



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

April 22, 2003

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Thomas D. Watkins, Jr., Chairman

SUBJECT: Update on Educational Legislation

A package of bills was introduced in the Senate that would provide some cost efficiencies for schools based upon input received from several hearings that the Senate Education Committee held over the last couple of months. Department of Education staff has analyzed the proposed bills. The bills and analyses are described below.

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Bill Number</i>	<i>Description</i>
2	SB 364	<i>School Days; Eliminates minimum 180 day requirement for pupil instruction.</i>
17	SB 365	<i>School Data; Requires the Center for Educational Performance and Information to collect all school data.</i>
27	SB 366	<i>Professional Development; Eliminates professional development requirements.</i>
34	SB 367	<i>Categorical Fund Use; Eliminates restrictions on use of at-risk and early childhood funding.</i>
52	SB 368-369	<i>Accreditation; Eliminates state accreditation program and financial penalties for schools that are not accredited.</i>

It is recommended that the State Board of Education receive the Update on Educational Legislation as provided in the Superintendent's memorandum dated April 22, 2003.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • HERBERT S. MOYER – TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • ELIZABETH W. BAUER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

DRAFT

THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Date: April 22, 2003
Bill Number: Senate Bill 364
Sponsor: Senator Valde Garcia

Purpose:

Senate Bill 364 would amend section 388.1701 of the *State School Aid Act* to eliminate the requirement that local school districts provide a minimum of 180 days of pupil instruction. The financial penalty for providing fewer than 180 instructional days would be removed although the requirement to provide a minimum of 1,098 hours would be retained. The requirement that 75% of a district's membership needs to be in attendance on each day in order for the district to receive full funding for that day would be eliminated.

Arguments For:

- Providing a district more flexibility to establish an alternative school calendar with fewer instructional days could result in reduced expenditures for utilities, transportation, food service, and staff support.
- Adjusting the school calendar to provide fewer but longer instructional days could provide students with more time during the day to focus on any given curriculum area or assignment.
- Research has demonstrated that student dropout rates decline and teacher and student attendance improves in districts that have established a four-day school week. (Litke, 1994)
- In districts that adopt a four-day school week, the fifth day could be used for remedial

education, student enrichment, and/or professional development.

- Districts could make up lost instructional time due to snow days, etc., by rescheduling half-days as full-days or otherwise extending the length of the school day rather than adding days to the school calendar.
- There is nothing in current law that would prevent a district from adopting an unusual calendar or school day, such as scheduling Saturday classes, or a school day that begins at noon or runs into the evening. Further, a district may already schedule a four-day school week while remaining in compliance with the instructional day and hour requirement. That few if any districts have adopted such a calendar or schedule may indicate that local school boards would be hesitant to make such a move without the support and concurrence of the staff and community.

Arguments Against:

- There is concern that an alternative school schedule could be adopted without demonstrated community support, solely for the purpose of saving money. There are no accountability measures required by the bill. Current law allows the State Superintendent to waive the minimum day requirement if the district has adopted an experimental school year. The State Superintendent has the authority to require accountability measures to assure community support and academic achievement.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • HERBERT S. MOYER – TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • ELIZABETH W. BAUER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

- Research has shown that unsupervised students get into more trouble during the hours of 3:00-6:00 p.m. If a district adopted a four-day school week, students who no longer require child care would have more unsupervised time, which may result in serious parental and community concerns. (FBI National Incident Based Reporting System, 1997.)
- If a district adopted a calendar of fewer but longer school days, it may be difficult for a special education or elementary student to adjust. This may negatively impact their social and academic achievement.
- A school calendar that may differ markedly from parents' work schedules (i.e., four-day school week) has the potential of disrupting existing child care arrangements. It may be costly and difficult for parents to arrange child care on the fifth day.
- The elimination of the requirement that 75% of a district's membership be in attendance on a given instructional day in order for the district to receive full funding for that day may result in reduced pupil attendance.

Suggested Amendments:

- Under the *Public School Employees Retirement Act*, a member is granted one year of service credit for at least 6 hours per day and 170 days in a school year. The act would need to be amended to adjust this hour and day requirement. (See HB 4114 and HB 4486, as introduced.)
- Current law "forgives" up to two instructional days that have been cancelled due to circumstances beyond the control of school authorities (e.g., excessive snow). Departmental policy has been that the associated number of instructional hours may also be forgiven. SB 364 would eliminate this provision. It is suggested that the provision be retained but would refer specifically to the forgiveness of a

certain number of instructional hours (12 or 14) that are lost due to circumstances beyond the control of school authorities.

- Section 380.1284 of the *Revised School Code* outlines the required days and hours of pupil instruction increases through the 2006-2007 school year and thereafter, or until the requirements reach 190 days and 1,140 hours. The language in the *Revised School Code* should be amended to bring it into compliance with the language in the *State School Aid Act* regarding the number of days and hours that a school district shall offer in order to receive full membership.

Fiscal Impact to State: Minimal.

Fiscal Impact to Local Unit of Government:

A local school district with an alternative school schedule with fewer days could realize decreased costs for utilities, transportation, food service, and staff support. In addition, there would be no state aid penalty to a district for days that do not have at least 75% of the district's membership in attendance.

Administrative Rule Requirements:

Administrative Code Rules governing *School District Pupil Accounting for State Aid Distribution* would need to be amended.

Departments Impacted:

Department of Education

Background Information:

- An analysis of research on a four-day school week is provided. (Attachment A)
- Section 388.1701(3) of the *State School Aid Act* requires a district to receive a state aid penalty if they do not meet the required minimum number of days and hours. For the 1999-2000, 2000-01 and 2001-02 school years, a total of 73 penalties were levied. In each of those years, the vast majority of the penalties

were for districts having fewer than 75% of their pupils in attendance on each instructional day. A total of 12 deductions were made over the three year period for districts that fell short of the 180-day requirement (three in 1999-2000, four in 2000-01, and five in 2001-02).

- Current law allows a district to apply for a waiver for an experimental school year schedule which may provide fewer than 180 days. To date, only one district has applied to the State Superintendent for approval to adopt a four-day school week.

Other Information:

Oakland Schools, Support (4-3-03)

Michigan Association of School Boards,
Support (4-3-03)

Allegan County ISD, Support (4-3-03)

Michigan Education Association, Nonsupport
(4-3-03)

Four-Day School Week

Research Analysis

DRAFT

Pros

- Significant savings on utility bills, food programs, substitute teachers, support staff, transportation, and building wear and tear. Schools have reported a savings of approximately 20%.
- Satisfaction surveys of students, parents, and staff consistently demonstrate strong support.
- Students and teachers benefit from less interrupted class time as a result of longer class periods and fewer transitions at all grade levels. This increases efficiency of instruction.
- Teacher and student attendance improves.
- Student dropout rates decline.
- Student discipline referrals decrease.
- Most districts reported an increase or no change in student achievement. Some districts reported an increase in standardized testing and ACT scores.
- The fifth day can be used for student enrichment and quality staff development.
- More students were able to complete homework assignments during the school day allowing more free time in the evening.
- More time for participation in extracurricular activities and for personal business, such as doctor appointments.
- The school day is longer so many parents were home before and after school on school days. Fewer parents need before and after-school child care on school days. This savings offset the cost for child care on the fifth day.
- School days missed due to inclement weather could be made up on the fifth day instead of the end of the school year.
- An alternative school week schedule is more successful with community support. Community size may determine whether responses to a four-day week will be positive or negative.

