

MINUTES
JOINT MEETING
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Tuesday, June 27, 2017

TIME: 10:00 A.M.

PLACE: Lincoln Auditorium

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Nonini, Den Hartog, Guthrie, Crabtree, Buckner-Webb, Ward-Engelking

Chairman VanOrden, Vice Chairman McDonald, Representatives Shepherd, Boyle, Clow, Mendive, Kerby, Cheatham, Amador, DeMordaunt, Moon, Syme, Ehardt, Scanlin(Kloc), McCrostie, Toone

ABSENT/ EXCUSED: Representatives Clow, DeMordaunt, Moon, Syme, Kloc, Vice Chairman Thayn, and Senator Winder

Senator Guthrie participated via conference-phone

GUESTS: Fred Birnbaum, Idaho Freedom Fund; John Watts, Veritas Advisors; Dwight Johnson, CTE; Dave Hill, SBOE; Samantha Verdell; Betsy Russel, The Spokesman Review; Carlie Foster, Lobby Idaho; Marilyn Whitney, Governor's Office; Karen Echeverria, Jess Harrison, ISBA; Suzanne Budge.

CONVENED: **Chairman Mortimer** called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM.

Chairman Mortimer indicated that is unusual for Senate and House Education Committees to meet as a Joint Committee, but it is very important to have an opportunity to keep up-to-date on important issues such as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). He thanked the Superintendent, the State Board staff, the Speaker of the House and many others for joining the meeting

Chairman VanOrden thanked the committee members for their time to review and comment on the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. Also, she thanked the State Board of Education for preparing the presentation on such short notice.

Sherry Ybarra, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education (SDE), noted how much work and effort was put in the Idaho Consolidated State Plan by the Department of Education team and expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to present the plan before the committee.

Superintendent Ybarra introduced **Duncan Robb**, Chief Policy Adviser, State Department of Education.

PRESENTATION: **Duncan Robb**, Chief Policy Adviser, State Department of Education, started the presentation by mentioning that the Idaho Consolidated State Plan is supplemental, but it does not replace Idaho's K-12 priorities as defined by the Governor's task force recommendations or strategic plans for the State Board of Education. All states must apply to the US Department of Education in order to receive federal funds to serve disadvantaged students which puts Idaho's Consolidated State Plan as the application for federal education funds that covers nine federal program areas. The application describes the priorities and use of funds for each of the nine programs covered by the law. The plan describes how it will differentiate the schools, identify schools for improvement, and provide support and assistance to at-risk subgroups of students, funds and facilitates professional development for educators. **Mr. Robb** mentioned that the total of funds for all nine programs comes to \$83,044,937 for 2017-18 school year.

Before explaining the plan, **Mr. Robb** referred to the background history on programs adopted by US Department of Education and Idaho. He highlighted "No Child Left Behind" enacted by Congress in 2001 which was reauthorization

Of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which Idaho submitted a plan in 2002. At that time, Idaho submitted separate plans for each program for which funding is received. In 2011 Idaho adopts new ELA and Math Standards. In 2012 the President authorized the US Department of Education to grant states waivers from the 100% proficiency goal. In 2014 Idaho implements a new assessment to measure the standards. When No Child Left Behind was due for reauthorization, Congress and the President passed Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015, which brings requirements to the Consolidated Plan.

The Plan begins with Title 1, Part A which contains two major components: challenging Academic Standards and Assessments and Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities.

Mr. Robb noted that the federal government requires states to adopt specific accountability practices in order to access the funds. It does not affect a number of the state's existing accountability mechanisms and they are not going to be replaced.

ESSA requires states to include a number of subgroups of students such as: economically disadvantaged, English learners, students with disabilities, major racial/ethnic groups. **Mr. Robb** mentioned the term "N-size," which is the number of students necessary to be included when desegregating information by subgroups for accountability purposes. The minimum number of students required for a given group to be included in school identification is $N \geq 25$, which is the N-size used in Idaho's ESSA waiver. This minimum is required for all student groups as well as subgroups. This N-size meets requirements for accountability, however for reporting N-size comes down to 5.

Sen. Mortimer asked for more information concerning the N-size determination.

Mr. Robb responded by going into great detail of how the committee determined the N-size to assure that one or two students would have an outsized impact.

