

MINUTES

LEGISLATIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 10, 2001

Morning—Room 519-S—Statehouse

Afternoon—State Department of Education —120 East 10th Street

September 11, 2001

Room 519-S—Statehouse

Members Present

Senator Dwayne Umbarger, Chair
Representative Jo Ann Pottorff, Vice Chair
Senator Christine Downey, Ranking Minority Member
Senator Lynn Jenkins
Senator Bob Lyon
Senator Lana Oleen
Senator John Vratil
Representative Lisa Benlon
Representative Kathe Lloyd (September 10)
Representative Bill Reardon (September 10)
Representative Ralph Tanner
Representative Jonathan Wells

Committee Members Absent

Representative Barbara Ballard

State Board of Education Members

J.B. "Sonny" Rundell, Chair
Janet Waugh, Vice Chair
Steve E. Abrams
Val DeFever
Sue Gamble
Carol Rupe
Bill Wagnon

Legislative Staff

Ben Barrett, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Carolyn Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Stuart Little, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Paul West, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Renaë Jefferies, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Avis Swartzman, Office of the Revisor of Statutes

State Department of Education Staff

Dr. Andy Tompkins, Commissioner of Education
Dale Dennis, Deputy Commissioner
Dr. Alexa Pochowski, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Learning Services
Dr. Martha Gage, Team Leader, Certification and Teacher Education

Conferees

Duane Goossen, Director, Division of the Budget
Val DeFever, Legislative Coordinator, Kansas State Board of Education
Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director of Advocacy, Kansas Association of School Boards
Mark Hauptman, Assistant Superintendent for Special Services, USD 489 (Hays)
Bruce Givens, Director, South Central Kansas Special Education Cooperative, Interlocal No. 605 (Iuka)
Deborah Haltom, Director of Special Education, USD 512 (Shawnee Mission)
Terry Collins, Director, ANW Special Education Cooperative No. 603 (Humboldt)
Dr. Leo W. Pauls, Executive Director, The Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, Emporia State University
Dr. Connie Briggs, Director, Reading Recovery Program, The Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, Emporia State University
Linda Hazel, Director, National Board Certification Program, The Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, Emporia State University
Dr. Scott Waters, Director, Future Teacher Academy, The Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, Emporia State University
Beth Warren, Administrative Assistant, Future Teacher Academy, The Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, Emporia State University

Monday, September 10

Pupil-Driven Special Education Funding

Conferees met with the Committee to address pupil-driven special education funding formulas (census-based and weighted) which had been discussed at a prior meeting. Duane Goossen, Director of the Division of the Budget, spoke in support of the Governor's special education pupil weighting formula proposed to the 2001 Legislature. Mr. Goossen said his purpose was to explain the rationale behind changing to a weighted formula and that specific features of the Governor's proposal, such as two funding levels (one for children with severe disabilities and another for all other special education children) and the specific weights assigned (3.113 and 0.6968, respectively) are subject to adjustment. (In addition, under the Governor's proposal, catastrophic aid would be funded separately.) He told the Committee the weights had been based in large part on the amount of money that the Governor was recommending for special education categorical state aid.

Mr. Goossen told the Committee the Governor's proposal is relatively simple and straightforward and has the following additional merits:

- **Equity.** A weighting formula is based on each district's number of special education students, not the general student population or the number of special education teachers, and takes into account differences in the cost of services provided. Mr. Goossen acknowledged that under the present resource-based funding system there probably is a correlation between the number of special education teachers needed and the number and severity of disabilities of special education students, but that relationship is less direct than under a pupil weighted funding formula.
- **Predictability.** Under the Governor's proposal, funding would be based on a student count that would be unchanged during the course of the year. Under the current system, districts are reimbursed for special education teachers who are hired throughout the year at the discretion of the school district. Further, the current system, which pays a portion of special education excess costs, could be viewed as a disincentive to school districts to curb the amount they spend on special education because they know that most of those costs will be reimbursed. Mr. Goossen called the goal of funding special education excess costs at the 100 percent level "an open checkbook" and called attention to data showing that growth in the number of new special education teachers over the years has exceeded the growth in numbers of new students. A weighted system is predictable because all it involves is multiplying the number of special education students by the applicable weight, whereas a system based on the number of teachers tends to leave the growth variable to the initiative of school districts.
- **Flexibility.** Lower in priority as an attribute of the Governor's plan is the fact that, if funding is tied to students, not to special education teachers,

special education teachers would have more flexibility to teach both regular and special education students. Currently, whenever a special education teacher teaches regular students, such as when special education and regular students are in the same classroom, the district must determine how much of the teacher's time is spent with special education students for purposes of special education reimbursement. Under the proposal, the district would be reimbursed for services provided each special education child and could use that money however it wishes in order to provide the service.

