

**State of Oregon  
Legislative Fiscal Office**

900 Court St. NE, Rm. H-178  
Salem, OR 97301  
503-986-1828



Ken Rocco  
Legislative Fiscal Officer

Paul Siebert  
Deputy Legislative Fiscal Officer

To: Members of the Joint Committee on Student Success

From: Doug Wilson and Tim Walker, Legislative Fiscal Office

Date: December 12, 2018

Please find attached the recommendations of the three Joint Committee on Student Success's work groups and the preliminary cost estimates of the recommendations. As you review this information please consider the following:

1. Overall, the estimates in the attached document should be thought of as preliminary, giving the reader an idea of the size or magnitude of the costs. One reason for this is that many of the recommendations were not specific enough, so assumptions had to be made of the scale of the program or services a recommendation was addressing. Some recommendations were quite specific (e.g., decreasing class sizes), while others recommended an expansion in a specific service or program without stating specifically what the target was of that expansion.
2. Where applicable, the Quality Education Model or QEM was used for estimating the costs of a recommendation. Alternatively, some of the estimates rely on proposals already being discussed or that had been part of other efforts such as the Agency Request budget or in some cases the Governor's budget.
3. Many of the estimates are based on state-wide numbers and averages. This means that districts are treated proportionally even though there may be differences between schools or districts that could affect the costs. The law of averages is assumed.
4. Many of the recommendations will require additional building space and require new construction or remodeling. For example, many districts could face space shortage if class size is reduced. This will be a district-by-district issue and is not addressed directly in the pricing of these recommendations.
5. Similarly, many of these recommendations will require additional teachers, nurses, early learning/child care professionals, and other staff. Many of these are already in short supply, a problem only added to by some of these recommendations.
6. These recommendations have been "priced" independently, meaning they do not consider the potential impact of other recommendations.

7. In some cases, the pricing of some these recommendations assume a phase-in during the first biennium while others do not. As the Joint Committee moves forward with its decisions, LFO will assist in pricing these at the recommended phase-in schedule.
8. It is assumed that any additional costs are funded with General Fund resources. There may be opportunities for federal funds or other funds in some cases and these will be explored as the process moves forward.
9. Many schools or districts have implemented some of these recommendation in whole or in part. A district might have determined that class size is a priority and invested in teachers sacrificing investments in other areas. One issue that will need some discussion by the Joint Committee is how to treat these districts that have already made the investment -- the more specific a program or service is for a funding stream the more important this is an issue.

If you have any questions, please call me (503-986-1837).

## High Quality Classrooms Work Group

**GOAL: Make the teaching profession more appealing by recruiting, retaining, and supporting qualified teachers in every classroom.**

### **Recommendation #1**

*Establish \$20.7 million in new funding for grow-your-own programs in which districts partner with educator preparation programs to fill gaps in the educator work force. Ensure that these programs meet the following requirements:*

- a. Needs-based;*
- b. Require recipients to remain in public schools in Oregon for a period of time or repay the scholarship amount;*
- c. Limit the first 1,000 slots to those seeking to become teachers, with remaining slots available to those who are candidates in other licensure categories*

The Confederation of School Administrators (COSA) has a similar proposal which provided up to 1,000 students in each “cohort” up to \$5,000 annually to offset tuition and other costs of attending college with the intent of being awarded a degree from a teacher preparation program. It would require districts or groups of districts participating in the program to provide \$1 for each \$3 for the assistance. This component of the proposal would cost up to \$15 million for the first biennia (2019-21) representing three cohorts growing to \$35 million for 2021-23 for seven cohorts. Other biennial costs in the COSA proposal included \$500,000 for planning grants to a district(s) to establish the program, \$250,000 to districts for creating teacher cadet programs, \$350,000 to ODE for administrative costs, \$300,000 to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to support the program and “barrier busting”, and \$300,000 to the new Educator Advancement Council to support their efforts around the program. The total cost of the COSA program was \$16.7 million for 2019-21. The Workgroup recommendation was \$20.7 million and LFO assumes that each cohort would increase to 1,333 and 2019-21 cost would increase to \$19 million for the student assistance portion of the cost.

### **Recommendation #2**

*Support the goal of creating networks for professional learning, establishing the Educator Advancement Council inside ODE to maximize funds for teacher training.*

The 2019-21 Governor’s budget includes funding for the Educator Advancement Council (EAC) within the ODE budget. The Council would be an independent entity but would use ODE’s finance, personnel and other central office staff. This is like the relationship that the Early Learning Division and the Youth Development Division have with ODE.

The 2019-21 Governor’s budget for the EAC is \$60.9 million total funds. General Fund represents \$19.6 million of this total with the Network for Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL) accounting for the remaining \$41.3 million. \$8 million of the \$60.9 million is to be transferred to HECC for early learning related assistance and the Oregon Teachers Scholars program both of which relate to other recommendations in this document. NQTL is a carve-out from the State School Fund which is to be dedicated to the EAC starting in the 2019-21 biennium based on 2017 Legislative action.

Currently NQTL funds mentoring, school district collaboration, assistance for low performing schools and districts, grants for dyslexia screening, trauma informed pilots, leadership training, and a few ODE positions.

**Recommendation #3**

*Align collective bargaining agreements to the length of the biennium.*

There is not a feasible way to “price out” this proposal since there are several factors that affect bargaining including the term of the agreement. It is very difficult to separate the impact of just one of the many factors that go into a negotiated labor agreement.

**Recommendation #4**

*Establish a comprehensive mentorship and professional development system among Oregon’s teachers, examining Iowa’s Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) statute (Iowa Rev. Stat. 284.15) as a possible model.*

Iowa established a program which pays for the costs to school districts to provide for professional development and mentoring in each district. A teacher career pathway or ladder is established with five teacher designations -- initial, career, model, mentor and lead, the last three designations each having a reduction in the time they spend in the classroom, so they can assist other teachers or provide other professional development. Each of the three last designations have reduced instruction time assignments, have longer annual contracts, and receive additional salary.

