

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE EDUCATION STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 2, 2012  
8:30 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Alan Dick, Chair  
Representative Lance Pruitt, Vice Chair  
Representative Eric Feige  
Representative Paul Seaton  
Representative Peggy Wilson  
Representative Scott Kawasaki

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Sharon Cissna

**OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT**

Representative Tammie Wilson

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

PRESENTATION: UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA~ DR. ALEX HWU - DISTANCE  
EDUCATION

- HEARD

HOUSE BILL NO. 256

"An Act repealing provisions relating to the power and duties of the Department of Education and Early Development to intervene in a school district to improve instructional practices."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 313

"An Act relating to student counts and estimates for public school funding; and providing for an effective date."

- MOVED CSHB 313(EDC) OUT OF COMMITTEE

SUPERINTENDENT PRESENTATION: SKAGWAY SCHOOL DISTRICT

- REMOVED FROM AGENDA

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HB 256

SHORT TITLE: REPEAL STATE INTERVENTION IN SCHOOLS

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) DICK

01/17/12	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/6/12
01/17/12	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/17/12	(H)	EDC, FIN
01/25/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM BARNES 124
01/25/12	(H)	Scheduled But Not Heard
02/01/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
02/01/12	(H)	Heard & Held
02/01/12	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
02/03/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
02/03/12	(H)	Heard & Held
02/03/12	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
02/06/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
02/06/12	(H)	Heard & Held
02/06/12	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
02/22/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
02/22/12	(H)	Heard & Held
02/22/12	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
03/02/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106

BILL: HB 313

SHORT TITLE: STUDENT COUNT ESTIMATES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) FEIGE

02/03/12	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/03/12	(H)	EDC, FIN
02/17/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
02/17/12	(H)	Heard & Held
02/17/12	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
03/02/12	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106

**WITNESS REGISTER**

SHIH-HSUNG (ALEX) HWU, PhD; Director  
Center for Distance Education  
University of Alaska Fairbanks  
Fairbanks, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Presented an overview from the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

ANNETTE KREITZER, Staff  
Representative Alan Dick  
Alaska State Legislature

Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified on behalf of the sponsor to present the changes incorporated in HB 256, Version X.

MIKE HANLEY, Commissioner

Department of Education and Early Development (EED)

Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified and answered questions during the discussion of HB 256.

ELIZABETH SWEENEY NUDELMAN, Director

School Finance and Facilities Section

Department of Education and Early Development (EED)

Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the discussion of HB 313.

MICHAEL PASCHALL, Staff

Representative Eric Feige

Alaska State Legislature

Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** On behalf of the sponsor, Representative Feige, testified during the discussion of HB 313.

#### **ACTION NARRATIVE**

[8:30:56 AM](#)

**CHAIR ALAN DICK** called the House Education Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Representatives Feige, Seaton, P. Wilson, and Dick were present at the call to order. Representatives Pruitt and Kawasaki arrived as the meeting was in progress.

#### **Presentation: University of Alaska, Dr. Alex Hwu - Distance Education**

[8:31:22 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK announced that the first order of business would be a presentation by the University of Alaska on distance education.

[8:32:37 AM](#)

SHIH-HSUNG (ALEX) HWU, PhD; Director, Center for Distance Education, University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), began his PowerPoint presentation on eLearning at UAF. He explained that the Center for Distance Education (CDE) is comprised of 27-29

staff that operate and handle delivery of eLearning, or online courses, for the University of Alaska. He stated that 10 of CDE's staff work to develop courses, work with the training faculty, and transition the courses from face-to-face to online courses [slide 1]. He pointed out the department also has 10 student service personnel, including front desk, technical services, advisors, and the secure testing center personnel. He suggested that an enrollment of approximately 7,500 which translates to about 26,000 student credit hours (SCH) is currently being delivered. He reported the national trend has been to have 10-14 percent of courses offered online. He further reported that students like the flexibility of online courses and would like more opportunities to explore their educational options. He related that students are scattered statewide with the majority of the students centered near the Fairbanks UAF campus. He offered the CDE's student age distribution: 53 percent are 19-25, 19 percent are 26-30, and nearly 30 percent are 30 years and older. Since 2008, many people are returning to college, he said.

[8:34:48 AM](#)

DR. HWU stated that the out-of-state demographic distribution has increased by about 12 percent, but most students reside in Alaska [slide 2]. He explained that within Alaska, about half are from the Fairbanks-North Pole area, including the military base, and about half reside outside that area. He stated that sex ratio is 70 percent female to 30 percent male students, whereas the national average is approximately 55 percent female to 45 percent male [slide 3]. He reported the student age distribution is predominately within the ages of 19-25. He remarked that the adult learners take advantage of the flexibility of online learning so they do not need to confine their learning to day-time hours.

[8:36:04 AM](#)

DR. HWU used pie charts to indicate the growth of the program [slide 4]. He explained that Fairbanks-North Pole figures are growing, but outside Fairbanks is growing much faster. He pointed out that the eLearning's goal is to serve the students around the state. In response to Representative P. Wilson, he clarified he was referring to the students outside Fairbanks as the population that is growing more rapidly.

[8:36:30 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked whether UAF is the center for distance education for all three branches of the university system.

DR. HWU answered only UAF. In response to Representative Seaton, he explained that eLearning is comprehensive distance learning, but the UAA and UAS have a non-centralized system, which makes it more difficult for them to handle all of the logistics of distance learning.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked whether someone from Homer who is taking courses through the Kachemak Bay campus - which is a University of Alaska (UA) rural campus - would be taking his/her course through the UAF's eLearning or if it would be through the UA system.