Cons

- Some educators are concerned that the four-day week may appear to be inconsistent with the new emphasis for more time in school.
- There is limited evidence proving student achievement. Student achievement is generally not affected either positively or negatively.
- Providing child care on the fifth day can sometimes be costly and difficult to arrange.
- Special education students need repetition and it is more difficult for them to adjust to a longer school day. This may impact negatively on their social and physical development and academic achievement.
- At-risk students may have retention difficulties with an extra day off each week.
- A longer school day may be difficult for younger students.
- Extracurricular activities may be negatively affected. Athletic teams must leave early some days due to travel time to other sites.
- Once a four-day school week has been implemented it is hard to reverse. The budget reductions may prove very difficult to restore to support a five-day school week.
- The school day is longer and it is dark during the winter months. This may be a safety concern for younger students as they get on and off the school bus.
- Working parents are unable to supervise high school students on the fifth day. This can easily turn into a serious policing problem for communities.
- Working hours and salary will decrease for some staff (i.e., bus drivers, custodians, teacher aides).

Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

SFA**BILL ANALYSIS**

Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986
TDD: (517) 373-0543

Senate Bill 364 (as introduced 4-2-03)
Sponsor: Senator Valde Garcia
Committee: Education

Date Completed: 4-3-03

CONTENT

The bill would amend the Revised School Code to do the following:

- Remove the requirement that schools provide a minimum of 180 days of pupil instruction, or forfeit a percentage of their State aid allocation.
- Eliminate the two allocated "snow days" per district that currently count as days of pupil instruction.
- Reduce by 12 hours the required minimum number of pupil instruction hours.
- Delete a provision that at least 75% of a district's membership must be in attendance on any day of pupil instruction or the district will forfeit a percentage of its State aid.

Days and Hours

Currently, a district must hold at least 180 days of pupil instruction, or forfeit from its total State aid allocation for each day of failure 1/180 of its total State aid allocation. The bill would eliminate this requirement and the resulting penalty.

Under the Code, a districts also must provide a minimum number of 1,110 hours of pupil instruction, or forfeit from its total State aid allocation the ratio of the number of hours the district was not in compliance in relation to the required minimum number of hours. The bill would change the number of required hours to 1,098, but retain the requirement that any district not in compliance forfeit a percentage of its State aid allocation.

Currently, districts failing to meet both the 180-day and the 1,110-hour requirements are subject to only the higher of the two penalties. The bill would eliminate this provision.

The Code specifies that a school experimenting with an altered school year schedule may apply for a waiver for the 180-day requirement, provided it meets the required number of hours, and is consistent with all State Board of Education policies on school improvement and restructuring. Schools providing alternative scheduling for kindergarten also are not subject to the 180-day rule if they provide a minimum number of hours as specified under the Code. The bill would delete these provisions.

Alternative education programs approved by the Department of Education may apply for a waiver of both the 180-day and the minimum-hour requirements. Under the bill, these programs would need to apply only for a waiver of the minimum number of hours.

Under the Code, school boards must submit to the Department by April 15 of each fiscal year the planned number of days and hours of pupil instruction for the school year ending in the fiscal year. The bill would require the boards to submit only the planned number of hours for the following fiscal year.

Snow Days

Under the Code, two days on which pupil instruction is not provided due to circumstances out of control of a district, such as severe storms, fires, epidemics, or health conditions, may be counted toward the 180-day requirement. The bill would delete this provision.

75% of Attendance

Currently, a district not having at least 75% of the district's membership in attendance on any day of pupil instruction must forfeit 1/180 of its State aid. The bill would eliminate this requirement and the resulting penalty.

MCL 388.1701

Legislative Analyst: Claire Layman

FISCAL IMPACT

The bill would eliminate the requirement for a minimum of 180 school days. The number of days necessary to complete a school year would be determined by each school district individually. A school district still would have to provide a minimum of 1,098 hours of pupil instruction. This proposed change would allow school districts to operate on a four-day school week if they so chose. There could be substantial savings to a school district that chose to complete its school year in less than the currently required 180 days.

Several school districts were asked in a survey to estimate their cost savings if they were allowed to operate on a four-day school week. The amount of savings based on those responses was broken down on a per-pupil basis. Based on those results, it is estimated that the cost savings of moving to a four-day school week, while maintaining a minimum of 1,098 hours of instruction, would range between \$300 and \$500 per pupil depending on the size of the school district. Larger school districts with more buildings would save at the higher end of the estimate while smaller districts with fewer buildings would realize savings at the lower end. The savings would result from a combination of lower salaries for certain staff and the building operation costs such as heat, electricity, water, etc. that would be avoided. (These cost saving estimates are based on a small sampling of school districts and the results among individual districts are indeterminate and could be more or less than the estimates provided here.)

Additionally, the bill would eliminate the two so called "snow days". Since there would no longer be a minimum number of days required, districts would not necessarily need to make up those days so long as they met the 1,098-hour requirement. Based on the survey results mentioned above, it is estimated that each day that must be made up under the current law provision costs a district an average of \$15 to \$25 per pupil. As long as a district did not need to make up these days, it could realize that saving.

Finally, current law requires that at least 75% of a district's membership be in attendance on each day of pupil instruction and that a district be penalized for each day that there is not a 75% attendance rate. This provision would be eliminated under the bill. Thus, districts would no longer have to comply with the 75% attendance requirement or be penalized for not doing so, and therefore could realize a saving as well. This could be of benefit to a district where, for example, a flu epidemic broke out and the district thus was being penalized for each day that it did not meet the 75% attendance requirement.

Fiscal Analyst: Joe Carrasco

S0304\364sa

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.

SENATE BILL No. 364

April 2, 2003, Introduced by Senators GARCIA, KUIPERS, GEORGE, McMANUS, JELINEK, JOHNSON, SIKKEMA, HAMMERSTROM, CROSEY and PATTERSON and referred to the Committee on Education.