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Required % of Teachers to Designate</b>	<b>Reduced Instructional Time Requirement</b>	<b>Salary Supplement</b>
Model Teacher	10%	10%	\$2,000
Mentor Teacher	10%	25%	\$5,000
Lead Teacher	5%	50%	\$10,000

There are two cost components in this estimate -- the increased compensation for the three designations of teachers, and the cost of replacing the lost instructional time of the model, mentor and lead teachers. Assuming just under 30,000 teachers statewide, average statewide teacher compensation (based on 2016-17 salary information adjusted to 2019-21 costs), and the need to backfill the lost instructional time, the annual cost of this proposal is \$234.6 million General Fund (\$470 million General Fund biennial cost). If the assumption that the teachers hired to replace the lost instructional time are all beginning teachers and paid at a beginning salary, the annual cost is reduced to \$189.8 million (\$380 million per biennium). These estimates assume that all districts participate in the program in Oregon and would be reduced proportionately as the number of participating districts fall. If the school districts are responsible for the backfill in instructional time and the State covers the additional compensation costs of the model, mentor and lead teachers, the State costs fall to \$41.8 million General Fund annually or \$83.6 million for the biennium.

## **Recommendation #5**

***Establish a needs-based loan forgiveness or scholarship program for individuals who commit to teach in Oregon's public schools for 10 years.***

The cost of a scholarship program depends on the number of participants, the size of the scholarship, tuition amount, and the anticipated annual increase in the scholarship amount. In addition, there will be some staff and other costs to administer the program.

Over the past four years there have been an average of 3,889 new teachers who did not teach in the state in the prior year. Not all of these received their teaching degrees from institutions in the state. One factor to consider is the capacity of the teacher preparation programs in the state which have decreased over number in the past few years. For the purpose of the cost of this recommendation, I have used 500 new participants in this scholarship program each year. There are estimates for both a two-year year scholarship which tracks to the time they actually spend in the teacher preparation programs, and a four-year scholarship assuming the entire four-year span a student would spend in college.

The amount of the scholarship of course is a primary driver. Tuitions range from roughly \$7,500 to \$8,500 (annual for 15 credits a quarter) for an Oregon public university, to over \$40,000 for an Oregon private college. For the purpose of this pricing, an annual scholarship amount of \$5,000 is assumed and an annual increase in the award amount of 5%.

Under these assumptions, the 2019-21 estimate for a two-year and four-year scholarship program is \$7.8 million. For the 2021-23 biennium, the cost of the two-year scholarship program increases to \$11.3 million while the four-year program increases to \$19.5 million. These estimates do not include the cost of operating the program including staff costs and initial programming costs. Another factor to consider is whether this is the final piece of a student aid package or not. If it is, the cost would likely decrease as various public and private financial aid is factored in.

A comparable loan forgiveness program would likely have a lower net cost since some of the participants would not fulfill the 10-year requirement and there would be revenues as the "loan" is paid off. A loan forgiveness program would have significantly higher administrative costs since each participant would have to be tracked for ten years and a loan payment program would have to be established or contracted out.

**GOAL: Oregon's educators and administrators are prepared to teach to changing demographics and should reflect their local communities.**

## **Recommendation #1**

### ***Support the Oregon Teacher Scholars Program***

Current 2017-19 funding for this program is \$424,000 in Network for Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL) resources (carve-out from State School Fund). This provides scholarships for racially or linguistically diverse teacher candidates accepted and enrolled in a state-approved educator preparation program. Up to 68 individuals may receive \$5,000 scholarships. The Governor's budget for 2019-21 increases the amount for the program to \$1 million General Fund of

which most of the funds should be directed to the scholarships. If all the \$1 million is used for the scholarships, the total number awarded could be 200.

**GOAL: Schools have facilities that are accessible, safe, healthy, secure, and meet the comprehensive educational needs of students.**

### **Recommendation #1**

#### ***Increase funding for the OSCIM grant matching program.***

The Oregon School Capital Improvement Matching Program (OSCIM) provides matching funds for school districts passing local General Obligation (GO) bonds. The OSCIM Program will match a school district's local GO bond one-to-one up to \$4.0 million of local GO bond, or the amount approved in the local bond sale, whichever is less. After that, the OSCIM Program will match the local district's GO bonds between \$4.0 million and \$8.0 million based on the funding formula and priority list established by the Office of School Facilities. All grants are predicated on the successful passage of local bond measures.

In the 2015 - 17 biennium, the OSCIM Program was provided authorization to issue \$125.0 million and in 2017-19 biennium \$100.00 million. School districts requested an additional \$216.1 million over and above the budgeted levels. There were four districts that passed their bond measures that were not funded totaling \$20.8 million. Another 49 districts applied for but did not receive grants. The priority list is meant to provide funding for districts with high poverty levels and low assessed values. The real cost of this program is the General Fund debt service to pay back the bonds. Generally speaking (and depending on interest rates at the time issuance), each \$100 million of bonds require \$15.1 million General Fund debt service per biennium for ten biennia.

As to further need over and above these requests, the Office of School Facilities estimates (based on a survey of schools) that there is roughly \$5.7 billion in deferred maintenance needs in schools across the state. In addition, some of the recommendations from this Committee's work groups could increase the need for this program (e.g., smaller class size). If there is a significant increase in this program's authorized bonding amount or the next recommendation's program, there will be less bonding authority for other areas such as public universities, community colleges, and state government projects.

### **Recommendation #2**

#### ***Increase funding for the Seismic Rehabilitation Grant Program.***

The Seismic Rehabilitation Grants program was established by the 2009-11 Legislative Assembly with an initial \$15.0 million bond authorization. Each applicant must provide a seismic engineering study and provide a cost benefit analysis. A matrix is developed ranking the projects that are most in need of rehabilitation to those of least need. In general, the 20-person Advisory Committee awards grants to those projects that are most critical, and the committee also attempts to award geographically diverse projects, considering both rural and urban projects.

The Legislative Assembly authorized \$100 million in bonds for the program in 2017-19. In November 2018, the program had \$75 million available for schools and received 86 applications totaling \$200 million. The Seismic Fund has consistently been over-subscribed and has always awarded the full amount of the fund authorized by the Legislature. For perspective, the unmet need in the November 2018 cycle totals \$125 million and the General Fund debt service for each biennium would be roughly \$18.9 million.

Since 2009-11 a total of \$304.7 million has been authorized for Seismic Rehabilitation Grants. The Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) did a survey in 2007 that estimated the total need for seismic retrofitting to be \$750.0 million. ODE is working on developing a survey for the current needs. The DOGAMI figure is thought to underestimate the total need for seismic rehabilitation.

