

## MINUTES

October 14, 2003

Minutes of the special meeting of the State Board of Education held October 14, 2003, at the Utah State Office of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah. Meeting commenced at 12:25 p.m Chairman Kim R. Burningham presided.

Members present were:

Chairman Kim R. Burningham  
Vice Chairman, Janet A. Cannon  
Member Dixie Lee Allen  
Member R. Michael Anderson  
Member Linnea S. Barney  
Member Tim Beagley  
Member Laurel Brown  
Member Edward A. Dalton  
Member Greg W. Haws  
Member David L. Moss  
Member John C. Pingree  
Member Jed H. Pitcher  
Member Joyce W. Richards  
Member Debra G. Roberts

Member Teresa L. Theurer

Members Denis R. Morrill and Sara V. Sinclair were excused.

Also present were:

Executive Officer Steven O. Laing  
Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington  
Associate Superintendent Patrick Ogden  
Associate Superintendent Raymond Timothy  
Executive Director, USOR, Blaine Petersen  
Public Affairs Director Mark Peterson  
Board Secretary Twila B. Affleck

Also present were:

Members of the Press:

Jennifer Toomer-Cook, Deseret Morning News  
Ronnie Lynn, Salt Lake Tribune  
Amy K. Stewart, Standard Examiner  
Ann Fielden, Harcourt Assessment  
Linda Smith, Legislative Coalition for People with Disabilities  
Chad Harris, Governor's Office of Planning & Budget  
Martine Smith, Citizen  
Scott Hardy, Citizen  
McKell Withers, Superintendent, Salt Lake City School District

Charles Housman, Salt Lake City School District  
Trish Wlodarczyk, Salt Lake City School District  
Jo Ellen Killpack, Salt Lake City School District  
Pat Rusk, Utah Education Association  
Cheryl Phipps, Utah PTA

Member Linnea S. Barney lead the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Member Greg W. Haws offered a reverence.

Twila B. Affleck recorded the minutes.

Chairman Burningham excused Board Members Denis Morrill and Sara Sinclair.

### Performance Plus

Chairman Burningham expressed appreciation to all the people who have worked so hard in putting together and attending the summits as well as the public hearings. He noted in particular the Board's staff, Superintendent Steve Laing, Associate Superintendents, Patti Harrington, Ray Timothy, and Patrick Ogden. Also, Lynn Trenbeath, her assistants Carolyn Roberts, and Elizabeth Alldridge from the Davis School District. Chairman Burningham presented gifts to each of these three individuals from Davis School District.

Lynn Trenbeath summarized the key issues that emerged during the summit discussions including process recommendations based upon the comments, review of written data and conversations with the facilitators. (For complete details, see General Exhibit No. 9170.)

Patti Harrington, Associate Superintendent reported that the ad hoc committee has reviewed all the information and prepared their report.

Chairman Burningham indicated that in order to facilitate the meeting that the Board make all suggestions in the form of motions of three types: 1) general motions pertaining to the entire scope of the plan; 2) specific motions regarding immediate adjustments to the plan - Performance Plus; and 3) motions recommending longer consideration for possible future adjustment to the plan. He then presented his own remunerations that may help to facilitate motions and discussions. (For complete details, see General Exhibit No. 9171.)

Motion was made by Member Dixie L. Allen and seconded by Member David L. Moss that the Board adopt the recommendations on the second page of the letter from Mrs. Trenbeath under Executive Summary and Recommendations:

- Develop a Performance Plus Model that incorporates the recommendations.
- Reassemble the Steering Committee to review Summit information and revised Performance Plus pan.
- Utilize a task force to develop a time line for implementation of Performance Plus that includes funding needs for each aspect.
- Present the revised Performance Plus Model to all District Collaboration Teams. Explain how recommendations were incorporated. This will honor the comments and recommendations made by attendees at the Summits.
- Establish a task force to develop exit competencies and assessment methods that are linked to the core

curriculum. Task force members would include but not be limited to teachers, parents, higher education representatives, curriculum specialists, business representatives.

