

**CATALOG OF LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS
MADE TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DURING THE 1983 LEGISLATIVE SESSION
AND RESPONSES THERETO**

A Report to the Legislature of the State of Hawaii

**Submitted by the
Legislative Auditor of the State of Hawaii**

**Report No. 84-14
February 1984**

FOREWORD

Pursuant to legislative direction, the Office of the Legislative Auditor has undertaken a budget review and analysis program aimed at providing the Legislature with additional assistance and perspective in its consideration of program and budget requests coming before it for action.

In this second year of the program, we have followed up on our earlier budget review and analysis of the lower education program (Department of Education). The results of our examination are presented in a separate report. As part of this follow-up effort, we have compiled a catalog of legislative requests made in the 1983 session to executive agencies concerning lower education programs and the responses made to these requests.

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance extended to our staff by officials and staff members of the Department of Education.

Clinton T. Tanimura
Legislative Auditor
State of Hawaii

February 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
LISTING OF LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS DIRECTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DURING THE 1983 LEGISLATIVE SESSION	3

INTRODUCTION

As directed by the legislative appropriation acts, the Office of the Legislative Auditor has undertaken a program of budget review and analysis. The purpose of this program is to provide the Legislature with additional and independent review and analysis of budget requests and related program proposals. In the first two phases of this budget review and analysis effort, attention was focused on selected aspects of the programs of higher education, lower education, public welfare, and mental health. In addition, a follow-up effort on the lower education program was mounted during the past year. The results of our follow-up examination of the lower education program have been reported separately in Report No. 84-13.

In examining the executive programs, one of the steps we took was to identify areas of legislative interest and concern as reflected in formal requests to the affected agencies in the form of new statutes, statutory provisos, legislative committee reports accompanying bills passed by the Legislature, and legislative resolutions. Recognizing that the matters covered by these requests often have budget and program implications, we also sought to determine what kind of responses or reactions had been given to the legislative requests by the affected agencies.

In this catalog, we present a summary of each request, giving the title and source of the request, a brief description of the nature of the request, and a brief analysis of any response that was made to the request. It should be noted that not all of the requests required formal responses from the affected agencies. In those instances, this has been so noted. All lower education requests, whether addressed to the Department of Education, the Board of Education, the State Librarian, or the Superintendent of Education, have been considered as requests to the Department of Education.

Almost all of the requests have some budget implications. In some cases there is a fairly direct relationship between the request or response and the 1983-85 biennial budget and the supplemental budget under consideration in the 1984 legislative session. Where this is so, we have so indicated in the listing of the requests.

**LISTING OF LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS
DIRECTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DURING THE 1983 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

During the 1983 legislative session, 25 legislative requests were directed wholly or in part to the Department of Education (DOE). Those requiring formal responses by DOE are indicated by an asterisk. Requests which may have direct implications for DOE's 1983-85 biennial budget or the 1984-85 supplemental budget are indicated by a B in parentheses.

<i>Source of Request</i>	<i>Subject of Request</i>	<i>Page</i>
New Statutes		
1. Act 256	*School Priority Fund (B)	7
2. Act 298	*Achievement in Basic Skills Among Students in Low Stanines (B)	9
Statutory Provisions		
3. Section 23, Act 301	*Supplemental Budget Information Displayed on a School-by-School Basis (B) . . .	11
4. Section 24, Act 301	*Program Review by the Board of Education . . .	12
5. Section 25, Act 301	*Evaluation of "Grant-in-Aid" Programs (B) . . .	13
6. Section 29, Act 301	*Hawaiian Studies Program (B)	14
7. Section 30, Act 301	*Early Provisions for School Success Program (B)	15
8. Section 31, Act 301	*Compensatory Education Program for Alienated Students (B)	16
9. Section 32, Act 301	*Teacher Positions in the Office of Instructional Services and the District Offices (B)	17
10. Section 34, Act 301	*Relocation of Offices in Rented Space (B)	18