- **Simplicity.** Not a high priority but an attribute of the Governor's proposal nonetheless, simplicity is a virtue of a weighted formula because the number of students is merely multiplied by a weight.

In response to questions from Committee members, Mr. Goossen confirmed that paraprofessionals are included in the special education teacher count for reimbursement purposes as .4 FTE position. Committee members requested information showing the number of special education teachers and paraprofessionals listed separately.

Mr. Goossen agreed with a member who pointed out that the costs of providing similar services for students with the same disability could vary among the districts and that the Governor's proposal could require additional funding tiers. However, he cautioned against developing a complicated funding system with too many tiers.

Representative Reardon questioned Mr. Goossen about the premise underlying the Governor's proposal and asked whether cost containment is the goal and, if so, whether that goal is realistic given that the actual cost of providing special education services most likely will increase. Mr. Goossen responded by saying he has no illusions about a change in funding reducing special education costs, but basing the formula on the number of students, not on the number of teachers who are hired at the discretion of school districts, would make the growth more predictable.

Other Committee members questioned whether a weighted formula would encourage districts to over identify students with severe disabilities in order to qualify for more funding. Mr. Goossen responded that the State Board of Education has and could strengthen guidelines for various exceptionalities that would control the placement of students in special education categories and that the responsibility for ensuring that special education students are not over identified ultimately rests with the State Board.

Val DeFever, Member of the State Board of Education, reaffirmed the State Board's endorsement of the Governor's proposal, which originally had been given during the 2001 Session (Attachment 1). Ms. DeFever explained that the State Board is concerned about the possibility that school districts may over identify special education students in order to add more teachers. In addition, she pointed out that school districts currently are forced to transfer about \$100 million from their general funds to make up a special education funding deficit. The State Board's endorsement assumes that catastrophic aid would be in addition to the two tiers proposed by the Governor.

To provide more funding for special education, the State Board has adopted the policy that there should be a three-year phase in of funding to reach the goal of 100 percent funding of excess costs, with 90 percent funded the first year, 95 percent the second, and 100 percent the third.

Ms. DeFever cited advantages of the Governor's proposal, including a reduction in paperwork and record keeping and the inclusion of special education weights as part of the school finance formula, eliminating the necessity of running the special education appropriation through the formula in order to maximize local option budget authority. (Ms. DeFever's testimony, which is Attachment 1, includes a computer run showing the effect of the Governor's proposal on school districts.)

Committee members asked Dale Dennis, State Department of Education, if he could provide a comparison of what school districts would receive in special education funding under current law and under the Governor's proposal. Mr. Dennis explained that the information could be obtained for school districts that are not members of interlocals or cooperatives, but for those that are, the task of attributing costs for consolidated services to individual participating districts is formidable.

Mark Hauptman, Hays West Central Kansas Special Education Cooperative, argued that the current special education funding system should be retained (Attachment 2). Mr. Hauptman told the Committee that, while the current system fails to fully fund all special education excess costs, it has the merit of allowing districts to be reimbursed for teachers who are added during the year and is understood and accepted by the field. The fact that less than full excess costs is funded eliminates the possibility that school districts will profit from over identifying special education students or adding more teachers than they need. In contrast, according to Mr. Hauptman, census-based and weighted pupil formulas encourage the over identification of special education students.

In discussion with Committee members, Mr. Hauptman said that, even if his district were to receive more money under a different funding formula, he would prefer the current funding method because it is based on sound policy.

Bruce Givens, South Central Kansas Special Education Cooperative, Interlocal No. 605, supported retaining the current special education funding formula because it is stable and has endured the test of time (Attachment 3). However, if the Legislature is determined to make a change, he proposes the following plan that combines features of the existing formula and census-based and weighted funding:

- **Categorical Aid.** Local education agencies would receive teaching unit reimbursement for up to two directors of special education and for providers who work with early childhood special education students. This funding component would account for about 10 percent of special education excess costs.
- **Census-Based Funding.** School districts would receive 70 percent of special education excess costs funding for special education students, based on the statewide prevalence rate for special education students.

