

Implementation of ESHB 2261 – Proposed Recommendations from the QEC

This proposal is offered as a follow-up to our earlier issue paper that outlined suggested priorities for the QEC. It provides additional specificity regarding the content of the recommendations that should be forwarded to the Legislature in January. It offers a way for the QEC and the Legislature to meet our obligations under ESHB 2261 given the practical constraints within which we must operate. We are constrained by time, by the availability of good information from which to make decisions, and by the capacity of the state and the public schools to make immediate, sweeping changes throughout our K-12 education system.

At the same time, we are mindful of the Constitutional requirement to make ample provision for the education of all children. This is not a charge to be taken lightly. As the State Supreme Court pointed out in the Doran I decision, there is only once in the entire Constitution where a specified function is declared to be paramount. It is the Legislature's responsibility to implement this constitutional mandate fully and in accordance with the demands of modern society.

The recommended priorities and implementation schedule in this proposal are guided by:

1. Previous Court decisions, notably the Doran I guidelines that "ample provision" means unrestrained, full, and sufficient, and the Doran II case as it pertains to pupil transportation and supplemental instruction for students who would otherwise have difficulty accessing the general program of Basic Education, and
2. The timelines and topics required to be addressed under ESHB 2261;
3. Research literature on what makes a difference in student achievement, notably the meta-analyses conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy; and
4. Other empirical evidence, including studies by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee and data collected by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

1. The Legislature should adopt the prototypical school funding formula for implementation in 2011, with funding factors as assigned by the QEC at current levels of state spending.

Comment: The Funding Formula Working Group is making progress in developing the crosswalk between the current funding approach and the new prototypical school formula (see Table 1). This should remain the top priority for the QEC in our recommendations to the 2010 Legislature. A sense of urgency on this product must be maintained to ensure alignment between accounting, data systems, reporting, budget preparation, and state budget development for the 2011-13 biennium.

Table 1: Excerpt of Proposed Crosswalk - Prototype Formula at Current Spending Level

FUNDING CATEGORIES	Current Formula	Draft Prototype Formula* (Excerpt - Not all Factors are Represented)			
Teachers, Librarians, Counselors, Nurses, etc.	Certificated Instructional Staff K-4: 53.2 per 1000 5-12: 46.0 per 1000	Teachers (Class Size)	<u>Elementary</u> K-3: 25.23 4-6: 27.01	<u>Middle</u> 28.70	<u>High</u> 29.13
		(Per Building)			
		Librarians	.66	.53	.52
		Counselors	.49	1.12	1.89
		Student Health	.14	.08	.32
		Professional Dev Coach	.08	.10	.16

FUNDING CATEGORIES	Current Formula	Draft Prototype Formula*			
		(Excerpt - Not all Factors are Represented)			
Principals, Instructional Aides, Building & District Support Staff, District Administrators	Certificated Administrative Staff 4 per 1000 Classified Staff 17.02 per 1000	Principals	.95	1.40	2.06
		Instructional Aides	1.26	.48	.68
Maintenance, Supplies & Operating Costs	NERC \$511.42 (2007-08) Per FTE student	Office Support	2.74	1.65	3.52
		Maintenance	1.67	3.18	3.64
		Security	.18	.34	.39
		Other Central Administration (Certificated and Classified) X Percent of Building Level Staff (TBD)			
		Technology		\$53.75	
		Textbooks/Curriculum		\$57.70	
		Library & Other Supplies		\$122.52	
		Professional Development		\$8.82	
		Utilities/Insurance		\$146.05	
		Districtwide Support		\$50.12	
		Facilities Maintenance		<u>\$72.35</u>	
		<i>Per FTE Student (2007-08):</i>		\$511.42	
LAP - Based on low income students	\$228.20 (2007-08)	** 2.14 hours per week (extended day) in groups of 15 students			
Transitional Bilingual Program - Per ELL student	\$845.52 (2007-08)	** Elementary: 20% pull-out time in groups of 16 students Middle/High: 17% pull-out time in groups of 16 students			
Gifted - Per student, 2.314% of district enrollment	\$384.78 (2007-08)	<i>Crosswalk not yet developed</i>			
Special Education - Per eligible student	Birth-5: 1.15 X base FTE allocation K-12: .9309 X base FTE allocation	Birth-5: 1.15 X base FTE allocation K-12: .9309 X base FTE allocation			

*From Funding Formula Working Group as of 9/29

**Preliminary Draft, not yet considered by Funding Formula Working Group

The QEC should discuss *how* these baseline formulas might be adopted by the Legislature and whether there are likely to be differences between the Working Group’s recommendations and those from the QEC. The QEC should make a recommendation for how to deal with any topics not addressed by the Working Group.

- The Legislature should include a Program of Early Learning for at-risk children aged 3 and 4 as part of the definition of Basic Education, beginning in 2011 and phased-in over a three-year period to cover all eligible children who voluntarily choose to participate.