<i>Source of Request</i>	<i>Subject of Request</i>	<i>Page</i>
Senate Resolutions		
11. No. 22	Citizenship and Ethics.....	19
12. No. 32	Hawaiian Studies at the Postsecondary Level	20
13. No. 78	Establishment of an Arts Center at the Linekona School Site.....	21
14. No. 116	Public Library Portastucture in the Moanalua-Salt Lake Area	22
House Resolutions		
15. No. 31	*Criteria for Consolidation of Schools (B)	23
16. No. 33	*Library Services and Staffing (B)	25
17. No. 108, H.D. 1	*School Priority Fund (B) (See Act 256).....	7
18. No. 151	*Effectiveness of Selected Programs (B)	26
19. No. 153, H.D. 1	*Feasibility Study for an Intermediate School for Makakilo-West Beach (B)	28
20. No. 322, H.D. 1	*Educational Opportunities in Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (B)	29
21. No. 339, H.D. 2	*Equality in Course Offerings Among Large and Small Schools (B)	31
22. No. 346	*Expediting the Computer Literacy Program.....	33
23. No. 402, H.D. 1	Annual Community Meetings of Secondary Schools	34
24. No. 445, H.D. 1	*In-service Training of Educational Assistants.....	35
25. No. 488	Portastucture Library Facility in the Moanalua-Salt Lake Area (See Senate Resolution No. 116).....	22

Subject

School Priority Fund

Source of Request

Act 256, Regular Session of 1983.¹

Nature of Request

The school priority fund (SPF) statute was amended in two ways: (1) Section 296D-4 now requires principals to consult with teachers, parents and students whereas formerly, the latter two groups were to be consulted "to the extent practicable;" and (2) Section 296D-5 now requires that DOE submit an annual report to the Legislature which shall include but not be limited to an accounting of how funds were spent by the schools. The statute had previously been silent on the matter of reporting.

Executive Response

This act and House Resolution No. 108, House Draft 1, required similar information on the usage of SPF funds and the consultations that occurred. DOE's report was derived from SPF reporting forms that are routinely submitted to the state office. DOE also surveyed three districts on their use of SPF.

The schools' use of SPF reflected the May 1982 instructions which had given high priority to textbook replacement, classroom supplies and instructional equipment. The schools reported expending 35.5 percent for instructional equipment, 27.6 percent for educational supplies, 17.3 percent for textbooks, and 14.0 percent for other items, including excursions, computer rentals, etc. Only 5.6 percent was used for hourly certificated personnel. It is expected that this last percentage will rise as schools obtain more lead time and experience in purchasing personal services with their SPF moneys.

1. House Resolution No. 108, H.D. 1, Regular Session of 1983, is the source of a similar request.

One particular point of interest is that only 12 percent of the schools with the Hawaii English Program (HEP) reported spending anything on that program, and no school spent more than \$300. Thus DOE concludes that there was little or no negative effect on HEP after the appropriations act shifted \$561,000 of HEP funds into the SPF and left it up to schools to use their SPF funds if they needed more HEP materials than the HEP allotment provided.

The usefulness of mandatory consultation with faculty was rated "very high" by 31 percent of the principals and "high" by 47 percent while 16 percent rated it "average" and 6 percent rated it "low." More than three-fourths of the principals reported consulting with their teachers three or more times per year. The figures drop dramatically with regard to consultation with parents and students. About half of the principals consulted with parents once or not at all. Students were consulted once by a fourth of the principals and not at all by half of these administrators. Secondary students tended to be consulted more than elementary students.

The usefulness of SPF was highly rated by principals, teachers, and district superintendents, although there were requests to loosen the purpose of the fund. Non-instructional purposes were denied. Problem areas reported by DOE included: (a) the relative lack of background among members of the community to enable them to give meaningful advice to principals; (b) small schools not having the dollar volume for large projects although district superintendents have their 7 percent reserve and Foundation Program staffing to make some accommodation for this need; and (c) schools lapsing \$110,023. DOE reported that these problems are being addressed administratively, and recommends no changes to the fund's purpose or legislative guidelines.

It is apparent that the issue of consultation with parents and students needs further effort and review inasmuch as implementation of the latest amendment to the law is falling far short of the full scope that was intended by the Legislature. The Legislature may also want to monitor any action that may be taken with regard to the problem of some of the funds not being used and being allowed to lapse.

Subject

Achievement in Basic Skills Among Students in Low Stanines

Source of Request

Act 298, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The superintendent is to report annually to the Governor on the number and percentage of students who are scoring in the lowest three stanines in standardized tests, the actions being taken by DOE to improve the achievement levels of such students, the progress of the students in improving on a yearly basis, and analysis of the effectiveness of actions taken to address the needs of these students. The report is to be submitted to the Legislature 20 days prior to the convening of each session.

