

# MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2149

2001 SENATE EDUCATION

SB 2149

2001 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2149

Senate Education Committee

Conference Committee

Hearing Date 01-24-01

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1	x		0 - end
1		x	0 - 6.6
2		x	39 - 45.3

Committee Clerk Signature *Andrea Johnson*

Minutes: **CHAIRMAN FREBORG** called the committee to order.

**Attendance was taken with all members present.**

**CHAIRMAN FREBORG** called the hearing on SB 2149 which relates to required school curricula.

**Testimony in support of SB 2149:**

**GREG GALLAGHER**, Education Improvement Team Leader, DPI, testified in support of the bill. (see attached testimony). **SENATOR O'CONNELL** asked about Section 6, Repeal. He stated the repealer is the result of the interim committee on the rewrite of Title 15 with the recommendation that all sections within 15-38 be stricken and be reworked into what has now become 15.1-21. (this is identified in HB 1045).

**LINDA EDWARDS**, Director of Professional Development, NDEA, presented prepared testimony. (see attached). **SENATOR KELSH** asked her if she felt technology and voc/tech should be left out of standards. She stated that as a teacher she works with curriculum that

includes technology. SENATOR WANZEK asked with content standards and assessment, is there still enough flexibility for the classroom teacher to be creative and innovative in addressing a unique and local need of the students. She felt there is flexibility in aligning the curricula to the National Standards and she was never told how to teach to accomplish that. SENATOR FREBORG asked if NDEA believes in Standards and Assessment. She stated that Standards are critical and Assessment should be authentic and multiple source, based on what the student learned in the classroom.

**Testimony in opposition to SB 2149:**

JIM HOFMAN, Superintendent of Shiloh Christian School, presented prepared testimony in opposition to the bill. (see attached).

TONY WEILER, State Association of Nonpublic Schools (SANS), presented testimony in opposition to the bill. (see attached).

WILLIAM M. SCHUH, presented testimony in opposition to the bill. (see attached).

STEVE CATES feels the bill puts control of significant amounts of education in the hands of the Supt. Of DPI. He feels in the flow of dollars, there are rules to follow to receive money. He further feels there are many parents who do not support that concept. He wonders how our country got to where it is without standardized education. He feels standardized education downplays individualism. He would like to see local districts be able to adopt parts of the standards they feel are necessary. Also, this bill does not identify a specific problem.

CAM LEDAHL stated the founding fathers did not plan for central control over education. He feels local districts and parents should have a say in what their children are being taught. He feels standards should be voluntary.

**Those testifying in a Neutral position on SB 2149.**

Page 3  
Senate Education Committee  
Bill/Resolution Number sb 2149  
Hearing Date 01-23-01

DEAN BARD, ND Small Organized Schools, sees a need for standards. However, NDSOS supports SB 2036. The concern with this bill is the standards outlined should be developed by a wide range of input (boards, parents, etc.). They further feel the standards should be developed through the hearing process which would be a safeguard for the local community.

**The hearing on SB 2149 was closed.**

**TAPE 2, SIDE B, 39.0 - 45.3**

**SENATOR COOK moved a DO NOT PASS. Seconded by SENATOR FLAKOLL.**

**Roll call vote: 7 YES. 0 NO. 0 Absent. Motion Carried.**

**Carrier: SENATOR FLAKOLL**

**The Committee stood adjourned.**

**FISCAL NOTE**  
 Requested by Legislative Council  
 12/26/2000

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2149

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
<b>Revenues</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Expenditures</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	\$90,000
<b>Appropriations</b>	\$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	\$640,000

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

SB 2149 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, physical education.
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 2149, 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 2149, 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

Phy Ed-Complete-0

Phy Ed-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 2149 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 2149 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 2149 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 extensive professional development into the costs of such projects.

ESEA and Goals 2000 funding have been available to local districts and consortia for the past six years and has afforded many districts the opportunity to develop their own comparable content standards and curriculum alignment. Within SB 2149, any such projects are strictly voluntary with costs to be incurred by the district or nonpublic school that seeks such an option. Federal funds are readily available to local



districts and nonpublic schools through various professional development and curriculum development programs.