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled
"The state school aid act of 1979,"
by amending section 101 (MCL 388.1701), as amended by 2002
PA 476.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

1 Sec. 101. (1) To be eligible to receive state aid under
2 this act, not later than the fifth Wednesday after the pupil
3 membership count day and not later than the fifth Wednesday after
4 the supplemental count day, each district superintendent through
5 the secretary of the district's board shall file with the
6 intermediate superintendent a certified and sworn copy of the
7 number of pupils enrolled and in regular daily attendance in the
8 district as of the pupil membership count day and as of the
9 supplemental count day, as applicable, for the current school
10 year. In addition, a district maintaining school during the

SENATE BILL No. 364

1 entire year, as provided under section 1561 of the revised school
2 code, MCL 380.1561, shall file with the intermediate
3 superintendent a certified and sworn copy of the number of pupils
4 enrolled and in regular daily attendance in the district for the
5 current school year pursuant to rules promulgated by the
6 superintendent. Not later than the seventh Wednesday after the
7 pupil membership count day and not later than the seventh
8 Wednesday after the supplemental count day, the intermediate
9 district shall transmit to the department the data filed by each
10 of its constituent districts. If a district fails to file the
11 sworn and certified copy with the intermediate superintendent in
12 a timely manner, as required under this subsection, the
13 intermediate district shall notify the department and state aid
14 due to be distributed under this act shall be withheld from the
15 defaulting district immediately, beginning with the next payment
16 after the failure and continuing with each payment until the
17 district complies with this subsection. If an intermediate
18 district fails to transmit the data in its possession in a timely
19 and accurate manner to the department, as required under this
20 subsection, state aid due to be distributed under this act shall
21 be withheld from the defaulting intermediate district
22 immediately, beginning with the next payment after the failure
23 and continuing with each payment until the intermediate district
24 complies with this subsection. If a district or intermediate
25 district does not comply with this subsection by the end of the
26 fiscal year, the district or intermediate district forfeits the
27 amount withheld. A person who willfully falsifies a figure or

1 statement in the certified and sworn copy of enrollment shall be
2 punished in the manner prescribed by section 161.

3 (2) To be eligible to receive state aid under this act, not
4 later than the twenty-fourth Wednesday after the pupil membership
5 count day and not later than the twenty-fourth Wednesday after
6 the supplemental count day, an intermediate district shall submit
7 to the department, in a form and manner prescribed by the
8 department, the audited enrollment and attendance data for the
9 pupils of its constituent districts and of the intermediate
10 district. If an intermediate district fails to transmit the
11 audited data as required under this subsection, state aid due to
12 be distributed under this act shall be withheld from the
13 defaulting intermediate district immediately, beginning with the
14 next payment after the failure and continuing with each payment
15 until the intermediate district complies with this subsection.
16 If an intermediate district does not comply with this subsection
17 by the end of the fiscal year, the intermediate district forfeits
18 the amount withheld.

19 (3) Except as otherwise provided in this section, each
20 district shall provide at least ~~180 days of pupil instruction~~
21 ~~and a number of 1,098 hours of pupil instruction. at least~~
22 ~~equal to the required minimum number of hours of pupil~~
23 ~~instruction required for 2000-2001 under section 1284 of the~~
24 ~~revised school code, MCL 380.1284. Except as otherwise provided~~
25 ~~in this act, a district failing to hold 180 days of pupil~~
26 ~~instruction shall forfeit from its total state aid allocation for~~
27 ~~each day of failure an amount equal to 1/180 of its total state~~

1 ~~aid allocation.~~ Except as otherwise provided in this act, a
2 district failing to comply with the required minimum hours of
3 pupil instruction under this subsection shall forfeit from its
4 total state aid allocation an amount determined by applying a
5 ratio of the number of hours the district was in noncompliance in
6 relation to the required minimum number of hours under this
7 subsection. ~~A district failing to meet both the 180 days of~~
8 ~~pupil instruction requirement and the minimum number of hours of~~
9 ~~pupil instruction requirement under this subsection shall be~~
10 ~~penalized only the higher of the 2 amounts calculated under the~~
11 ~~forfeiture provisions of this subsection.~~ Not later than August
12 1, the board of each district shall certify to the department the
13 number of ~~days and~~ hours of pupil instruction in the previous
14 school year. If the district did not ~~hold at least 180 days~~
15 ~~and~~ provide at least the required minimum number of hours of
16 pupil instruction under this subsection, the deduction of state
17 aid shall be made in the following fiscal year from the first
18 payment of state school aid. A district is not subject to
19 forfeiture of funds under this subsection for a fiscal year in
20 which a forfeiture was already imposed under subsection ~~(7)~~
21 (4). ~~Days or hours~~ Hours lost because of strikes or teachers'
22 conferences shall not be counted as ~~days or~~ hours of pupil
23 instruction. ~~A district not having at least 75% of the~~
24 ~~district's membership in attendance on any day of pupil~~
25 ~~instruction shall receive state aid in that proportion of 1/180~~
26 ~~that the actual percent of attendance bears to the specified~~
27 ~~percentage.~~ The superintendent shall promulgate rules for the

1 implementation of this subsection.

2 ~~(4) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the~~
3 ~~first 2 days for which pupil instruction is not provided because~~
4 ~~of conditions not within the control of school authorities, such~~
5 ~~as severe storms, fires, epidemics, or health conditions as~~
6 ~~defined by the city, county, or state health authorities, shall~~
7 ~~be counted as days of pupil instruction. In addition, for~~
8 ~~2001-2002 only, the department shall count as days of pupil~~
9 ~~instruction not more than 4 additional days, and shall count as~~
10 ~~hours of pupil instruction not more than 24 hours, for which~~
11 ~~pupil instruction was not provided in a district after May 27,~~
12 ~~2002 due to a train derailment involving hazardous materials.~~
13 ~~Subsequent such days shall not be counted as days of pupil~~
14 ~~instruction.~~

15 ~~—— (5) A district shall not forfeit part of its state aid~~
16 ~~appropriation because it adopts or has in existence an~~
17 ~~alternative scheduling program for pupils in kindergarten if the~~
18 ~~program provides at least the number of hours required under~~
19 ~~subsection (3) for a full time equated membership for a pupil in~~
20 ~~kindergarten as provided under section 6(4).~~

21 ~~—— (6) Upon application by the district for a particular fiscal~~
22 ~~year, the superintendent may waive the minimum number of days of~~
23 ~~pupil instruction requirement of subsection (3) for a district if~~
24 ~~the district has adopted an experimental school year schedule in~~
25 ~~1 or more buildings in the district if the experimental school~~
26 ~~year schedule provides the required minimum number of hours of~~
27 ~~pupil instruction under subsection (3) or more and is consistent~~

1 ~~with all state board policies on school improvement and~~
 2 ~~restructuring. If a district applies for and receives a waiver~~
 3 ~~under this subsection and complies with the terms of the waiver,~~
 4 ~~for the fiscal year covered by the waiver the district is not~~
 5 ~~subject to forfeiture under this section of part of its state aid~~
 6 ~~allocation for the specific building or program covered by the~~
 7 ~~waiver.~~

