement performance-based school-wide bonuses.</p>	<p>Implement an incentive compensation program for teachers and their supervisors in each school building based on a combination of student academic achievement and student retention in secondary schools. Priority is given to immediate implementation of incentive compensation for principals and other supervisory staff.</p>	<p>Leg: 5 plus 2 for incentive pay for principals</p> <p>LEV: 2 (1 for a pilot basis on pay for hard to staff)</p> <p>G: 1</p> <p>Berg/Leg/LEV: 1</p> <p>Discuss: 1</p>
<p><b>Extra Pay for Mentors/Evaluator Teachers</b></p> <p><i>Should the state allocate additional pay for mentor teachers?</i></p>		<p>Provide release time for teachers who are mentors (see professional development section).</p>	<p>Provide additional pay for teachers who are peer evaluators or mentors.</p>	<p>Provide additional pay for teachers who serve as instructional improvement coaches to mentor new teacher and coach veteran teachers.</p>	<p>Lead teachers responsible for mentoring and coaching receive higher pay.</p>		<p>Leg: 5</p> <p>Berg/Leg: 3</p>
<p><b>Other Compensation</b></p> <p><i>Should the state provide other forms of compensation as an incentive for teachers?</i></p>		<p>Student loan forgiveness for teachers in shortage areas.</p>	<p>Student loan forgiveness for hard-to-serve areas.</p>		<p>Include health benefits in compensation surveys.</p>		<p>Berg/Leg: 7, 1 "OK"</p> <p>LEV: 3</p> <p>Discuss :1</p>

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>TRI Pay</b> <i>Should policies regarding supplemental pay for teachers be modified?</i>	Districts can provide teachers TRI pay using local revenue. TRI pay cannot cover basic education expenses.		Address variation in TRI pay in the new compensation system.		Revised levy law, new compensation system replace TRI pay.	Repeal the TRI law. All salary is subject to bargaining.	Leg/G: 7 Discuss: 2 Depends on regional adjustments to salaries
<b>Initiative 732</b> <i>Should I-732 continue to be a driver for cost of living adjustments?</i>		I-732 continues to drive COLAs.		I-732 continues to drive COLAs.	Eliminate separate I-732 COLA funding and include in basic education apportionment	Repeal salary increase provisions of I-732. COLAs are subject to bargaining.	Bergeson: 1, 1 no LEV: 2 G: 2 Discuss: 1
<b>Collective Bargaining</b> <i>Should collective bargaining for state funded staff be conducted at the state level?</i>	Collective bargaining for school employees is conducted at the district level.			No change.	The state should bargain state-funded compensation.	Transfer collective bargaining from local districts to the state; retain school employee collective bargaining rights and responsibilities.	LEV/G: 5 Discuss: 1
<b>Tenure</b> <i>Should continuing contract provisions be modified?</i>					Replace tenure with three year rolling renewable contracts for teachers and principals.	Repeal the continuing contract statutes for teachers; contracts are subject to bargaining. Repeal continuing contract statutes for principals.	LEV: 2 G: 2 "No" : 1

