

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2036

2001 SENATE EDUCATION

SB 2036

2001 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2036

Senate Education Committee

Conference Committee

Hearing Date 01-24-01

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1		x	42.7 - end
2	x		0 - 46.7
2 (01-31-01)	x		46.5 - end
2 (01-31-01)		x	0 - 15.0
Committee Clerk Signature <i>Andrea Johnson</i>			

Minutes: CHAIRMAN FREBORG called the hearing on SB 2036 relating to the adoption of state academic content standards for schools, and to the approval of schools.

Testimony in support of SB 2036.

ANITA THOMAS, Legislative Council, explained each section of the bill.

SENATOR O'CONNELL asked if there was any opposition in the interim committee. MS.

THOMAS stated there was much discussion by the interim committee..

GREG GALLAGHER, Education Improvement Team Leader, DPI, testified in support of the bill. (see attached). He stated this bill is the product of an 18 month study.

SENATOR KELSH asked if assessments were going to be required only of Title I students or all students. MR. GALLAGHER stated it would apply to all students. SENATOR O'CONNELL

asked what the repealer does. The repealers come from the proposals from the interim

committee's study on Title 15 and how to restructure. SENATOR FLAKOLL asked what the

difference in fiscal notes is for SB 2149 and SB 2036. He stated that SB 2036 incorporates some

elements (arts, technology and world languages) that the local district would address and thus the larger fiscal note. Question was asked if Federal Funds are available. Districts receive Federal Funds that are specifically directed to activities akin to what we are talking about in SB 2036 and SB 2149. In the last 5 years, the state has received (9% goes to local districts) \$8 million for GOALS 2000, which has been directed toward the improvement of curriculum across the state. In the last 5 years, ND has received about \$8 million in Title 6 Funds for innovative instructional purposes which are intended to move toward standards-based education practices. In the last 5 years, ND has received \$8 million in Title 2 Funds that are special development funds outright. In the last year the state has received the equivalent of a million dollars in professional development funds through the Class Size Reduction Act and this amount will increase over the next several years. In Title 1, there are a whole array of funds offered to local school districts to do works that are standards-based. In answer to SENATOR KELSH, MR GALLAGHER stated the authority of the Superintendent to set content standards is state law. DPI can develop content standards and make them available to local districts. SB2149 and SB 2036 states that the legislature believes that local school districts should move toward having a world view about what their content is about and that is what Standards is all about.

LINDA EDWARDS, Director of Professional Development, NDEA, presented testimony. (see attached). She believes curriculum, standards and assessments should be aligned. The trend of the past has been to teach strictly from the text book. She feels some teachers have a fear of what "standards" is and a fear that it might cause some change. SENATOR CHRISTENSON explained, "standards" are what a student should know and be able to do.

Testimony in opposition to SB 2036.

JIM HOFMAN, SANS, (see attached testimony for SB 2149) wants local school to be able to have input on standards and does not want the department to make the approved standards mandatory to non-public schools.

TONY WEILER, SANS, presented testimony (see attached). SENATOR KELSH asked if the opposition is to the cost of implementing the standards or the content of the standards. MR. WEILER stated they have opposition to both. They are opposed to who is setting standards, not the standards themselves, as long as they can be flexible and the district can decide.

WILLIAM SCHUH presented testimony (see attached).

STEVE BRANNAN, SANS, Superintendent at St. Mary's HS, Bismarck, stated DPI's guidelines for nonpublic schools are very helpful to use in putting together their curriculum. He doesn't question the standards but struggles with the mandate for nonpublic schools. SENATOR KELSH asked him if he would opt to remove nonpublic schools from the bill or would he rather the committee kill the bill. He stated he would opt to remove nonpublic schools from the bill.

SUZIE SUND opposes this bill because the local school won't be able to set standards without repercussion or loss of funds.

Written testimony presented from CHARLES DeREMÉR, Superintendent For Instructional Services for the Fargo Public Schools.

There being no further testimony, the hearing was closed on SB 2036.

The committee stood adjourned.

01-31-01, Tape 2, Side A, 46.5 - end, Side B, 0 --15.0

Discussion SB 2036. GREG GALLAGHER, DPI, stated this bill does not jeopardize Title I money. This takes some flexibility from the local districts which now are free to choose how

Page 4

Senate Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number SB 2036
Hearing Date ~~01-24-01~~

131-01

they move toward content standards. SENATOR CHRISTENSON feels this is a great boost, nothing to fear. She likes the fact that local schools still have control but are to adopt standards and core curriculum, and assessments and benchmarks. If the local districts don't act now in determining their own needs, someone or something will decide for them. SENATOR COOK stated that mandates are not wanted by local districts. SENATOR KELSH stated that this bill states either the local district adopt the states' standards or develop their own, subject to approval. More discussion.