DR. HWU answered the course is probably offered through the UA program.

[8:37:58 AM](#)

DR. HWU continued with his presentation to illustrate the growth of the program from 2007-2012, and the demand that is being placed on the program [slides 5-6]. He pointed out the CDE program does worry about bandwidth since the courses require students to use the Internet, but the CDE's program offers every student the opportunity to finish their education regardless of his/her location. The CDE has increased the student credit hours from about 45 percent during the period 2007-2012, compared to the overall UA's system growth of 3-5 percent in distance learning. He pointed out that the CDE unit is 98 percent self-sustaining. He highlighted that the CDE's program depends on tuition and fees with approximately two percent derived from the state budget. He stated that as entrepreneurs the CDE program must be able to react quickly to needs since students consider what is best for them. He emphasized that either the CDE providers help deliver the course in Alaska or the students will go somewhere else. He explained that the CDE is currently working on program development. Initially the program offered courses, but now the CDE program is offering a complete degree program online. The ability to complete a program online enhances students' interests. He referred to the graph labeled, "ABUS Enrollment Trend" which demonstrates that initially the degree was offered in the spring 2009, but began to increase by the spring 2010. In the coming year 600 students are anticipated to enroll as compared to 195 two years ago. He

concluded that this gives students an opportunity to finish all their required courses online.

8:40:24 AM

DR. HWU reviewed the Lower 48 demographics. He reported that most of the out of state students are in the Northwest. He stated that the CDE offers 184 courses [slide 8]. The CDE currently offers three degree programs, including a Master's of Innovation in Education Degree. He stated that the CDE works with all the UAF departments and is considering the possibility of expanding to offer mechanical engineering and fisheries. He pointed out that many of the fisheries courses require hands-on experience and are not suitable for distance learning due to the need for expensive simulators. However, accreditation standards are ensured through appropriate oversight by the professors. The online course is handled differently than a face-to-face course, yet the student can engage in an individualized manner. The professors base the outcomes on what they believe students should learn. The CDE finds activities and course content to meet the objective. A course may not work on chapters 1-12 sequentially, but may bounce from chapter 2 and 15 if that provides a better approach. He stressed that the same standards apply, but the experience is different. He highlighted that courses are built to allow students to really engage their own learning style. Some people like to read while others like to study in the middle of the night. Still others like to study early in the morning. The regular courses do not allow that flexibility while online learning paths do. The interactions between faculty, classmates, and students still occur.

MR. HWU reported that according to national studies performed over the past fifteen years, students learn at least the same or better for online courses, with an assessed rate of three percent higher. He said this means the courses and programs must be of good quality. The courses are of excellent quality. The research was obtained from the University of Phoenix online courses and for profit classes totaling about 1 million in enrollment per semester, which includes California, Texas, and Florida. He recapped the course design and the personal learning environment is structured. Every single course that is developed requires a critical thinking component. He emphasized the importance that is placed on problem solving matched to real life applications. He also emphasized the importance of building in safe failure components since students learn so much from mistakes. Each course is carefully treated and the faculty tries to dream big. He suggested that the faculty approaches

the topic by thinking about the ultimate Biology 103 course as a starting point as opposed to using the status quo since that means the course is based on technology that's 50-years old. He pointed out that technology is so advanced that it is important to take advantage of the faculty and students engaging together. He stated he has numerous slides as part of the presentation, but he has covered most of the material. The additional information covered in the slides is for committee members to review.

8:45:16 AM

DR. HWU said that CDE has been concerned with the students who arrive at the university from throughout the state in need of remedial courses. He highlighted that enrollment in developmental math and English has been up substantially. That indicates that the kids coming in from high school are not yet ready for university courses. They spend the first two years learning what they should have learned in the junior and senior high school years. He expressed concern over this since it will take these students six or seven years to complete college. He has been working with the EED to find out how to bridge the gap and help students prepare earlier by offering appropriate courses in junior and senior high school. By doing so students can finish college in four to five years. He said part of the challenge has been to figure out how to do that since the infrastructure has not been created to provide this approach. Furthermore, rural school districts do not have the faculty to offer four years of science, math, and English, which is problematic. He stated that addressing these issues is part of the effort the CDE has undertaken. He suggested that with collaboration it is possible to reach that goal.

8:47:06 AM

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON asked whether the gap exists because students have not been able to get the extra course work or because schools aren't teaching to a high enough level. She inquired as to the reasons that students are not ready to perform college level courses.

DR. HWU indicated that high school teacher turn-over is a problem. The rural school districts may have one teacher to cover grades 9-12. The resources are minimal to deliver the necessary courses. He did not think a newly-trained teacher has the depth to provide the mathematics or English in depth. He stated that it is the nature of Alaska since communities are so

spread out. He pointed out that 140 school districts have less than 20 students in their high schools. He did not think any other state in the U.S. has had to face that big of a challenge. Several factors cannot be controlled, such as teacher retention; however, building high quality course content can be controlled and these fundamentals ensure the outcome is reached.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON asked whether the state should provide another teacher for distance learning.

DR. HWU acknowledged that having a highly-qualified teacher would be a help. He also suggested training so teachers become familiar and comfortable with the course work. He concluded that having both approaches would help since it could provide more than one way to resolve the problems. He reiterated that he is genuinely surprised at the diverse group of students that teachers must teach in rural Alaska since they must cover four grades and seven different subject areas.