### **Recommendation #3**

*Implement the recommendations of the School Safety Task Force, establishing a statewide school safety and prevention system with four elements: 1) effective bullying and harassment prevention programs; 2) effective youth suicide prevention; 3) multi-disciplinary statewide student safety net system; and 4) promote use of the SafeOregon tip line.*

The 2019-21 Agency Request budget for ODE included a proposal to address the recommendations of the School Safety Task Force including the elements listed above. The proposal requests \$1.9 million General Fund with \$1.7 million for grants to Education Service Districts and others to assist their area districts in establishing multi-disciplinary teams to develop intervention plans for students at risk of violence. The funding would be used to hire regionally based school safety and prevention specialists, youth suicide prevention specialists, and contracted services for student threat assessment training and technical assistance. The funding for the grants represent one year of the 2019-21 biennium so the two-year cost of this package increases to roughly \$3.7 million. The remaining requested funding would be used for statewide coordination of the system, the costs of a state-wide steering committee and technical assistance resources.

**GOAL: Implement the policy goals of the Quality Education Model.**

### **Recommendation #1**

*Provide funding to limit class sizes as recommended in the Quality Education Model and include these limits in ODE's Division 22 standards as long as funding is provided at the level recommended by the Quality Education Commission, and allowing some flexibility for districts in the rule-making process:*

- *20 students in kindergarten and grade 1;*
- *23 students in grades 2 and 3;*
- *24 students in grades 4 and 5; and*
- *29 students in core academic classes in grades 6 to 12.*

Using the QEM, the following are 2019-21 costs of implementing the recommended class sizes:

- |  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| • 20 students in kindergarten and grade 1                | \$110.6 million        |
| • 23 students in grades 2 and 3                          | \$ 53.2 million        |
| • 24 students in grades 4 and 5                          | \$ 64.1 million        |
| • 29 students in core academic classes in grades 6 to 12 | <u>\$142.0 million</u> |
| • <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$369.9 million</b> |

### **Recommendation #2**

**Provide funding to support specialists in every elementary school:**

- **Art teacher;**
- **Music teacher;**
- **Physical Education teacher;**
- **Talented and Gifted teacher;**
- **Teacher Librarian;**
- **English Language Learning teacher; and**
- **School Counselor or Psychologist.**

The QEM and its recommended staffing levels for these specialists are used for this estimate. This model assumes that the equivalent of 4.5 FTE of a combination of these specialist is provided to the representative elementary school in the QEM. An elementary school of 360 pupils is the size of the representative school so larger or smaller schools would receive a correspondingly proportionate amount. Currently, the statewide average staffing level for these specialists is the equivalent of 3.0 FTE, so this estimate assumes the addition of 1.5 FTE for each representative school. The total cost for adding this additional 1.5 FTE across the state is \$250.4 million General Fund for 2019-21.

### **Recommendation #3**

*Provide sufficient funding for alternative programs for special needs and at-risk students in every middle and high school*

The 2018 QEM report has an estimate that addresses this recommendation. This estimate assumes that 2.0 FTE would be added to each prototype middle school to assist these students while 1.75 FTE would be added to high schools. The estimated biennial cost for this is \$192.4 million General Fund.

**GOAL: Implement effective programs and interventions in order to create high-quality educational experiences for Oregon's students.**

### **Recommendation #1**

*Require ODE to develop a list of evidence-based and promising practices, strategies, and programs that districts can select from for their school improvement efforts*

If this recommendation is just for ODE to develop the list it would be limited to some additional ODE staff time to research, compile, and distribute the list, likely less than one FTE (roughly

\$200,000 or less). If the effort was to expand to include bringing together teachers and other educators to develop the list the cost would increase. This approach would not include any funding for financial assistance to districts for school improvement efforts.

The 2019-21 Agency Request budget included a related \$28.4 million General Fund package to expand school improvement efforts including; (1) \$19.7 million to assist additional ESSA designated Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools, (2) \$4.0 million of General Fund backfill for decreased funding in federal Title I funding for school improvement grants, and (3) \$4.7 million to backfill the Network for Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL) funding for Low Performing Schools and School & District Turnaround grants as NQTL funds are redirected to the proposed new Educator Advancement Council programs.

### **Recommendation #2**

*Require ODE to establish a separate accountability system for alternative schools.*

- *Require ODE to provide targeted assistance and interventions to all alternative schools and programs.*
- *Require ODE to change the standard for identifying schools as Comprehensive Support and Improvement or Targeted Support and Improvement to include more non-alternative schools.*

There have been discussions with ODE staff regarding this recommendation. ODE has begun to address this issue as it was as part of a recent Secretary of State audit. At this time, a cost estimate is not completed. LFO and ODE will continue to work on determining a cost estimate in the future.

### **Recommendation #3**

*Establish categorical funding and require schools to establish before- or after-school tutoring and supports for struggling students.*

This is very similar to the previous recommendation to assist special needs and at-risk students in every middle and high school. The primary difference is that this recommendation is for all grades and not just middle and high school. Using the same assumptions in the previous recommendation of 2.00 FTE for middle schools and 1.75 FTE for high schools as well as 0.50 FTE for elementary schools, the estimate for all three levels increases to \$275.7 million General Fund for 2019-21.

### **Recommendation #4**

*Establish categorical funding and require the following elements of a statewide Talented and Gifted (TAG) program:*

- *Universal screening prior to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade using the potential-to-perform eligibility standard, identifying TAG students at every school with consideration of the state's equity lens;*
- *Periodic ODE evaluation of TAG identification disparities in each school district with recommendations to remedy those disparities;*
- *Program requirements for schools and districts, including teacher training requirements and consideration of school schedules.*

Under current practice, responsibility for identifying TAG students is left to the school districts and may consist of parental referrals, teacher referrals, or some form of standardized testing. There is a lack of uniformity across the state in identifying TAG students or the use of standardized testing. Results can vary from 30% of students identified as TAG students in a school district in the Willamette Valley to 2% of students identified as TAG eligible in a coastal school district. There are two tests that are nationally recognized. They are the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) and the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT). The average costs of the tests are \$10.50 per student and the test should be applied during second grade. There are roughly 45,000 second graders in any given year and it would cost \$472,500 per year to provide a consistent test to all second graders.

Periodic ODE evaluation to identify disparities in each district with ODE providing recommendations to address the disparities would require additional staff resources. Currently ODE has one position assigned to TAG responsibilities. It would likely take up to an additional two positions at a 24-month cost of \$296,694 each to meet this part of the recommendation.