Executive Response

DOE submitted a detailed report which focuses on the first of the requirements of Act 298. State, district, and school scores are reported for grades 4, 6, 8, and 10 in the 1982 testing program. Also, DOE manually retrieved information on individual students in the lowest three stanines in 1980, and for 1982 determined where they were and their scores.

While the manual retrieval of this information entailed much work on DOE's part, it yielded information that could be useful to DOE. The unexpectedly higher transiency rate (fourth graders no longer at the same school) should spur DOE to follow through on the whereabouts of transferred students, particularly those who remain within DOE. This latter group was not separately reported and it is not clear what follow-up procedures are in place for these transferred students.

The different patterns of scores from grade level to grade level, and from district to district, should be carefully scrutinized by both the Legislature and DOE. The relatively high proportions of students in the lowest three stanines in given grade levels and on reading tests despite the infusion of additional resources should raise such concerns as: (1) the types of students who comprised the test group; (2) the inclusion or exclusion of such categories of students as the learning disabled,

physically disabled, or those non-native English speakers with at least moderate facility in English, etc.; and (3) the relationship between the infusion of resources (including federal funding) and the test scores, etc.

The report is vague and generalized on the matter of the department's actions to improve the achievement levels of the students in the lowest three stanines. Moreover, even as improvements in standardized test scores have been achieved in several grade levels, the whole issue of the meaningfulness of standardized tests alone as measures of student competence must be kept in perspective.

Subject

Supplemental Budget Information Displayed on a School-by-School Basis

Source of Request

Section 23, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

DOE was directed to submit to the 1984 Legislature two sets of information on a school-by-school basis. These are: (1) the general funds being requested for each school in each education program category; and (2) a report on each school's expenditures—actual expenditures for FY 1982-83 and projected expenditures for FY 1983-84. The first school-by-school display was to accompany the supplemental budget request while the second set, the expenditure reports, were to be submitted no later than two weeks after the convening of the 1984 session.

Executive Response

The executive's supplemental request of \$1.2 million for DOE is largely for regular and special education teachers for unanticipated enrollment increases. DOE reports that it cannot identify the schools where the additional teachers would be placed since assignments are based on official enrollment counts taken in the Fall. DOE's Part II request (i.e., those budget requests which are beyond the executive budget ceiling) has been prepared on a school-by-school basis wherever possible.

DOE responded to the second part of the request (expenditure reports for each school for FY 1982-83 and projected expenditures for FY 1983-84), by submitting its computer printouts of accounting information. While each school's accounts are shown, these still do not represent the total cost of operating each school, for the large expenditure for regular teachers—\$142 million in FY 1982-83—is still reported only as one large account rather than by individual schools. Thus, there is yet no way for the Legislature to determine what each school costs.

Subject

Program Review by the Board of Education

Source of Request

Section 24, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The Board was directed to develop and implement a system for regular and periodic review of the ongoing programs and operations of DOE. The system is to include, but not be limited to, the following elements: (1) annual reviews scheduled so that all programs shall be reviewed by a specified date; (2) programs scheduled so that related subjects shall be reviewed as simultaneously as possible; (3) meaningful criteria; (4) procedures and safeguards to reorganize, expand, reduce or terminate programs when deemed appropriate as a result of the review; and (5) opportunity for public input in the review process.

The Board was to submit a report of its findings and recommendations 20 days prior to the convening of the 1984 session.

Executive Response

The Board's response consists of two parts: (a) a report which discloses that the review system is still under development, with plans and implementation scheduled for FY 1984-85; and (b) an attachment from the superintendent's accountability system document, titled "review framework," which sets forth schedules for review and evaluation starting from the current year.

A considerable portion of our follow-up report on budget review and analysis in DOE is devoted to program review and evaluation in the department. We find deficiencies and ambiguity in the superintendent's accountability system and deficiencies in the reports which emerged from that system. See our Report No. 84-13 for a fuller discussion of this matter.

Subject

Evaluation of "Grant-in-Aid" Programs

Source of Request

Section 25, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The DOE is required to submit an evaluation of each of six "grant-in-aid" programs at least 20 days prior to the convening of the 1984 session.²

Executive Response

DOE submitted separate reports on each of the six grant programs. Every program was judged "effective" and all but one were judged "efficient." In view of the deficiencies in the system for program review and evaluation, these reports which are products of that system must be regarded with skepticism concerning the conclusions and recommendations they contain. See Report No. 84-13 for a discussion of each of the separate evaluation reports.

