

**Adequacy/Distribution Workgroup**  
Commission to Study School Funding  
November 19, 2020, 3-4:30 pm

**Meeting Minutes**

Present: Val Zanchuk, Barbara Tremblay, Jane Bergeron-Beaulieu, Jay Kahn, Dick Ames, Corinne Cascadden, Mary Heath, Dave Ryan, Dave Luneau Also in Attendance: Jordan Hensley, Bruce Mallory, Carrie Portrie, Jenn Foor. 8 public attendees.

Just after 3pm, Jay Kahn welcomed work group members and called the roll.

**Initial thoughts on Accountability and Data draft.**

Jay asked the group to review the draft regarding accountability and data needs. He asked the workgroup to reflect upon what is in the draft and what is missing.

Bruce shared his screen with the draft posted, and noted Chris Dwyer would send her thoughts along.

Jay suggested adding comments on the value of existing state data to the Commission's work as a benchmark for comparisons across districts. There could be a connection with NCSL and ECS resources – we used these early in the process.

Corinne and Barbara noted some edits about spelling out acronyms in the draft for consistent public understanding.

Val asked, with the evolution of competency-based accountability, how do we account for this in today's education discussion in NH? Is there going to be some data or number that illustrates a category of competency?

Corinne agreed that we include something about competency in the data. It may not be clear how to measure success using competencies because it's performance-based for mastery with alignment to units of credit. Need to include competencies in our conversations – additional district criteria – how well do students complete competencies. Reference to PACE districts (25-30 working on this).

Dave Ryan noted that the standardization of mastery of performance is ongoing in the manner of developing a balanced score card: student performance, educator performance, and systems performance from an improvement standpoint and goals established in the classroom. How are the systems changing and what are the impacts. The biggest challenge is implementing these changes across the state. Reference to legislation passed in 2005. Grades are based on mastery still, and the focus in Exeter has been to focus on shifting culture to a competency-based model. COVID-19 has helped to advance this work through online systems like SeeSaw and Canvas – students can re-submit, revise – scored on rubrics that have different levels of mastery. In K-2 there is more narrative feedback and no grades. These methods of reporting will go with the students. Teachers are finding using the "I can" competency statements are more effective. The

challenge regarding school funding is there is not a standardized method at this point. Teachers are now following a competency-based leadership map. It's an appreciative inquiry stance through a leadership competency. This model requires additional professional development and attention to teachers' practice.

Val wondered how these changes are accounted for, so the funding model can account for students' needs and a standard.

Barbara noted that the end of the second paragraph is important – monitoring, assessing, looking at where we are and what we need to do.

Corinne wondered about how to measure progress on work-study practices.

Mary noted that school districts are required to input a variety of information through the student identifier, and the Commissioner of Department of Education has sought to use Canvas that would collect data K-12. Is this a way the Department of Education to extend the possibilities of i4See to extend competency-based education. Dave clarified that Canvas is a learning management system, which is different than i4See. Prior to 9<sup>th</sup> grade Canvas is not as useful to measure mastery, SeeSaw works better for students below grade 9. *The main issue is about personalization. How do we take state dollars, while measuring individual growth, and allocate them when moving to competency-based education?*

Jay asked for those familiar with post-secondary data and employment data, which are in the statute, these are the data that the state assigned student identifier (SASID) should be addressing.

Dave said their district gathers their graduate data from the national student loan clearing house. There is more interest to track who completes post-secondary education for 2 to 5 years. Data is easiest to acquire for when students apply and matriculate to college, not when they graduate or if they transfer, etc. In short, it is challenging to track students post-secondary.

Jay confirmed that it falls on districts to track graduates, which Val connected to the 65 by 25 goals – the connection to career and technical education and workforce post-secondary. The issue is not unique to New Hampshire. It is an area where additional resources are needed. Val noted from the perspective of the business community – Career and Technical Education is helpful to acquiring the knowledge that makes students useful in New Hampshire's workforce.

Mary asked that something to put in about the ability for New Hampshire Department of Education to track the competency-based information in some way. It is important to understand this when thinking about adequacy and funding.

Jay noted that competency-based education measures are complicated and challenging to gather, as was the data collected during the research contracted by the Commission (American Institutes of Research)

Val noted the connection between funding and policy – what missing on the policy and data collection side that is need to refine and improve the funding.

## **Continued review and discussion of findings and recommendations in Adequacy Workgroup draft report**

At 3:39 the work group reviewed the adequacy workgroup draft findings.

Bruce noted some of the findings were re-ordered based on comment and re-read all 6 findings listed in the adequacy draft report section.

### ***Comments about the findings.***

Mary noted that number 5 addresses some of her concerns and wondered if charter schools are included in this statement? Will people know they are included? How will it come forward so people know?