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Classified Staff Salaries</b>  <i>Should classified staff salaries be allocated by type of position? How should salary levels be determined?</i>	No state salary allocation schedule; each district receives an allocation based on historical salary allocations.	Break out staff into categories (e.g., instructional aides, secretaries, grounds workers, central administration) and base salary allocations on the weighted average salaries of classified state employees.	Create discrete categories of staff with allocations based on current statewide average actual salaries. Provide a regional adjustment for labor market differences. Phase-out differences in allocations based on historical salaries.	<p>Create discrete categories of staff with allocations based on current statewide average actual salaries. Adjust for regional labor market differences.</p> <p>Additional COLA above I-732: 3% effective Sept. 1, 2009 and 2% effective Sept. 1, 2010. CQEW to make recommendations for salary adjustments in 2011-12.</p>	Salaries set by the state compensation survey and updated annually.	Merge classified school personnel system with the state personnel system, with appropriate job classifications, job descriptions, and salary schedules.	<p>Bergeson: 1 Leg: 4 LEV: 1 G: 2, 1 no, 1 only if bargain at state level</p> <p>Discuss # of categories; address equity</p>
<b>Administrator Salaries</b>  <i>How should administrator salary allocations be determined?</i>	No state salary allocation schedule; each district receives an allocation based on historical salary allocations.	Equalize salary allocations. Next, identify appropriate method to allocate salaries based on what districts pay for qualified administrators.	Funding for staff in central admin allocated based on a lump sum percentage. Regional adjustment for labor market differences. Phase-out differences in allocations based on historical salaries.	<p>Use actual compensation levels for allocations.</p> <p>Additional COLA above I-732: 3% effective Sept. 1, 2009 and 2% effective Sept. 1, 2010. CQEW to make recommendations for salary adjustments in 2011-12. Adjust for regional labor market differences.</p> <p>CQEW to recommend salary adjustments starting in 2011-12.</p>	Salaries set by the state compensation survey and updated annually.	Increase administrator base salary allocations to the highest local district base salary for each staff category.	<p>Leg: 2 (1 "ok") G: 1, 1 no Bergeson: 2</p>

If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Inputs: Other Operating Costs</b>							
<b>Non-employee Related Costs (NERC)</b>  <i>Should NERC allocations be adjusted? If so, on what basis?</i>	\$10,178 per CIS (or approximately \$500 per student) in 2008-09 (with enhanced allocations for career and technical education programs).	Allocate \$1,383 per student (within general apportionment), including new funding for technology (\$282/student) and curriculum adoption (\$126/student).  In a LEAP document, break allocation into commonsense categories.	Example of initial allocation rate per student in prototype high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$258 student technology</li> <li>• \$200 instructional technology</li> <li>• \$155 curriculum/ materials</li> <li>• \$216 energy &amp; utilities</li> <li>• \$103 professional development</li> <li>• \$310 central office</li> <li>• Other \$102</li> </ul> Total = \$1,344.	Example of initial allocation rate per student in prototype high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$48 Principal's office supplies</li> <li>• \$264 General School Supplies</li> <li>• \$142 student technology</li> <li>• \$51 Capital outlay</li> <li>• \$266 Contractual svcs.,</li> <li>• \$895 Other miscellaneous</li> <li>• \$288 central services</li> </ul> Total = \$1,953/student.  Future NERC allocations to be set by the CQEW based on updated prototype schools model.	K-12 Expenditure Forecast Council determines allocations.	Allocate \$941 per student, by category. Funding is for allocation purposes, but in a new categorical formula. Inflate based in indices related to costs. Categorical formula is folded into general apportionment when district-based bargaining is transferred to state.	Leg: 5 (note: imp. to allocate directly to per-student costs in the school bldg; update periodically)  Bergeson: 1  Discuss: 2  Allocate <u>and</u> report in categories
<b>Facilities Maintenance</b>  <i>Should facilities maintenance staff be allocated separately?</i>		Funded within classified staff ratios.		Funded within classified staff ratios.	K-12 Expenditure Forecast Council determines allocations.	Per 1,000 students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.8 facility maintenance</li> <li>• 1.6 grounds keepers</li> <li>• 5.1 custodians.</li> </ul> \$130 per student for supplies. Funding is for allocation purposes, but in a new categorical formula. Categorical formula components folded into general apportionment when district-based bargaining is transferred to the state.	Bergeson: 1  G: 4

