

----- Original Message -----

From: [Kim Howard](#)

To: [Grassroots](#)

Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2008 11:28 AM

Subject: [grassroots] FW: BEF update

Yesterday the BEF continued to discuss major topic areas. Where decisions can be made, staff has been directed to add them to a draft final version. Chair Grimm has made it clear that changes can still be made to the draft proposal and that committee members are not obligated to vote the same way once the final version is drafted. There are approx. 7 more topic areas to be covered. Chair Grimm expects that these discussions will finish sometime next Monday and that the group will start review of the final draft that day. Meetings will continue all day next Tues. and Wed.

What is clear from the discussions is that many details will still need to be worked out/clarified once the committee presents its proposal. Each of these topics is highly complex. This committee will not be able to develop the detail to the level needed for implementation.

It is also clear that the committee is committed to change. In each of the topic areas, committee members have typically not voted for the status quo; they are interested in voting for a proposal for change.

Staffing levels - The committee voted to use the legislators' proposal as the basis for the discussion of staffing levels. To help inform this discussion, Jennifer Priddy had provided a side-by-side analysis of the staffing levels recommended by each proposal for a prototype high school. The vote was very close between the OSPI proposal and the Legislators' proposal. There are some differences between the two, including a slightly lower class size recommendation in the Legislators' proposal. In general, all proposals recognized the categories of staff that are needed and came up with similar recommended ratios. The group will continue the discussion of staffing level recommendations next week

Core 24 – The group agreed to use the Core 24 framework to help shape their recommendations. There is agreement about the need to fund a 6 period day. Some students would need more than that. How to accommodate the need for some students to have additional time is still to be worked out.

Planning time – It was agreed that teachers would have 1 hour of planning time per day.

Early learning – There was a lengthy discussion about early learning and whether or not this should be included in the new definition of basic education. The chair assured the committee that their mandate as described in SB 5627 was broad enough to include early learning. In the end it was decided that early learning would be included in the draft. It sounded like the draft wording would include some combination of Chair Grimm's and the League of Education voters proposals, which would involve expanding the number of at risk children served.

Collective Bargaining – Long discussion which was continued from last week. Chair Grimm presented a proposal for state takeover of collective bargaining. Committee members felt this went too far. Rep. Hunter indicated that he will be presenting an alternative proposal next week. Staff may also be modifying the Grimm proposal based on the conversation. This discussion will continue.

TRI pay – This is teacher pay which is funded by local levies and is essentially additional pay. Additional work duties are not currently required. There is general agreement that more parameters need to be built into TRI pay. The committee agreed that the final recommendation would be that TRI pay should be based on additional time requirements related to job duties. (There was a lot of concern expressed about how all of these pieces would need to work together. When this piece is implemented during a phase in of other funding would be critical to the health of the system.

Accountability – There was agreement to support the legislators’ proposed recommendation that the State Board of Education work be supported. This work is still in draft stage, but does include a grading system based on multiple measures and then state directed support and intervention for schools that do not show progress.

Certification - Agreed on the legislators’ proposal to implement a new statewide evaluation and certification system, which recognizes different career stages of entry, professional certification and professional advancement. All teachers must achieve professional certification within 2-5 years.

Professional Development – Committee agreement on the legislators’ proposal with some modifications. This would involve a new structured mentoring program focusing on new teachers.

I-728 - Agreed that I-728 funding would be folded into the funding model and not continue to exist as a separate funding stream. Again, with this issue there were concerns about how this would be phased in and the implications for districts. One piece of I-728 that the group agreed to try to retain would be the concept that there be community involvement in the local decision-making about funding. Given that most funding streams will be converted to block funding under the proposal, this piece will be especially significant, and is something that PTA would strongly support.

Levies - Fascinating discussion which I recommend that you listen to online via twv. This took place during the last 30-40 minutes of the meeting. The bottom line is that our levy system needs to be fixed, but that it is very difficult to fix without having any losers. There is general agreement that there needs to be less reliance on levies for basic education costs. Some strong arguments in favor of the need for local levy money, which allows for local innovation. Agreement of the group that this topic needs to be dealt with last as a part of the “phasing in” discussion.

Next week’s meetings are in the Cherberg bldg. All meetings start at 9AM.

Kim Howard
Community Relations/Advocacy Coordinator
Washington State PTA
1.800.562.3804 Office
253-241-7187 Cell
253.565.7753 Fax - khoward@wastatepta.org
*'every **child.** one **voice.**'*

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This E-mail and any attachments may be intended for the personal and confidential use of the sender and/or recipient(s) named above. This message is not a public document. If you have received the E-mail in error, do not review, transmit, convert to hard copy, use, or disseminate this E-mail or any attachments. Delete this message and notify the sender by return E-mail. Thank you.