8 (4) ~~-(7)-~~ Not later than April 15 of each fiscal year, the
 9 board of each district shall certify to the department the
 10 planned number of ~~days and~~ hours of pupil instruction in the
 11 district for the school year ending in the fiscal year. In
 12 addition to any other penalty or forfeiture under this section,
 13 if at any time the department determines that 1 or more of the
 14 following has occurred in a district, the district shall forfeit
 15 in the current fiscal year beginning in the next payment to be
 16 calculated by the department a proportion of the funds due to the
 17 district under this act that is equal to the proportion below
 18 ~~180 days and~~ the required minimum number of hours of pupil
 19 instruction under subsection (3), as specified in the following:

20 (a) The district fails to operate its schools for at least
 21 ~~180 days and~~ the required minimum number of hours of pupil
 22 instruction under subsection (3) in a school year. ~~including~~
 23 ~~days counted under subsection (4).~~

24 (b) The board of the district takes formal action not to
 25 operate its schools for at least ~~180 days and~~ the required
 26 minimum number of hours of pupil instruction under subsection (3)
 27 in a school year. ~~including days counted under subsection~~

1 ~~(4)~~.

2 (5) ~~(9)~~ In providing the minimum number of hours of pupil
3 instruction required under subsection (3), a district shall use
4 the following guidelines, and a district shall maintain records
5 to substantiate its compliance with the following guidelines:

6 (a) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, a pupil
7 must be scheduled for at least the required minimum number of
8 hours of instruction, excluding study halls, or at least the sum
9 of 90 hours plus the required minimum number of hours of
10 instruction, including up to 2 study halls.

11 (b) The time a pupil is assigned to any tutorial activity in
12 a block schedule may be considered instructional time, unless
13 that time is determined in an audit to be a study hall period.

14 (c) A pupil in grades 9 to 12 for whom a reduced schedule is
15 determined to be in the individual pupil's best educational
16 interest must be scheduled for a number of hours equal to at
17 least 80% of the required minimum number of hours of pupil
18 instruction to be considered a full-time equivalent pupil.

19 (d) If a pupil in grades 9 to 12 who is enrolled in a
20 cooperative education program or a special education pupil cannot
21 receive the required minimum number of hours of pupil instruction
22 solely because of travel time between instructional sites during
23 the school day, that travel time, up to a maximum of 3 hours per
24 school week, shall be considered to be pupil instruction time for
25 the purpose of determining whether the pupil is receiving the
26 required minimum number of hours of pupil instruction. However,
27 if a district demonstrates to the satisfaction of the department

1 that the travel time limitation under this subdivision would
2 create undue costs or hardship to the district, the department
3 may consider more travel time to be pupil instruction time for
4 this purpose.

5 (6) ~~-(9)-~~ The department shall apply the guidelines under
6 subsection ~~-(8)-~~ (5) in calculating the full-time equivalency of
7 pupils.

8 (7) ~~-(10)-~~ Upon application by the district for a particular
9 fiscal year, the superintendent may waive for a district the ~~100~~
10 ~~days or~~ minimum number of hours of pupil instruction requirement
11 of subsection (3) for a department-approved alternative education
12 program. If a district applies for and receives a waiver under
13 this subsection and complies with the terms of the waiver, for
14 the fiscal year covered by the waiver the district is not subject
15 to forfeiture under this section for the specific program covered
16 by the waiver.

17 (8) ~~-(11)- Beginning in 2000-2001, a-~~ A district may count up
18 to 51 hours of professional development for teachers as hours of
19 pupil instruction. A district that elects to use this exception
20 shall notify the department of its election.



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

DRAFT

Date: April 22, 2003
Bill Number: Senate Bill 365
Sponsor: Senator Nancy Cassis

Purpose:

Senate Bill 365 would amend the *Revised School Code* to require the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to collect all school data.

Arguments For:

- Utilizing the CEPI as a central data source would help to reduce redundancy of effort for the local and intermediate districts, public school academies (PSAs), and Department staff.
- Having one data submission stream for school districts to provide information to all of state government, including but not limited to Education, Community Health, Treasury, and the Public School Employees Retirement System, should reduce inconsistencies in data definitions and report formats.
- CEPI has the technical staff to do the computer programming necessary to collect the data.
- CEPI has the potential to allow districts online access to the data and creation of specific reports.

Arguments Against:

- Facilitation between CEPI and the information technology staff assigned to the Department has frequently been difficult to achieve in a timely manner.

- CEPI should be responsible for not only collecting the data, but also giving the information back to the Department in a ready to use format. CEPI should complete all reporting functions. This has historically not been the case.

- Success in achieving the goal of streamlined information reporting with reliable and accessible results is questionable without an improved communications mechanism between CEPI, the districts, and the other departments of state government.

- There is concern that incompatibility in hardware and software among the local districts and state agencies may complicate this goal.

- The August 15, 2003, deadline is too soon to require CEPI to start collecting all data. CEPI should be given the flexibility to phase-in data collections based on their resources. For example, the annual financial audits that are collected by the Department's Office of Audits could continue to collect the data until CEPI is ready to take on the responsibility.

Suggested Amendments:

- Remove the implementation deadline.

Fiscal Impact to the State:

CEPI may incur additional costs initially for increased staff and hardware and software applications that would be needed to collect new information currently required by other state

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • HERBERT S. MOYER – TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • ELIZABETH W. BAUER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

agencies. However, there could be a long-term savings experienced by the state.

Fiscal Impact to Local Unit of Government: Districts may incur additional costs initially for increased staff and hardware and software applications that would be needed to collect new information currently required by other state agencies. However, there could be long-term savings experienced by the districts.

Administrative Rule Requirements: None.

Departments Impacted: Potentially every state agency may be impacted.

Background Information:
In September 2000, Executive Order 2000-9 established CEPI as a two-year state agency to provide education data management functions. In July 2002, an amendment to the *State School Aid Act* moved the CEPI office to the Department of Management and Budget [2002 PA 521].

General Comments:
There needs to be an assessment of the various reports that are submitted by school districts to different entities across state government. It may not be realistic to immediately shift all responsibility to CEPI. Adequate resources would need to be obtained and a phase-in schedule adopted in order for this endeavor to succeed.

Other Information:
Oakland Schools, Support (4-3-03)
Michigan Education Association, Support (4-3-03)
Michigan Federation of Teachers, Support (4-3-03)
Middle Cities, Support (4-3-03)
Allegan County ISD, Support (4-3-03)

Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

SFA**BILL ANALYSIS**

Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986
TDD: (517) 373-0543

Senate Bill 365 (as introduced 4-2-03)
Sponsor: Senator Nancy Cassis
Committee: Education

Date Completed: 4-3-03

CONTENT

The bill would amend the State School Aid Act to require that the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) collect all information from school districts and intermediate school districts that is currently submitted to various State departments, officers, or agencies.