If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Inputs: Programs for Special Populations</b>							
<p><b>Remediation (assistance for at-risk students)</b></p> <p><i>Should learning assistance for struggling students be provided as a separate category of funding?</i></p> <p><i>Should funding assumptions and levels be adjusted?</i></p>	<p>\$265.08 per eligible Learning Assistance Program (LAP) student in 2008-09 for staffing and materials.</p> <p>Funding levels assume instruction is provided in groups of 15 LAP students by a fully certified teacher.</p>	<p>Funding formula for reading and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce class sizes districts with 75%+ poverty</li> <li>• small group tutoring with 1 teacher/15 students for 10% of students, scaled up as poverty increases</li> <li>• intensive tutoring with 1 teacher/3 students for 1% of students.</li> </ul> <p>Allocations include funding for program management and support, professional development, and instructional materials.</p>	<p>Adjust core funding for prototype schools based on the percent of students eligible for free and reduced price meals. Allocations assume certificated teachers, but districts can use instructional aides in lieu.</p> <p>Example for prototype high school: 2 tutoring hours/week for groups of 5 students and 10 summer school hours/week for groups of 10 students for 4 weeks.</p>	<p style="color: blue;">Adjust core funding for prototype schools based on % students eligible for free and reduced price meals. Allocations assume certificated teachers, but districts can use instructional aides in lieu.</p> <p style="color: blue;">Improve teacher/student ratio to 1:50.</p> <p style="color: blue;">Beginning in 2011-12, LAP funding may be incorporated into the basic education foundation formula.</p>	<p>Using a weighted student enrollment formula to be specified by a K-12 Resource Model, supplemental funding is provided for students eligible for free/reduced price meals.</p> <p style="color: blue;">New Targeted K-12 Intervention Fund funds research-based innovative intervention programs, including monitors for students at risk of dropping out.</p>	<p>The state provides for the identification of at-risk students and provide appropriate, uniform, and integrated instructional programs, incorporating ELL and LAP programs, and documented by student.</p> <p>Funding is separated from other programs and based on best practices identified OSPI; instruction is provided by certificated teachers.</p>	<p>Bergeson: 1</p> <p>Leg: 5</p> <p>LEV: 1 (use weighted student formula)</p> <p>G: 2</p> <p>Discuss: 2</p>
<p><b>English Language Learners (ELL students)</b></p> <p><i>Should instruction for ELL students be provided as a separate category of funding?</i></p> <p><i>Should funding assumptions and levels be adjusted?</i></p>	<p>\$840.64 per eligible student in 2008-09 for staffing and materials.</p>	<p>Base program resources: 1 teacher/18 ELL students. Enhanced staffing ratio for small programs (few ELL students); very large programs (many ELL students); diversity of languages; and for secondary school programs. Per FTE staff, program administration resources, additional contract days for professional development, and instructional resources are also provided.</p>	<p>Adjust core funding for each prototype school to provide additional instructional time based on the percent of ELLs in the student population.</p> <p>Example for prototype high school: 1 intensive class/day for groups of 8 students.</p>	<p style="color: blue;">Improve teacher/student ratio to 1:25.</p> <p>Beginning in 2011-12, bilingual funding may be incorporated into the basic education foundation formula.</p>	<p>Using a weighted student enrollment formula to be specified by a K-12 Resource Model, supplemental funding is provided for ELL students.</p>	<p>The state provides for the identification of at-risk students and provide appropriate, uniform, and integrated instructional programs, incorporating ELL and LAP programs, and documented by student.</p> <p>Funding is separated from other programs and based on best practices identified OSPI; instruction is provided by certificated teachers.</p>	<p>Bergeson: 2</p> <p>Leg: 4</p> <p>LEV: 1 (use weighted student formula)</p> <p>G: 1</p> <p>Leg/G: 1</p> <p>Discuss: 2</p>

If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Special Education</b>  <i>Should the special education funding formula be altered?</i>	Special education funding is .9309 * basic education allocation. (For birth through 5, the factor is 1.15)  Capped at 12.7% of FTE enrollment in district.  Safety net funding provide as a statewide line item for districts incurring excess special education costs.	No change from current policy; increases in basic education funding will improve special education funding.	No change from current policy, assuming an increased basic education allocation.  For safety net funding, districts are expected to account for excess costs using a newly revised accounting system.	Improve teacher/student ratio to 1:15.  In 2009-11, increased basic education allocation improves special education funding.  Beginning in 2011-12, special education funding may be incorporated into the basic education foundation formula.  No change to safety net.	Using a weighted student enrollment formula to be specified by a K-12 Resource Model, supplemental funding is provided for special education students.		Leg:5  Bergeson: 2
<b>Gifted and Highly Talented Students</b>  <i>Should GHT be considered basic education?</i>  <i>Should GHT funding levels be changed?</i>	\$378.13/eligible student in 08-09.  Limited to 2.314% of district basic education FTE enrollment.		Add to definition of basic education. As noted above, set class sizes of 15 for AP/IB classes.  Example for prototype high school: for schools with 2% GHC students, provide 2 tutoring hours/week for groups of 5 students and 10 summer school hours/week for groups of 10 students for 4 weeks.	Career academies provided in high schools for small learning communities with a particular career focus. This is included in the overall 1:21 average teacher student ratio.	Add to definition of basic education.		Leg: 5, 1 no LEV: 1, 1 no Keep current %, re-examine \$ amount