2. The six programs are Palama Interchurch Council—Immigrant Youth Program, Language Arts Multicultural Program, Maui Hui Malama, Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, Comprehensive Education Dropout Prevention Program, and Holomua Project. The first five programs should be categorized as "purchases of service" rather than "grants-in-aid." The Holomua project is neither; it is a government program.

Subject

Hawaiian Studies Program

Source of Request

Section 29, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

Legislative concern over the Hawaiian studies program continues to be manifested even as some expansion has been authorized. DOE was directed to incorporate a restructured program design into a report due 20 days prior to the 1984 session. An evaluation of the program in terms of its effectiveness with students rather than the resources expended is also required by the appropriations act. In the committee report to the 1983 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature further clarified that it intends that DOE evaluate the Hawaiian studies program in the manner suggested by the Legislative Auditor in 1983.

Executive Response

While a far-ranging report on this program has been submitted, the issue of the restructured program design as required by the Appropriations Act has not been addressed. Not much has been planned or undertaken by DOE with respect to the requirement for an evaluation in terms of the program's effectiveness in achieving objectives and results with students. Further details on the lack of substantive responses are contained in our Report No. 84-13.

Subject

Early Provisions for School Success Program

Source of Request

Section 30, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The Early Provisions for School Success Program (EPSS) is currently in its second year. The Legislature continued the new program only for the first year of the biennium with the proviso that an evaluation be submitted 20 days prior to the convening of the 1984 session.

Executive Response

Preliminary and short-term results indicate some benefits from EPSS but the Legislature should be fully satisfied that the gains are attributable to EPSS before it authorizes any further expansion. As discussed in our 1984 budget review and analysis report (Report No. 84-13), the Legislature should be aware that DOE's plans for the future of EPSS are expansive, the program is more costly than is shown in the budget, and the per student cost has been understated.

Subject

Compensatory Education Program for Alienated Students

Source of Request

Section 31, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

DOE was directed to evaluate all of its programs for alienated students under Compensatory Education, including the Comprehensive School Alienation Program (CSAP) and the various learning centers and alternative programs in schools and off-campus locations. The programs were funded for the first year of the biennium only, with the condition that before any further appropriations are made for the second year, the DOE must submit its implementation plan to integrate the various programs. A report was due 60 days prior to the convening of the 1984 session.

Executive Response

DOE submitted a two-part response: (1) a report on all its alienation programs and (2) an implementation plan for a statewide comprehensive alienation program. Neither of the parts responds to the concerns of the Legislature for this \$4 million program. Effectiveness data, target group data, and per student costs are not consistently reported for the component parts of this program. The "implementation plan" submitted is merely DOE's existing plan, re-named to fulfill the legislative request, but with no real change in the program's design. This is another of the DOE's reports commented on in our 1984 follow-up budget review and analysis of DOE (Report No. 84-13).

Subject

Teacher Positions in the Office of Instructional Services and the District Offices

Source of Request

Section 32, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

DOE was directed to evaluate the teacher positions in the Office of Instructional Services (OIS) at the state level and in the seven district offices to determine which positions are nonessential. Also, a plan to streamline OIS and the district offices and redeploy nonessential teacher positions back into classrooms was requested. A report on that redeployment was due 20 days prior to the convening of the 1984 session.

Executive Response

DOE reports that all teacher positions at the state and district offices are "essential" on the basis of a user survey of principals and teachers. Thus it has not deployed any of them back to classrooms or made any plans to do so.

A plan to reorganize OIS was presented to the Board in late January 1984 for its information and reaction. Rather than streamline OIS, it recommends the addition of a function (test development) currently assigned to the Office of the Superintendent.

DOE's response does not recognize legislative concern for more efficient use of management staffing in DOE. More detailed comments on this response are in our 1984 follow-up budget review and analysis (Report No. 84-13).

Subject

Relocation of Offices in Rented Space

Source of Request

Section 34, Act 301, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

As an alternative to renting space for DOE administrative activities, the Legislature has urged DOE to relocate such activities to schools where declining enrollments over the past several years have created excess space. The Legislature directed DOE to explore alternative housing for administrative activities remaining in rental space and report 20 days prior to the 1984 session. The report is to include a comparison of the cost of relocation versus the cost of renting in FY 1983-84.