Sen. Mortimer asked if there was a possibility to combine schools that don't meet N-size requirements, so that they may be funded. **Mr. Robb** responded there is no way to combine schools that do not meet the N-size, but small schools will be helped in additional ways.

Mr. Robb continued with long term goals such as: academic achievements – reduce percentage of non-proficient students by 50% in six years based on the 2016 rate.

Sen. Nonini commented on the long-term goal of graduation rate and asked **Mr. Robb** what Idaho's high school graduation rate was in 2016. **Mr. Robb** responded saying the rate in 2016 was 78.9%.

Rep. Kirby asked a question about the trajectory being six years whether it would be possible to increase graduation rates of students with disabilities from 15% graduation rate to 57.5%. Also, the improbability for English learners to go from a rate of 6.9% to 53.5% in six years. **Mr. Robb** responded by saying the methodology would be applied to all the student groups throughout the state equally. Further, some schools in Idaho have demonstrated the ability to move students at that rate in the recent past.

Rep. Amador asked if these percentages would be expected for each grade level or whether it is a total/overall type of system; and if not, where do these percentages come from. **Mr. Robb** stated that the state report card would be talked about later in the presentation. The grade level would be seen in certain circumstances.

Mr. Robb continued with the presentation on the topic of indicators. ESSA requires states to identify indicators which serve as the criteria that schools are measured in the following 5 areas: Academic Achievement Indicator, Other Academic Indicator (for elementary or secondary schools that are not in high schools), Graduation Rate, English Language Learner Proficiency, and Non-Academic Measure (School Quality/Student Success). There are three categories: K-8, High School, and Alternative High Schools. In addressing the non-academic or school quality measures, Idaho's framework includes more than one in each school category. The non-academic area has been a challenge for several states. Accountability data will be reported on a school report card annually.

School Report Card: ESSA requires that all states describe the system in which we will differentiate all public schools in the state. Idaho once used a 5-star rating system. The state moved away from the 5-star system because it was not a good way to gage the schools' rating. Idaho will meaningfully differentiate all schools annually using the state's report card, which will show school progress on all indicators in the Accountability Framework for which data is available.

There are several steps that describe how a school's performance results in annual meaningful differentiation in Idaho's school report cards, which will note whether a school has been identified for improvement or not identified. For the first indicator, identify Achievement and Growth for Achievement is the percentage of students proficient or advanced. Determine rank of Achievement and Growth relative to all other public schools in the state. Calculate percentile for Achievement and Growth. Choose higher percentile for each school. Repeat for all indicators, and take the average. Repeat for all Title I schools in the state and rank schools from highest to lowest. Choose the bottom 5% as comprehensive schools within the K-8, high school, and alternative schools categories; and as a last step, schools in the top 10% of achievement will be recognized.

Rep. Kerby made a comment on indicator weights for Idaho's most common school configurations where school quality will be weighted at 10% for all schools, with the remaining indicators weighted evenly across the remaining 90% and highlighted that it is very appropriate.

Sen. Mortimer asked **Mr. Robb** to clarify why the report will be issued every three years when data is available every year.

Rep. Amador asked to detail year to year data concerning academic growth on the student level and asked about the growth percentages associated with different data sources.

Sen. Ward-Engelking asked **Mr. Robb** if the goals for ESL and special education learners are realistic and what will happen if the Title 2 money goes away at the federal level - whether there is a back-up plan in case Title 2 funding ends.

After discussion, Superintendent **Sherry Ybarra** addressed the committee with two points regarding questions from the committee.

Mr. Robb continued the presentation with school identification methodology: to order schools based on the average and identify the lowest 5% of Title 1 schools in each school category; non-Title 1 schools will fall in the same range.

Sen. Den Hartog asked **Mr. Robb** to clarify if the graduation rates allow for students to finish during the summer after their 4th year.

Sen. Nonini asked about the state's four-year cohort graduation rate of less than 67% being considered comprehensive support and improvement schools and how many schools fall into that category now. **Peter Koehler**, Chief Deputy Superintendent, addressed the committee and answered Sen. Nonini's question as well as follow up questions by Sen. Nonini.

Rep. Tune asked a question regarding the number of schools brought into discussion by **Sen. Nonini**, wondering if the number of schools counted are all high schools, alternative schools and traditional high schools or what the majority of the schools counted are. **Mr. Robb** answered by explaining how N-size makes a big difference.