[8:51:12 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON said he was intrigued by his reference to different learning styles. He asked whether the course materials are set-up to meet the varying styles. He further asked whether the course is tailored for one learning style or if there are multiple facets in a single course.

DR. HWU answered that all the online courses are managed by a learning management system and they use Blackboard at UAF. The course is developed in a complete manner, including You-Tube, and base learning simulation so students can review the material multiple times and may not need to take notes. The students can decide whether they would learn best by watching a video as opposed to reading so students approach the material in the manner that best suits them. They may decide to read the material and listen to the lecture or watch the lecture and take notes, or not. Students may go to a lecture course and miss something the professor said and not understand the concept; however, with distance learning the students can re-watch the lectures as many times as necessary.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON recalled he coordinated the learning network with the high schools. He asked whether the courses can be provided to high school students.

DR. HWU answered that the CDE can provide expertise in course development. Additionally, they offer developmental math and

English courses, which are basically sophomore, junior or senior math courses. The CDE can work with the EED to transition those courses to offer to high school students throughout the state or make it optional as a dual credit so the students can earn college credits while they finish their requirement courses to qualify for Alaska Performance Scholarship Program. Additionally, CDE can scope the infrastructure for supporting teachers and mentoring the high school students.

[8:54:43 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK remarked that if Dr. Hwu and his team structure high school courses that it would provide a seamless transition from high school to college. Additionally, the CDE could train Alaska's teachers to be developing online courses.

**HB 256-REPEAL STATE INTERVENTION IN SCHOOLS**

[8:55:31 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 256, "An Act repealing provisions relating to the power and duties of the Department of Education and Early Development to intervene in a school district to improve instructional practices."

[8:55:46 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT moved to adopt a proposed committee substitute (CS) labeled 27-LS1117\X, Luckhaupt/Mischel, 2/27/12 as the working document.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON objected for the purpose of discussion.

[8:56:24 AM](#)

The committee took a brief at ease.

[8:56:55 AM](#)

ANNETTE KREITZER, Staff, Representative Alan Dick, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of the sponsor, explained the changes incorporated in Version X of HB 256. She referred to the first change on page 6, lines 12-15, which she said adds the language, "... notwithstanding that a school or district has demonstrated two consecutive years of improvement, the district may, in its discretion, choose to receive restoration services for a third

year." She explained that this language allows a school or district after two consecutive years of improvement to choose to maintain or continue restoration services.

MS. KREITZER referred to page 6, line 30 through page 8, line 9, which was rewritten to reflect sponsor's intention of setting out year 1 and year 2 activities of the restoration. She explained that by August 15 in year one the district superintendent and Department of Education and Early Development's (EED) commissioner can select at least one independent expert. Additionally, the expert(s) will evaluate the school in the areas requested by September 15 of year one on implementation of the 1998 Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools. She related that by October 15 of year 1 the expert(s) are required to produce a written report and distribute it as well as post a summary on the Internet.

MS. KREITZER stated that by November 15 of year 1 the superintendent and the department must select a qualified coach, and the local school board and the EED will select a qualified coach. These coaches will advise the district regarding the needs identified in the evaluation. She related that on June 1 of year 1 the district will provide to the department, parents, legislature and post on the Internet a summary of progress of these efforts and the observations and recommendations of the coaches.

MS. KREITZER related that in year 2, not later than September 15, the superintendent and local school board are required to have a mandatory selection and hiring of two additional qualified coaches to advise the district. Additionally, by June 1, the district will provide to the department, parents, legislature and post on the Internet a summary of the progress of these efforts.

MS. KREITZER referred to page 8, lines 10-11, and stated this was slightly rewritten. She then referred to page 8, lines 18-21, which adds a member of the state Board of Education (BOE) and the four qualified coaches to the school improvement team selected under (A) and (B) of this paragraph, and one member of the local school board. She pointed out that concern was raised about having a legislative member on the team so the legislative member was deleted from the team.

MS. KREITZER referred to page 8, lines 27-31 and page 9, lines 1-2. She related her understanding that there was concern about specifically what the team would be doing and how to ensure that

some benefit comes out of that effort. Thus this provision adds a requirement that the school improvement team develop a three-year plan to restore the school. The team may redirect district funding to improve instruction. The superintendent must implement the team's plan. Finally, at the end of each school year, the team will evaluate and adjust the plan. She explained that this gets to the concern the committee had to ensure the separate components result in something more concrete and will provide continual checks and balances.

MS. KREITZER referred to page 9, lines 3-4, which would add a new section requiring the department to request proposals from and provide grants - subject to appropriation - to schools or districts in restoration. She concluded that these are the changes to the proposed CS from Version E to Version X.

[9:03:10 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON related the coaches are provided from district funds. He inquired whether those are subject to legislative appropriation. He asked how the expenses will be covered.

MS. KREITZER answered that it is implied that the department will pay for the coaches but it is not specified in the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON recommended clarifying how the coaches will be funded.

[9:04:29 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON removed his objection. There being no further objection, Version X was before the committee.

[9:04:47 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT moved to adopt Amendment 1, which read [original punctuation provided]:

Page 7, Line4:

DELETE

[student preparedness]

Insert

Preparedness of students to learn

Page 8, Line26:

DELETE  
[student wellness]  
Insert  
Preparedness of students to learn

[9:04:51 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON objected for the purpose of discussion.