- **Pupil Weighting.** School districts would be eligible to receive additional funding for special education students with severe disabilities. This funding would account for about 10 percent of special education excess costs.
- **Catastrophic and Transportation Aid.** Current funding formulas for catastrophic and transportation aid would be continued.

Elaborating on his prepared remarks, Mr. Givens said that the Governor's proposal will increase the number of students identified as needing special education services because districts will believe by doing so they can get more funding. In addition, because funding is tied to the student, there would be no incentive to set goals for special education students that eventually would result in them discontinuing special education services.

Deborah Haltom, USD 512 (Shawnee Mission), expressed her support for census-based funding (Attachment 4). Ms. Haltom explained that she has worked in states that use census-based and weighted formulas for special education and her opinion is that census-based funding is the best because it:

- allows for the most local control;
- is the most neutral on the issue of identification;
- focuses more on student needs rather than labeling requirements;
- reduces more restrictive and higher cost services; and
- is fairer.

According to Ms. Haltom, assigning weights to students based on level of disability can drive costs up because parents of more severely disabled students will demand more services because they know that school districts will be reimbursed at a higher level for services provided. Ms. Haltom challenged the Committee to identify ways in which school districts could cut special education costs, given that services are mandated by state or federal law and that case law has tended to support the expansion of services that are required.

Terry Collins, ANW Special Education Cooperative No. 603, told the Committee that the eight school districts served by his special education cooperative have had declining enrollment, but special education enrollments and the number of special education teachers and paraprofessionals has increased. Mr. Collins attributed some of the increase in students who need special education services to socioeconomic conditions. In addition, deinstitutionalization and placement of foster care children in special education programs have contributed to the increase. He said that in his area there are 22 hard-to-manage students in local high schools and there are three autistic children who will require a total of

\$120,000 in special education services. The situation is compounded by the fact that special education teachers are hard to find and the cooperative is having to hire teachers with waivers in order to fully staff programs.

Mr. Collins listed several components of a good special education funding formula:

- The formula must take into account the fact that school districts in general must provide employee salaries and benefits.
- The formula must be equitable.
- The formula should fully fund special education transportation and catastrophic aid.

Following Mr. Collins' presentation, the Committee engaged in discussion with the conferees. Mr. Hauptman was asked to comment on the possibility that school districts have an incentive to add special education paraprofessionals because the lower salary for such staff, equated to full-time, could be paid all or in large part by teaching unit categorical aid. (That amount is estimated to be \$20,507 in FY 2002.) He responded that, unlike special education teachers whose salaries in most cases are only about half covered by special education categorical aid, salaries of paraprofessionals who make about \$7 per hour (which would equate to about \$20,000 per year) could be paid entirely from the per teacher reimbursement and thus would be more economical to hire than special education teachers.

Regarding incentives under the various funding proposals being discussed, Mr. Collins said that under census-based funding those districts with a high incidence of special education students would be disadvantaged because the amount of funding available would be based on a statewide average, not on the actual number of special education students who need to be served. He also explained that under a weighting formula the incentive would be to classify a student as needing as many services as possible in order to benefit from more funding. Under the current system, Mr. Collins said the tendency is to classify the child as less, rather than more, disabled, when a child could fit into two categories.

Mr. Hauptman responded to a question about how it is possible for some districts to have special education excess costs funded at greater than 100 percent by saying that it would be possible if teacher salaries were relatively low and the district received low-enrollment weighting. (The question referred to findings of an audit of selected districts conducted by the Legislative Division of Post Audit in 1998.) Ms. Haltom commented on an aspect of Kansas law that allows parents of students enrolled in private schools to request that the full range of special education services provided by public schools be made available to private school children. She explained that Kansas law requires public school districts to provide more services than are required under federal law. Dale Dennis was asked whether it is possible to determine the cost of special education services provided private school students and he responded that those costs are not readily available. He then was asked if such data could be provided for those districts that are not members of special education cooperatives, for which it is presumed that the data are easier to obtain.

(Staff Note: Testimony regarding pupil-driven special education funding continued the following day.)

Meeting with the State Board of Education

The Committee met jointly with the State Board of Education for the purpose of addressing the following questions:

- What obstacles do school districts encounter which prevent them from helping all students learn well?
- What changes need to be made to overcome these obstacles?