The Program should be implemented through a combined school and community-based delivery system with approved providers and overseen collaboratively by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Department of Early Learning. “At-risk” should be defined as eligibility for the ECEAP program. The Program should offer the same services as the current ECEAP program until there is agreement on an alternative proposal for services for this population of children.

Comment: The research is clear on the importance of early learning for school readiness. For at-risk children to have an equitable opportunity to access and be successful in the regular Basic Education

program when they enter kindergarten, supplemental education must be made available through a Program of Early Learning. This proposal is not inconsistent with the Governor’s desire for a comprehensive early learning system for all children aged birth to five. We respect the efforts of DEL, OSPI, Thrive by Five and other stakeholders to design a comprehensive, integrated system and anticipate their recommendations so that this proposal can be aligned with them. This proposal simply targets one specific component of that system: the program which is considered Basic Education. The three-year phase-in balances the very high priority for this program with a recognition that there may be system capacity limitations, particularly in the statewide availability of approved providers.

OFM, OSPI, and DEL should discuss the issues associated with multiple service delivery systems and provider approval, and provide information on the cost to implement this proposal, since estimates must be developed on the number of potentially eligible children.

3. **The Legislature should adopt a preliminary implementation plan under ESHB 2261 that addresses both a phase-in of the Program of Basic Education and improvements to selected components of the prototypical school funding formula as follows:**

Program Phase-In

- **A Program of Early Learning for at-risk children should be phased in over a three-year period beginning in 2011;**
- **Funding of the new pupil transportation funding formula should be phased in beginning in 2011;**
- **Full-day kindergarten should be incrementally phased-in according to the statutory schedule (high poverty schools first), with completion in 2018;**
- **The QEC Workplan for 2010 should result in a recommendation for the 2011 Legislature regarding a phase-in schedule and funding for:**
 - **Increased instructional hours as required under ESHB 2261**
 - **Opportunity for 24 credits for graduation based on the SBE Core 24**

Prototypical School Formula Phase-In

- **Class sizes of 15 in grades K through 3 should be phased in over a five-year period beginning in 2011 and with initial priority on high poverty schools;**
- **Increased allocations should be provided beginning in 2011 for librarians, school health, and classified staff using the Basic Education Finance Task Force recommendations;**
- **Increased instructional time should also be provided beginning in 2011 to support the LAP and Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program, with preliminary numbers based on the Task Force recommendations pending additional input from the Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee; and**
- **The Maintenance, Supplies and Operating Costs (MSOC) factors in the funding formula should be increased in 2011 based on data collected by OSPI about costs incurred by school districts.**

The Compensation Working Group and the Local Finance Working Group should be convened beginning in May 2010. OSPI and the PESB should make a research-based recommendation regarding professional development.

Comment: This proposal, which is illustrated in Tables 2 and 3 below, incorporates the most convincing research and the clearest available evidence of need for increased resources, tempered by the capacity of the system to accommodate new programming.

Fund the Fundamentals. We have learned there is no technical reason to delay implementation of the new pupil transportation funding formula to 2013, and we have undisputed documentation of underfunding. OSPI will need a supplemental appropriation of \$670,000 for software development to implement the formula, and a change to the law enacted in 2009 will be required.

Similarly, OSPI has gathered convincing evidence that school districts are spending more for day-to-day operations than the state is providing. Costs of core items such as utilities, curriculum, and supplies far exceed the MSOC allocations (currently the NERC). In the long run, the allocations for technology and curriculum should be based on a stated policy of expected capacity and a replacement cycle. This is something the QEC should examine more closely.

Provide Critical Support Staff. Personnel data demonstrates that school districts hire far more classified support staff than the state assumes. Improvements in support for facilities maintenance are needed to preserve the physical plant and prevent long-term expenses in the capital budget. We have created high expectations for student data, which must be managed by office staff at the building level. The need for additional librarians and nurses is well known; school districts increasingly struggle to provide and maintain these professionals who provide critical support in educational technology, instruction, and student health and well-being.

Focus on Primary Grades. This proposal places a higher short-term priority on K-3 class size reduction compared to implementation of full-day kindergarten, in part because the research suggests that changes must be made to instruction in the primary grades in order to sustain the gains in student achievement from full-day kindergarten. A phase-in is necessary to accommodate capacity limitations in physical plant and qualified teachers. It makes sense to follow the same phase-in scheme (focus first on high-poverty schools) for K-3 as we are following for full-day Kindergarten. The cost-benefit of class size reduction in the upper grades is not as clearly supported by research. Furthermore, we should examine the impact on student learning of the combination of Early Learning, full-day Kindergarten, and significantly smaller classes in the primary grades. The early boost in student achievement may permit larger classes in the upper grades.

Close the Achievement Gap. In keeping with our need to close the achievement gap, an additional priority must be increased instructional time and learning opportunities for struggling and non-English proficient students. In the short term, enhanced federal funding can address these needs, but the federal funds expire in 2011. This proposal uses the Basic Education Finance Task Force recommendation as a placeholder, pending additional input and consideration of recommendations from the Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee.