The final part of this recommendation requires further work and further direction. Teachers would have to be trained in how to deliver educational services to TAG students. Some have estimated that one teacher per school on average would need to be certified for TAG expertise. This would be an expensive venture (1,400 schools at 88,000 per year) and Pacific University is the only school in the state that provides TSPC recognized TAG certification. The cost of certification is approximately \$9,000 and requires the successful completion of 13 credit hours of coursework. There are currently only 18 individuals with TAG certifications in the state. The larger questions include; (1) what direction should be taken on addressing TAG students, (2) the intensity of the instruction, and (3) what grade levels should be included. At the minimum, it is likely that additional professional development for all teachers is needed, possibly provided by teachers with the certification.

### **Recommendation #5**

***Identify students early in high school that should be placed in honors, Advanced Placement, or International Baccalaureate classes.***

This seems to be more of a recommendation for teachers to communicate with each other about individual students. ODE could provide guidance or suggested criteria on what type of student should be considered for these classes, but there should not be a significant cost to ODE to provide that guidance.

### **Recommendation #6**

***Add sufficient funding to raise the cap on funding for students identified as special needs to 14 percent and add funding to the high-needs disability account.***

It is important to note that both items mentioned here are funding mechanisms and do not necessarily cover all the costs of the student covered under the items. Current law limits the number of students eligible for the Special Education or *special needs* weighting factor in the School Funding Formula to 11% of total district base ADM. For the 2016-17 school year, 159 districts exceeded the 11% while the remaining 38 districts were under the limit or had no IEP students. Currently the statewide percent of students eligible for this designation is

13.4%. If the limit or cap was increased to 14%, the annual cost of the increased is estimated to be \$81.4 million or \$163 million per biennium based on 2016-17 data. There would still be 79 school districts over the cap at 14%. This increase would mean changing the mix of distribution under the School Funding Formula benefitting some districts at the expense of others depending on their mix of students.

For the *High Cost Disability Cost*, the carve-out from the State School Fund was increased from \$18 million annually to \$35 million annually starting in the 2015-16 school year. With that increase, the account has been able to cover roughly around 50% of the eligible costs (above \$30,000 per high cost eligible student). Based on the OED estimate for the 2017-18 school year, the \$35 million will cover 50.8% of the eligible costs. To cover all eligible costs based on the 2017-18 school year, an additional \$33.9 million annually would be needed or \$67.9 million for the biennium. There would also be some inflation that would increase that estimate some. The carve out from the State School Fund could be increased to cover these estimated increased costs, but that would mean less funding distributed to districts for the general grant through the formula.

### **Recommendation #7**

*Add a 1.75 FTE to ODE for Title IX Coordinator positions.*

This would add one full-time Operations and Policy Analyst 4 position and one part-time Operations and Policy Analyst 3 position who would need a good understanding of federal and state civil rights law. The 2019-21 estimated cost would be \$501,820 General Fund with a small increase in future biennium since the full-time position would be for 22 months as it will not be hired right at the beginning of the biennium.

## College and Career Ready Work Group

**GOAL: Support and promote career-connected learning by leveraging the assets of the community. Career connected learning may occur through career and technical education (CTE) or career and technical student organizations (CTSOs). Community assets include (but are not limited to) businesses, local community colleges, and universities.**

### **Recommendation #1**

#### ***Fully fund Ballot Measure 98***

Ballot Measure 98 (2016) established the High School Graduation and College and Career Readiness Program to address issues relating to career and technical education, college-level educational opportunities in high schools, and dropout prevention strategies. The Legislature funded this program at \$170 million for 2017-19. The Ballot Measure's language (statutory) assumed greater funding based on \$800 annually for each student in grades nine through twelve, so the \$170 million represented roughly 60% of assumed amount. The \$800 is to be adjusted each biennium base on the growth in the State School Fund. To fully fund Ballot Measure 98 for 2019-21, it is estimated that \$303.2 million will be required based on the estimated number of high school students and the increase in the State School Fund at current service level.

### **Recommendation #2**

***Support Career Technical Student Organizations (CTSO), incentivizing districts to create and continue chapters of these organizations. Use the list of organizations currently approved by the State Board of Education and add a method by which districts can ask to have additional CTOS recognized by the state.***

The 2019-21 current service level includes \$727,000 General Fund in the Student Leadership Center program which provides funding for these types of organizations (e.g., DECCA, FFA) for statewide activities as well as grants to local school-based chapters. As of June 2018, there were 284 organizations at schools in Oregon with FFA representing the largest number at 103. For the 2017-18 grant cycle (first year of the biennium), there were \$131,800 in grants to local chapters (typically around \$1,000 each) which is less than in previous years where it has been around \$200,000. Roughly \$400,000 per biennium is allocated for local chapter grants, \$100,000 is reserved for statewide training, and some of the remaining is for administering the grants through a contract with an outside organization. Increasing the amount of funding would allow more funding being available for local district activities and programs. Students involved with these organizations still must pay fees and travel costs which may be keeping more students from participating.

There was a \$3 million proposal in 2012 which would have provided \$5,000 grants to local chapters which would have helped integrate the CTSO programs into school curriculum including supporting the CTSO teacher/advisor.

According to ODE staff there already exists a process for adding new organizations so more detail is required to determine the cost of this portion of the recommendation.

**GOAL: Meet the statewide 40-40-20 goal by 2025 for those 25 and under in that year and every subsequent year.**

### **Recommendation #1**

*Establish or continue culturally, linguistically, and disability responsive college and career navigation programs in every middle and high school, to include programs such as ASPIRE, AVID, and/or career counselors.*

Funding is the 2019-21 current service level budget for the Office of Student Assistance and Completion (OSAC) of HECC is \$634,951 total funds which will provide grants to 155 schools with ASPIRE sites at a grant size of just less than \$4,100 per biennium. The ASPIRE program is located in schools and provides a variety of services including mentoring students. The 2019-21 Agency Request budget for the ASPIRE program includes an additional \$1.1 million General Fund for grants to another 113 sites at the same grant level. Average grants have not changed for a few biennia. A further \$1.7 million General Fund in resources would add funding for another 71 sites (bringing the total number of sites to 339) and increase the average grant to \$5,120. In contrast there are approximately 435 middle and high schools.

Counselors are trained and licensed for a comprehensive counseling system in the schools involving academic, guidance and mental/behavioral health related counseling. The guidance related functions make up only a share of the work they do, and the amount varies from school to school. A recommendation from another work group found that meet the counseling standards set out in the OARs, an additional \$237.9 million is required, but that is for counselors covering academic, guidance and mental/behavioral health. A third of that cost may roughly be attributable to guidance related activities allocating \$79.3 million General Fund as the cost.