Bruce reminded the group that these issues are addressed in the special education larger brief. Jay noted an edit – It is the cost of meeting special education mandates.

A conversation was then had about the briefs created as part of the adequacy workgroup that will be included in the appendices. Jane brought up the concern linked to Mary's point about special education costs and charter schools – having heard from stakeholders that this is a concern.

Bruce jumped to page 5 of the draft and reference to special education and charter schools. Jay noted the recommendation in the special education section on page four. In the top line recommendations on page 1, Bruce noted adding an item about special education funding for students in charter schools. Jay noted, the special education funding needs to follow the student – Jane clarified that there is additional monies required. The intent of money following the child is not possible. Mary noted that when a district has a lot of charter schools (e.g., Manchester) special education costs become challenging – they need further inquiry and examination to think about how it could work differently or better.

Bruce briefly reviewed the current draft regarding the definition of adequacy on page 2. Edits and clarity to language under categorical aides on pages 3 and 4.

Bruce highlighted a section under recommendations and considerations for categorical aid programs – reference to changes in categorical weights would lead to the need to change the education cost model (page 3).

Dick asked about the sentence began, “any such changes,” and asked to remove the word state.

Jay asked to scroll back to the recommendation under charter schools and special education (page 5) – There is a need to rationalize reimbursement rates – it's the reimbursement that is not correct. Jane noted the term charged is okay because Charter Schools providing special education services are charging schools. There is not a rate setting or consistency – the Charter School determines what they will charge. The department of education sets a rate that private schools can charge public schools for special education, and charter schools do not have a set rate. There is not an evidence-based link between the what is charged and the service provided – there is a

special education service rate developed by the New Hampshire Dept. of Education for private schools but not for charter.

Dick wondered if the language could be changed to enable the setting of reasonable rates for special education services charged to Local Education Agencies (LEA) by charter schools.

Corinne asked about the bullet “affirm that official guidance documents, including data entry...” and Jane explained the misalignments that exist between guidance and tracking systems and special education law.

Corinne wondered about the specificity of recommending a phase in over a multi-year period versus a timeframe? Jay noted it is at the will of legislature. Corinne showed concern that the broad language would inhibit implementation. Bruce noted there will be an implementation section in the report – information about the budget pre- and post- COVID, shifts in the legislature post December 1 will influence implementation, more discussion on November 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Val wondered how the recommendations under the definition of the cost of an adequate education is placeholder language or an intent to change the statute – need to get rid of the term input to be clear. Get rid of the minimal inputs terminology if you are going to focus on outcome.

The first and second paragraph was under discussion for clarity about the shift in definition of the cost of an adequate education. Jay noted the intent of the second paragraph was to show the components listed in RSA 193-E:3 will not change. Val reiterated, the requirements will not change in terms of academics and standards. The change recommended by the work group is focused on student outcomes. Jay suggested separated the paragraphs. Make a statement about what it means to move to a performance-based definition focused on outcomes rather than inputs.

Jay quoted: RSA 193-E:2.b – (approximate wording) I shall use the definition of an opportunity for an adequate education to determine the resources necessary of specific programs. Bruce noted this part in the paragraph for Jay to add clarifying language. Bruce also noted the need to for the Commission to make the connection for the public more clearly between.

Jay noted that addition comments and discussion can continue tomorrow, November 20, 2020. Both a fiscal policy workgroup and adequacy workgroup draft report will be updated for discussion overnight for discussion.

### **Public Commenting via Q& A**

Fred Bramante 03:13 PM  
Great question, Val.

Fred Bramante 03:34 PM  
What if it's not a college experience but, further learning (i.e. Career Schools, industry credentials, etc)?

Fred Bramante 03:38 PM

What about requiring personal learning plans for every student?

Fred Bramante 03:38 PM

What if you actually had a role in educational policy?

Fred Bramante 04:00 PM

Whose job is it to cost this out? Is the plan level funding but a different distribution model or increased funding or both?

Fred Bramante 04:11 PM

I hope that this is not going to be a uniform per pupil statewide rate, as it is currently, is it?

Fred Bramante 04:13 PM

What does TRUED UP mean?

Fred Bramante 04:17 PM

Dammit Val! Will you ever Stop asking hard questions!!??

Fred Bramante 04:21 PM

Val, are you asking that we get rid of the boxes to be checked, i.e. class size etc, and give districts whatever flexibility they need to get their students to adequacy?BOLD!!!

Fred Bramante 04:25 PM

Physical size of classrooms, teacher credentials, libraries, courses to be taught, credits required for graduation, etc, etc,

Fred Bramante 04:26 PM

I'm actually somewhat excited about this conversation.

Meeting materials can be found under 11/19/2020:

<https://carsey.unh.edu/school-funding/resources-and-meetings/meeting-documents-video>