If a district were to develop its own alternate content standards at a minimal benchmark level using various outside documents for validation, it may, based on historical documentation, anticipate a cost of \$5,000. This cost would only cover the alternate content standards and not curriculum alignment. However, since an alternate standard is not required by SB 2149, it would not be an appropriate state cost. Therefore, the estimated, required, financial impact to local districts and nonpublic schools regarding alternate content standards, is \$ 0, local funds.

### *3. Aligning curriculum to content standards.*

SB 2149 provides that the state superintendent require local districts or nonpublic schools to align their curriculum to approved content standards at the benchmark grades 4, 8, and 12. The process of aligning curriculum to approved standards is to be phased in over the course of three school years.

Because content standards, by their nature, are high-level content guides, they cannot stand alone as a legitimate curricular tool ready for classroom use. Content standards, instead, serve as a foundation upon which any curriculum is built. And it is expected that any such alignment process will cost money. Any alignment activity must minimally address the benchmark grades 4, 8, and 12. To align additional grades beyond the benchmark is strictly voluntary.

The costs incurred by a district to align curriculum to standards can vary considerably, depending on the scope of the project's grade levels and the depth of research undertaken by the district. As itemized above regarding standards development, a review of historical, local Goals 2000 curriculum development grants indicates that local district can spend between \$5,000 and \$40,000 to align curriculum to standards per discipline. Although, it must be noted, higher-priced projects cover expanded k-12 grades and incorporate extensive professional development into the costs of such projects.

ESEA and Goals 2000 funding have been available to local districts and consortia for the past six years and have afforded many districts with the opportunity to align curriculum to standards. Federal funds are readily available to local districts and nonpublic schools through various professional development and curriculum development programs.

Based on historical grant documentation and a budget survey of three districts engaged in extensive curriculum alignment, the establishment of content standards, and the alignment of curriculum to standards combined at grades 4, 8, and 12 would cost districts or consortia approximately \$5,000 per discipline to conduct. A \$5,000 estimate is considered liberal to accomplish the minimal requirements of SB 2149. The chart below offers an overview of the estimated costs per year per district/consortium to be in compliance with SB 2149. It must be noted, that many schools conduct curriculum development and professional development within consortia. It is reasonable to assume, based on historical practice, that the vast majority

of districts would develop curriculum alignment within a consortium.

**Local District/Consortium Impact for Curriculum Alignment At Benchmark Grades 4, 8, 12  
2002-2003**

ELA-\$5,000

Math-\$5,000

**2003-2004**

Science-\$5,000

Soc Studies-\$5,000

**2004-2005**

Health-\$5,000

Phy Ed-\$5,000

Based on the table above, a district/consortium that would conduct its own curriculum alignment would incur a cost of approximately \$45,000 to accomplish the requirements of SB 2149 over a three-year span. It is estimated, based on previous curriculum development activity, that approximately 20 districts might participate in independent curriculum development activities and the remaining districts might participate within approximately 40 curriculum development consortia. Therefore, if each district or consortium pursued its own independent curriculum alignment activities, 65 district/consortium centers combined would generate separate curriculum alignment activities at an estimated cost of \$325,000 per discipline.

Three mitigating factors will lessen any such development costs that might be absorbed by the state's general fund. First, several districts and consortia (e.g., Grand Forks, Bismarck, Wahpeton) have invested considerable financial and human resources, with the aid of federal grants, to generate grade-specific, k-12, content standards and aligned curricula in most disciplines. These products have undergone considerable validity reviews and are being made available to any interested districts or consortia, free of charge. Such free exchanges of products have greatly reduced development costs to districts. Even if a district were to develop its own curriculum alignment, it would do so at a reduced cost. Given the requirements of SB 2149, it is conceivable and permissible for a district to adopt the aligned curriculum of another district or consortium at no cost. Therefore, if a district were to adopt another district's curriculum alignment, it is possible for a district to meet the full requirements of SB 2149 for \$0.

Second, many districts have already invested into and completed their curriculum alignment activities. Although the Department of Public Instruction has not collected curriculum alignment data thus far, anecdotal reports from the field indicate increased alignment activity within the past three years. Curriculum development is an ongoing, historical activity of districts. It is something that simply must be