### **Recommendation #2**

*Require every school district to adopt an intervention strategy and equip every district with an early warning system for students at risk of dropping out, including students who are chronically absent.*

An Early Indicator and Intervention System (EIIS) combines the use of data and structured teams to proactively identify struggling students. EIIS is designed to signal in real time when a student begins to struggle. Not all districts have utilized the technology even as many have invested in their own systems. The 2019-21 Agency Request Budget included \$1 million for: (1) training on developing and implementing student focused teams, (2) developing and providing guidance on the necessary components for an EIIS, (3) training and guidance to districts on establishing an intervention tracking system, (4) funding to enable districts to evaluate their EIIS, and (5) resources for assisting districts in acquiring information technology solutions for creating an EIIS in the second year of the biennium. The first four items were allocated \$600,000 to assist 40 districts in the package while \$400,000 was allocated for the assistance in item #5. Overall, ODE estimates that 103 districts would be assisted with the \$1 million. There is also a proposal to provide districts

\$3.00 per ADM per year to fully fund the grants in item #5 for all districts This would cost an estimated \$3.5 million General Fund in 2019-21.

### **Recommendation #3**

***Require every school district to have an intervention program for 8<sup>th</sup> graders at risk, such as a summer bridge program.***

Two programs were looked at that appear to meet the objectives of this recommendation. The target group for such a program were 8th graders that scored a 1 or a 2 on the English/language arts (ELA) or Math assessment. Just over 18,000 students met the criteria for English/language arts and approximately 24,300 students for Math. This estimate assumes roughly 50% of these students would participate and adjustments were made for those students that qualified for both ELA and Math. The estimate includes class time (15 hours per week) for each program area, transportation for some students, materials, and meals. This is based on a three-week program. The estimated cost of such a program is \$21.3 million General Fund. A four-week or five-week would roughly cost proportionately more. This estimate is also a statewide average, a more refined pricing would have to look at a district-level data.

### **Recommendation #4**

***Create a statewide network of students, supported by Education Service Districts, to advise policymakers.***

There are two approaches to this recommendation. A more formal robust effort would provide Education Service Districts (ESD) with funding for a part-time position in each region to organize and lead the students involved in this process, costs of holding regional meetings, and costs of participation in state-wide meetings including travel. This assumes several students in each region participating. This could cost as much as \$2.8 million with additional costs at ODE to hold the state-wide meetings and to assist with setting up the regional structure.

A second approach would be to have a selected group of students with one or more selected by each ESD with little or no regional based meeting time. The state-wide group would meet quarterly with limited ODE resources setting up the meeting and staffing it. Much of the cost would be travel reimbursement of students traveling to Salem or central location to meet with policy makers. This more limited approach would be less than \$100,000 General Fund.

### **Recommendation #5**

***Direct ODE to work with OHA to combine current student surveys into a valid, reliable statewide student and school climate survey***

Currently, the Oregon Health Authority - Public Health Division (OHA-PHD) administers the Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) and the Student Wellness Surveys (SWS) in alternate years. Both surveys have similar content and topic areas but use different methodologies. Some of the key content area differences between the two surveys are that the OHT contains questions related to reproductive and sexual health, physical activity and nutrition, while SWS contains more questions related to illicit drug use and attitudes and perceptions about substance use and other risk behaviors.

Both surveys include questions related to tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use, and also questions related to school success, school climate and safety, positive youth development and mental health. In 2020, OHA-PHD will launch a single integrated Student Health Survey to improve and streamline the survey.

### **Recommendation #6**

***As resources are available, support nonprofit community organizations at work on improving student achievement through literacy programs. Direct the State Board of Education to create a list of recommended programs for districts to engage as partners.***

In the 2019-21 current service level there is a small appropriation (\$51,850 General Fund) to provide state support to the Reach Out and Read Program which incorporates books into pediatric care and encourages families to read out loud. Books are distributed through medical provider's offices. Also, in the current service level is \$271,631 General Fund for the Start Making a Reader Today or SMART program. SMART is a volunteer driven tutoring program for at-risk K-3 readers. Currently, approximately 5,000 volunteers in Oregon read with over 10,000 young students. Funding also is used to purchase books. ODE estimates that the funding provided to SMART resulted in the purchase of over 10,000 books as well as funding other costs of the program. State funds are combined with other funds for these programs including donations. SMART's average cost per child is \$325 annually. These and other similar programs could be expanded to serve more preschoolers and those at-risk students in the early grades.

### **Recommendation #7**

***Require and incentivize districts to establish district- and school-level attendance teams to work with the ODE technical assistance staff and resources outlined in the state's Chronic Absenteeism Statewide Plan. Require and incentivize ESDs to establish ESD-level attendance teams to support districts.***

This is like a recommendation of the Students Ready and Able to Learn work group.

Chronic absenteeism is defined as "a student missing more than ten percent of enrolled school days for any reason". In 2016, the Legislature approved \$25,000 to develop a Chronic Absenteeism plan as well as \$500,000 General Fund for pilot projects. In 2017-19, \$6.2 million was approved for grants to districts to implement the plan and to hire "coaches" to help districts. This amount is carried forward in the 2019-21 current service level budget. In the 2019-21 Agency Request budget, ODE requested \$6.6 million General Fund in additional funding mostly for grants to make sure that districts with chronic absenteeism rates of 25% (state-wide average is 17%) are addressing the issue and to support regional consortiums to target culturally specific students in each region.

## **Recommendation #8**

***Require districts to create and implement family engagement plans. Direct ODE to establish a list of recommended practices for districts.***

School districts are currently required to put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents in all its schools with Title I programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The parental involvement plan insures that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning; that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school; and that parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child.

Any school district receiving Title I funds is required to have a district wide parental involvement policy. Of the 196 school districts in Oregon, 188 receive Title I funds and are therefore required to have district-wide parental involvement policies. In addition to schools, the district wide policy would also cover Head Start, Reading First, Early Reading First, Even Start, Parents As Teachers, Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters, and State-operated preschool programs. ODE is responsible for ensuring that school districts receiving Title I funds have district wide parental involvement policies that meet the ESEA requirements. The districts not receiving Title I funds typically do not have enough students meeting the Title I requirements to make it worthwhile to accept the funds. ODE may have some limited costs to research and compile a list of recommended practices.