Executive Response

DOE reported that it has moved four activities from rented spaces since 1976, the largest of which was the Office of Instructional Services. Three activities remaining in rented space are the Windward and Leeward District offices and the DOE storeroom. DOE states that the two district offices can be moved into school facilities if funds for the relocation are appropriated—\$300,000 for each district office. Current lease rent for Windward District is \$46,900 with an increase to \$66,300 in 1984. Lease rent for Leeward District is \$23,142.

DOE reports that relocation of the storeroom to a school is not feasible for two reasons: (a) schools are not built with high ceilings and docking facilities and (b) warehousing operations are not compatible with school operations. DOE's requests to the Department of Accounting and General Services and the Department of Land and Natural Resources to locate a state-owned warehouse or land to construct a warehouse have not succeeded thus far. The current annual lease rent is \$92,000.

DOE's response adequately addresses the three specific activities which remain in rented spaces. However, the larger issue of maximum usage of all existing educational facilities and the department's hope to once again reconsolidate OIS in one facility were not addressed.

This response is commented on in our 1984 follow-up budget review and analysis of DOE (Report No. 84-13).

Subject

Citizenship and Ethics

Source of Request

Senate Resolution No. 22, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

In recognition of the rapidly changing values of American society without the traditional foundations to guide young people, the Legislature requested DOE to encourage its teachers to emphasize citizenship and ethics in the classroom. This, however, is to be done without the addition of special programs or curricula.

No specific report was requested.

Executive Response

According to DOE officials, the department is carrying out the activities that it attested to when it presented testimony on this resolution during the 1983 session.

Subject

Hawaiian Studies at the Postsecondary Level

Source of Request

Senate Resolution No. 32, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The University of Hawaii, in cooperation with the DOE, was requested to examine the role of the University in providing adequate educational opportunities for students who wish to pursue Hawaiian studies at the postsecondary level. The Legislature was concerned that only DOE had so far made an effort to implement the 1978 constitutional mandate for the State's promotion of Hawaiian studies.

A report is requested 20 days prior to the 1984 session.

Executive Response

The University of Hawaii is the lead agency in responding to this request. The University reports that its role with respect to the study of Hawaiian culture, history and language encompasses its three major functions: (1) preservation of knowledge through its research collections, (2) dissemination of knowledge through instructional courses, and (3) creation of knowledge through faculty research and scholarship. The University cooperates with DOE in several ways in the promotion of the Hawaiian culture: (1) in-service training of teachers and educational officers through Hawaiiana courses and workshops, (2) pre-service training through its Hawaiian language concentration in the Bachelor of Education and professional diploma programs, and (3) curriculum development for the DOE Hawaiian studies program by the Curriculum Research and Development Group.

Subject

Establishment of an Arts Center at the Linekona School Site

Source of Request

Senate Resolution No. 78, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The chairman of the Board of Land and Natural Resources and the Board of Education, or their designees, are to negotiate with the Contemporary Arts Center for the lease of the site upon which the former Linekona School sits.

The site in question is bounded by Victoria, Young, and Beretania streets. After serving a large variety of uses, the site has been under consideration for a new state library facility. The main, original building has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places. Any use of the site will have to accommodate that listing. Because the cost of renovating that building would be prohibitive, the resolution proposes its lease to the Contemporary Arts Center.

Executive Response

The Department of Land and Natural Resources heard the concerns of the Contemporary Arts Center and those who support the use of the site by the Center. However, the site is still under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education which has not yet arrived at a decision on its use.

Subject

Public Library Portastucture in the Moanalua-Salt Lake Area

Source of Request

Senate Resolution No. 116, Regular Session of 1983.³

Nature of Request

The permanent site of a new public library in the Moanalua-Salt Lake area is still under negotiation and will not be available for some time. In the meantime, in order to replace the inadequate bookmobile service, the resolution requests the office of library services to place a temporary facility called a "portastucture" somewhere in the community.

Executive Response

The Office of Library Services encountered several problems in trying to place a portastucture in the Moanalua-Salt Lake area. The alternative approach, which is nearing implementation, is to lease commercial space at the Salt Lake Shopping Center on a temporary basis until the permanent library is built. The temporary library will be small—approximately 2,000 square feet—but is intended for high volume patronage with popular materials for adults and children. There will be daily service from the Pearl City regional library.

Negotiations are continuing for the permanent library site on surplus federal land. According to library officials, the prospects for acquisition are promising.