If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Early Learning</b> <i>Should EL be considered basic education?</i> <i>Should EL funding levels be changed?</i>	Department of Early Learning created in 2006. Oversees non-K-12 programs.				Align Early Child Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) with Head Start. Fund ECEAP at Head Start levels (increase from \$6,630 to \$8,725/child). Expand number of children served so that all eligible children are enrolled.	Incorporate instruction for pre-school children into a standardized program of instruction for students at risk of failing to meet state learning standards.	G: 5 LEV: 1 Discuss: 1 Keep current policy
<b>Career and Technical Education (CTE)</b> <i>Should CTE funding and staffing enhancements be adjusted?</i>	Grades 9-12, higher staffing than non-CTE: 0.92 CIS and .08 CAS/19.5 CTE student FTEs. NERC: \$23,381/CIS. \$1.7 million for high demand program grants	Provide in grades 7-12 and increase staffing to 1 staff per 18.5 students. "Use it or lose it" CAS provision. \$75 for equipment replacement in NERC (total CTE NERC is \$2,191/ student FTE). Fund summer school for math, science, and technology CTE programs. Adjust high demand grant amount based on demand.	Class sizes of 15 at the middle and high school levels. Enhanced funding for equipment and supplies to meet industry standards.	Career academies provided in high schools for small learning communities with a particular career focus. This is included in the overall 1:21 average teacher student ratio.	Using a weighted student enrollment formula to be specified by a K-12 Resource Model, supplemental funding is provided for CTE students.		Leg: 3 Bergeson: 3 LEV: 1 Discuss: 1 Keep current policy

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>CTE Skills Centers</b>  <i>Should skills center funding be adjusted?</i>	Staffing: .092 CIS and .08 CAS/16.67 student FTEs. NERC: \$18,489/CIS. Equipment replacement \$125/student. Up to \$485,000/year for extended day programs (\$500/student FTE). Summer school programs and grant dollars to I-BEST. \$1.7 million in high demand program grants.	Increase staffing to 1 staff per 18.5 students. "Use it or lose it" CAS provision. \$125 for equipment replacement in NERC (total NERC is \$2,191/student FTE). Change I-BEST funded staffing ratio to 1:25 ELL students. No change to extended day/summer school funding. Adjust high demand grant amount based on demand.		Skills center funding provided as separate program.  Remainder of CTE funding folded into new foundation formula.			Bergeson: 2  Covered in cap task force recs?  Not core to the K-12 basic ed system  Staff at 1:15  Keep current policy
<b>Other Special Programs</b>			Provide state funding for students up to age 21 to complete a high school diploma in different educational settings (ESDs, community and technical colleges, and community based organizations).  Provide state funding for an online learning system with a single point of entry for student enrollment and catalog review.	Behavioral support programs, in the form of additional social workers at 1/1,703 students and campus security at \$27/student.  Extracurricular at \$330 per high school student, \$202/student in middle school, \$123/student elementary for staff and supplies.	Targeted K-12 Intervention Fund funds research-based innovative programs, e.g. Navigation 101.  State funds "13th Year" tuition free for all high school graduates to incentivize students to pursue post-secondary job training, college or university degrees.		Leg: 5, 1 "OK"  Maybe staff/NERC allocations could be used for online. Does it need separate funding?