2010 Workplan: Core 24 and Six Period Day. The QEC does not have enough information to make a recommendation regarding the cost implications and an appropriately staged phase-in of increased instructional hours and 24 credits for graduation. These two items are closely inter-related and must be the top priority for our 2010 Workplan.

Table 2 : Preliminary Phased Implementation Plan - Program Elements

PROGRAM ELEMENTS	Current	ESHB 2261	Phase-In Proposal
Early Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECEAP/Headstart + 17,700 slots for at-risk children Not Basic Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on ECEAP services Multiple approved providers All at-risk 3 & 4 year olds (voluntarily) by 2013-14 Part of Basic Education
Instructional Hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kindergarten 1 - 6 7 - 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 450 (except some high poverty schools, not Basic Education) 1,000 (Districtwide Average) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,000 by 2018, phased in by high poverty schools 1,000 by 2018 1,080 by 2018 (6-period day)
Credits for Graduation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19 (not in statute) Credits specified by SBE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,000 by 2018, phased in by high poverty schools 1,000 by 2018 1,080 by 2018 (6-period day) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,000 by 2018, phased in incrementally each year by high poverty schools QEC Workplan for 2010 and Recommendation to 2011 Legislature
Pupil Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Radius Mile Formula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19 (not in statute) Credits specified by SBE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QEC Workplan for 2010 and Recommendation to 2011 Legislature
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Radius Mile Formula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity for 24 credits, adopted by SBE subject to approval by Legislature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QEC Workplan for 2010 and Recommendation to 2011 Legislature
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Radius Mile Formula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expected Cost Model, no later than 2013-14 Increased funding could be phased in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase-in Expected Cost Model starting in 2011-12

Table 3: Preliminary Phased Implementation Plan - Formula Elements

FUNDING CATEGORIES	Prototype Formula - Proposal			
	Priorities for Change are Highlighted			
		Elementary	Middle	High
Teachers, Librarians, Counselors, Nurses, etc.	Teachers (Class Size)	K-3: 15.0 by 2015-16 4-6: 27.01	28.70	29.13
	(Per Building)			
	Librarians	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Counselors	.49	1.12	1.89
	Student Health	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Professional Dev Coach	.08	.10	.16
Principals, Instructional Aides, Building & District Support Staff, District Administrators	Principals	.95	1.40	2.06
	Instructional Aides	1.26	.48	.68
	Office Support	3.0	3.0	3.50
	Maintenance	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Security	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Other Central Administration (Certificated and Classified) X Percent of Building Level Staff (TBD)			
Maintenance, Supplies & Operating Costs	Technology		\$113.80	
	Textbooks/Curriculum		\$122.17	
	Library & Other Supplies		\$259.39	
	Professional Development		\$18.89	
	Utilities/Insurance		\$309.21	
	Districtwide Support		\$98.64	
	Facilities Maintenance		\$160.66	
	Per FTE Student: (2007-08)		\$1,082.76	

FUNDING CATEGORIES		Prototype Formula - Proposal	
		Priorities for Change are Highlighted	
LAP - Based on low income students		2.0 hours per week (extended day) in groups of 5 students* 10 hours per week, 4 weeks (extended year) in groups of 10 students*	
Transitional Bilingual Program - Per ELL student		Elementary: 20% pull-out time in groups of 8 students* Middle/High: 17% pull-out time in groups of 8 students*	
Gifted - Per student, 2.314% of district enrollment		Crosswalk not yet developed	
Special Education - Per eligible student		Birth-5: 1.15 X base FTE allocation	K-12: .9309 X base FTE allocation

**Preliminary pending input from Achievement Gap Oversight Committee*

Compensation & Local Finance. Finally, a critical component of school finance is certificated, administrative, and classified employee compensation. There are known inequities that lack any rational basis and must be addressed sooner rather than later. The Compensation Working Group should be convened beginning in May 2010 rather than waiting until July of 2011. Furthermore, the PESB and OSPI should make recommendations to the QEC in 2010, based on the best recent research, regarding the amount of time needed for high quality professional development and the form that professional development should take. These changes will also require modifications to the law enacted last year. The Local Finance Working Group should also be convened as soon as possible after the 2010 session, as long as key staff are available to do the work.

Ongoing Responsibilities. Recommendations for changes to other aspects of the prototypical school funding formulas should be part of the ongoing work of the QEC, and should be informed by the latest research, data, and the system capacity reports produced by the OSPI.

OFM and OSPI should prepare cost estimates of this proposal.

- The Legislature should closely monitor the outcomes of the new BEST (Beginning Educator Support Team) program. If the program proves effective, sufficient funds should be phased in beginning in 2011 to cover all first year teachers.**

OSPI is just beginning to revamp the mentoring and support program for beginning teachers, based on research and standards developed in cooperation with the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession. The new BEST program aims to provide a much more intensive and rigorous program of mentoring, support, and professional development than the previous state TAP, with better alignment to state certification standards and performance expectations. The program is in its pilot phase, and a report is due November 1, 2010. OSPI should be expected to demonstrate the effectiveness of the program through a rigorous evaluation (not anecdote). If BEST proves effective, it should be provided for all first year teachers.