3. House Resolution No. 488, Regular Session of 1983, made a similar request.

Subject

Criteria for Consolidation of Schools

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 31, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The consolidation of underutilized schools continues to be an issue on which the Legislature has attempted to obtain Board of Education action. Two previous legislative requests have not been answered. The 1983 Legislature made two requests: (1) that the Board develop and adopt objective criteria for the consolidation of underutilized schools and review the procedures for consolidation and (2) that the Board develop a plan for consolidation, once the criteria and procedures have been adopted.

The Board was to report on its criteria and procedures for consolidation prior to the closing of the 1983 session. A report on the plan for consolidation and its timetable is due prior to the convening of the 1984 session.

Executive Response

The Board responded to the first part of the request on April 12, 1983, by informing the Legislature that it had approved a proposed rule concerning the consolidation of public schools. It was being sent to the Governor for approval to hold public hearings. Portions of the rule delineate the conditions under which a consolidation study would be initiated, and the procedures and criteria that the task force on consolidation are to follow. The Governor approved the draft of the rule for public hearings on August 16, 1983, but as of February 1984, those public hearings have not been held.

The Board has reported to the 1984 Legislature in a second report that in anticipation of the passage of the rule, DOE surveyed the districts for the schools which meet the criteria for initiating the feasibility study for consolidation. Sixteen schools in all seven school districts were identified, of which five are being pursued further or are on their way to consolidation. One closure has been completed. Seven

schools have been allowed to be retained, with no feasibility study planned. The fate of three others appears to be contingent upon other factors with no indication of when they will be reviewed.

The report is insufficient in conveying the actual standards by which closure will or will not be recommended. Although the proposed rule delineates the "considerations," i.e., the characteristics, that a task force shall consider, it does not indicate at what levels of "adequacy," "advantages," "disadvantages," or "net financial savings," etc., closure will occur. Thus the Legislature will be no more informed in the 1984 session than it was in the 1983 session as to the conditions under which underutilized schools will be consolidated or when.

Subject

Library Services and Staffing

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 33, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The Board of Education was requested to conduct a comprehensive review of public library services and staffing in light of the increasing demand for services from the general public. Such a review shall include an examination of the alternatives available to assure that the libraries are run with maximum efficiency. A report on findings and recommendations from the Board was due prior to the convening of the 1984 legislative session.

Executive Response

The Office of Library Services prepared a master plan for the library system through 1990 and submitted it for Board review on December 15, 1983. The Board approved it unanimously. The master plan calls for the public libraries to be open every day for the 40 percent of the population that will be using library services by 1990. Three new libraries are planned for a statewide total of 50 facilities. Copies of the master plan have been forwarded to the Legislature.

Subject

Effectiveness of Selected Programs

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 151, H.D. 1, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The notable increase in specialized programs to supplement regular instruction such as the intensive basic skills, early provisions for school success, and gifted and talented programs has represented a considerable investment of resources. Some concerns have been raised that specialized programs may create other problems or may not be as effective as hoped.

DOE was requested to evaluate the objectives, methods of program delivery, and program effectiveness for the three programs named above. In addition, specific information was requested for each of the three programs.

A report was due 60 days prior to the convening of the 1984 legislative session.

Executive Response

DOE reported separately on each of the three programs. All three reports were prepared under the new system of program review and evaluation as described by *The Superintendent's Accountability System August 1983*. As we discuss in our follow-up report on budget review and analysis in DOE (Report No. 84-13), the deficiencies and ambiguity of the new system were manifested in the poor quality of the reports prepared in response to legislative requests. More specifically, we found budgeting, cost calculation, and program installation anomalies with the early provisions for school success program report and serious deficiencies in objectives, measures, target group definition, and cost calculations with the report on the gifted and talented program.

The intensive basic skills (IBS) program report displays similar problems. Although the department has submitted extensive statistics on its target group and "success" ratio, the design of this program appears to be so broad as to make it

impossible to attribute any success achieved to this program alone. Moreover, the focus appears to be narrowly placed on the passage of the Hawaii State Test of Essential Competencies (HSTEC).

The target group of IBS also appears to overlap considerably the target groups of other programs which presumably are separately and adequately funded. Specifically, special education students and students of limited English proficiency comprise a significant portion of the IBS students. Both groups are already otherwise provided for, and their inclusion in IBS may come as a surprise to the Legislature. Also, the legislative concern that IBS students may be a duplicated target group of other programs, such as federal programs for educationally disadvantaged students, has not been answered by this report. DOE maintains that such multiple service data are not obtainable from its data collection system.