[9:05:11 AM](#)

MS. KREITZER explained Amendment 1. She referred to page 7, line 4, which she said goes to the areas that the independent expert would review. She explained that the bill drafter suggested the changes to better reflect the sponsor's intent. She explained that the same change is made on page 8, line 26 to student wellness, which was actually intended as the preparedness of students to learn.

CHAIR DICK stated that his intention is to have the expert assess whether parents are sending students to school that are sleepy or are not ready to learn.

[9:06:26 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON removed his objection. There being no further objection, Amendment 1 was adopted.

[9:06:59 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT moved to adopt Amendment 2, which read [original punctuation provided]:

Page 7, Lines 9-11:

DELETE  
[1998 Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools, prepared by the Assembly of Alaska Native Educators;]

Insert  
Alaska State Cultural Standards

[9:07:06 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON objected for discussion.

[9:07:11 AM](#)

MS. KREITZER explained Amendment 2. She stated that Amendment 2 corrects an error in the proposed CS, noting the bill drafter inadvertently inserted in the evaluation that experts shall evaluate the extent to which the districts have implemented the 1998 Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools, but it should have read the Alaska State Cultural Standards.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON removed his objection. There being no further objection, Amendment 2 was adopted.

[9:07:51 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT moved to adopt Amendment 3, which read [original punctuation provided]:

Page 8, Line 5:

Following "June 1, provide to the ..."

Insert

State Board of Education

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON objected for the purpose of discussion.

[9:08:06 AM](#)

MS. KREITZER explained Amendment 3. She referred to page 8, line 5, which relates to the second year report provided to the department, parents, and legislature on the summary of the progress of their efforts; however, the bill sponsor thought that at this point in time the state Board of Education should also receive a copy of that report to provide them with an update.

[9:08:32 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON removed his objection. There being no further objection, Amendment 3 was adopted.

[9:08:42 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON referred to page 7, lines- 1-5, of sub-subparagraph (i), which read, " ... selection by the superintendent of the district and the commissioner of at least one independent expert in the area of business services,...." She asked whether that language means the commissioner is going

to provide an expert in business services, an expert on board governance, or will the commissioner pick out of this group one independent expert.

[9:09:39 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK answered that the intent of this provision is to have the expert evaluate all of the specified areas. These address the concerns for areas that a district may be deficient such as the business office, the board, and other items outside the curriculum. He understood the question is if an expert's expertise is limited to one of those areas. He suggested it may need clarification.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON agreed this sub-subparagraph needed clarification for the intent and what the expert will handle. She was unsure of the meaning of the term "human relations" noting it could mean the relationships of the kids to the teachers, the relationships of the board to the school, or the relationship of the administration.

CHAIR DICK answered his intent was all of the above. He certainly welcomed any clarifying thought.

[9:11:20 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON referred to line 2, and suggested after expert, to delete "in" and insert "to evaluate" and on line 3 adding an "s" to area. The language would read, "... the district and the commissioner of at least one independent expert to evaluate the areas of business services, board governance, leadership...."

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 4. On line 2 delete "in" and insert "to evaluate" and on line 3, add an "s" to area. She said the language would read, "to evaluate the areas of business services, board governance, leadership, facilities...."

[9:13:18 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK said he would also be willing to include administrative leadership since that would be the original intent.

[9:13:37 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON moved to adopt a reworded Conceptual Amendment 4. She restated her motion for adopting Conceptual Amendment 4. She stated that on line 2, delete "in" and insert "to evaluate" and on line 3 add an "s" to "area" and after "governance," add "administrative". There being no further objection Conceptual Amendment 4 was adopted.

[9:14:36 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON suggested defining human relations since the term is very broad.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT offered his belief there may be a common understanding of what the human relations is associated with, which would mean the relations between the teachers, the administrators, and the janitors. He related his understanding that human relations would be under the umbrella of the typical situation.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE suggested leaving the term in the CS. He related his understanding that it would be the selection by the superintendent of the district, the commissioner, and that this language would suffice and give them some latitude to decide.

[9:16:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked to have a future presentation by the department as to how it will be integrated and facilitated.

[9:16:56 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON commented that the changes may help things since the district would have a clearer understanding of what to expect with the independent expert(s) and the department would have a better understanding of how to proceed. She thought this would help the goal of collaboration to happen automatically.

[9:18:01 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked at what point would year one begin. He offered his belief the bill added some provisions to be proactive, but was unsure of when it takes place and under what conditions.

[9:18:34 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK agreed he thought it was a little blurry, as well.

[9:18:48 AM](#)

MS. KREITZER referred to page 6, line 29, to subparagraph (B), which read, "for the second school year after the designation of a school as a low-performing school...."

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON said he was unsure at what point this provision would be applied, and whether it was during the adequate yearly progress (AYP) or the first year that a school misses the AYP. He was not certain if the low performance is targeted for the year one to start action.

CHAIR DICK agreed, noting he had the same thought, but was willing to allow the department to define.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON clarified he would like the department to explain the definition. He expressed concern that this could affect the fiscal impact by implementing restoration activities after the first year of low performance.