The bill provides that by August 15, 2003, each State department, officer, or agency that collects information from districts or intermediate districts would have to make arrangements with CEPI and the districts to have CEPI collect the information and then provide it to the department, officer, or agency as necessary. To the extent that it did not cause financial hardship, CEPI would have to arrange to collect the information electronically. Each affected State department, officer, or agency would have to provide CEPI with any details necessary for it to collect information as required by the bill.

MCL 388.1694a

Legislative Analyst: Claire Layman

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact of this bill is indeterminate, at both the State and the local levels. On the State side, it is likely that there would be additional costs initially, as CEPI would gear up to collect new information currently required by other State agencies. The Center would have increased personnel needs and possibly increased hardware and software application costs, in order to electronically collect and/or compile the information required by other State agencies. Over time, however, once the systems were implemented, the need for increased personnel would be diminished. The Center still would need to compile the information and pass it along to the other State agencies that currently receive reports from districts, but this process, too, would become more streamlined over time. At the same time, the need for staff in other State agencies dedicated to collecting and compiling these data would probably diminish, as CEPI would take over this function.

On the local side, the fiscal impact is more difficult to characterize. Since districts still would be faced with the same reporting requirements, the only change would be that they would be reporting to one State agency, CEPI, rather than to multiple State agencies. If there is currently duplication of reporting (i.e., the same information provided to two or more State agencies), then local districts would experience cost savings when CEPI eliminated the duplication. Also, it is feasible that by centralizing the reporting to one State agency, districts would centralize the employees who send the data to the State, and perhaps increase efficiencies among employees, possibly needing fewer employees who would become experienced at submitting electronic data in standardized formats provided by CEPI. Putting an actual dollar figure to this analysis is not practicable.

Fiscal Analyst: Kathryn Summers-Coty

S0304s365sa

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.

SENATE BILL No. 365

April 2, 2003, Introduced by Senators CASSIS, KUIPERS, McMANUS, GILBERT, GARCIA, PATTERSON, CROPSEY, HAMMERSTROM, SIKKEMA and BROWN and referred to the Committee on Education.

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled "The state school aid act of 1979," by amending section 94a (MCL 388.1694a), as amended by 2002 PA 521.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

1 Sec. 94a. (1) There is created within the office of the
2 state budget director in the department of management and budget
3 the center for educational performance and information. The
4 center shall do all of the following:

5 (a) Coordinate the collection of all data required by state
6 and federal law from all entities receiving funds under this
7 act.

8 (b) Collect data in the most efficient manner possible in
9 order to reduce the administrative burden on reporting entities.

10 (c) Establish procedures to ensure the validity and

SENATE BILL No. 365

1 reliability of the data and the collection process.

2 (d) Develop state and model local data collection policies,
3 including, but not limited to, policies that ensure the privacy
4 of individual student data. State privacy policies shall ensure
5 that student social security numbers are not released to the
6 public for any purpose.

7 (e) Provide data in a useful manner to allow state and local
8 policymakers to make informed policy decisions.

9 (f) Provide reports to the citizens of this state to allow
10 them to assess allocation of resources and the return on their
11 investment in the education system of this state.

12 (g) Assist all entities receiving funds under this act in
13 complying with audits performed according to generally accepted
14 accounting procedures.

15 (h) Other functions as assigned by the state budget
16 director.

17 (2) Not later than August 15, 2003, each state department,
18 officer, or agency that collects information from districts or
19 intermediate districts shall make arrangements with the center,
20 and with the districts or intermediate districts, to have the
21 center collect the information and to provide it to the
22 department, officer, or agency as necessary. To the extent that
23 it does not cause financial hardship, the center shall arrange to
24 collect the information in a manner that allows electronic
25 submission of the information to the center. Each affected state
26 department, officer, or agency shall provide the center with any
27 details necessary for the center to collect information as

1 provided under this subsection.

2 (3) ~~(2)~~ The state budget director shall appoint a CEPI
3 advisory committee, consisting of the following members:

4 (a) One representative from the house fiscal agency.

5 (b) One representative from the senate fiscal agency.

6 (c) One representative from the office of the state budget
7 director.

8 (d) One representative from the state education agency.

9 (e) One representative each from the department of career
10 development and the department of treasury.

11 (f) Three representatives from intermediate school
12 districts.

13 (g) One representative from each of the following educational
14 organizations:

15 (i) Michigan association of school boards.

16 (ii) Michigan association of school administrators.

17 (iii) Michigan school business officials.

18 (h) One representative representing private sector firms
19 responsible for auditing school records.

20 (i) Other representatives as the state budget director
21 determines are necessary.

22 (4) ~~(3)~~ The CEPI advisory committee appointed under
23 subsection ~~(2)~~ (3) shall provide advice to the director of the
24 center regarding the management of the center's data collection
25 activities, including, but not limited to:

26 (a) Determining what data is necessary to collect and
27 maintain in order to perform the center's functions in the most

1 efficient manner possible.

2 (b) Defining the roles of all stakeholders in the data
3 collection system.

4 (c) Recommending timelines for the implementation and ongoing
5 collection of data.

6 (d) Establishing and maintaining data definitions, data
7 transmission protocols, and system specifications and procedures
8 for the efficient and accurate transmission and collection of
9 data.

10 (e) Establishing and maintaining a process for ensuring the
11 accuracy of the data.

12 (f) Establishing and maintaining state and model local
13 policies related to data collection, including, but not limited
14 to, privacy policies related to individual student data.

15 (g) Ensuring the data is made available to state and local
16 policymakers and citizens of this state in the most useful format
17 possible.

18 (h) Other matters as determined by the state budget director
19 or the director of the center.

20 (5) ~~—(4)—~~ The center may enter into any interlocal agreements
21 necessary to fulfill its functions.

22 (6) ~~—(5) From the general fund appropriation in section 11,~~
23 ~~there is allocated an amount not to exceed \$2,332,000.00 for~~
24 ~~2001-2002 for payments to the center.~~ From the general fund
25 appropriation in section 11, there is allocated an amount not to
26 exceed \$4,500,000.00 each fiscal year for 2002-2003 and for
27 2003-2004 to the department of management and budget to support

1 the operations of the center. The center shall cooperate with
2 the state education agency to ensure that this state is in
3 compliance with federal law and is maximizing opportunities for
4 increased federal funding to improve education in this state. In
5 addition, from the federal funds appropriated in section 11 for
6 2002-2003 and for 2003-2004, there is allocated the following
7 amounts each fiscal year in order to fulfill federal reporting
8 requirements:

9 (a) An amount estimated at \$1,000,000.00 funded from
10 DED-OESE, title I, disadvantaged children funds.

11 (b) An amount estimated at \$284,700.00 funded from DED-OESE,
12 title I, reading first state grant funds.

13 (c) An amount estimated at \$46,750.00 funded from DED-OESE,
14 title I, migrant education funds.