Subject

Feasibility Study for an Intermediate School for Makakilo-West Beach

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 153, H.D. 1, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The Makakilo-West Beach area has experienced a population growth since 1970 and current projections indicate a further growth. The area is now served by an intermediate school approximately six miles away. A concern among the community that this is too great a distance and that the enlargement of the community would warrant its own intermediate school prompted the request for a feasibility study.

DOE was requested to submit a report on its findings and recommendations 20 days prior to the convening of the 1984 session.

Executive Response

DOE evaluated the enrollment projections, capacity at Ilima Intermediate, costs of another intermediate school, and effects on Ilima if another school were built at Makakilo-West Beach. In all four respects, the data indicated that another intermediate school was not feasible at this time. The Board concurred.

Subject

Educational Opportunities in Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 322, H.D. 1, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The juvenile offenders incarcerated at the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF) are generally characterized by low academic achievement levels. Nevertheless, their school day at HYCF is shorter than normal. The range in sentencing and confinement arrangements also contribute to disruptions in their schooling. Overall, the Legislature was concerned that the program at HYCF is not sufficiently geared to promote rehabilitation.

The DOE, working with the Department of Social Services and Housing, the League of Women Voters, the Family Court, and the Department of Health, was requested to study several issues: (1) a 12-month school year and a longer school day at HYCF, (2) administration of such a program by DOE as compared with a contractual arrangement with a private organization; (3) creative alternatives for the unique educational needs at HYCF; (4) evaluation of the mainstreaming process of former HYCF detainees who return to the regular public schools; and (5) the teaching methods, counseling, and test scores of detainees.

The DOE was to submit its report 20 days prior to the convening of the 1984 legislative session.

Executive Response

A Committee on Educational Opportunities at HYCF was formed, reviewed the areas of concern expressed in the resolution, and developed recommendations. The committee found that a 12-month school year and longer school day *per se* were not feasible at this time for a variety of reasons, and proposed instead a tri-agency effort by DOE, DOH, and DSSH. Some immediate results have already materialized in the form of DSSH resources for some school programs and DOE staff assisting DSSH staff. Timing for increased interagency cooperation is opportune because DSSH is

developing a master plan for new facilities and a reorganization of the facility's management system.

The alternative of contracting out the educational services was considered among the options for a 12-month school year. For the current average population of 100 students the cost is estimated to be \$500,000. Providing the 12-month school through the use of civil service and/or certificated personnel would range from \$244,002 to \$578,436.

The report appears to be somewhat weak on the issue of the mainstreaming of detainees. While reporting factually on the procedures for mainstreaming, the statistics on returnees, and the lack of follow-up on those who leave the facility, the report does not indicate whether this issue will be pursued further by the interagency efforts. Although this report generally seems to respond to legislative concerns, the Legislature may want to monitor follow-up actions taken by the affected agencies to ensure that long term and meaningful improvements are made in the educational programs at HYCF.

Subject

Equality in Course Offerings Among Large and Small Schools

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 339, H.D. 2, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

A concern was expressed that in spite of the State's efforts over several decades to improve public education there may still be some shortcomings in the educational opportunities for students in smaller schools. DOE was requested to review the regular staffing, foundation staffing, and course offerings in large and small schools. A report was due 20 days prior to the convening of the 1984 legislature.

Executive Response

DOE studied four factors in determining that equal educational opportunity relative to course offerings exists. These four were: (1) secondary school profiles (overall enrollment, number of students from low income and welfare families relative to enrollment, and mean achievement test scores); (2) curriculum (basic and elective Foundation Program courses); (3) staffing (including all off-ratio, federal and special positions); and (4) student participation (ratio of course enrollees to school enrollment and minimum participation required). While finding itself to have adequately provided for equal opportunity, DOE also found a need for improving programming of courses. The department thus has developed a handbook for principals and initiated training for principals on programming and scheduling.

Two types of information from this study should be noted. First, there appears to be a constricted range of course options available to intermediate school students. The problem will be exacerbated by DOE's shift to a 7-8 configuration in all intermediate schools and a 9-12 configuration in all high schools which is already well under way. The decrease in enrollment and/or the relatively small size of the intermediate schools will leave principals with perhaps even fewer courses than reported. This problem is not adequately addressed in this report.