The questions were considered by five groups comprised of State Board members, Committee members, and staff and the session was videotaped. Responses by the groups included the following:

Group One, Chaired by Dr. Bill Wagnon

- Children are not learning what they are supposed to be learning, which requires educators and policy makers to develop a better understanding of what constitutes at-risk behavior and how to deal with students who are not achieving. Specific programs need to be targeted for early childhood education and non-native speakers. Parents should be encouraged to become more involved in their children's education and programs such as Parents As Teachers should be expanded. Attention must be given to foster children who are in the educational system, including ways to better maintain and transfer records. Test scores from the state assessments for all children should be disseminated promptly.
- The commitment to professional development should be taken more seriously, including the assurance that teachers will receive appropriate pay and benefits. Class size also should be limited.

Group Two, Chaired by Representative Pottorff

- Discipline is a problem, which could be addressed by setting clear expectations and, most importantly, identifying clear consequences of bad behavior.
- Cultural factors, including the home atmosphere, have deteriorated, which could be addressed by the establishment of networks for parents and educators, with programs intended to make parents partners in their child's education.

- Limited time to accomplish educational goals is a problem, which could be addressed both by specific programs, such as extended day, weekend, and summer school activities, but also by a change in attitude that places a higher value on academics than on extracurricular activities.
- The student population is more diverse, creating a need for smaller class size in order to meet the needs of all students and for better teacher preparation to address the needs of students “who are not in the middle.”

Group Three, Chaired by Val DeFever

- Expectations have been raised and additional demands placed on the educational system, which can be met by having longer school days and by creating partnerships that involve parents, educators, business leaders, and the wider community.
- There is a teacher shortage, which can be addressed by higher pay, alternative routes to teacher certification, greater use of provisional certification, development of incentives to recruit staff for hard-to-fill positions, and innovations such as “grow your own teacher” programs.
- Technological changes require the development and expansion of a network to make technology available at a reasonable cost to school districts.

Group Four, Chaired by Carol Rupe

- The Legislature tends to micromanage, which thwarts flexibility at the local level and ignores the constitutional role of local governing boards.
- There are unfunded mandates and a lack of funding for disadvantaged students, which could be addressed by adequate funding of Base State Aid Per Pupil. In addition, multi-year funding would lend more stability and allow for better planning.
- There is a lack of clarity about what schools are supposed to do, which could be addressed by clearer expectations.
- The quality of teaching sometimes is poor, which could be addressed by more teacher scholarships in order to attract better people to the profession, salary differentials for teachers based on qualifications and willingness to work in hard-to-fill areas, and teacher mentoring.
- There is a lack of time to devote to academics, which could be addressed by longer school days.

Group Five, Chaired by Senator Oleen

- Problems exist with teachers that include lack of adequate staff development and mentoring and lack of meaningful rewards for teachers. These problems could be addressed by developing inservice opportunities to meet building needs, providing more mentoring of new teachers, and the institution of a reward system for teachers and for buildings. It is important to make any reward system building-wide because if students succeed, it is due to the efforts of all teachers involved.
- The socio-economic background of students causes some to be at-risk and also may cause educators to assume that the students cannot succeed. Efforts must be made to provide extended day opportunities and most particularly to keep expectations high for all students, regardless of their backgrounds.
- Parents often are uninvolved in their child's education, which could be addressed by programs and innovations intended to make parents partners in their child's education, including the scheduling of conferences at a time that is more convenient for parents.
- The same classroom most likely contains students who are learning at different levels, which necessitates such things as longer school days.

Tuesday, September 11

Pupil-Driven Special Education Funding (continued)

Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards, lent his association's support to the recommendation of the State Board of Education that 100 percent funding of special education excess costs be phased in over a three-year period (Attachment 5). He spoke in opposition to census-based funding on the grounds that such a system does not take into account differences in the number of special education students among districts or in the cost of services districts must provide. He told the Committee his organization could support a pupil-weighting system such as that proposed by the Governor's Task Force on the 21st Century as long as care is given to ensure that the weights accurately reflect differences in costs, that there are ongoing adjustments made to the weights so that they continue to reflect actual costs, and that no district would lose money in the conversion from the current funding formula to a new one.

Mr. Tallman elaborated by saying that, because special education is mandated by both state and federal law, students are entitled to services. This fact means that there are few opportunities to reduce costs. In discussion with Committee members, Mr. Tallman said he does not think converting to a pupil-weighting system would result in over-identification of special education students because of guidelines and constraints imposed by the State

Board of Education. He noted that those states that have pupil-weighting systems do not evidence a particularly high incidence of special education students. He said he thinks a pupil-weighting model could provide more flexibility for school districts, assuming that the Legislature does not impose excessive constraints, and cautioned that a weighting system should be based on actual costs of services, not merely on special education labels.