SENATOR COOK moved a DO NOT PASS. Seconded by SENATOR WANZEK.

Roll Call Vote: 4 YES. 3 NO. 0 Absent. Motion Carried.

Carrier: SENATOR WANZEK

FISCAL NOTE
 Requested by Legislative Council
 12/14/2000

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2036

Amendment to:

1A. State fiscal effect: *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	1999-2001 Biennium		2001-2003 Biennium		2003-2005 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	\$90,000
Appropriations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect: *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

1999-2001 Biennium			2001-2003 Biennium			2003-2005 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$320,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,120,000

2. Narrative: *Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.*

SB 2036 proposes to establish state content standards, to require the adoption of local content standards, and to require the alignment of state standards to local curriculum. The proposed legislation would enact the following provisions:

1. Content standards are to be developed by the state and set at benchmark grades 4, 8, and 12.
2. Content standards would be phased in over a span of two successive school years, beginning with 2002, until all of the following disciplines were fully implemented: English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, health, the arts, physical education, world languages, and technology.
3. State content standards in every discipline would be continuously updated every five years to remain current with accepted practices.
4. Local districts and nonpublic schools would either adopt the state content standards or develop alternative content standards that meet or exceed the rigor of the state standards, as validated by the state superintendent of public instruction.
5. Local districts and nonpublic schools would align their curriculum to the approved content standards for

each discipline. This alignment process would be phased in over a span of three school years, beginning in 2002.

A. Logistical and budgetary impacts to the state.

Within SB 2036, a requirement is placed on the state superintendent to develop state content standards at benchmark grades 4, 8, and 12, in nine discipline areas. These standards are to be updated on a five-year cycle.

Content standards development costs.

The Department of Public Instruction has developed detailed protocols concerning the development and continual revision of state content standards. Given the product and timeline requirements of SB 2036, the Department of Public Instruction will meet all product deadlines as stipulated. The Department's product protocols will accommodate any future scheduled updates. Scheduled revisions to current standards will begin in 2001-2002.

All products have been produced with the use of federal Goals 2000 and Title VI funds. The use of federal funding to revise future updates to the state content standards is contingent on the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In the event that future federal funding is inadequate, any future updating of state standards would need to shift to state funding. It is estimated, based on well-established practices, that the cost of updating each discipline will approximate \$30,000. An estimated breakdown of development costs to be incurred by the state is provided below.

State Impact to Develop State Content Standards, Benchmark Grades 4, 8, 12
2002-2003

ELA-Revision-\$30,000

Math-Complete-0

Science-Complete-0

Soc Studies-Complete-0

2003-2004

Health-Complete-0

Arts-Complete-0

Phy Ed-Complete-0

World Languages-Complete-0

Math-Revision-\$30,000

2004-2005

Science-Revision-\$30,000

Health-Revision-\$30,000

B. Logistical and budgetary impacts to local districts and nonpublic schools.

Within SB 2036 a requirement is placed on local districts and nonpublic schools to (1) adopt or adapt the state content standards and (2) to align local curriculum to the approved standards.

In establishing estimates to local districts and nonpublic schools, a clear understanding of the proposal's stated requirements is required.

1. Adopting state content standards.

SB 2036 states that local districts and nonpublic schools can minimally adopt the state's content standards at benchmark grades 4, 8, 12. Since the state assumes the full cost and responsibility for developing state content standards at grades 4, 8, and 12, a local district or nonpublic school need assume no cost in adopting state content standards. A district or nonpublic school need only enact through a formal resolution of its school board the adoption of the state's content standards to be in compliance with this provision. It is assumed, however, that the district will incur minimal costs associated with reviewing, publishing, and distributing the standards. These costs are currently absorbed by districts as they regularly review their curriculum guides. The estimated financial impact per local district or nonpublic school, however, for the actual development of the content standards is \$ 0, local funds.

2. Developing alternate academic content standards.

SB 2036 allows local districts or nonpublic schools, at their voluntary discretion, to develop alternate content standards that meet or exceed the rigor of the state's content standards as determined by the state superintendent. Any such standards must minimally address the benchmark grades 4, 8, and 12.

The costs incurred by a district to develop alternate content standards can vary considerably, depending on the scope of grade levels within the project and the depth of research undertaken by the district. A review of historical, local Goals 2000 curriculum development grants indicates that a local district can spend between \$5,000 and \$40,000 to develop alternate content standards per discipline. Although, it must be noted, higher-priced projects cover expanded k-12 grades and incorporate additional curricular alignment and