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Inputs: Teacher Certification and Training</b>							
<p><b>Teacher Certification</b></p> <p><i>Should the state's teacher certification requirements be revised?</i></p> <p><i>What role should the state play in overseeing teacher certification?</i></p>	<p>Teachers are required to hold a teacher's certificate issued by a state-approved authority. The Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) sets policy and provides oversight.</p>		<p>Implement a new statewide evaluation and certification system with a common set of evaluation standards at different stages of a teacher's career: entry, professional certification, and professional advancement. System based on peer review by other teachers, similar to NBPTS practices. Oversight by PESB and delivered through Educational Service Districts (ESDs). All new teachers must achieve professional certification within two to five years.</p>			<p>Establish national standardized teacher certification and endorsement tests based on state student academic standards.</p> <p>Repeal all other certification requirements and alternatives. Eliminate state oversight of college teacher preparation programs.</p> <p>Prohibit classroom assignment of unqualified teachers.</p>	<p>Leg: 5 (include PESB oversight); 1 no to NBPTS cert</p> <p>Ques: how can state effectively prohibit assignment of unqualified teachers?</p> <p>G: 1, 1 no, 1 yes to prohibit assignment part only</p> <p>Discuss: 2</p>

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<p><b>Teacher Professional Development</b></p> <p>(for LIDs, see p. 6)</p> <p><i>Should the state provide separate funding for teacher professional development?</i></p>	<p>Non-basic education appropriations for mentor training and programs, and 3 additional professional development days for middle/high school math and science teachers.</p>	<p>Implement a 2-year mentoring program for all new teachers, with a 1:15 ratio in the first year, plus 3 days of professional development and 1 day of mentor release time. In the second year, the ratio is 1:20 with 1 professional development day and 1 day of mentor release time.</p> <p>Districts are provided \$1,000 for each first year educational staff associate (ESA) for professional development and \$800 in the second year for mentor stipends, specialized training, or release time.</p> <p>Allocate 1 mentor for every 30 professional certification candidates. Fund a “mentor academy” and 2-day training for pro-cert facilitators.</p> <p>Provide 1 day of training for principals and colleagues.</p> <p>Fund 1 FTE per ESD for regional coordination.</p>	<p>First 5 years of a teacher’s career is a planned professional growth period; each teacher is assigned a mentor from their school or district. Mentor teachers get paid for the extra work; state to provide funding for release time for mentors. Mentors required to be NBPTS certified and trained.</p>	<p>3 substitute days per teacher at \$250/day</p>	<p>Induction program for new teachers including a mentor for every 15 new teachers. Programs lasts at least 2 years—ideally 5—with an intensive first year and decreasing intensity with each following year. Increase funding to at least \$8,000 (for a two year program) per teacher.</p>		<p>Leg: 5</p> <p>1 yes generally to mentoring; provide for all (not just new teachers)</p> <p>Bergeson: 1</p> <p>Discuss: 2</p>

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Inputs: Finance</b>							
<b>Revenue Sources</b>  <i>How should any potential cost increases be funded?</i>			Fund cost increases by giving K-12 a larger percentage of the growth in the state budget over the next three biennia. Expect K-12 funding to eventually return to 50% of the state general fund (an approximate 25% increase in funding).	Two potential sources to contributed to a "full funding of basic education account" in the state treasury for increases to basic education:  (1) In odd numbered years, if prior fiscal biennium general state revenues exceed the previous biennium's by >5%, transfer 50% of <b>the amount above</b> to the basic education account.  (2) Restructure the uncollected state property tax for schools by increasing the state collected property tax rate by \$0.25 per \$1,000 of assessed value.			Leg: 2, 1 no  FFC: option 1, 2 no; option 2, 1 "we should discuss" both: 1
<b>Levies</b>  <i>Should the levy lid be adjusted?</i>  <i>Should levy equalization policy be changed?</i>	Levy lid: 24% for 204 districts; lid varies, up to 34%, for 91 grandfathered districts.  Local effort assistance (state matching money for high tax rate/low property value districts).		All districts can raise up to 30% of funding they receive from state and federal governments.  Levy equalization: all districts to have per-student funding within a defined range.  If changes are made to levy base (state plus local funds), the amount collected in levies is equally adjusted.		State absorbs a "large portion" of local levy funding. Levies are to be used only for educational supplements approved by local voters (e.g., lower class size, athletics, fine arts, and extended learning). Consider eliminating the levy lid but maintain equalization.	When the state fully funds basic education and local levy funds are separated and limited to other than basic education obligations, the local levy lid should be repealed and levy equalization funding eliminated.	Leg: 4 still thinking thru equalization; eliminating lid open to discussion  LEV: 1 G: 2  Depends on the definition of basic ed