- Research effective K-12 intervention and remediation programs.
- Appoint a task force to investigate strategies to involve and train parents about their role in competency measured education.
- Utilize a team such as the State Staff Development Council to lead discussion and planning for professional development for teachers and other staff members.
- Continue discussion with higher education to formulate pre-service training needs, portability of competencies on transcripts, and other issues relating to a continuing relationship with public education.
- Form a task force to develop the funding formulas, taking into consideration the need for teacher and other staff salaries, extended school days, necessary technology for online assessment, capital expenses necessary to support remediation and intervention strategies, rural district needs, and other financial issues as warranted.
- Develop a plan for the implementation of pilot programs in both urban and rural school districts.
- Review and evaluate current comparable programs in and out of state.
- Develop a comprehensive public relations plan to educate the public regarding Performance Plus.

Member Tim Beagley commented that these do not seem like general things to address, they are more specific. He spoke against voting on them as a group.

Motion was made by Member Teresa Theurer and seconded by Member Joyce W. Richards to amend the motion to remove bullets No. 2 and No. 4.

Member Theurer commented that she did not feel that the Board needed to do these things.

Member Greg Haws commented that he is not necessarily opposed to these specific items, but felt the Board needed to get back to more generalities.

Members Theurer and Richards withdrew their amendment to the motion.

A Substitute Motion was presented by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon and seconded by Member Teresa Theurer that the Board affirms their support for the general concepts of competency education as suggested in the Performance Plus draft.

Member John Pingree presented an amendment to the motion to add at the end as well as increase the graduation requirement. He felt that this concept is where we started. There being no second the amendment died.

Member Tim Beagley commented that when we started this concept we agreed that there was some set of competency abilities that everyone in the state should be able to have in order to graduate from high school, and that we could some how measure those. He did not feel that that logic was accurate. He was not sure that a set of competencies in Logan would be exactly the same as a set of competencies in St. George. While the ideas of competency is a good one, it may well be that competency, as with beauty, may well be in the eye of the beholder. He questioned if there was a way to define what that means without losing the individuality of the students.

Superintendent Laing noted that this is really the heart of a couple of the recommendations in the summary letter from Mrs. Trenbeath. He pointed to the fifth bullet on the first page of the letter: "Definition of competency and

how competencies would be determined and assessed was reiterated many times in each of the Summits.” This would indicate questions and concerns around that definition. On the second page, fifth bullet: “Establish a task force to develop exit competencies and assessment methods that are linked to the core curriculum...” Seems to be somewhat related. Therefore, if we accept the motion as presented, does it include the reconsideration of what we define as competency or are we accepting the definitions of competency as advocated in the Performance Plus Proposal?

Chairman Burningham suggested that the Board may want to amend the statement to say: We affirm the Utah State Board of Educations support for the general concepts of competency education as suggested in the Performance Plus draft as it currently exists and as it will be amended.

Member Ed Dalton commented that since this seems to be a continual work in progress, this is what we need to do. To further define, give examples and answer those questions as they relate to competency.

Amendment to the motion was made by Member Edward A. Dalton and seconded by Member R. Michael Anderson to take the original language and add to it that as suggested in the Performance Plus draft and with other modifications as determined after study and recommendation and approval by the Board. Motion: “We affirm the USBE support for the general concepts of competency education as suggested in the Performance Plus draft and with other modifications as determined after study and recommendation and approved by the Board.

Member Linnea Barney felt that with the addition the Board would be moving from the general ideas. She suggested that we take out the specific reference to performance plus and say we support the concept of competency education.

Substitute Amendment to the motion was made by Member Linnea S. Barney and seconded by Member Laurel Brown to take out the words after competency education. Substitute Amendment: We affirm the USBE support for the general concepts of competency education.

Member Mike Anderson commented that he supported Member Dalton’s point because from here on out we are going to be making decision regarding Performance Plus. If we stop at competency this is something we have already stated in a number of ways, but it does not allow for continual changes and approvals to be done by the Board.

Substitute Amendment carried with Members Allen, Barney, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Members Beagley and Pingree opposed.

Motion was made by Member David L. Moss and seconded by R. Michael Anderson that we show support for the general concepts of competency education as suggested in the Performance Plus draft and other modification as determined after study and recommendations and action by the Board.