Rep. Tune expressed concern that most of the small school districts may fall out of the N-size of 25 and would thus not receive funding. **Mr. Robb** explained that this is an area where people have struggled with the trade-off inherent in setting a minimum N-size and that the State Board of Education is receptive to feedback on this issue.

Rep. McDonald noted that the rural communities would suffer if it is not addressed. **Rep. McDonald** asked what the Department of Education is doing to value rural students like any other school district. **Mr. Koehler** explained how federal funds and the state budget numbers break down. The Department of Education targets certain schools in need through various programs and the Department views each and every child as having equal value regardless of where they come from.

Rep. McDonald asked for examples of other programs that are available in the absence of federal funding. **Mr. Koehler** provided examples: the Superintendents Network; the Principals Network; the Mentor Program; the Building Capacity Program; and the Regional Mathematics Centers.

Sen. Ward-Engelking asked how many schools in Idaho fall below the minimum N-size number of 25. **Mr. Robb** was unable to provide an answer and asked to get back to the committee with the number.

Mr. Robb continued the presentation with the Identification Cycle – every three years.

Sen. Den Hartog asked how much of the \$83 million dollars that is coming from federal dollars is intended to target these struggling schools. **Mr. Robb** answered about \$2 million dollars.

Chairman VanOrden asked if this discussion is the accountability piece concerning the \$83 million to the federal government. **Mr. Robb** confirmed that this is the federal government holding schools and districts accountable for federal funds, and that the amount of funds that are flexible enough to go to low performing schools is quite small.

Superintendent Ybarra addressed the committee regarding special programs for rural schools.

Mr. Robb continued with the 95% Participation Rate Requirement segment of the presentation followed by the Targeted Support and Improvement segment.

Rep. Kirby asked for explanation of the achievement gap exceeding 20% and the seemingly untenability of the percentages which may cause nearly every school in the state to fall into the 20% designation. **Mr. Robb** answered that the U.S. Department of Education will look very closely at the ways the state defines and sets the definitions of the categories.

Rep. Kirby asked for explanation of the achievement gap exceeding 20% and the seemingly untenability of the percentages which may cause nearly every school in the state to fall into the 20% designation. **Mr. Robb** answered that the U.S. Department of Education will look very closely at the ways the state defines and sets the definitions of the categories.

Mr. Robb continued the presentation with how the state will support schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

RECESS: Was called at ____p.m. by **Chairman Mortimer**.

CONVENED: **Chairman Mortimer** called the meeting back to order at 1:10 PM.

Superintendent Ybarra addressed the committee concerning three topics that were discussed earlier. She spoke about the N-size, the comprehensive support of identifying schools every three years, and the concern of **Rep. Kirby** of the methodology for the support to the special populations versus the calculation for accountability.

Rep. Kirby asked **Superintendent Ybarra** why all of the resources are going into under-achieving students but there is no goal to turn proficient students into advanced students. **Rep. Kirby** is concerned that they are not giving educational opportunities for the advanced kids to grow as they are giving the other kids. The only measure we are looking at now is moving kids from basic to proficient. **Rep Kirby** would like something in this plan to see the upward movement of all students.

Superintendent Ybarra responded to the questions by **Rep. Kirby** by saying the department will look into his concerns and that the nice part of ESSA is the flexibility of the state to address these issues.

Mr. Robb continued the presentation with the exit criteria for the schools that end up in comprehensive and targeted support categories and what happens if schools have not exited comprehensive support after three years. **Mr. Robb** also addressed the ESSA Reporting Requirements for the school report cards.

Mr. Robb presented the remaining eight programs of the plan: Title I-C Migrant Education Program; Title I-D Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk; Title II-A Supporting Effective Instruction; Title III – English Learners Program; Title IV-A Student Support and Enrichment; Title IV-B 21st Century Community Learning Centers; Title V-B Rural Education Achievement Program; Title IX-B McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

Mr. Robb finished the presentation by speaking about the timeline and specific dates for revisions and finalizing the plan for submission to the federal government.

Chairman VanOrden asked **Dr. Linda Clark**, President of the State Board of Education, to discuss the meeting held with the stakeholders on June 26th.