[9:20:32 AM](#)

MIKE HANLEY, Commissioner, Department of Education and Early Development (EED), explained that the department is focused on kids and wants to maintain the focus. He suggested HB 256 directs the department and districts when things are not going well and kids are not performing well. He remarked that the bill adds some positive aspects. He referred to page 2, line 14, which read "the number and percentage of, and the reasons for," which he thought was a good thought. He added that having exit surveys is a good idea, and one the department did a voluntary survey, but received zero responses, in fact, in one intervention district the teachers were instructed not to fill it out. He was unsure how to implement this without making it mandatory. He recalled Representative Seaton's concern was that the contract would somehow need to be affected to make that happen. He said that the department does want to do this. He commented that one possibility would be to make phone calls, but he has not had good results.

[9:22:52 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked whether a requirement could be incorporated into the future contracts of the teachers' associations.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY responded that the other side of that is to determine what empowers teachers to say, but both could provide powerful data. He asked whether the requirement would be for all districts and if districts could be encouraged to do so.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON cautioned against interviewing every teacher every year. They either stay or leave, but the committee is interested in the reasons teachers leave. He suggested the contract could contain a provision for an exit survey provided by the department. He suggested this could be done as a conceptual amendment.

[9:24:48 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON stated it is difficult to get complete honesty so the information is not always accurate on an exit survey. She suggested that if the teacher leaves because the principal is lousy and so indicates it may affect the next job application as the teacher may get a poor recommendation.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON responded that it would need to be handled by the department and not the district to segregate it from the district and superintendent.

[9:25:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KAWASAKI agreed with having the department engaged to conduct exit surveys to provide more honest responses. He likened it to the private sector in which a person would not list a job, necessarily, if the boss didn't like them.

[9:26:19 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT agreed and interjected that teachers might feel free to express their concerns in the appropriate context. He offered his belief that if he left a job and had a bad experience he would probably [not] list it on future applications since it is unlikely the employer would give him a good recommendation. He thought it would give the teachers an opportunity to voice their concerns and supported the exit survey.

[9:27:06 AM](#)

COMMISSIONER HANLEY suggested that phone calls have been made and some responses have been received. He stated that if districts were in a restorative process, the district could report the personnel who had left and the department could follow-up in-house.

[9:27:56 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON suggested adding contact information.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY responded that the department has most of those records.

[9:28:17 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON suggested that the information be confined to districts in restoration. He inquired as to whether it should apply to all teachers departing the schools. He suggested having a contractual agreement inserted for teachers upon exit to avoid problems by early detection and proactivity.

CHAIR DICK expressed concern about the time left in the legislative session.

[9:29:27 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT suggested that the education committee could put this forth. He favored having every district report so the department has good information. In response to Chair Dick, he agreed a committee bill would be a good idea.

[9:30:08 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON commented that the language requiring an exit survey would be included in the information for reporting to the legislature. He suggested doing a conceptual amendment that teachers will fill out an exit interview by the EED.

[9:30:54 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON referred to page 2, line 14, which read, "(8) the number and percentage of, and the reasons for, turnover in certificated personnel and superintendents." She added that (9) reads, "the number of teachers by district and by school...." She inquired as to whether that captures all the schools.

[9:31:27 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK stated (9) relates to teachers who are teaching outside the teacher's area of endorsement. He suggested that would encompass more.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON related her understanding that it would apply to every school.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON agreed Section 1 relates to the report provided by the department, which covers all of the schools. He related his understanding if the bill requires adding the reasons for departing on an exit survey that he did not see a provision in the bill to include the mechanism to do so unless an amendment is made to require a provision in future contracts that teachers must furnish the information when they depart.

[9:32:17 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON thought he previously made a motion, but offered to do it again. He made a motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 5, on page 2, line 15, to add that future district contracts will be required to include a provision that teachers, certified personnel, and superintendents will complete an exit survey as designed by the Department of Education.

[9:33:13 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KAWASAKI said it may be duplicative since the Fairbanks and Anchorage school districts already complete surveys now.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT asked whether the Fairbanks and Anchorage school districts use an outside vendor.

REPRESENTATIVE KAWASAKI answered that it is internal.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT offered his belief that using the department would provide separation from the principal and people within their school since the department could obtain better information.

REPRESENTATIVE KAWASAKI agreed and fully advocates for the change.

There being no further objection Conceptual Amendment 5 was adopted.

CHAIR DICK recalled previous questions on funding.

[9:35:03 AM](#)

COMMISSIONER HANLEY referred to page 4, lines 19-20, which read "(4), prescribe by regulation a minimum course of study for the public schools that includes elective and career and vocational courses in addition to the core curricula;...." He offered his belief that this would alter the graduation requirements. He explained that the regulation for a minimum course of study determines what students need to graduate, which is currently 21 credits. The intent may not be to make that change, but the language essentially increases it to 22-23 units from 21.

CHAIR DICK related his understanding that he worked with Charles Wolforth on this language. He did not think this should be included.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said he appreciates the focus on career technical education (CTE), but when it requires in addition to the minimum course of study that language refers to the graduation requirements. He suggested that may be a separate topic not intended by the bill's sponsor.

CHAIR DICK asked Commissioner Hanley for a recommendation.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY recalled a prior version of HB 256, in which part of the focus would be to ensure that CTE courses are being offered. He said he is resistant to change the graduation requirements.

CHAIR DICK agreed.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY suggested that in the midst of the evaluations and advisors that it should be included in their focus to incorporate cultural standards so as to focus on CTE.

[9:37:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON suggested deleting "that includes" and inserting "ensuring," which would help since the scholarship program allows for college courses, but many students would benefit from career and vocational courses. She offered her belief this language would help make sure the process is happening. She asked for committee input.

