

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE EDUCATION STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 1, 2023

8:01 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Jamie Allard, Co-Chair
Representative Justin Ruffridge, Co-Chair
Representative Mike Prax
Representative Tom McKay
Representative Rebecca Himschoot
Representative Andi Story

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative CJ McCormick

OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT

Representative Andrew Gray
Representative Alyse Galvin
Representative Jennifer Armstrong
Representative Genevieve Mina
Representative Maxine Dibert
Representative Cliff Groh
Senator Loki Tobin

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 69

"An Act relating to the reclassification of first class cities as second class cities; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

PRESENTATION(S): UNCOVERING THE MYTHS OF SCHOOL CHOICE BY BOB GRIFFIN

- HEARD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 69

SHORT TITLE: RECLASSIFICATION OF FIRST CLASS CITIES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) CRONK

02/10/23 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/10/23 (H) EDC, CRA
03/01/23 (H) EDC AT 8:00 AM DAVIS 106

WITNESS REGISTER

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE CRONK
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: As prime sponsor, introduced HB 69.

DAVE STANCLIFF, Staff
Representative Mike Cronk
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: On behalf of the prime sponsor,
Representative Cronk, gave the sectional analysis of HB 69.

BOB GRIFFIN, Senior Education Research Fellow
Alaska Policy Forum
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled
"Myths and Merits of School Choice."

BEN DEGROW, Policy Director
Education Choice
Foundation for Excellence in Education
Midland, Michigan

POSITION STATEMENT: Gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled
"Education Choice: Overview and Trends."

LESLIE HINER, Vice President
Legal Affairs
EdChoice

Indianapolis, Indiana
POSITION STATEMENT: Gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled
"Educational Choice: The Future of Education and Its
Constitutional Foundation."

MATTHEW LADNER, PhD, Director
Arizona Center for Student Opportunity
Arizona Charter Schools Association
Phoenix, Arizona

POSITION STATEMENT: Gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "The
Future of Public Education is...Excellent."

JODI TAYLOR, representing self

Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: As a parent, gave invited testimony on school choice.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[8:01:08 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR JAMIE ALLARD called the House Education Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:01 a.m. Representatives Prax, McKay, Himschoot, Allard, and Ruffridge were present at the call to order. Representative Story arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 69-RECLASSIFICATION OF FIRST CLASS CITIES

[8:02:02 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 69, "An Act relating to the reclassification of first class cities as second class cities; and providing for an effective date."

[8:02:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE CRONK, Alaska State Legislature, as prime sponsor, introduced HB 69. He pointed out that the first-class city of Tanana has been unable to transfer its school to the Yukon-Koyukuk rural education attendance area. He stated that this is because a first-class city would need to be reclassified to legally transfer. From the annual report from the local boundary commission, he pointed out that a minimum population of 400 residents is required to form a first-class city; however, there is not a mechanism for automatic reclassification if a city's population drops. He stated that the proposed legislation would be the first step in allowing the Tanana school to be transferred to the Yukon-Koyukuk School District. He referenced past legislation which had been required to allow the transfer of a different small school into another school district. He concluded that without this legislation the Tanana school cannot be transferred.

[8:03:57 AM](#)

DAVE STANCLIFF, Staff, Representative Mike Cronk, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of the prime sponsor, Representative

Cronk, presented the sectional analysis [copy included in the committee packet], which read as follows:

Section 1:

City Population Eligibility: Establishes a threshold of "less than" 400 persons, as verified by the latest US Census, for automatically reclassifying a first-class city that requests such action.

Local Boundary Commission Timeframe: Once requested, a timeframe of 10 days is established for the Local Boundary Commission to notify the requesting city council that they are officially eligible for reclassification.

City decision timeframe: After the council receives official notification by the Local Boundary Commission, the city has 30 days to reject the automatic reclassification.

City reconsideration timeframe: If the city council opts to reject the automatic reclassification for one year from the date.

Section 2:

Establishes immediate effective date.

[8:05:09 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD announced that HB 69 was held over.

[8:05:15 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:05 a.m. to 8:06 a.m.

PRESENTATION(S): Uncovering the Myths of School Choice by Bob Griffin

[8:06:34 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD announced that the final order of business would be several presentations on school choice.

[8:06:51 AM](#)

BOB GRIFFIN, Senior Education Research Fellow, Alaska Policy Forum, gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Uncovering the Myths of School Choice" [hard copy included in the committee packet]. He stated that the Alaska Policy Forum is a nonpartisan thinktank. He provided an overview and introduced the other presenters, as listed on slide 2. He shared that he is a member of the Alaska State Board of Education; however, he stated that he is not present at the meeting in this capacity and the board is not affiliated with the school choice issue except for the Tribal compacting work he is involved with.

8:09:34 AM

MR. GRIFFIN noted that he has provided the committee with the same information provided to the board concerning the optimistic outcomes for the state's educational ranking, as it has had some of the lowest learning outcomes in the country. He stated that there is a fare amount of work to be done, but because there are already students enrolled in distance learning, improvements have been seen. He reminded the committee that, even though there have been disappointing results regarding the state's educational ranking, "our kids are just as bright, our teachers are just as dedicated, and our parents love kids just as much as anywhere else." He expressed the opinion that the differences in outcomes are mainly related to policy decisions.

8:11:16 AM

MR. GRIFFIN expressed the hope that the presentations will communicate how policy makers can help improve student outcomes. He noted that the subject is complicated and school choice is only one element. He referenced that states with successful ratings in education have some school choice options which may work in Alaska. He pointed out some of the assets already available in Alaska for school choice. He advised that homeschools in Alaska are hard to track as many families are living off the grid. He continued that the state already has 21,000 students in correspondence schools, which relates to about 17 percent of the student population. He suggested that because of this, Alaska has one of the lowest percentages of learning loss from the COVID-19 pandemic. He discussed several of these correspondence schools in the state.

MR. GRIFFIN continued that the 28 charter schools in the state are another asset, with 6,700 enrolled students. He showed the data on slide 2, which points out the downside to charter schools in the state, as Alaska ranks low among other states.

He contributed this to the state's laws restricting charter schools. He added that other alternative education programs in the state include Montessori schools and the boarding school at Mt. Edgecombe. