

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

January 23, 2009

8:03 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Paul Seaton, Chair
Representative Cathy Engstrom Munoz, Vice Chair
Representative Bryce Edgmon
Representative Wes Keller
Representative Peggy Wilson
Representative Robert L. "Bob" Buch
Representative Berta Gardner

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

OVERVIEW(S): DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, TEACHING AND LEARNING
SUPPORT, ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

No previous action to record

WITNESS REGISTER

MARK LEWIS, Director
Administrative Services
Department of Education and Early Development (EED)
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Offered information and responded to
questions during the overview from the department.

LES MORSE, Deputy Commissioner
Assessment and Accountability
Department of Education and Early Development (EED)
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Responded to questions during the overview
from the department.

CYNTHIA CURRAN, Director
Teaching and Learning Support (TLS)
Department of Education and Early Development (EED)

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided an overview of the TLS program.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[8:03:23 AM](#)

CHAIR PAUL SEATON called the House Standing Committee on Education meeting to order at 8:03 a.m. Representatives Seaton, Munoz, Wilson, Edgmon, Keller, Buch, and Gardner were present at the call to order.

^OVERVIEW(S): DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, TEACHING AND LEARNING SUPPORT, ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

[8:03:48 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON announced that the only order of business would be an overview by the Department of Education regarding teaching and learning support, and assessment and accountability.

[8:04:21 AM](#)

MARK LEWIS, Director, Administrative Services, Department of Education and Early Development (EED), said he would address questions previously submitted to the department by the committee.

[8:06:20 AM](#)

MR. LEWIS turned to the first question, regarding the Unity Project - the longitudinal data system. He reported that the project was a U.S. [Department of Education] grant, the award for which was \$3.5 million. The project was scheduled to last from October 2006, through October 2008. A one-year, non-monetary extension was requested by the department because of set-backs, and the extension was granted through October 2009. Mr. Lewis said that in fiscal year 2009 (FY09), the department received a general fund appropriation of \$610 thousand from the state to maintain the project, which he noted was a requirement under the grant. Thus far, the department has spent \$2.5 million, and has approximately \$770,000 in federal and the majority of the \$610,000 state's general funds remaining. He remarked that it is difficult to find qualified analyst programmers within Alaska; the department has had to look for contractors from the private sector, which has caused project delays.

8:08:15 AM

CHAIR SEATON asked Mr. Lewis to summarize what is being done on the program related to the longitudinal data set.

8:08:24 AM

MR. LEWIS reviewed that as information is received in the department's assessment unit, the system helps by identifying errors in the data. Once corrected, records are stored in a data warehouse, at which point research can occur. Another element of the program has to do with automating web portals, which allows web access to people in the districts who have the proper security access to do their own research. The ultimate goal of the longitudinal data system, he said is to make quality decisions based on the information over a period of time.

8:11:04 AM

MR. LEWIS, in response to Chair Seaton, said currently the information is performance data related to student identifiers, not budget data. However, he said it is anticipated in the future that a budget element could be added.

8:11:25 AM

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER inquired if this system will be ongoing.

MR. LEWIS confirmed that the intent of the department is for the program to continue in a maintenance phase after the initial system is set up. He noted that is the purpose of the general funds the department received last year. In response to follow-up questions, he clarified that there were issues related to the department's infrastructure, which were resolved through the use of Alaska vendors. The formal solicitation awarded the contract to an out-of-state vendor through a competitive process. The uniqueness of the project meant that there were only a certain number of vendors who could compete; therefore it was anticipated that there would be out-of-state vendors for the large contract. He offered further explanation regarding the difficulty in hiring from within the department, noting that expertise and pay scale were two issues. He said the administration is aware of the issue.

8:15:25 AM

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER asked for further details regarding the pilot program.

MR. LEWIS related that data was collected last fall from the following districts: Juneau, Sitka, Kodiak, Delta-Greely, Matanuska-Susitna, Anchorage, and Fairbanks. This spring, data will be collected by means of the system, piloting with many of the aforementioned, plus Northwest Arctic, Galena, Wrangell, and Copper River. He deferred to Les Morse to supply the timeline to fully implement the program.

[8:16:04 AM](#)

LES MORSE, Deputy Commissioner, Assessment and Accountability, Department of Education and Early Development, explained that the department will be working out the timeframe during the next academic school year. In response to a follow-up question, he said as the department rolls out new components, there will be professional development. The department is trying to figure out how to do professional development in a way that allows it to "take advantage of distance education in many arenas."

[8:19:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked about the department's hiring process.

MR. LEWIS outlined the department's hiring process, noting that the department uses a hiring tool called, "Workplace Alaska." When recruitment fails, the Department of Administration (DOA) tracks the information to determine the reason(s) for the failure.

[8:20:48 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER queried if the longitudinal data study can sort and provide statistics for how a district, building, teacher, or a specific student is performing. Is the system sophisticated enough to generate such information.

MR. MORSE said the department is currently able to provide that information, however, it is not easily generated, nor can anyone at a district level access the information. The intent, behind the longitudinal data system, is for full automation, and to allow districts and researchers, with secure/authorized access, to perform analyses. Regarding the concern for bandwidth, he said it would not be a problem, because the files that come

across will be in a low profile, text format that can be compressed to a zip file.

8:22:34 AM

MR. LEWIS moved on to name the core services for teaching and learning support: to provide leadership and technical assistance to schools related to state and federal education requirements and strategies that will result in improved student success; to provide assistance to parents, families, schools, to achieve greater involvement in students' education; to administer statewide testing and assessments; to provide technical assistance to district staff and collect and analyze data; to provide ongoing and daily technical assistance to grantees related to increased student achievement, educational improvement, school health, and safety; to administer and provide technical assistance to schools, with options such as statewide correspondence programs and charter schools; to issue and administer state and federal grants, contracts, reimbursable services agreements for the provision of direct student instruction and professional development; to administer teacher certification and accreditation of teacher education; to assure quality of instate teacher administration programs; and to administer to youth in detention and special schools.

8:24:09 AM

MR. LEWIS directed attention to page 2 of a handout in the committee packet entitled, "FY2010 Operating & Capital Budget." He highlighted the following agency operations listed on page 2: Student and School Achievement, Statewide Mentoring Program, Teacher Certification, Child Nutrition, and Early Learning Coordination. The latter is where Head Start is housed. Mr. Lewis noted the general, federal, and "other" funds that are allocated to these operations, as shown on page 2. In response to Chair Seaton, he confirmed that the budget for Child Nutrition includes [\$86,600] in general funds from the State of Alaska and [\$35,494,100] in federal funds.

8:26:49 AM

MR. LEWIS directed attention to a spread sheet on pages 9-10, which outlines how resources are allocated within the Teaching & Learning Support Component. In response to Chair Seaton, he confirmed that, in regard to state assessments, there is nothing listed under the federal column, while there is \$3.7 million listed under federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) column. He

explained that at one time NCLB was included in the federal column, but it was broken out from that column when someone requested the information on its own. He offered his understanding that the money for NCLB is acquired directly from the federal government to fulfill the program requirements.

[8:29:05 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER pointed to the special education component and noted that it receives federal funding. She asked if the amount listed reflects the total funding for all children holding an individual education program (IEP). She said her question pertains to her desire to ascertain which children are not graduating. She suggested that Alaska may have a disproportionate number of special needs children due to parental/student, drug/alcohol abuse, as well as encouragement for military personnel to locate to Alaskan installations based on the services available for a child with an IEP. Do our schools meet these students' needs, and if not, would that not skew the statistics for the state's low graduation rates.

[8:31:25 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON announced that a future meeting may be covering this line of questioning.

[8:32:13 AM](#)

MR. LEWIS offered his understanding that "within this program," the special education federal allocation is most likely directed toward monitoring and compliance. He said he believes that the special education funds to which Representative Gardner has referred, flows through the Foundation Formula directly to the school districts to implement their [special education] program.

[8:32:47 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON specified that special education would be addressed at Wednesday's meeting.

[8:33:13 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE EDGMON noted that the category of small Rural School Achievement has an allocation of \$170,000, while the State Assessments category receives \$3.7 million, and he said he would like to know if these two entities combine to work together.

8:34:11 AM

CYNTHIA CURRAN, Director, Teaching and Learning Support (TLS), Department of Education and Early Development (EED), explained that the small rural school achievement program is a federal program that allows districts with small enrollments to combine federal funding to use in other federal programs. She offered an example of how Title IV funding could be combined with Title I funding, to assist students. In response to a follow-up question, she confirmed that there is no direct relationship with state assessments program.

8:36:07 AM

REPRESENTATIVE MUNOZ expressed concern for the low funding allotted for counseling and suicide prevention.

MS. CURRAN offered her understanding that the department is working with Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) to address the issue, and she offered to provide further information to the committee.

8:36:40 AM

REPRESENTATIVE MUNOZ questioned what the line for Alaska Mineral & Energy Resources Education Fund (AMEREF) relates to. MR. LEWIS responded that AMEREF is a grant, from that board, to fulfill contractual obligations for providing a curriculum to children regarding mineral and energy resources within Alaska.

8:38:10 AM

MR. LEWIS, in response to a question from Representative Keller regarding the Alaska Longitudinal Data System component, explained that in the FY10 budget there will be no federal funds associated with that program. He emphasized that the funding shown on the chart is only an estimate and subject to fluctuation.

8:39:39 AM

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON commented on the mineral kits and AMEREF lesson plans, for the benefit of committee members who are not familiar with the program. She then asked whether there are areas that suffered federal funding reductions when money was directed to fulfill NCLB requirements.

[8:41:24 AM](#)

MR. LEWIS said he would provide information to the committee, as to which areas may have lost funding, when NCLB was enacted, and whether the state is offsetting the funding loss, or if the schools are expected to make do with less funding.

[8:41:38 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH offered his understanding that there was a mandate to fund NCLB at a certain level, but that the reality is that it has been funded at a lesser level.

[8:43:03 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON suggested that the committee hear a separate presentation on NCLB.

[8:45:00 AM](#)

MR. MORSE relayed that for the five years previous to his current position as deputy commissioner, he served as the director of the Assessment and Accountability Division, which is why he will be speaking to the committee regarding that topic. Further, he said he would discuss plans for the future. He noted that the new director of the Assessment and Accountability Division is Erik McCormick.

MR. MORSE listed the seven statewide assessments overseen by the assessment portion of the Assessment and Accountability Division as follows: the high school graduation qualifying exam, a developmental profile, a standards-based assessment, a norm (ph) reference test that is given yearly to two graduate levels students, an English language proficiency assessment given to approximately 18,000 students each year, an annual alternate assessment for about 600 students with severe disabilities, and a national assessment carried out each year with the federal government to ascertain educational progress. He noted that the standards-based assessment is the major test for accountability, and the one the committee would likely hear the most about when talking to schools regarding student assessments.

[8:48:29 AM](#)

MR. MORSE spoke about the work that has been done towards creating effective/meaningful assessments. He said with the

current vendor, the department owns the assessment programs and can build on them. State ownership has saved \$1.4 million last year. The vendor, called, "Data Recognition Corporation," has won another bid to continue this work for EED. Additionally, new services have been gained under this vendor.

8:52:35 AM

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER asked when the students are tested in the different subjects.

MR. MORSE responded that students are tested in reading, writing, and mathematics, at grade levels 3-10, while students are tested in science at levels 4, 8, and 10. He said testing for science is only in its third year; it is required by NCLB, not by state statute. He predicted that as educators begin to receive, and review, data related to science, they will begin to examine and modify existing curriculum to best meet student needs.

8:56:51 AM

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH expressed concern for the state to establish a means to utilize information in a more effective and efficient manner.

MR. LEWIS specified that in terms of "high-level, broad perspective with technology in the State of Alaska," there is some consolidation. He said Enterprise Technology Services Davison, DOA, oversees "the backbone of the state system." Within that purview, a state information technology plan is submitted each year to DOA, and the Office of the Governor, to demonstrate DHSS's intent is for the given year. The purpose of that is not only to help the department plan, but also to take advantage of any opportunities to consolidate services. Each department has its own mission, and sometimes consolidation is not an option.

8:59:28 AM

MR. MORSE, in response to Representative Keller, noted that in addition to the state's standards-based assessment and the nation's NATE (ph), which compares Alaska students to other states and to the nation, there is one other test that shows how Alaska's students are doing across the nation, and that is called the Terra Nova. He said although the tests are for different purposes, comparisons can be made between them. He

said it is important to ensure that school districts are looking at those analyses in order to address student needs at the classroom level. Last year, he noted, a vendor held a workshop to assist in understanding the analyses of these tests for practical application. Regarding the NATE, Mr. Morse said Alaska is not at the top half, but is not at the bottom, in terms of national performance. He said he does not think Alaska's performance is that poor, because other indicators need to be considered. For example, Alaska is one of the top three states in terms of having the largest numbers of students, by percent, who have limited English proficiency and participate in that assessment. States have the right to exclude certain students from the NATE, and Alaska has a low exclusion rate, which should be factored when comparing Alaska to other states.

[9:04:36 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked about students with limited English proficiency, but who do not fit the profile for English as a second language, and how these students are being met.

MR. MORSE answered that the department is now identifying those students better than in the past because of the specific assessments conducted. The information gathered determines whether the student has difficulty in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. He noted that a few years ago there were 20,500 students, and students have been "exited from the program." Targets are designated, but school districts find it challenging to meet those targets.

[9:08:50 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE EDGMON requested further explanation of assessments and identification of students whose aptitudes are best suited for the vocational arena.

MR. MORSE said there is an eighth assessment that is not part of the aforementioned seven, and it is called Work Keys; housed in the Career and Technical Education Unit of TLS, and overseen by Ms. Curran. The overall Work Keys program includes an elementary, middle, and high school testing component, which shows students' vocational skills in the areas of reading and mathematics and provides valuable information to districts and the state upon which to make curriculum and program changes. The Work Keys assessment is in the pilot stage. A requirement to have the work done on computer has been recommended and is expected to be in place in the coming years. The rest of the

assessments have skills imbedded within them that address basic mathematics, reading, and writing, which are also vocational skills. Therefore, as people in the districts begin to receive the data from those assessments, they can begin to identify/address the skills that students lack.

[9:11:25 AM](#)

MR. MORSE addressed the role of the Assessment and Accountability Division. He noted that in addition to assessment, the division reports the data for school accountability to federal and state agencies. He explained that this incorporates student and teacher performance data: the adequate yearly progress calculation, and the results of each school examination, including dialogues with underperforming schools.

[9:13:53 AM](#)

MR. MORSE described how along with the awards, data and surveys are collected in order to better analyze school performance. He acknowledged that some educators are not pleased with the award program. He noted that some schools have performed well despite incentives, and that the program has not created increased learning. He reported that some principals make use of the performance growth information, and he stated that EED would continue to collect and distribute the data. He offered his belief that the principals are the key players in the performance incentive program.

[9:17:19 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER asked if the same schools continue to be eligible for awards.

MR. MORSE conveyed that the performance growth calculations are done yearly for each school.

[9:18:01 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER noted that there weren't many surprises of the winning schools in her district, as those schools received a lot of parent involvement.

[9:18:36 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON asked if this is the first program that has tracked individual growth vs. individual performance within each school.

[9:19:51 AM](#)

MR. MORSE replied that there was another more complicated federal program. He recounted that the current assessment system is comprehensible, and geared for educators to gauge performance. He noted that previous assessment systems have offered different assessments for different school years; not allowing for comparison and analysis.

[9:21:20 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON offered support for the current growth model system to help increase performance.

[9:23:11 AM](#)

MR. MORSE confirmed for the committee, that the longitudinal data system is a growth model, and reported that it also allows school districts to review the data.

[9:23:41 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH offered his belief that motivation, incentive, and encouragement must come from within each division.

[9:24:54 AM](#)

MR. MORSE reminded the committee that all of the aforementioned is part of the Accountability and Assessment Unit. He called attention to his current role as Deputy Commissioner for EED, which identifies support for the districts/schools as a department wide priority. He declared support for Senate Bill 285, which allocates funds for technical assistance and staffing to support district needs. He reported that his position works closely with the TLS division.

[9:27:30 AM](#)

MR. MORSE conveyed that distribution of the increased funding for technical assistance will be his responsibility.

[9:28:09 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON asked for an analysis of how anticipated annual student growth is determined.

MR. MORSE said that he would provide the information.

[9:29:04 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MUÑOZ asked if local teachers are utilized as mentors.

[9:29:35 AM](#)

MR. MORSE replied that mentors are hired from hub cities across the state, and assigned 14 to 16 teachers. An effort is made to make assignments close to the mentor's home city.

[9:31:00 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN explained TLS is primarily a federally funded division. She pointed out that the staff is comprised of certified teachers. She described the duties of TLS, which includes analysis of: state and federal legislation, educational trends, standards and assessment activities, school improvement strategies, and research based programs to help improve student achievement. She explained that TLS offers some technical assistance to Alaska's school districts, conducts conferences for goal attainment of state and federal initiatives, writes grants for state and school district funding, and collaborates with many other groups to create programs for student achievement. She reported that TLS processes teacher certification applications, issues grants, and monitors school districts to ensure compliance with federal and state requirements.

[9:33:33 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON asked whether a school district receives progress information only on request.

[9:34:29 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN said that all teachers and school districts in need of help will receive the information.

[9:35:11 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN read the mission statement of the Title I NCLB program, which includes equitable student access to high quality education and increased student achievement through federal resources. She explained the program process, and went on to describe the programs within Title I: Title IA - funding for low achievement students from low-income families; Title IC - funding to assist migratory children; and Title ID - funding for neglected, delinquent, and at risk students.

[9:37:13 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER asked Ms. Curran which program addresses drop-out prevention and delinquency issues.

MS. CURRAN responded Title I, Part D.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked how the low income, delinquent or at risk children are identified.

MS. CURRAN replied that she would provide the committee with that information.

CHAIR SEATON asked if delinquency was defined as children under 16 not in school.

MS. CURRAN explained that, being a federal program, the definition may vary from state statute. To a follow-up question, she agreed to provide both definitions to the committee.

[9:40:11 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN called attention to Special Education, for which TLS is also responsible, and pointed out that Alaska has approximately 18,000 special needs students, between ages 3-21. She reported the mission of Special Education was to improve academic achievement as well as social and behavioral skill development. In step with the nation, Alaska has a dearth of Special Education teachers. She noted that the early learning programs are a part of special education.

[9:42:02 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN explained the Title II program, noting each component: Teacher Quality, Math and Science Partnerships, Transition to Teaching, and Higher Education grants.

[9:43:39 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked who the Transition to Teaching program attracts.

MS. CURRAN replied that applicants come from all walks of life, and, as the program provides on the job training, it is not always necessary for a potential teacher to return to college.

CHAIR SEATON surmised that this program is more than identification of trades people to teach vocational education.

MS. CURRAN conveyed that the state already has a program for trade craftsman to receive a Type M teaching certification. She clarified that the new program requires a person to have a Baccalaureate (BA) degree.

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH asked if age or other restrictions would hamper entrance to the program.

MS. CURRAN responded that the program has no age limit attached; however, it does require the BA, a background check, and passage of a basic skills test in reading, writing, and mathematics. In response to a committee member's request, she agreed to provide requirement details for this program.

[9:47:35 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN explained how Title II, Part D, provides school districts with professional development funds to update and integrate existing technology into instructional format. Further, she said, Part D provides "leadership and support to local career and technical education programs that prepare students for further education and that result in family supporting careers." She relayed that this includes the Alaska Career Ready initiative, which develops thousands of occupational profiles and the necessary basic job skills for career placement. The program allows students to self assess their qualifications and provides lessons for further preparation.

[9:49:29 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH asked who developed the assessment.

MS. CURRAN stated that the assessment was developed by the American College Testing (ACT) company. Although ACT is a

college testing program, it is understood that certain skills are necessary for many professions that do not require a four year degree.

[9:51:15 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON reflected on a program that Mt. Edgecombe has utilized, and asked if this program were similar.

MR. LEWIS replied that this was a new program.

[9:51:52 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON clarified that the ACT program would direct a student to the areas they need work, in order to attend college or take another vocational direction.

MS. CURRAN emphasized that this is not a placement assessment, but rather an informational program to encourage attainment of skills for success in any chosen occupation. In response to Chair Seaton, she offered to provide program access to committee members for their review.

[9:54:36 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON requested a demonstration of this program along with the other aforementioned educational tools be scheduled for a future committee meeting.

[9:55:32 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN continued to explain Part D, focusing on Child Nutrition Services (CNS). She reported that CNS offers "USDA meal programs to school districts, residential child care institutions, family day care homes, child and adult day care centers, and summer food programs." She pointed out that CNS also distributes USDA Commodity Foods and provides emergency food assistance statewide.

CHAIR SEATON acknowledged committee interest in the food program and recommended an in-depth review at a future meeting.

[9:57:27 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN continued with the responsibility that TLS carries for Grants and Contracts funding.

[9:58:01 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER asked for an explanation of the 30 percent budget increase from FY09 to FY10.

MR. LEWIS directed the committee's attention to the budget document titled "FY2010 Operating and Capital Budget, December 15, 2008 - Agency Budget," and explained that Page 3 only represents the general fund, and page 4 reflects all of the funding sources.

[9:59:21 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN continued with Title III, to explain that, under English Language Acquisition, it provides grants and assistance for limited English proficient students. She described Title IV as a health group, which includes addressing means for students to meet high standards outside of the school setting.

[10:01:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked if additional youth surveys would be beneficial in efforts to garner federal aid.

MS. CURRAN replied that this group administers the youth risk behavior survey. She agreed to provide the committee information regarding the survey tie-in with federal funding.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked if these were federal or state grants.

MS. CURRAN responded that Title IV is a federal grant.

[10:02:44 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN specified that the Title IV curriculum includes counseling for suicide prevention, HIV prevention, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS) information, and at-risk students. Additionally, it includes resources for charter school development. In response to Chair Seaton, she clarified that the charter school grants are for planning and start-up, not sustainability.

[10:05:09 AM](#)

MS. CURRAN discussed the Title V program that encompasses the statewide correspondence programs.

10:05:25 AM

MS. CURRAN referred to the teacher certification program, which accepts and analyzes certification applications, and then issues certificates to qualified teachers, administrators and special service providers.

10:06:26 AM

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH expressed concern within his constituency for a timely response regarding the teacher certification process.

CHAIR SEATON requested more information regarding the timeliness of the process in order to identify the issues.

MR. LEWIS responded that this information would be supplied to the committee. He acknowledged that TLS has experienced internal issues, which have caused past delays, and are being corrected.

MS. CURRAN announced that a stakeholder meeting is scheduled, where statute and process changes for streamlining the teacher certification process, will be discussed.

10:12:04 AM

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER requested a pie chart that would allow the committee a visual reference for the federal funding distribution among the various Title programs.

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH added his interest in having a top down, flow chart of the operations through each agency and to the Alaska State Legislature.

10:14:05 AM

MS. CURRAN agreed to comply with both committee requests, and concluded her presentation.

10:14:38 AM

CHAIR SEATON offered that he had received positive feed back on the earlier mentioned Teacher Mentoring program.

10:15:20 AM

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH opined his view of how education has evolved from the three basics of reading, writing, and arithmetic, to what teachers are required to address in today's multi-layered programs. Although it is positive progress to implement the expanded requirements, it creates a funding dilemma for sustainability. He advocated that basic education is a requisite and that a part of the process should be to inform parents of their role as their child's first teacher, and stressed that schools should educate, not raise, children.

CHAIR SEATON noted no more comments, and adjourned the meeting.

[10:17:02 AM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Education Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 10:17 a.m.