CHAIR DICK entertained suggestions for an amendment.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY cautioned against adding this to the minimum course of study unless the intent is to ensure that every student attends a CTE course. He pointed out that some students want to take the AP courses and then move on to college and not every student needs the CTE courses, but the opportunity should be available.

[9:39:34 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT suggested after "that" to insert "could," which would be loose but would not require it.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON disagreed that each student must take the courses, but the flexible language makes certain it is available.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON related that Section 4 says the department shall do a number of things, including in paragraph (4), "prescribe by regulation a minimum course of study...." He offered his belief that establishes the minimum graduation requirements. He suggested that CTE be separated and not put into the prescribed minimum requirement section.

CHAIR DICK suggested taking the issues of the department out of committee for discussion between his office and the commissioner.

[9:41:21 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT suggested striking the language in paragraph (4)," ... that includes elective and career and vocational courses in addition to core curricula;..." He was unsure he was willing to move out a bill to address one issue and potentially create a whole different issue. He did not want to see that kind of collateral damage.

[9:41:53 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON noted that the questions being addressed are policy decisions and she asked for the committee to remain involved in the process. She acknowledged that the committee may want some things the commissioner does not want.

[HB 256 was held over.]

**HB 313-STUDENT COUNT ESTIMATES**

9:43:33 AM

CHAIR DICK announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 313, "An Act relating to student counts and estimates for public school funding; and providing for an effective date."

9:43:59 AM

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT made a motion to adopt the proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 313, labeled 27-LS1223\M, Kirsch/Mischel, 3/1/12.

9:44:15 AM

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON objected for the purpose of discussion.

9:44:31 AM

REPRESENTATIVE ERIC FEIGE, sponsor, referred to the proposed committee substitute by section. He stated that two sections have been changed, but everything else is the same as Version A of the bill. He referred to Section 4, which adds a provision to prohibit a municipal assembly from taking funds away from a district after having allocated the funds to the district. He stated that in talking to some of the chief financial officers in the districts he discovered one of their frustrations is that they may do very well on managing their money, and most of these districts actually spend less than what is planned into their budgets. However, for some districts that lie within municipalities or boroughs, the local government currently has the option at the end of the year to reallocate or reappropriate surplus funding remaining in the district's unrestricted funds account, which is the local contribution funding. He characterized this as something of a shell game with the public, since at the start of the year local government announces it is spending "x" amount on education, but at the end of year the borough will remove funding allocated and use it for other purposes. He offered his belief that it would be a great help to the districts if the ability to reappropriate the funds was curtailed.

9:46:32 AM

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE referred to Section 7 and explained that under current statute, the unrestricted reserve account is limited to 10 percent. He explained the district can maintain only up to 10 percent of what they have expended in the current school year and those funds can be retained until the next school year. This bill would raise it to 15 percent, which would allow districts to manage their own funding and allow the districts to maintain a greater reserve fund. He suggested that this would allow them greater flexibility to manage fluctuations in their cash flow and manage their funds instead of having their funds managed for them by local government. Finally, Section 11 would provide an effective date clause. The fiscal note has not been changed, he said.

[9:47:41 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON related that last year the Kenai Peninsula School District had to return some funds to the Kenai Peninsula Borough (KPB) since they were over their legally allowed cap. He asked how this provision will influence the district and if the EED would take the excess funds by reducing the contribution to the district in the same manner they do if contributions are over the cap and state funding is reduced by that amount.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE answered that it would allow the KPB School District to sit close to the ten percent cap so it would raise that cap and give them more latitude to run up to that cap if necessary. He suggested he was probably correct in terms of the ability to reallocate or reappropriate the funds. He stated that if they were at the cap local government would still not be able to withdraw the funds.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON stated that in the circumstance of the KPB school district the state would reduce funding for the school district on any amount over the cap.

[9:50:12 AM](#)

ELIZABETH SWEENEY NUDELMAN, Director, School Finance and Facilities Section, Department of Education and Early Development (EED), answered that if a school district has more than 10 percent in unreserved fund balance at the end of the year, the state would reduce state funding, thus returning the funds to the state.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON stated that under the current circumstance the borough had funded additional money above the minimum the

school district would return the funding to stay within the cap to the borough. He related his understanding that under the bill, the district would have paid the money, but the funds would reduce the state funding for the schools. He recapped that they couldn't transfer the excess to the borough and would need to transfer it to the state.

MS. NUDELMAN stated that if they were returning the money since they were at the cap and chose to return it to the local government rather than the state that is correct.

[9:51:46 AM](#)

CHAIR DICK recalled times in which money was shoveled into one end of the district, but the money was taken out the back end. He related his understanding that this language would fix that problem. He referred to Section 7, which seems to provide the districts with the security of knowing what their budget will be, but they need more flexibility since the student count could fluctuate so they need the leeway in order to respond to the unforeseen changes. He commented that these are both good changes.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE suggested that the problem Representative Seaton is raising could be fixed by a conceptual amendment.

[9:53:08 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON referred to Section 8. He asked whether there were any changes.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE answered that Section 8 is the same as Section 6 in Version A.

[9:53:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON removed his objection. There being no further objection, Version M was before the committee.

[9:53:57 AM](#)

MICHAEL PASCHALL, Staff, Representative Eric Feige, Alaska State Legislature, stated that the changes that Representative Feige addressed are the only changes to the bill.

[9:54:20 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE referred to Conceptual Amendment 1, on page 8, line 20. He stated that if the population of a district increases by five percent it would be eligible for supplemental funding for the current year from the EED. He reiterated the threshold is five percent. He suggested that five percent is relative and could be a lot of money or not. There was a fair amount of resistance from some of the larger districts since it was a significant amount of funding for some districts at five percent. He explained that Conceptual Amendment 1 would lower that to a three percent threshold. He asked members to keep in mind that most student populations typically do not change more than about one percent.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1, on page 8, line 20, which read, as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Change Sec. 6 AS 14.17.410(b)(1)(H) by deleting [FIVE] and inserting three.

[9:56:13 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT objected. He said the school district in his community is large so he objected. He stated that in his school district it would amount to 1,200 students, which is a lot of money. He acknowledged that the figures do not change very much. He suggested that the range is between 200 and 900 students. The potential would exist that several hundred students could be involved and districts would not have the funding. He agreed it is better, but he could not continue to support this. He stated that between 200 and 300 students represents less than one percent of the students, which may be manageable in his school district. He suggested language that said increases by the lesser of 200 students or a three-percent cap.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE agreed.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 1, on page 8, line 20 to read: increases by "the lesser of two hundred students or three percent." He suggested the bill drafters could correct the conceptual amendment to match the intent.

[9:58:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON objected for the purpose of discussion. She recalled Representative Pruitt had stated 200-900 students. She asked for the percentage 200 students of the total school district's population.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT reported the school district in his school district has 44,000 students, so 220 students would be about one-half of one percent. He computed that for 200 students at the current student base allocation of \$5,800 would represent \$1.1 million for his school district.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON asked for the figures for the overall budget.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT answered it was about \$700 million.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON stated that a small school system with a tiny budget comparatively would be significant.

[9:59:34 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE asked for the amount that the Anchorage School District currently has in reserve.

MR. PASCHALL answered the Anchorage School District has about \$56 million in their unreserved fund balance. This issue has been debated and the larger school districts - except for those districts in which the local government removes the funding - have the funding to cover the year. The Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 1 actually would increase the comfort level. He stated that considering smaller school districts and looking at percentages instead of dollars and the overall impact varies by district. He suggested Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 1 addresses the issue because the carryover from this year to next year is at issue and may affect whether the district can make it to next year. He remarked that next year the money will be received. He acknowledged the Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 1 was designed for the smaller school districts where the percentages are more crucial. He offered his belief that would satisfy the concern.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON said that she was unsure.

[10:01:56 AM](#)

MR. PASCHALL answered that it is a cash flow and not an income issue. He referred to the basis for HB 313, which is to change

the timing of the funding and not the amount of the funding. He highlighted some objections were raised with respect to cash flow. He stated that he reviewed the numbers and cash flow was not an issue for the majority of the school districts. He did not speak to Anchorage, but Fairbanks raised a similar objection; however, he stated they have the cash flow to do this. He stated that the Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 1 addresses the concern and the bill sponsor is agreeable. He anticipated that the second amendment would allow for an alternative funding method in the current year.

[10:03:08 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON withdrew her objection to Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 1. There being no further objection, Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 1 was adopted.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT withdrew his objection to Conceptual Amendment 1. There being no further objection, Conceptual Amendment 1 was adopted.

[10:03:32 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 2, which read [original punctuation provided]:

Add a new section to read: "If a district is unable to meet current year funding needs and is not protected by the provisions of AS 14.17.410(b)(1)(H), the district may apply to the department for supplemental funding for the current fiscal year."

[10:04:00 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON objected for the purpose of discussion.

[10:04:09 AM](#)

MR. PASCHALL referred to page 8, following line 29.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE stated that Conceptual Amendment 2 would assist small school districts where the addition of 1-3 students does not cross the threshold; however, if they are special or intensive needs kids the cost would be significant and the addition would then exceed the threshold. He explained that it would meet any other requirements for additional funding that

cannot be foreseen at this point. He characterized this amendment as a catch-all and as a way for a school district that may not have reserves and additional expenses to still seek funding from the department.

[10:05:31 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked whether this would be limited to requests for additional funding under this chapter or it applies for any reason.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE responded that the intent is to address situations in which a school district does not have any reserves, but has additional expenses due to changes in the school population, and to provide an avenue to seek supplemental funding from the department. He said it is not intended to be used every year, but just for special cases.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON agreed with the changes to the timing of the formula, but his interpretation of the amendment is it appears when a school district has a shortfall, no matter the reason, that no restrictions apply for supplemental funding. He suggested the language needs to be tightened to the change in the student count timing.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE answered that this language requires an application to the department, but it does not guarantee that the department will approve and distribute supplemental funds. He emphasized that there needs to be some provision in the bill so the school district doesn't become bankrupt in the middle of the school year.

[10:07:17 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON agreed if it is driven by the change in the student count. He offered his belief that this language represents a fundamental change if the legislature allows districts to apply for supplemental funding due to shortfalls. The school districts could then shift money between districts without anything being related to the count.

[10:08:20 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 2 to delete "needs" at the end of the first line and add, "because of change in student counts" and

leave the existing language. Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 2 would read, as follows:

If a district is unable to meet current year funding because of change in student counts and is not protected by the provisions of AS 14.17.410(b)(1)(H), the district may apply to the department for supplemental funding for the current fiscal year.