The reported student to instructional staff ratio ranged from 20.3:1 in Maui District to 23.2:1 in Central District. Among schools, the range was 15.3:1 to 24.8:1 in FY 1982-83. Significantly, it appears that secondary schools enjoy smaller pupil-teacher ratios than the collective bargaining contract requires—in some cases, as many as 10 students less per teacher.

The ability of DOE to report staffing ratios in terms of *all* instructional staff is significant. Heretofore, staffing ratios have generally been reported only in terms of regular teachers, the collectively bargained ratio of 26.15:1 being the commonly understood deployment pattern. The fact is that the ratios are actually less, by three to six students per teacher on a district-by-district comparison.

Also, the department's ability to report on all instructional staff, from all funding sources and programs, will enable the Legislature to better address a concern that it has expressed in the past as well as in 1983. That concern has been about the elusiveness of information on the entire scope of programs and services available for a given target group or a given school. In the State's focus on programs in its budgeting system, it is sometimes difficult for legislators to determine all the services being provided by geographic location or identified program beneficiaries. However, this report reveals that it is possible to gather and disseminate information by target group or school location.

Subject

Expediting the Computer Literacy Program

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 346, H.D. 1, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The Legislature believed that the implementation of a computer instruction program in the public schools had been delayed by both DOE and the Department of Budget and Finance (B&F). The Legislature was particularly concerned that B&F's procedures for the lease or purchase of equipment had unnecessarily prolonged the implementation. Thus, the resolution requested that the departments expedite the matters under their respective jurisdictions.

A report was due from both departments no less than ten days prior to the adjournment of the 1983 legislative session.

Executive Response

A report was submitted to the Legislature as requested and the procedural problems appear to have been resolved. A seven-workday turnaround schedule to approve purchases has generally been adhered to by B&F. DOE has encountered problems with the large number of amendments to school requests caused by the budget restrictions for fiscal year 1984. Schools have had difficulty meeting the requirement that requests be submitted only twice each year and the data processing branch of DOE has found itself receiving an array of modifications to lease or purchase requests. DOE officials, however, expect the situation to ease soon.

Subject

Annual Community Meetings of Secondary Schools

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 402, H.D. 1, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

The Legislature was informed that the establishment of school-community councils by departmental regulation has not ensured that students, parents, and members of the community have in fact been consulted by school administrators. It was believed that an annual public meeting would provide school administrators with an opportunity to consult with the community on school priorities, programs, and policies, and would help to reduce any alienation that might exist between school officials and the school constituency.

DOE was requested to require all secondary schools to hold an annual community meeting. No report was required.

Executive Response

On May 5, 1983, the superintendent instructed district superintendents to require all principals to hold annual community meetings starting with school year 1983-84. A set of guidelines which cover the following items was issued: (1) the meeting should be held during the first semester and be in conjunction with a Parent-Teacher-Student Association or school-community council meeting; (2) the school's total program should be addressed; (3) the main purpose should be informational—i.e., to receive community input and disseminate information about the school—and lengthy discussions about concerns should be left to another forum; (4) consideration should be given to training school administrators to conduct such community-wide meetings; and (5) each principal should maintain a log on attendance, topics covered, publicity methods, and evaluation of usefulness.

Subject

In-service Training of Educational Assistants

Source of Request

House Resolution No. 445, H.D. 1, Regular Session of 1983.

Nature of Request

Educational assistants (EAs) are employed by the DOE for a variety of tasks in the schools. Their work with students requires that they be knowledgeable in several areas, but the resolution suggests that in-service training opportunities so far available to them have not been adequate to their needs.

The DOE was requested to identify the types of training needed, to provide for that training, and to establish a committee to monitor the training needs on an ongoing basis. The study was due 60 days prior to the convening of the 1984 legislative session.

Executive Response

A committee of personnel from DOE, Department of Personnel Services, the UH community college system, and the educational assistants has been formed to coordinate training for EAs. The Teacher Institute Day in February was used to conduct a needs assessment among EAs, the findings of which will become the basis for planning specific training activities. The major agencies involved have identified the types of training which would be appropriate for each to provide.

This appears to be an adequate start. Continuous monitoring by the EAs themselves will be needed to ensure that these plans reach fruition. Periodic review by the Legislature would also be appropriate.