**GOAL: Establish a statewide reengagement plan for youth who have left high school.**

## **Recommendation #1**

***Direct the Youth Development Division (YDD) to develop and administer a statewide reengagement system for youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who have either left school or are not making sufficient progress toward meeting the requirements for a high school diploma. Under this system, school districts or community college districts can provide youth reengagement programs. Programs must offer academic instruction either for credit toward a diploma or to help prepare for the General Educational Development (GED) test, as well as services such as academic and career counseling or coaching, and assistance with accessing services or resources that support at-risk youth. Funding will be provided via the State School Fund. The State Board of Education will be authorized to establish, by rule, criteria for participating districts or community colleges to receive funding. Establish policies within Oregon's accountability system that will not penalize school districts for attempts to reengage students.***

It is unclear what is meant by funding being provided via the State School Fund (SSF). This could mean a carve-out from the SSF, but that would mean less being distributed for general educational purposes without additional SSF funding. The estimate below is priced with the assumption that grants would be provided to schools or organizations to help create and implement qualified programs that enable eligible students to reengage in education.

YDD staff at ODE estimate that there are between 23,000 and 40,000 youth state-wide that would be eligible for a program like this. Based on program experience, YDD staff suggested that 7% to 10% of the eligible population would participate with the percentage growing as time went on. This estimate assumes a 24- month period that includes 7% participation for the first year and 10% for the second year. Per student cost is set at \$7,000 per year so the estimated 24-month cost from \$27.8 million to \$53.5 million General Fund depending on size of the eligible population (between 23,000 and 40,000). There would be some YDD and ODE start-up costs to establish or identify qualified programs.

LFO would suggest that a pilot program be first established and operated for at least a year to determine the effectiveness of the program and begin to establish best practices. This would also provide information of the potential number of participants as well as a more detailed estimate of the cost per student.

**GOAL: Establish a certification program for Career and Technical Education (CTE) teachers that is standardized and transferable across districts.**

**Recommendation #1**

*Establish a task force, led by the Oregon Association for Career and Technical Education (CTE), that will examine the barriers to CTE licensure and make recommendations to the legislature.*

As with other task force related recommendations, the estimated cost of this recommendation depends on how robust of a process is taken. If the intent is to have a series of meetings at a central location and have limited staff participation that would require backfill of current job responsibilities, the cost is not great (e.g., \$100,000). If there is greater staff participation and the need for research and other activities, the costs increase.

**GOAL: Evaluate the effectiveness of assessments for informing teacher practices in real time and for giving students information about their progress in a timely manner.**

**Recommendation #1**

*Require districts to share scores with teachers immediately upon receipt.*

This should not be a significant cost to ODE or to districts.

**Recommendation #2**

*Encourage the use of formative assessments.*

Oregon currently funds a federally mandated summative assessment with General and Federal Funds which is given once near the end of the school year for grades 3 through 8 and 11th. Summative assessments provide information how schools, districts and state-level programs prepare students to meet the state content standards. There are two other type of assessments which are more student-centered -- interim assessments and formative assessment practices. The 2019-21 Agency Requested Budget included funding to address the need for these other assessments and

assessment practices. General Fund resources were requested to purchase the interim assessment for Math and English/language arts (ELA) from the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium (SBAC) which provides the current summative assessment. ODE's \$3.4 million General Fund request assumes a rollout in the second year of the biennium with a student participation rate of 100%. Based on this assumption, the interim assessment cost would be \$2.0 million General Fund per year. Other components of the request costing an estimated \$400,000 General Fund includes funding for interim assessment for science for selected grades and training and technical assistance resources especially for use of formative assessment practices. In addition, \$725,000 General Fund was designated for assessment professional development and \$250,000 General Fund to support a systemic shift to a student-centered assessment system.

Based on recent conversations with ODE, the interim assessment component of this package could be rolled out the first year with a phased-in approach of student participation. The first year of the biennium would cost \$1.3 million General Fund for the interim assessment based on a student participation rate of 50%. The second year assumes a 75% participation rate costing \$1.5 million General Fund. A full two-year package with these assumptions would be \$5.55 million General Fund when you also include the other items above.

### **Recommendation #3**

***Fund resources to mitigate the disruption to schools caused by testing, such as additional computers and test proctors to speed the process.***

Disruption during the assessment testing occurs for several reasons including tying up computer labs, movement of students, and lost learning time. Testing generally happens around the month of May concentrating the disruptions over a short period of time. One solution may be to make available computers or devices which would allow students to take the tests in their own classroom. The American Institute for Research (AIR) who administers the assessments for Oregon says that devices like a Chromebook meets the technical needs. Providing resources to districts to purchase a set of these for a group of classrooms could prevent some of the disruptions and still allow for the tests to be taken within a given time frame.

Based on a set of devices for each five classrooms in the grade levels required to take the assessments and using 2017-18 class size and enrollment data, an estimated 63,164 devices would be required. At a per unit cost of \$220 with additional cost per unit for other equipment (e.g., transport cart) the total cost would be approximately \$14.5 million across the state. There would have to be consideration for those districts with limited broadband access (mainly smaller districts). These devices could be used for other uses during the year including the interim assessment discussed in the recommendation above. There would still be disruptions including that in the classroom, but other disruptions in the school would be decreased.

### **Recommendation #4**

***Include growth information (past years' scores) on individual student reports in order to give context for current scores.***

This should not be a significant cost to implement this. ODE will have some programming costs as the student report is changed, but they do make changes to these reports from time to time.

## Students Ready and Able to Learn Work Group

**GOAL: Support healthy attached family relationships to help ensure every child is ready to learn when they enter school by providing access to services for all children and families who need them; including but not limited to, prenatal care, home visiting, education and engagement for new parents, and school readiness programs.**

### **Recommendation #1**

*Expand home visiting programs to move toward voluntary universal home screening and ensure that families with identified service needs are directed to the appropriate service providers.*

The Early Learning Division's (ELD) primary home visiting program is the Healthy Families Oregon program funded at \$30.7 million total funds (\$25.7 million General Fund) in the 2019-21 current service level budget. Assuming the same number of recipients (families) as estimated that will be served in 2017-19 (3,237), the estimated average cost per family will be \$9,444 total funds. For 2017-19, between 10% and 11% of the total estimated 30,000 eligible families were served. Each additional 1,000 served will cost an estimated \$9.4 million. To serve 25% of the eligible population will cost an additional \$40.3 million.