Activities of the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, Emporia State University

Dr. Leo Pauls, Executive Director of the Jones Institute, introduced staff members and discussed several activities of the Institute (Attachment 6). He told the Committee that an expected study of teacher supply and demand, which traditionally has been done on a regular basis by Emporia State University, will not be completed this year because only about 75 to 80 percent of the school districts responded to the survey. Dr. Pauls said he is working with the State Department of Education to see if a cooperative venture can be instituted which would result in better participation by all school districts in the future. It is possible the study could be expanded to include data on all school personnel, not just teachers.

Dr. Connie Briggs, Director of Reading Recovery, told the Committee that the program to prepare teachers to become Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders requires one year to complete and requires that the teacher already have a Masters degree. She said that a Teacher Leader could train between 8 and 12 other teachers a year and that those teachers can serve a total of about 85 students. She said that a study of the Reading Recovery program at the Southwest Regional Service Center in Sublette shows that, of 850 students who were served, more than 80 percent are able to function on their own in the regular classroom and no longer need reading services. Dr. Briggs cited studies that show that Reading Recovery is one of the least expensive intervention models available, costing less than federal programs for disadvantaged students, special education programs, and grade retention. The program targets low-achieving first grade students, provides individual lessons taught by trained reading teachers, and provides intensive, short-term intervention.

Kansas currently has nine Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders who are counted as special education teachers for purposes of special education reimbursement, up to an aggregate limit of \$180,000. Dr. Briggs told the Committee that locating Teacher Leaders at service centers throughout the state is a good way to ensure that all districts have access to the Reading Recovery program. In response to a question, Dr. Briggs agreed that a Regents university, with appropriate funding, could serve as a resource for a state network of Reading Recovery centers and suggested that Emporia State University is well situated to perform that role.

The relatively small number of Teacher Leaders in Kansas means that Kansas has not participated in some national studies of the effectiveness of the program, according to Dr. Briggs. However, she said Emporia State University is conducting its own study and should have a report available in the next year. In response to a question about how students are identified to be in Reading Recovery programs, Dr. Briggs said multiple assessments, including observation, are used. She explained that the decision to

participate in the Reading Recovery program is made at the school district level and could involve hiring a Teacher Leader or providing training to currently-employed teachers. When asked whether volunteers might not be a more cost-efficient way to work with students who need help with reading, Dr. Briggs responded that volunteers are effective in the classroom, but for those students who are poor learners, the specialized diagnostic and reading skills of a well-trained reading teacher are needed.

Dr. Scott Walters, Director of the Future Teacher Academy, presented information about the Academy, including the fact that 65 percent of participants in the years 1989 through 1997 selected teacher education as their field of study. The Academy has been an annual event for 12 years and allows approximately 50 high school juniors and seniors to participate in an intensive four- to-six-day program intended to keep them in Kansas and motivate them to prepare to enter the teaching profession. The Academy received an appropriation of \$65,000 for FY 2002, which replaces lost private foundation funding.

Dr. Walters told the Committee that the following new activities are planned:

- The establishment of a second site in order to expand the program to a total of 100 students and to make it more accessible (discussion is underway with Dodge City USD 443).
- The establishment of a “junior” academy for recent eighth grade graduates, targeting diverse ethnic backgrounds and minority status.
- An expansion of educators who participate in the Academy to include National Teacher Hall of Fame inductees, Kansas Teacher of the Year recipients, and National Board certified teachers.

Linda Hazel, Director of the National Board Certification Program, reported that there is research showing that teachers who are National Board certified are perceived to be better teachers. She said a study of National Board certified teachers in Kansas is underway and will produce data that can be used to assess the effectiveness of the program.

Among information presented by Ms. Hazel is a listing that shows the number of National Board certificated teachers in each state. The number of National Board certified teachers in Kansas is 43. Commenting on states that have large numbers, such as North Carolina, Ms. Hazel explained that some states give bonuses as an incentive to become National Board certificated, provide higher pay, or offer other incentives. At the request of the Committee, Ms. Hazel agreed to provide additional information about incentives in other states. She also agreed to provide information about the number of teachers on a waiting list to participate in the National Board Certification Program in Kansas.

In Kansas, teachers are given a stipend of \$1,000 to participate in the program and receive an annual bonus of \$1,000 for each of the ten years for which certification is valid. Additional funding to pay for teachers who enter the program is provided by federal grants. For example, Kansas State University is the recipient of a three-year Teacher Quality

Enhancement Grant and some of that money has been used to help teachers obtain National Board certification.