15 (d) An amount estimated at \$500,000.00 funded from DED-OESE,
16 improving teacher quality funds.

17 (e) An amount estimated at \$526,100.00 funded from DED-OESE,
18 drug-free schools and communities funds.

19 (7) ~~(6)~~ Funds allocated under this section that are not
20 expended in the fiscal year in which they were allocated may be
21 carried forward to a subsequent fiscal year. From the funds
22 allocated for 1999-2000 that were carried forward under this
23 section and from the general funds appropriated under this
24 section for 2002-2003, the center shall make grants to
25 intermediate districts for the purpose of assisting the
26 intermediate districts and their constituent districts in data
27 collection required by state and federal law or necessary for

1 audits according to generally accepted accounting procedures.
2 Grants to each intermediate district shall be made at the rate of
3 \$2.00 per each full-time equated membership pupil times the total
4 number of 2000-2001 pupils in membership in the intermediate
5 district and its constituent districts. An intermediate district
6 shall develop a plan in cooperation with its constituent
7 districts to distribute the grants between the intermediate
8 district and its constituent districts. These grants shall be
9 paid to intermediate districts no later than the next regularly
10 scheduled school aid payment after the effective date of this
11 section.

12 (8) ~~(7)~~ If the applicable intermediate district determines
13 that the pupil counts submitted by a district for the February
14 2002 supplemental pupil count using the single record student
15 database cannot be audited by the intermediate district pursuant
16 to section 101, all of the following apply:

17 (a) The district may submit its pupil count data for the
18 February 2002 supplemental pupil count using the education data
19 network system.

20 (b) If the applicable intermediate district determines that
21 the pupil counts submitted by the district for the 2002-2003
22 pupil membership count day using the single record student
23 database cannot be audited by the intermediate district pursuant
24 to section 101, the district may submit its pupil count data for
25 the 2002-2003 pupil membership count day using the education data
26 network system.

27 (9) ~~(8)~~ At least 30 days before implementing a proposed

1 electronic data collection, submission, or collation process, or
2 a proposed change to 1 or more of those processes, the center
3 shall submit the proposal and an analysis of the proposal to the
4 senate and house of representatives appropriations subcommittees
5 responsible for this act. The analysis shall include at least a
6 determination of the cost of the proposal for districts and
7 intermediate districts and of available funding for districts and
8 intermediate districts.

9 (10) ~~(9)~~ As used in this section:

10 (a) "Center" means the center for educational performance and
11 information created under this section.

12 (b) "DED-OESE" means the United States department of
13 education office of elementary and secondary education.

14 (c) "State education agency" means the department.



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

DRAFT

THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Date: April 22, 2003
Bill Number: Senate Bill 366
Sponsor: Senator Alan Cropsey

Purpose:

Senate Bill 366 would amend sections of the *Revised School Code* to eliminate the number of professional development days a district must provide to teachers each school year.

Arguments For:

- Eliminating professional development requirements could reduce costs to local school districts.
- By retaining the required 3-year induction period for new teachers, with assignment of master teachers, college professors or retired master teachers as mentors and a focus on classroom management and instructional delivery, the minimal elements of induction are maintained.
- For some local school districts, the length of the school year may be reduced where additional days had been added to the 180 school days for professional development.
- Some administrators report teacher complaints that the professional development sessions provided in their district are not helpful and extend the school year five additional days.
- Teachers who have met certification requirements and applied for a continuing certificate after March 15, 1994 are required to take college credit in a planned course of study or complete a master's or higher degree periodically throughout their career to maintain certification. The coursework may provide a

sufficient level of professional development for these individuals.

Arguments Against:

New Teacher Induction

- By removing the requirement for districts to "provide" time, the actual time commitment required for a new teacher to experience mentoring and induction will become voluntary. **Lack of serious state commitment to induction has been related to high new teacher turnover; time is a basic required resource, even if additional funding for these programs is not available.** The implementation of the current law is just now beginning to have impact on teacher induction practice. Much of the power of the program is in the additional time identified for induction, permitting interaction with the mentor and other supportive staff.
- Without the requirement to provide 15 days of professional development over 3 years for new teachers, the implementation of new statewide teacher induction and mentoring standards (designed to strengthen new teachers, reduce local turnover, and keep them in the profession) could be seen by districts as a problem, an "un-funded initiative," not an opportunity to use those 15 days more productively. This perception will lessen the impact of induction on teacher retention and development.
- Novice teachers in Michigan could have less support and fewer professional development

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • HERBERT S. MOYER – TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • ELIZABETH W. BAUER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

opportunities available to them during the crucial first three years of teaching, when their needs are greatest.

- William Sanders' research (Sanders & Rivers, 1996) shows that student achievement suffers in classrooms with new teachers, particularly if a student has back-to-back years with new teachers; serious state effort to strengthen new teachers is critical to student achievement.
- The cost of providing professional development does not need to be prohibitive. A wide variety of job-embedded professional development opportunities could be used to satisfy the required 15 days over 3 years, including joint planning, observation of master teachers and other activities that do not involve speakers, substitute teachers, travel or fees.
- The professional development needs for new teachers are significantly different than those of experienced teachers as they enter the profession. This statement is supported by vast research on new teacher induction. Teachers continue to develop their practice in the first few years and are most open to influence from outside forces during those years. Evidence supports that the "bad habits" formed in the first few months of practice may remain throughout the teacher's career.
- A recent multi-state survey of new teachers conducted by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory in Chicago found that new teachers identified "lack of support and isolation" as the leading cause for leaving the profession. Numerous studies have found that between 30% and 50% of all new teachers leave the profession in the first five years. A good induction program that provides support to new teachers for their needs reduces the percentage of attrition to 7% or less. Good support programs save districts significant amounts of funds by retaining teachers in the classroom.

- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) recognizes the value and importance of induction/mentoring by allowing local districts to use federal funds to support such programs.

- The State Board of Education has recognized the need for a strong standards-based induction/mentoring period for new teachers. In acceptance of a report from the Task Force on Ensuring Educator Excellence the Board recognized the value of requiring the successful completion of induction as one of the conditions for advanced certification as detailed in Policy Action 2.

- The Department of Education is providing guidance on induction/mentoring to the local districts and is suggesting that the required 15 days of professional development may be delivered in as small as one-hour increments, thus providing the local districts with flexibility in meeting the *Revised School Code*.

Professional Development

- Section 388.1701(11) of the *State School Aid Act* allows school districts to count up to 51 hours of professional development as part of the 1,098 hours of student instruction that provides a means to avoid the cost of additional days and cost of substitute teachers.

- Stakeholders expect Michigan teachers to have increasing content knowledge, increasing ability to cope with classroom diversity, and skills to teach an ever-changing student population. That requires continued learning beyond the pre-service learning at the university.