As the Joint Committee considers this recommendation, it is recommended to look at the other home visiting programs administrated by the State. Another program may be more appropriate for some of the families than this particular program.

### **Recommendation #2**

*Increase access to intensive early childhood services such as Early Head Start and Relief Nurseries.*

For the 2019-21 current service level, **Early Head Start** is funded at just less than \$1.7 million (all General Fund) providing funding for 64 slots. In addition, federal funding provides for approximately 2,000 slots. The estimated need for services under this program is roughly 25,000 children. Adding another 1,000 slots would cost approximately \$25 million General Fund.

Current service level funding for **Relief Nurseries** is \$11.4 million total funds (\$9.3 million General Fund). Average funding per child is approximately \$7,700 and the anticipated 3,300 children served during 2017-19 represented under 10% of the children needing some level of service. Adding services for another 1,000 children is estimated to cost \$7.8 million General Fund for 2019-21.

### **Recommendation #3**

***Fully fund Early Intervention (EI) and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) services for children with disabilities and delayed learning.***

The 2019-21 current service level budget for the Early Intervention program (up to age 3) and the Early Childhood Special Education program (age 3-5) totals \$227.5 million total funds (\$194.4 million General Fund). This federally mandated program serves all eligible children based on the need for services which is estimated at 26,000. In reality, the funding has not kept pace with the increasing costs, so service levels have been reduced over time. Based on the current estimated costs and student needs, it would take an additional \$75 million General Fund to fully fund the program for 2019-21.

### **Recommendation #4**

***Explore additional policy options to build an integrated birth-to-five system that supports children and families.***

Without identification of what these options are it is impossible to provide a cost estimate. The 2019-21 Agency Request budget for ELD did include a \$10 million General Fund for a parenting education program to “support establishment, expansion and sustainability of community-based parenting education programs”. This proposal would build in part upon the foundation-funded Oregon Parenting Education Collaborative (OPEC) that is available to families in 32 counties through 15 parenting hubs. There are likely other options that meet the intent of this recommendation that can be explored.

**GOAL: Provide all children with access to affordable high-quality preschool programs.**

### **Recommendation #1**

***Increase access to state subsidized preschool programs for children aged 3 to 5 who have not entered kindergarten, particularly for children living at or below 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL).***

The State funds two primary preschool programs for children age 3 till they attend Kindergarten. Oregon PreK program serves 8,100 children out of the approximately 20,000 eligible children under 100% of the FPL (the companion federally funded Head Start program serves another 4,400) and costs \$9,100 annually per child (2017-19 cost). Preschool Promise costs \$11,500 annually per child and serves 1,300 children of the roughly 40,000 that are eligible. 2019-21 current service level funding for Oregon PreK is \$156.4 million and is \$37.1 million for Preschool Promise.

For **OR PreK**, if the assumption is to serve half of the remaining approximately 7,500 children, eligible but not served, the 2019-21 cost would be roughly \$70 million General Fund. This is a full 24-month cost and likely would be phased-in at a lower cost. This does not address issues including transportation and compensation issues that have been brought forward by advocates.

To illustrate the cost of adding additional **Preschool Promise** capacity, the Agency Request budget for ELD included a package which increased the number children served by 10,000 including a dedicated Tribal set aside (400 slots) by the end of 2019-21. This phased-in cost was approximately \$131 million General Fund plus additional funding for agency operations and capacity building. A fully phased-in two-year estimate for the 10,000-child expansion is \$239 million plus the operations and capacity building resources.

It should be noted that these cost estimates assume that there are sufficient quality providers which in many areas of the state is an issue. There may be alternative program designs for preschool programs available, but until they are identified they cannot be “priced-out”.

## **Recommendation #2**

*Expand the early learning workforce by increasing the capacity of training and certification programs across the state.*

Almost all the community colleges have some associates degree or certificate programs for early learning and education. The programs at the four-year institutions are also now very important given the recent federal and state quality efforts which require or recommend bachelor’s degrees for some of this workforce. The Governor’s budget for 2019-21 includes funding of \$7 million General Fund that would address this recommendation. Initial discussions indicate that \$1 million would be directed at efforts between community colleges and public universities to establish career paths for early learning workers seeking certificates and degrees in the subject area. This is to coordinate the programs between institutions, so students have a smoother transition. The remaining \$6 million would be for financial assistance to early learning and education students across the spectrum of programs.

**GOAL: Provide sufficient resources to schools and families to meet the behavioral health, physical health, nutritional and support needs so students can reach their full potential to learn.**

## **Recommendation #1**

*Increase access to behavioral and physical health services by increasing the number of counseling, mental health, school nurses, and other staff available to students. These services could be provided directly by school staff or in partnership with other organizations such as School-Based Health Centers, Community Care Organizations (CCOs), community groups, and county mental health and public health agencies.*

The cost of this recommendation should be explored in more detail. This very rough estimate should be viewed as providing a perspective of what magnitude this recommendation’s cost might be. For this first attempt, the estimate relies on standards for number of nurses or counselors in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs). For the general school population, the standards call for one nurse for each 750 students, while for counselors the standard is one counselor for each 250 students for a comprehensive counseling program. These ratios are used on a total school population of 580,000 (2017-18).

For nurses, there are several nurses assigned to medically fragile or complex students or students who are dependent on a nurse to be in school. This reduced the number of students to apply the ratio to since they already had a nurse allocated to them. Based on this, the ratio or standard drives the need for 738 nurses. After factoring out the number of current nurses, the result demonstrated the need for 637 additional nurses. Based on the state average for school nurses' compensation, the net cost for nurses after adjusting for cost increases since 2017-18 is \$126.1 million for the 2019-21 biennium. It should be noted that some of this could be offset by districts (possibly with state assistance) being more aggressive in seeking Medicaid reimbursement for some of the services.

OAR 582.022.2060 requires districts to have a comprehensive counseling system which would include both advising/guidance and mental health. The 250:1 ratio is a recommendation, not a requirement. Using the same type of calculation for counselors, the ratio or standard demonstrates the need for a net increase for 1,109 more counselors. The 2019-21 estimate for this is \$237.9 million. It is likely that any serious mental health issue would have to be referred to another staff professional with more mental health related training or to an outside entity. This number should not be considered as the total need for mental or behavioral health since many school districts currently contract out for mental health services, so it is difficult to factor that into this net estimate. On the other hand, the need for mental health services was repeated over and over again as one of the primary needs for the schools. The 250:1 ratio may date back several years and may not truly reflect current needs.