PRESENTATION: **Peter Koehler**, Chief Deputy Superintendent, started the presentation on ISAT scores for English Language Arts, Math and Science and showed the charts with the Percentage of Proficient or Advanced Students in 2015, 2016 and 2017. According the Peer Review there are 6 sections for each assessment administered for accountability and Idaho meets ELA and math standards but not science. **Mr. Koehler** noted there are some issues within the test: technical quality and cognitive levels. Once the standards are finalized, the State Board of Education will bring a new test online for the school year 2018-19 for a trial run and finalize it in 2020. In order to do this, additional funds will be requested.

Mr. Koehler continued with SAT. The number of children taking the SAT is growing, but a child does not have to take the SAT to graduate. They can take the ACT. ACT tests are paid for by a student's family. The SAT is paid for by the state. Many students planning on going to college take the ACT test. **Mr. Koehler** went over the latest SAT survey results.

Mr. Koehler presented the IRI Pilot Program. The IRI was originally designed to be a diagnostic test to assist the teachers and parents to find how K-3rd students are performing. Over the years, IRI eventually evolved into a test that simply measured fluency. Fluency is important, but comprehension is what drives reading. A new IRI was generated to use new criteria to assess students. The new IRI takes about 15 minutes to complete and it is taken on a computer.

Mr. Koehler continued the presentation with Advanced Opportunities. **Mr. Koehler** went over the cost breakdown of the program. The state will be paying 12 million dollars this year for Advanced Opportunities. Dual credit courses and the top GEM and top non-GEM courses were presented.

Mr. Koehler closed his segment of the presentation with Return on Investment for Advanced Opportunities. In FY-17, every \$1.00 spent on dual credit through Advanced Opportunities saved families \$4.66 on college.

PRESENTATION: Blake Youde, Chief Communications & Legislative Affairs Office, Idaho State Board of Education started the presentation on 2015-16 Teacher Evaluation Review Phase II update. Idaho Code Section 33-1004B(14) charges the State Board of Education with conducting annually a review of a sample of teacher evaluations. The State Board works with 18 recognized experts and 180 administrators from across the state to conduct evaluations and reviews and make sure it's done annually. Purpose of the review is to determine if evaluations are being conducted with fidelity.

After the February Phase I review, the board came to the conclusion that there is clear evidence of administrators' efforts to accurately evaluate teachers in Idaho, but there is not a common understanding of requirements for conducting evaluations. Additional guidance, training, and clear direction from the state need to be provided to improve the process. Changes to three administrative rules needs to be reviewed during this upcoming session. Also, there is a need to create an evaluation clearinghouse to provide resources for district use and to explore the possibility on implementing a statewide electronic evaluation management system.

Mr. Youde noted that the board and administrators already started work on 2016-17 Evaluation Review and anticipate completing both phases by the end of 2017.

Dwight Johnson, Administrator, Idaho Career & Technical Education, gave a brief update on Career & Technical Education Program which increases career opportunities for Idahoans. Recent survey of company executives showed that availability of skilled labor has become the number one issue in their business decision making process. There are four specific components that prepare Idahoans to enter high-skilled positions in the labor market. Better connect education to employment and attract students to more technical related fields, with that the legislation will be prepared to have CTE programs presented to 7th grade students; need to continue to extend the capacity both secondary and post secondary CTE programs to exceed bigger number of students participating in it.

Mr. Johnson noted that they were pleased to receive funds to build a brand new CTE facility which expands the capacity for future students as well. To expand secondary programs, the Legislature was generous in starting a program that is a performance based funding program of FY-18 of \$300,000, and will be asking for additional dollars in FY-19 to continue that source of funding that is performance based. The additional funding will be based on results. The third component requires quality improvement of CTE programs. This includes program alignment.

Twenty-three post-secondary programs are aligned where credits will be able to transfer throughout the six technical colleges in the program.

Mr. Johnson addressed the critical problem of the shortage of CTE teachers. Idaho Career & Technical Education is trying to attract professionals who have worked in a technical industry for 20 years, and in turn, teach these people how to become teachers and instruct students in Idaho. A new process has been adopted to remove the cost barrier for private sector professionals to become teachers. This process will have no out-of-pocket expense for these people who want to become CTE teachers.

ADJOURN: There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 3:21 PM

Senator Mortimer
Co-Chair

Tetiana Kanashuk
Secretary

Representative VanOrden
Co-Chair