Motion was made by Member Greg Haws and seconded by Member Tim Beagley to table this motion feeling that this should be the last motion adopted by the Board. Motion to table carried with Members Allen, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Members Anderson

and Moss opposed.

Motion was made by Member Greg W. Haws and seconded by Member Debra G. Roberts to adopt general motions 2, 3 and 4 from those recommended by Chairman Burningham:

(2) Implementation of the full concept of competency as promoted in Performance Plus will require a minimum of \$203 million new dollars as suggested in statewide presentations. (3) The process for implementing a competency-based system should begin now. Some actions are clear and should be initiated immediately. Other avenues will require care and careful research to initiate. Any actions taken must be supported by the appropriation of adequate funding. (4) Depending on financial support appropriated, staff should determine a step-by-step time line for implementation of competency education. Such a plan should include immediate steps and long-range steps. Some aspects may be implemented statewide. Other aspects may be best piloted in smaller jurisdictions. All actions should involve teacher-student-parent-decision maker input.”

Member Dave Moss requested clarification on point 4, with regard to step-by-step time line for implementation. Are we going to be specific about those steps? He recommend that be clarified in the language.

Amendment to the motion was made by Member David L. Moss and seconded by Member Teresa L. Theurer that the last portion of Motion #4 from Chairman Burningham read: “Depending on financial support appropriated, staff should determine the prioritization, and a step-by-step time line for implementation of the individual steps or components of competency education.

Amendment to the amendment was made by Member Teresa Theurer and seconded by Member Laurel Brown to take out the two sentences next to the last: “Some aspects may be implemented statewide. Other aspects may be best piloted in smaller jurisdictions.” The amendment would then read: “Depending on financial support appropriated, staff should determine the prioritization, and a step-by-step time line for implementation of the individual steps or components of competency education. Such a plan should include immediate steps and long-range steps. All actions should involve teacher-student-parent-decision maker input.”

Member John Pingree voiced concern about removing the reference to piloting the process.

Member Theurer indicated that the Board has not discussed the issue of piloting.

Member Tim Beagley spoke against the amendment to the amendment on the basis that the staff would be the State Office Staff and we would force the implementation time on the districts rather than let them establish their own time line.

Amendment to the Amendment carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Beagley opposed.

Amendment to the original motion was made by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon and seconded by Member Linnea S. Barney to eliminate two lines in the middle of Motion No. 3. “Some actions are clear and should be initiated immediately. Other avenues will require care and careful research to initiate.” These are vague and open to any individuals interpretation. Motion No. 3 would then read: “The process for implementing a competency-based system

should begin now. Any actions taken must be supported by the appropriation of adequate funding.

Member Beagley indicated that this would make the two sentences diametrically opposed to each other.

Amendment carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Beagley opposed.

Amendment to the Motion was made by Member Laurel Brown, seconded Teresa Theurer on Motion No. 4, “Depending on financial support appropriated, staff should recommend to the board, instead of ~~determine a~~. Motion carried unanimously.

Original motion to adopt Chairman Burningham’s General Motions 2, 3 and 4 as amended carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Member Tim Beagley and seconded by Member R. Michael Anderson that the Board recognizes the need for and will support flexibility at the district level in implementation of a competency based education system. Motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards and Roberts voting in favor; Members Theurer and Cannon opposed.

Member Dave Moss voiced concern that with all the work that has been done on Performance Plus that somewhere in our general motions we are not acknowledging our support of Performance Plus.

Motion was made by Member David L. Moss and seconded by Member R. Michael Anderson to return the previous motion to the table.

Member Greg Haws commented that he could not vote on the original motion at this time because the ad hoc committee had further recommendations and that the motion needs to be the last motion made.

Motion to return the previous motion to the table was withdrawn

Member Teresa Theurer, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee presented recommendations from the Committee relative to the Performance Plus Proposal.

Motion from the Committee that on Page 5, under the Required units of general education courses include: Three changes: Adjust Science and Social Studies to go along with existing board rule. Health and Physical Fitness, combine and have 1.5 of those units specified as they currently are. It is understood that we will need to address the teacher certification in those classes to make sure we do not cause problems for the local districts.

Member Debra Roberts questioned if the science requirement allow districts to use some of the ATE science classes? It was clarified that the current Board rule does not allow that. Member Roberts requested that the rule be amended to include those classes for the science requirement. Staff was instructed to address the Board rule on science requirements and the possibility of including the ATE classes.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon questioned if this would require an adjustment to the Board rule to remove the .5 elective currently in social studies. The Board agreed to add this to the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion from the Committee to change the title relative to exit competencies on Page 5 to read: Students will perform exit competencies while earning units of general education. First paragraph as written except to eliminate last sentence and the bullets; keep the last paragraph.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington suggested that the last paragraph be changed to read: Following careful dialog with stakeholders from throughout the state,... Included in the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion from the Committee under Students shall earn course units through one of the following: (1) Earning a grade of C or better (which grade is reflective of the final ability of the student) and passing the appropriate end-of-level test (CRT) within the Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) (where available).

Discussion ensued as to how this might be attained. It was noted that this would be an enormous paradigm shift in teacher thinking. It was also noted that this is the core of what we are trying to do.

Superintendent Laing commented that he is hearing a definition of a grading period being a fraction of a unit of credit. Then saying you need a C at each grading period. He indicated that the Board would specify each unit of credit for graduation but it doesn't preclude the district from chopping up them up into smaller pieces if they desire. A grading period is by district definition a sub unit of credit and you are not going to accept anything less than a C.

Member Dixie Allen commented that this would take effort and practice out of the testing, and would place the general competency level for specific areas we define as important to know.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington commented that what is missing is every class should have standards and be driven by those standards. It is not being said, but it is clearly there in the background.

Amendment to the amendment was made by Member Tim Beagley to change the wording to: Earning a course grade of C, adding as determined by district policy, then the rest of the sentence. There being no second, motion died.

Lynn Trenbeath commented that it is important to remember that we don't know what competencies are. It is difficult for the Board to pull together when there are so many courses and competencies that have not been developed. There are projects ongoing throughout the state where districts are taking different courses and trying to determine some of those exit competencies. It is not just letter grades, but also the competencies that also contribute to what that student has accomplished.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion from the Committee under Students shall earn course units, to strike Paragraph No. 2.

Member Theurer indicated that the Committee recommends this because of the public comments that were received and the need to teach the students to test well.

Member Debra Roberts voiced concern for the need to protect those kids who truly have test phobia.

Discussion ensued relative to the reflection of the test and what it means to the students.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon questioned if we opt these students out are we still in compliance with the requirements of No Child Left Behind? Superintendent Laing responded that NCLB requires 95 percent participation rate. There are very stringent requirements about how students are exempted from that. It may require them to take the test, but it does not require them to take it seriously.

Motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards and Theurer voting in favor; Members Burningham and Roberts opposed.

Motion from the Committee that the Board direct staff to develop lines of evidence the students need to do in order to take the CRTs without taking the class.

Superintendent Laing questioned if they were proposing that the iteration of lines of evidence be from which districts can choose or can they go above and beyond? How directive would these be?

Member Laurel Brown clarified that the intent was that the Board would give some direction, but leave flexibility for the districts.

Clarification of the Motion: Students provide evidence of preparation in a subject area according to guidelines established by the State Board of Education, and pass the CRT.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion from the Committee under Students Shall Earn Course Units Through One of the Following: (4) Where end of level CRTs do not exist earning a grade of C or better (which grade is reflective of the final ability of the student) or demonstrating competency in the subject area according to requirements established by the USBE.

Motion carried unanimously.

Member Theurer reported that the Committee discussed whether we wanted the same stipulations to count for the classes that districts are requiring above our requirements. The Committee consensus was that this would be for all courses taken by students. This applies to all courses required for graduation.

Member Laurel Brown expressed concern that the Board is really raising the bar, and for the students in special education or are English Language Learners it is going to be much more difficult. She questioned if we wanted to raise the bar so high there is no allowance for error? If so, are we going to provide intervention for those that don't get a C in choir? She felt it should just be for the 18 the State Board requires.

Member Theurer commented that this may be one thing we could allow districts to decide on, above the 18.

Member Greg Haws commented that there was not a vote taken on this in the Committee meeting. He felt that it should remain with the 18 and beyond that let the district make the decision.

Motion from the Committee under Middle Level Students Must Earn Required Units of General Education

following Pre-Algebra, English 8 and Integrated Science 8 the new language adopted on page 6 be inserted: Earning a course grade of C or better (which grade is reflective of the final ability of the student) and passing the appropriate end-of-level test (CRT) within the Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS)

It was clarified that this would just apply to the three courses listed, Pre-Algebra, English 8 and Integrated Science 8.

Superintendent Laing commented that this is a pretty strong statement. He questioned if the Board had a more definitive idea of what the consequence are? Pass them at this level or what? Obviously we are going to intervene, we anticipate remediation, but if those efforts don't generate competency then what? He felt more thought needed to go into this issue.

Motion carried with Members Allen, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Anderson absent.

Motion from the Committee that under the section "Accommodations May Be Made for Some Students" to use the word modifications whenever we can in place of the word accommodations. That this issue be referred to a task force to address the accommodation/modification issue in line with State Board rule. Motion carried with Members Allen Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Anderson absent.

Member Theurer reported that the Committee discussed the issue of diplomas. Motion from the Committee that the Board ask staff to study differentiated diplomas, incorporating in the study the Board's current rules and develop something the Board can discuss further. Motion carried with Members Allen, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Anderson absent.

Member Theurer reported that one area the Committee did not get to was on page 5 relative to academic choices of the area of focus, the last bullet under High School Students Must Earn Required Units of General Education As One Measure of Ability.

Motion was made by Member Tim Beagley and seconded by Member Edward A. Dalton to change the wording to: student elective choices (3) \*, to say students elective choices should be conscientiously chosen by the student in coordination with counselors and parents.

Member Linnea Barney commented that she felt there needed to be a section that recognizes the importance of counseling and the need for parent involvement in student choice.

Following discussion, Member Beagley amended his motion to change the wording to: student elective choices (3).

Superintendent Laing commented that since the Board was requiring districts to offer 24 credits, and there is no criteria around student electives, he recommended it be changed to 5.

Discussion ensued relative to the number of electives, either 3 or 5 or go back to the original 9.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon suggested that with all the concern about electives that the Board leave this issue alone and go for the competencies we are most concerned about.

Member Dixie Allen suggested that the Board stay with the 24 credits, 18 required by the Board and six electives.

Superintendent Laing indicated that would not accommodate the released time.

Further discussion ensued relative to the number of required and number of elective courses.

Motion was made by Member Tim Beagley and seconded by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon to strike the wording ~~academic choices in areas of focus~~ and replace it with: additional requirements and electives as prescribed by the local board.

Member Debra Roberts commented that this would weaken the SEOP process, and this is very much needed. She also felt that there are some districts that if they aren't required won't do it.

Motion carried with Members Allen, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Pingree, and Richards voting in favor; Members Moss, Roberts and Theurer voting against, Member Anderson absent.

Member Linnea Barney felt there should be something in the document regarding counseling direction for students.

Motion was made by Member Linnea S. Barney and seconded by Member Tim Beagley to add a statement at the beginning: Each student should begin with the end in mind and choose a plan carefully with direction from parents and counselors according to his/her aims and goals of each, recognizing difference in aptitudes and interest. Availability of adequate counseling is essential to this process.

Superintendent Laing questioned if the motion was to apply to the K-12 system? If not, you may want to specify a certain grade level for this to apply to. Further, does the Board have a concept of what counseling is adequate? He indicated that the \$203 million does not include a specific level of counseling services. If we do this, we will want to come back and revise the budget figures.

Discussion ensued as to where this would apply and where the statement would be placed in the document. It was suggested that this statement would fit more closely directly under the heading High School Students Must Earn Required Units of General Education as One Measure of Ability.

Further discussion ensued relative to where the money currently is for counseling and how this would fit into the budget request.

Member Debra Roberts requested that the statement include a phrase that it be a student/occupation plan.

Member John Pingree voiced concern with the current ratio of counselors to students and the need for more counselors, costing more money.

Member Dixie Allen commented that in her school the teachers and staff step in and help the counselors.

Clarification of the motion and the wording of the statement: Each student should begin with the end in mind and choose a plan carefully with direction from educators and parents, according to aims and goals of each student, recognizing differences in aptitudes and interests. Availability of adequate counseling is essential to this process.

Motion carried with Members Allen, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Anderson absent.

Placement of the statement would be directly under the heading “High School Students Must Earn Required Units of General Education as One Measure of Ability.”

Member Ed Dalton questioned that as we proceed if there are some things we feel strongly about from our hearings that we need to have attended to before we go on this course.

Chairman Burningham responded that there have been so many changes and adjustments that we may need a chance to look at this fully one more time. He felt the Board needed to look at this a second time with all of the changes. He indicated that the next regularly scheduled board meeting is November 14, and questioned if that was too late?

Superintendent Laing commented that the general motions made by the Board today are quite encompassing and responding to the recommendations from the Summits and the public hearings will also be quite encompassing. He indicated that staff could revise this with the input given today, and prepare another one for consideration. For the Board to reconsider this we need to do it in the November 14 meeting or schedule another special meeting. There are some issues that are fundamental to this proposal that have yet to be resolved. Such as, does the Board still feel that the CRTs are the appropriate tool for the determination of competency? They still exist in Items 1 and renumbered 2 and 3. Is the Board going to continue to do that?

Dr. Laing commented that there is a lot of work yet to be done by staff and questioned how the Board wanted to go about doing it.

Member Ed Dalton commented on the next steps of the process. He indicated that there has been quite an interjection of the concept of task forces. Is this something that is down the road or an immediate type approach.

Superintendent Laing requested direction and clarification for the task forces, are they of the Board, stakeholders or who?

Motion was made by Member Debra G. Roberts and seconded by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon to bring back on the table the motion that we support the general concept of competency as defined in Performance Plus draft as determined after study and recommendation approval by the Board. Motion carried with Members Allen, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member

Anderson absent.

Discussion ensued relative to whether or not the document is still a “draft” or if we need to change it to “plan.”

Member Dave Moss commented that we need to acknowledge the fact that a tremendous amount of work has been put into this document, yet we still support the premise of the Performance Plus Proposal.

Member Moss requested that he be allowed to reword his original motion.

Motion was made by Member David L. Moss and seconded by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon that the Board’s support of the general concepts competency based education as discussed in the Performance Plus Proposal as amended. Anticipating additional and modifications as determined by the Board. Motion carried with Members Allen, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Anderson absent.

Chairman Burningham voiced concern about the issue of a faster turn around time for the CRTs.

Superintendent Laing indicated that the means by which we calculated the assessment portion will provide wireless computer labs at a ratio of 60 per 500 students for the purpose of turning around assessment.

Discussion ensued relative to the needs, if any, for another meeting prior to November 14.

Chairman Burningham suggested the Board meet prior to November 14 to review the document again based on the input from today’s meeting.

Superintendent Laing stated that he heard a lot in the public hearings a concern relative to the priority of using the CRTs. This issue still has not been addressed as to whether or not we are going to continue to use the CRTs. There are a lot of people who agree on the concept, but not on any specifics. He felt that if we are relying on the CRT as a means of demonstrating proficiency we need to gel around that.

Member John Pingree suggested that the Board have another meeting to look at what has been decided so far and that the Superintendent raise all the questions alluded to so the Board can become more comfortable with what may happen.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon stated that if there is another meeting she would like to see us address the budget numbers we have proposed to do this proposal with. She suggested that the general numbers be presented with more specifics on how the general numbers were determined and if we give the legislature the option of dealing with this as a line item, how would we break out those numbers.

Following further discussion on the need for another meeting, a meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 29, 2003 at 12:00 p.m.

Discussion ensued relative to the task forces and whether or not there would be representation from the Board on them. It was determined that board members be included on the task forces.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.