This very rough estimate assumes that these needs to be filled with district hired staff. A district may find it more effective and efficient to contract with a CCO, public health department or other provider for these services based on local factors. Regardless, this is one area there should be much more work in determining what level the need is and the resources required to meet that need.

### **Recommendation #2**

***Establish a funding source/formula separate from the State School Fund specifically for school physical and mental health as well as for other “wraparound” and support services.***

This is a recommendation to establish a separate funding stream for specific services. By itself this recommendation does not cost a specific amount but is a means of distributing funding to districts based on specific factors. Examples of the funding that could be distributed through this mechanism could include that outlined in recommendation #1 above or the following recommendation #3. There might be a cost to ODE to establish the initial formula and then the ongoing costs for calculating and distributing the funds like what is currently done for the general school revenue formula.

### **Recommendation #3**

***Provide greater access and connections for students and their families to wraparound and support services that address issues that prevent a student from reaching their full potential.***

In general, wraparound services can be understood as offering health, behavioral health, nutrition, social services, and other supports to families and children to assist in educational success. Wraparound services can be provided in several ways including focused teams assisting individual students, a community school setting, or where the school provides a staff person (contract or

school staff) who works connecting services with the student and their family. Many schools and communities have their own models for providing wraparound services based on local views of what needed and what local services are available.

To illustrate what the cost might be statewide, the Family Access Network (FAN) model is used. FAN is a network of partners in Central Oregon including 52 K-12 public schools in Deschutes and Crook Counties and 100+ community partners including local churches, businesses, services clubs, non-profit organizations, and county departments. The school districts provide staffing in the schools to link students and families with referrals to local resources for food, clothing, stable housing, and healthcare. This model, or a similar model, could prove useful in having a resource within each school responsible for providing referrals to social services to ensure that students are ready and able to learn. The school districts in Deschutes and Crook Counties contribute 26 positions to staff the 52 schools.

There are approximately 1,410 schools in Oregon and placing a half-time advocate responsible for referrals and assistance would require 710 positions. Schools with smaller enrollments would need fewer resources while larger schools would need more. These positions would be at the instructional assistant level and it is assumed that one full-time position would staff two schools. Each FTE would cost approximately \$50,336 annually including compensation and all benefits. The total statewide cost estimate would be approximately \$71.4 million General Fund per biennium.

#### **Recommendation #4**

*To address hunger of school-aged children, expand the eligibility for free/reduced lunches or make it easier for more schools to use a school wide free breakfast/lunch program.*

There are two options in this recommendation -- (1) increase the income threshold for eligibility of children to get free and reduced breakfasts and lunches and (2) make it easier for schools to participate in the Community Eligibility program which provides the opportunity for schools to offer free breakfasts and lunches to all students in the school.

Currently, students are eligible for free breakfasts and lunches if their household income is at or below 130% of FPL and reduced priced meals if household income is at or below 185% of FPL. For breakfast, federal funds are used to reimburse schools \$1.75 for each free meal and \$1.45 for a reduced-price meal. For lunch, federal funds are used to reimburse school \$3.33 for each free meal and \$ 2.93 for a reduced-price meal. The first option would increase the threshold for reduced prices for students in households with relatively higher incomes. For those students in the households with higher incomes, state General Fund resources would have to be used since they are above federal eligibility levels. 2019-21 costs are:

#### *Breakfast*

Cost of covering households between 185 and 200%	\$8.5 million General Fund
Cost of covering households between 200% and 250%	\$12.9 million General Fund

#### *Lunch*

Cost of covering households between 185 and 200%	\$35.2 million General Fund
Cost of covering households between 200% and 250%	\$53.6 million General Fund

The second option is to make more schools elect Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) by providing funding so all meals served are reimbursed at a rate equivalent to the federal free rate. In the 2016-17 school year, 94 of 331 schools participating in CEP were eligible for all meals being reimbursed at the federal free rate since at least 62.5% of the students were included in the Identified Student Percentage (ISP). For those qualified schools where their ISP students make up is between 40% and 62.5%, it is estimated that \$3.9 million General Fund would be required for breakfast and \$13.3 million General Fund for lunch. This would enable 237 schools participating in the Community Eligibility program to have all meals funded at the federal free rate and add 124 schools which are eligible for Community Eligibility but don't participate because they would receive less federal meal reimbursements.

**GOAL: Maximize learning time for students, including instructional time, through a longer school year, summer learning programs and increased student attendance**

**Recommendation #1**

*Increase learning time by adding additional days to the school year including factoring in those districts with alternative school periods such as four-day weeks.*

The cost of adding a school day is \$51.6 million per day for 2019-21 based on the QEM. From information provided by ODE, the length of the school year in Oregon ranges from less than 140 days to over 185 days (some may be four-day per week schools). More importantly is the average length of the school day factoring in district enrollment. When this is factored in, the weighted length of the school year for the 2017-18 school year was roughly 170 days. Many policy makers would like to have a 180 school year Oregon's districts. That would mean a further investment of an additional \$516 million General Fund for 2019-21 to bring the average up to 180 days holding all other costs proportionately even

**Recommendation #2**

*Provide resources so students have access to a three- to six-week summer learning program starting initially with low income students who are behind current education benchmarks.*

The 2018 QEM report included the cost of additional summer school for struggling students at \$33 million General Fund. This amount assumes that this is an increase over and above what is already spent for this purpose. This assumed that 20% of the students would participate (excluding kindergarteners) in a 5week/5 day per week session.

**Recommendation #3**

*Support statewide and district level efforts to reduce chronic absenteeism*

This is similar to a recommendation of the College and Career Ready work group.

Chronic absenteeism is defined as "a student missing more than ten percent of enrolled school days for any reason". In 2016, the Legislature approved \$25,000 to develop a Chronic Absenteeism plan as well as \$500,000 General Fund for pilot projects. In 2017-19, \$6.2 million was approved for

grants to districts to implement the plan and to hire “coaches” to help districts. This amount is carried forward in the 2019-21 current service level budget. In the 2019-21 Agency Request Budget, ODE requested \$6.6 million General Fund in additional funding mostly for grants to make sure that districts with chronic absenteeism rates of 25% (state-wide average is 17%) are addressing the issue and to support regional consortiums to target culturally specific students in each region.