10:08:50 AM

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE referred to [subparagraph] (H), which is referenced in Conceptual Amendment 2 refers to the student counts.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON withdrew proposed Conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 2.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE declared that the intent is not to reward bad behavior, but if a situation arises beyond the control of a school district, especially a small school district, the department can be engaged to assist. The department will determine the merits of supplemental funding.

10:09:55 AM

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON referred to page 7, line 5, which refers to the adjusted ADM.

The committee took an at-ease from 10:09 a.m. to 10:10 a.m.

10:10:24 AM

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked whether this language is a new subparagraph (I) or if it will be a new section.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE offered his belief that it would be a new [subparagraph] (I).

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON suggested if the language is a new subparagraph (I), it would relate to the previous subsection on page 7, line 5, which would pertain to the calculation of the ADM for school districts. He explained that if a school district is not protected by one provision it is protected by the ADM calculation in subsection (b) in circumstances in which the district cannot meet its needs. He highlighted that if the proposed conceptual Amendment 1 to Conceptual Amendment 2 only

applies to subparagraph (H) it would only apply to the three or five percent change in student counts; however, if the proposed amendment is to subparagraph (I) it would also affect the adjusted ADM calculation.

[10:12:05 AM](#)

MR. PASCHALL explained the intent of Representative Feige's Conceptual Amendment 2 is to only apply to unique circumstances such as if the school district is not protected due to the greater than three percent student count change. In those instances the school district could apply to the department. He related a scenario in which one school district has a \$26,000 reserve, which is five percent of their operating budget so the most this school district could have in reserve is not enough to cover hiring a single intensive need aide. This school district would need to have some type of assistance in order to exist in that unique situation. He agreed the language should only apply to school districts with student count changes.

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON agreed the new subparagraph (I) goes beyond the sponsor's intent.

The committee took a brief at-ease.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE withdrew Conceptual Amendment 2.

[10:14:14 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 3, which incorporates language in subsection (c), on page 5, lines 8-9, such that it would read:

The assembly may not reallocate or reappropriate for another purpose the amount appropriated from local sources to the district for school purposes unless the unrestricted portion of its year end fund balance in the school operating fund exceeds the amount set in AS 14.17.505(a).

[10:15:42 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON objected for the purpose of discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE stated that this addresses Representative Seaton's earlier concern. He explained that if the school

district is at its maximum reserve amount then it can reallocate funds.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON pointed out that some school districts don't have a reserve account.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE explained that funds cannot be withdrawn by the assembly. He further explained that what has happened in some school districts is they have a surplus at the end of the year. The local government, such as a borough assembly, reallocates the surplus to a project, such as a sidewalk. Conceptual Amendment 3 would prevent that from happening. Furthermore, it prevents a shell game from happening. The borough would announce it is spending \$27 million on education, but in reality reappropriates the funding at the end of the year.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON clarified that Conceptual Amendment 2 is not being rewritten. She withdrew her objection to Conceptual Amendment 3. There being no further objection, Conceptual 3 was adopted.

[10:17:26 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE suggested passage of the bill and redraft the language attempted for Conceptual Amendment 2 for consideration by the Finance Committee.

[10:17:45 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 10:17 a.m. to 10:19 a.m.

MS. NUDELMAN offered to answer any questions.

CHAIR DICK asked whether the department has specific concerns with the proposed legislation.

MS. NUDELMAN responded that she shared the concern with Conceptual Amendment [2], as withdrawn, since it would allow school districts to simply ask for funds. She agreed with the discussion that the committee is having on that count. She referred to the fiscal note with this bill. She explained that when school districts receive funding because the count has gone up, it increases the funding level under the old system. She advised that the department will revisit the fiscal note at three percent to reflect the increase.

[10:20:04 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked whether she could estimate how the fiscal note of \$1 million at five percent would change.

MS. NUDELMAN answered that the fiscal note was estimate and it could be scrutinized especially based on some of the amendments.

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON agreed the three percent is a significant change.

[10:20:45 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE asked for an estimate of the current amount that is spent on education per year.

MS. NUDELMAN responded that the state entitlement represents approximately \$1 billion as a rough figure.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE asked whether the change would be \$2 million at three percent.

MS. NUDELMAN said she would not disagree, but she wanted to calculate the amount.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE highlighted that the committee is considering \$2 million in a potential \$1 billion funding stream.

MS. NUDELMAN acknowledged she understood his logic.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE pointed out that the percentage is negligible.

[10:21:57 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SEATON asked whether placing the Conceptual Amendment 2 under (H) would that be more appropriate and not relate to the ADM calculation.

MS. NUDELMAN responded that would be appropriate for schools who fall into the three to five percent category, but she has not given any thought to those schools that have a change in enrollment that do not fall into the three or five percent categories.

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE pointed out the amendments are in response to the public testimony as well as conversations with the parties that manage the funds.

[10:23:41 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE offered Conceptual Amendment 4 using the previous language of Conceptual Amendment 2, as a subsection of AS 14.17.410 (b) (1) (H), which read:

If a district is unable to meet current year funding because of change in student counts and is not protected by the provisions of AS 14.17.410(b) (1) (H), the district may apply to the department for supplemental funding for the current fiscal year.

There being no objection, Conceptual Amendment 4 was adopted.

[10:24:03 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE P. WILSON moved to report the proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 313, labeled 27-LS1223\M, Kirsch/Mischel, 3/1/12, as amended, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. There being no objection, the CSHB 313(EDC), as amended, was reported from the House Education Standing Committee.

[10:24:24 AM](#)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Education Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 10:24 a.m.