

Board of Public Education Program Goal		Agency/Program #: 5101-01-G1
		Division: Administration
		Program:
Agency Name:	Board of Public Education	
Agency Contact:	Steve Meloy, Executive Secretary	444-6576
LFC Contact:	Senator Wanzenried, Senator Schmidt	
LFD Liaison:	Kris Wilkinson	444-5834
OBPP Liaison:	Nancy Hall	444-4899

Program or Project Description:
 Board of Public Education's statutory and constitutional obligations to set standards and the accreditation status of every public K-12 school in Montana.

Appropriation, Expenditure and Source					
Fund Name:	2008		2009		Approp & Expenditure numbers are as of April 15, 2008
	Approp.	Expended	Approp.	Expended	
General Fund	209,772	173,173			
State Special	177,958	127,948			
Federal Funds	0	0			
Total:	\$387,730	\$301,121	\$0	\$0	

Legislative Goal(s):
 Set standards for a quality education as defined by law.

Legislative Performance Measures:

- Revise and monitor standards in the following areas:
 - Science Content and Performance Standards – Complete amendment to standards by July 1, 2008. 100 percent of schools will be in compliance by July 1, 2010 as measured by the Annual Accreditation Process; Appendix E-1 of the Montana School Accreditation Standards and Procedures Manual in collaboration with the Office of Public Instruction
 - Distance Learning – Complete Phase II of the Distance, Online Learning work by July 1, 2009. 100 percent of schools will be in compliance by July 1, 2011 as measured by the Annual Accreditation Process; Appendix E-1 and E-13 of the Montana School Accreditation Standards and Procedures Manual.
 - Teacher Licensure – Complete amendments to Chapter 57 (Licensure Standards) by July 1, 2009. 100 percent of schools will be in compliance by July 1, 2011 as measured by the Annual Accreditation Process; Appendix E-1 of the Montana School Accreditation Standards and Procedures Manual.
- Monitor All Content and Performance Standards – 100 percent of schools will be in compliance by the Board of Public Education's March meeting each year as measured by the Annual Accreditation Process; Appendix E-1 of the Montana School Accreditation Standards and Procedures Manual.

2009 Biennium Significant Milestones:		Completion Dates	
		Target	Actual
1	Work with OPI to encourage school districts to demonstrate progress towards improvement of those schools in advice status.	10%	8.9 Schools
2	Work with OPI to encourage school districts to demonstrate progress towards improvement of those schools in deficiency status.	5%	6.3 Schools

Agency Performance Report:

As we reported to Senator Wanzenried during the formulation of our goals for this process, we cautioned that the success or failure of school districts meeting the standards lay entirely with the school districts. In its role as regulators, the Board extends forth the standards which must be met and when schools or school districts fall short of the standards they are placed in several deficient categories based on the severity and the frequency of the standards violated.

School districts across the state are facing budgetary shortfalls in the second year of this biennium and are faced with budget cuts or the need for successful mill levies in order to maintain the status quo. Because of the increased scrutiny by the legislature and the courts of the Board's accreditation status of schools, the Board on March 20, 2008 made a request of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction regarding the 2007-2008 progress report to the Board based on on-site accreditation visits for schools with accreditation violations. Specifically, the Board asked for further information on the following points:

1. In each category – Regular/Minor Deviation, Advice, Deficiency; what is the number of students in schools under that status?

2. In each category – Regular/Minor Deviation, Advice, Deficiency; what is the percentage of students in schools under that status? In other words, how many students are affected by schools that are deficient in each of these categories?

3. A review of variance to standards to quantify the most frequently requested variances and illustrations of how those variances are meeting or exceeding the standard. An example most recently brought to the attention of the Board is the allowance for missassigned teachers, which has almost tripled this past year, to be considered under the category Regular or Regular with Deviations in contrast with the Board's own rule 10.55.604 which states, "that standards pertaining to teacher licensure or endorsement are not included in the category of which a school district may apply for a variance."

The basis for these questions is the Board's attempt to find out why 27% (1/4) of all schools and 32% (1/3) of our middle schools are in advice or deficiency status. These figures do not even include first time missassignment of teachers. The Board needs to know if:

- Our rules are aligned with current best practices of schools in the global society?
- The reporting data bases have become more sophisticated and therefore skew the collection of more effective, useable data?
- Local school districts are making choices to not meet the given standard and if so why?
- Is there a scarcity of resources which don't allow the local school districts to meet the standards given their best effort to do so?

Could scarcity of resources be broken down into scarcity of time, human resources, and/or fiscal resources?

In response to the Board's inquiry, the Superintendent of Public Instruction has promised a discussion regarding schools that are in a continuous state of deviation from the standards to assure consistency with the intent toward continuous education improvement. This discussion is scheduled to start on May 9, 2008.

LFD Narrative:

Version	Date	Author

Change Description