- Work by Tennessee's William Sanders (Sanders & Rivers, 1996) demonstrates that the quality of a teacher is the single most influential factor on the achievement of children.

- Teacher cognitive ability accounts for more variance in student achievement than any other

measured characteristic of teachers (Greenwald, Hedges and Land, 1996; Ferguson & Ladd, 1996; Kaine & Singleton, 1996; Ehrenberg & Brewer, 1994.)

- Adult learning research calls for work-embedded professional development, which in combination with section 388.1701(11) of the *State School Aid Act*, does not translate into a longer school year or the expenditure of funds for expert speakers.
- Eliminating the five professional development days will mean that more employed Michigan teachers will need to pay for graduate college credit to meet professional development needs, particularly for sustained development required by NCLB.
- NCLB requires each state annually report to the U. S. Department of Education the number of teachers receiving high quality professional development as defined in Title IX of the act. The repeal of this section could significantly reduce the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development.
- The State Board of Education adopted the recommendations of the Task Force on Ensuring Educator Excellence that the renewal of a teaching certificate be linked to the completion of practice-based professional development.
- As the Department has developed a definition for highly qualified teachers, as defined in Title IX of the NCLB, linkage has been created between a teacher meeting the criteria and participation in high quality professional development. A purposeful attempt to link federal requirements with state requirements is being suggested. Repeal of section 380.1527 will seriously undermine the effort to assure that Michigan teachers are highly qualified.

NCLB Impact:

New Teacher Induction

- NCLB requires strong mentoring and induction for alternatively prepared teachers. Michigan has responded that our 15 days over 3 years and the new induction standards will meet the federal requirement for these teachers, along with all new teachers. Elimination of the 15 days will require that districts be very carefully attuned to the preparation path of their teachers, with differentiated professional development and induction based upon this preparation.
- NCLB lists induction/mentoring as one example of professional development that meets the law's definition; however, this listing assumes a dedication of teacher and mentor time to the induction effort that will no longer be evident in Michigan.

Professional Development

- NCLB is standards-based reform that requires that teachers must have professional development to deliver academic curriculum aligned with high content standards.
- Michigan's response to NCLB in the area of highly qualified teachers depends heavily on the availability of quality professional development that meets the federal definition, which limits it to sustained professional development, such as the 5 days embedded in the school year. One-shot workshops will not meet NCLB criteria. Eliminating the 5 day requirement will make it more difficult for districts to support their employed teachers who need such embedded development in order to achieve the status of "highly qualified."
- NCLB requires states to show annual advancement in the number of quality teachers, thus, eliminating state professional development requirements would show a lack of state priority on advancing teaching quality.

- This bill may affect federal funding that comes into Michigan under NCLB authorization if it keeps many Michigan teachers from reaching the "highly qualified" status in time.

- NCLB includes components that requires 1) learning standards for each academic subject for each grade, 2) assessments that are aligned to those standards and 3) provisions for holding educators accountable for student learning. To adequately learn this new and developing information, teachers must be provided opportunities for professional learning. It is unreasonable to expect that all of this learning will occur outside their work week.

Suggested Amendments: None.

Fiscal Impact to the State: Possible loss of federal funds.

Fiscal Impact to Local Unit of Government:
A local school district could save costs associated with the provision of professional development. However, elimination of this requirement could also reduce federal funds that flow through to local districts.

Administrative Rule Requirements: None.

Departments Impacted:
Department of Education

Background Information:
Requirements for new teacher induction were first added to the *Revised School Code* by 1993 PA 335. Professional development requirements for teachers were added by 1999 PA 289.

Other Information:
Oakland Schools, Nonsupport (4-3-03)
Michigan Education Association, Nonsupport (4-3-03)
Michigan Federation of Teachers, Nonsupport (4-3-03)
Allegan Schools, No position (4-3-03)

Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

SFA**BILL ANALYSIS**

Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986
TDD: (517) 373-0543

Senate Bill 366 (as introduced 4-2-03)
Sponsor: Senator Alan L. Cropsey
Committee: Education

Date Completed: 4-3-03

CONTENT

The bill would amend the Revised School Code to eliminate the required number of days of professional development a district must provide to its teachers each year.

Currently, Section 1527 of the Code requires that the board of each school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy provide at least five days of professional development to its teachers. The bill would repeal this section.

The Code further requires that, for the first three years of their classroom teaching, new teachers receive at least 15 days of professional development (not including the five required under Section 1527), the experiencing of effective practices in university-linked professional development schools, and regional seminars conducted by master teachers and other mentor mentors. The bill would eliminate this requirement.

MCL 380.1526 & 380.1526a

Legislative Analyst: Claire Layman

FISCAL IMPACT

The elimination of the five-day and the 15-day professional development requirements would result in savings for all school districts.

The exact amount of savings is indeterminate since the cost of professional development for teachers varies widely among school districts and is directly related to the number of teachers in each district. Although the actual cost of professional development training is indeterminate, the savings attributable to the cost of hiring substitute teachers for each day that a full-time teacher is involved in professional development training can be estimated. The State-wide average cost of a substitute teacher on a per-day basis is \$75. Thus, for the five days of professional development that are currently required annually for both new and veteran teachers, a school district could expect to save an estimated \$375 per year per teacher who is absent due to professional development training. This estimated saving would be in addition to whatever savings resulted from the cost associated with the actual professional development training.

Fiscal Analyst: Joe Carrasco

S0304/s366sa

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.

SENATE BILL No. 366

April 2, 2003, Introduced by Senators CROPSEY and KUIPERS and referred to the Committee on Education.

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled "The revised school code," by amending sections 1526 and 1526a (MCL 380.1526 and 380.1526a), section 1526 as amended by 1995 PA 289 and section 1526a as added by 1996 PA 159; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

1 Sec. 1526. For the first 3 years of his or her employment
2 in classroom teaching, a teacher shall be assigned by the school
3 in which he or she teaches to 1 or more master teachers, or
4 college professors or retired master teachers, who shall act as a
5 mentor or mentors to the teacher. During the 3-year period, the
6 teacher shall also receive intensive professional development
7 induction into teaching, based on a professional development plan
8 that is consistent with the requirements of section 3a of article
9 II of ~~Act No. 4 of the Public Acts of the Extra Session of 1937,~~

SENATE BILL NO. 366

1 ~~being section 38.83a of the Michigan Compiled Laws 1937 (Ex~~
2 ~~Sess) PA 4, MCL 38.83a, including classroom management and~~
3 ~~instructional delivery. During the 3 year period, the intensive~~
4 ~~professional development induction into teaching shall consist of~~
5 ~~at least 15 days of professional development, the experiencing of~~
6 ~~effective practices in university linked professional development~~
7 ~~schools, and regional seminars conducted by master teachers and~~
8 ~~other mentors.~~

9 Sec. 1526a. Training in teaching 1 or more college level
10 equivalent courses may be included in the professional
11 development plan ~~, and in the required 15 days of professional~~
12 ~~development,~~ under section 1526.