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Are Funding Formulas for Allocation Purposes Only?</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes: 6  Use rptg system to know how \$ is spent
<b>Allocation Basis</b> <i>Are allocations determined on a student, staff, or school basis?</i>		Funding and staffing levels are determined based on prototype schools; allocations are made on a per-staff basis.	Funding and staffing levels are determined based on prototype schools; allocations are made on a per-student basis.	Funding and staffing levels are determined based on prototype schools; allocations are made on a per-staff basis through 2010-2011. Starting in 2011-12, the CQEW will recommend new <b>per-student</b> funding formulas.	Using a "K-12 Resource Model," funding and staffing levels are determined based on prototype schools; allocations are made on a per-student basis.	<b>Funding and staffing levels are determined based on prototype schools; allocations are made on a per-staff basis.</b>	Leg: 6  1 yes generally for prototype schools  Discuss: 2
<b>Provide Enhanced Funding for Small Schools?</b> <i>Should small and/or remote and necessary districts receive funding enhancements?</i>  <i>Should these enhancements be considered part of basic education?</i>	Funding enhancements for districts with K-6/8 schools under 60 student FTEs; middle schools under 20 FTEs; high schools under 300 FTEs; and districts with no high schools. Level of enhancement varies by district. Not part of basic education.	Yes	Yes	Yes  2009-10: increase the small school formula factors by: Grades K-6: 12.9% Grades K-8: 2.5% Grades 7-8: 3.7%  2010-11, an additional increase of: Grades K-6: 3.2% Grades K-8: 2.5% Grades 7-8: 0.9%  <b>Thereafter, the CQEW to align prototype schools with the economy of scale requirements for small schools.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	No. Eliminate small schools funding enhancements except for remote districts necessary for the health and safety of non-district residents. The amount currently used to enhance small schools funding is shifted to general apportionment.	Bergeson: 1 Leg: 2 G: 3  Yes generally: 1  Depends on the base

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Initiative 728</b> <i>Should I-728 funds be defined as basic education and included in general apportionment?</i>		Fold into basic education formulas		I-728 funds may be included in new foundation formula developed by CQEW in 2011-12.	Eliminate separate I-728 funding and include in basic education apportionment	Repeal I-728 and transfer the funds to general apportionment for staffing ratios and salary allocation improvements.	Berg/LEV/G: 7 Implicitly, legs expect I728 to disappear
<b>Phase-in</b> <i>How should funding components be phased-in?</i>		Phased in over an 8-year period.	Phased in over a 6-year period. Specific phase-in to be outlined in draft legislation.	6 year phase-in specified by component starting in 2009-10 and 2010-11 in current formulas. Thereafter, CQEW to recommend future changes. Legislature adopts new funding formula starting in 2011-12.			Leg: 6 Bergeson: 2
<b>Capital</b> <i>Should state support for capital construction be considered part of basic education?</i>	Not part of basic education. Legislative task force in process.						1: See cap task force recs Discuss: 1 No: 2
<b>Transportation</b> <i>Should the transportation funding formula be revised?</i>	Transportation for students to and from school is part of basic education. Funding formula revision in process.				Maintain a separate formula for transportation based on cost drivers including the number of students, density, and special education.		3: See transpo cmte recs, if approp 1: yes, revise LEV: 1