In response to a question from Senator Lyon, Ms. Hazel agreed that methods used to assess the effectiveness of National Board certified teachers could be used to assess the performance of all teachers. Senator Lyon noted that reliable assessments would make it possible to evaluate teachers who enter the classroom via alternative certification routes.

Dr. Pauls provided information about a project of the Renaissance Group, a coalition of 35 universities with teacher education programs that prepare one in ten new teachers nationwide. He said the Group recently has received two large federal grants. One is a three-year \$8.0 million grant to be used to determine what schools of education should be teaching new teachers so that the teachers will be more effective. The other will be used to fund a study by Keith Geiger, the Jones Distinguished Professor, who is doing a study of international students at two- and four-year institutions in Kansas.

Beth Warren concluded the presentation by Jones Institute staff members by telling the Committee that all programs at the Institute are oriented toward teachers.

Senator Oleen said she wants the Committee to consider recommending to the 2002 Legislature continued maintenance and enhancement of programs underway at the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence.

School Finance Study

Staff reviewed the bid to do an evaluation of the cost of a suitable education that was submitted by A & M (Augenblick and Myers), in conjunction with the National Conference of State Legislatures and the Education Commission of the States ([Attachment 7](#)). The staff explained that notice of the Request for Proposal was widely disseminated among research groups and national organizations, including those with an education orientation. Other than A & M, the only other individual or organization that expressed interest in the proposal was a Kansas State University professor, Dr. David Thompson, who has experience in school finance and has served as an expert witness in school finance litigation. The staff explained that both A & M and Dr. Thompson had requested and been supplied additional information about the proposal, but that Dr. Thompson decided not to submit a bid because he thinks the endeavor should involve the convening of a national panel and should be done over a longer span of time than currently is contemplated.

Committee members expressed concern that the current completion date (March 29) may have discouraged others from bidding, but also noted that there probably are only a few individuals and groups in the country that are qualified to do such a study and the submission of only one bid perhaps is not surprising.

Senator Oleen assured members that, in her opinion, the Legislative Coordinating Council would not object if the study is not done until the 2002 Session ends, noting that quality is important and also that the Legislature probably could not devote full attention to the study if it becomes available just as the session is concluding. Senator Oleen also

suggested that contact should be made with other states in which A & M has conducted studies to check references.

Concern was expressed that the major participants in the study have an education orientation, which could preclude other interests, such as parents, local board members, and representatives of the community at large, from being considered. Several members expressed confidence that the Committee itself would provide outside input in meetings with the consultants and that the consultants themselves will have to get the input of others in order for the study to be accomplished. It also was noted that the parties who submitted the bid represent a public-private mix of interests, including the business community represented by the Education Commission of the States.

Representative Tanner made a motion, seconded by Senator Downey, that the Committee accept the bid submitted by A & M, in consultation with the National Conference of State Legislatures and the Education Commission of the States, and that the completion date of the study be extended. Senator Vratil objected to taking action and pointed out that, as long as it is agreed there is no urgency to complete the study, the Committee should allocate adequate time to check references for A & M and to meet with the consultants at the October meeting. Upon the initiative of the mover and seconder of the motion, the motion to approve the bid was tabled.

The Committee directed the staff to arrange for representatives of A & M to be at the next Committee meeting for the purpose of discussing the study and receiving input from members. Based on what transpires at that meeting, the assumption is that a contract will be developed that can be submitted to the Legislative Coordinating Council for approval. The staff also was instructed to make relevant recent audits done by the Legislative Division of Post Audit available to A & M.

Committee members continued their discussion about who should have input in the study. Senator Vratil observed that educators are the persons most knowledgeable about education and that the consultants are in the best position to know how the study should proceed. Senator Oleen agreed that the consultants know best how to conduct a study, but they should be informed that the Committee expects them to get broad input that extends beyond teachers. Senator Lyon expressed concern that professional consultants with an education orientation would produce a study that supports the status quo and that input should be sought that includes expenditure data from private schools.

Meeting Date Change

The Committee agreed to change its early-October meeting dates from October 1 and 2 to October 8 and 9.

Committee Minutes

Upon a motion by Representative Pottorff, seconded by Senator Jenkins, the minutes of the meeting of August 27-28 were approved.

The meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by Carolyn Rampey

Approved by Committee on:

October 8, 2001