13 Enacting section 1. Section 1527 of the revised school
14 code, 1976 PA 451, MCL 380.1527, is repealed.



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

DRAFT

Date: April 22, 2003
Bill Number: Senate Bill 367
Sponsor: Senator Wayne Kuipers

Purpose:

Senate Bill 367 would amend sections of the *State School Aid Act* that allocate funding for at-risk programs, the Michigan School Readiness Program (MSRP), and the All Students Achieve Program (ASAP) to allow districts to determine use of funds locally.

NOTE: The following analysis is arranged to address the three program areas separately.

At-Risk Pupils Funding

Arguments For:

- Provides maximum flexibility to districts in use of funds.
- Allows districts to meet district goals or specific needs and provide local choice to determine services.

Arguments Against:

- Removing restrictions could result in the elimination of supplemental services being provided to at-risk pupils with these funds.
- District use of funds may not meet the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) match requirements.
- Removal of the reporting requirements eliminates the Department's ability to assess the positive impact of this funding for at-risk pupils.

- Removal of the restrictions on how at-risk dollars must be spent eliminates the focus of these dollars and places this categorical at greater risk of elimination.

- The purpose of the funding under current law matches the State Board of Education strategic goal: "Attain substantial and meaningful improvement in academic achievement for all students/children with primary emphasis on chronically underperforming schools and students." This funding helps the state focus on the Board priority while allowing districts to determine the "how" it will be spent.

- The federal government provides over \$600,000,000 in supplementary funding to programs under federal Titles in the state. The commitment of state funds for supplemental services emphasizes the commitment of the state to all students especially the lowest income students.

- Recent reports indicate that districts used over \$2,000,000 for the breakfast program. The districts also used over \$40,000,000 for reducing class size in grades K-6.

Match or Maintenance of Effort:

- This program also provides about 10% of the state's TANF match through the Family Independence Agency (FIA). FIA receives \$775 million in federal funds based on this match.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • HERBERT S. MOYER – TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • ELIZABETH W. BAUER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Michigan School Readiness Program**Arguments For:**

- Purposes of the legislation are appropriate and positive; improving parenting skills, improving school readiness, reducing the number of pupils retained in grade, and reducing the number of pupils requiring special education services are continuing goals and should be supported.
- Provides local choice in provision of services.

Arguments Against:

- The proposal dismantles an effective, research-proven program, Michigan's prekindergarten program for four-year-old children at-risk of school failure, the Michigan School Readiness Program (MSRP).
- MSRP is a fully-developed program with standards, assessment, accountability, and monitoring. MSRP provides infrastructure, support, and quality in local areas.
- MSRP has been in place since 1985. Families and districts are counting on it for next fall.
- Districts could choose to continue MSRP as is, but because there would be no possibility of state monitoring, no application, and no reporting on program elements, it would be likely that local areas would deviate from the quality standards in order to offer additional or different services. It is only high-quality services that produce the desired effects.
- MSRP is a national model with a scientific evaluation. MSRP saves the state money because it reduces retention by half in at-risk students. At-risk children who attended MSRP as four year olds are significantly more likely to score well on the MEAP at grade 4 in both reading and mathematics.

- The proposed changes run counter to Superintendent Tom Watkins' proposal to the State Board of Education to implement high-quality universal prekindergarten for all Michigan four year olds. The Michigan School Readiness Program and its standards, assessment, evaluation, and accountability system would be the foundation of a universal prekindergarten initiative.
- The Michigan School Readiness Program is a prominent piece of infrastructure on which a number of federal and foundation grants in process have been based.
- Governor Granholm's Great Start initiative is not well-served by dismantling this research-based effective program for children at risk.
- There is no requirement to focus on at-risk children.
- These are continuing allocations at a level rate to current recipients. There is no mechanism to add grantees if new districts or PSAs would like to initiate projects. Districts that served as fiscal agents for other districts in a consortium would not be required to serve their consortium members but could use the funds themselves in any way they desired.
- There is no requirement that districts provide implementation plans to the Department. The Department must instruct districts to collect impact data, but there is no mechanism to collect or compile these data. Since each initiative would be of its own design, the evaluation data could not be accumulated to understand the statewide impact. The Department cannot analyze data to evaluate the impact of program design or implementation of which it has no knowledge. There is no way to know if districts are using the funds as required because there is no monitoring or oversight.

- Recipients may determine locally how best to use the funds. There is no requirement for collaboration or even input beyond the school district. MSRP currently requires community collaboration.

- This law takes effect October 1, 2003. FY 2003 *State School Aid Act* requires that the Department collect data and calculate allocations for FY 2004 before the amendments take effect.

NCLB Impact:

- Many potentially at-risk children and schools have made admirable gains precisely because of their participation in the Michigan School Readiness Program, as evidenced by the program evaluation. Elimination of the program infrastructure would weaken the results, and cause more schools to find themselves unable to make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Match or Maintenance of Effort:

- These funds are used as match for the federal Child Care and Development Fund and Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and data are collected for that purpose through an interagency agreement with the Family Independence Agency (FIA). There is a specific provision in the federal requirements for those programs for state classroom prekindergarten programs to be used for these purposes. Elimination of program requirements would reduce Michigan's ability to qualify for these important federal funds. The programs that are implemented might not meet the purposes of TANF; therefore, the funds could not be used as match or MOE.

- The federal government is considering state management of Head Start. The President's proposal requires continuation of state prekindergarten initiatives at the same level to qualify. Michigan might lose federal Head Start opportunities if the Michigan School Readiness Program state aid funds are used differently.

All Students Achieve Program

Arguments For:

- Purposes of the legislation are positive.
- The legislation attempts to further early childhood goals and to allow local flexibility in funding.

Arguments Against:

- Section 32b is the former All Students Achieve Program-Parent Involvement and Education (ASAP-PIE) grants. There was no funding for this program in 2002-2003, but language allowed grantees to carryover funds indefinitely. Repealing this section could mean that the carryover funds are no longer legislatively allowed.

- Section 32f is the former All Students Achieve Program-Literacy Achievement Program (ASAP-LAP) grants. There was no funding for this program in 2002-2003, but language allowed grantees to carryover funds indefinitely. Repealing this section could mean that the carryover funds are no longer legislatively allowed.

- Section 32j, as proposed by the Governor for 2003-2004, would provide funding for ISDs to be the administrative focus for collaborative interagency early childhood work. The bill suggests that funding would not be provided for this purpose.

Match or Maintenance of Effort:

- ASAP-PIE and ASAP-LAP are both used to calculate Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for TANF through interagency agreement with FIA. Loss of the MOE for the carryover years could mean that Michigan will be able to draw fewer federal TANF funds.

Fiscal Impact to the State: Possible loss of federal funds.

NEXT PAGE