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<b>Oversight</b>							
<p><b>Accountability: Academic</b></p> <p><i>How should the state hold districts accountable for student academic performance?</i></p> <p><i>What kind of assistance or interventions should be provided to districts with low performance levels?</i></p>			<p>Use SBE proposed accountability system to recognize exemplary schools and provide assistance to priority schools.</p> <p>Implement a common state-provided student information system to connect information about students, diagnostic test scores, teachers, and courses. Include a dropout early warning system.</p>	<p>CQEW to recommend to the legislature funding levels sufficient to give students opportunity to meet state learning standard. CQEW to report on the percentage of recommended funding that is appropriated.</p> <p>The CQEW will identify longitudinal performance indicators <b>and data needed</b>; calculate expected performance of schools relative to funding; report annually.</p>	<p><b>Fund single statewide P-20 data collection system that links student achievement and teacher data.</b></p> <p><b>Districts required to set three-year achievement targets.</b></p> <p><b>Implement state inspections for low performing schools.</b></p>	<p>The Governor is delegated the authority to impose performance standards appropriate to each district and to intervene in the absence of satisfactory performance.</p>	<p>Leg: 5 (1 vote for student data system specifically)</p> <p>G: 1</p> <p>Discuss: 1</p> <p>Follow SBE's work</p>
<p><b>Accountability: Financial</b></p> <p><i>How should the state hold districts accountable for budgeting and expenditures?</i></p>			<p>Establish financial accountability and spending transparency through a common budgeting and accounting system.</p>	<p>CQEW to use a prototype schools model to make budget recommendations to the legislature. CQEW will determine fiscal impacts of policy changes from legislative session. Make adjustments for school size, region, family income level, and other relevant student demographic factors.</p>	<p>Clearly delineate state and local responsibilities. Simplify state revenue distribution by combining basic education programs into one allocation. Develop on-line tools for public access to budget information.</p> <p><b>K-12 Expenditure Forecast Council will establish explicit assumptions as the basis for all proposed resource needs and spending levels.</b></p>	<p>The Governor is delegated authority to adjust general apportionment allocations by up to 5% to accommodate diverse district needs and encourage innovation. Adjustments may include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced funding for hard-to-staff schools</li> <li>• Funding for alternative schools</li> <li>• Incentives for small district consolidation</li> <li>• Directing the use of philanthropic grants</li> </ul>	<p>Leg: 7</p> <p>G: 1</p> <p>Discuss: 1</p> <p>Separate cost from expend and match rev to cost; use district "users" to develop system</p>

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*

## Comprehensive Proposals Submitted by Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force Members: A Summary

Proposal Component	Current State Policy (where applicable)	Terry Bergeson	Reps. Hunter, Sullivan, Jarrett, Anderson, Priest, and Sen. Tom	Full Funding Coalition	League of Education Voters Foundation	Dan Grimm	Member Notes: indicate preferred proposal in this column
<p><b>Accounting</b></p> <p><i>Should the state require and/or fund a common financial accounting system?</i></p>			Implement a common, budgeting and accounting system, administered by the state and provided at no charge to districts.	Account for expenditures of maintenance and operations levy revenues as a separate program or programs	<p>Revamp chart of accounts to require districts to fully and transparently report all spending for regular education, special education, compensation,</p> <p>Rework expenditure classifications using a NCES recommended structure. Provide for training in and auditing of the data system.</p>	Develop a single accounting and reporting system that separates state and local funds.	<p>Leg/G: 8</p> <p>FFC: 2</p>
<p><b>Data</b></p> <p><i>What data systems are necessary to implement accountability requirements?</i></p> <p><i>Should the state provide funding for districts to implement student information systems?</i></p>			<p>State to provide funding for administrative technology (e.g., student information systems) and online learning.</p> <p>Need a “rigorous research initiative” to link scores in the teacher evaluation system to student learning.</p>	Develop statewide data reporting systems that contain information on student outcomes, demographics and enrollments that could be compared to fiscal expenditure patterns for individual schools.	<p>Build P-20 longitudinal data system that includes teacher identifier with the ability to match teachers to students and student-level college-readiness test scores.</p> <p>Adopt standardized course descriptions and integrate into K-12 data system.</p>	Teachers assigned to each student should be identified by grade level or course based on standardized course descriptions and should include the performance of each student on standardized tests.	<p>Leg: 4</p> <p>LEV: 4</p> <p>G: 5</p> <p>Link outcomes to finance where possible</p>

*If a component is not explicitly addressed in a proposal, the table cell is blank.*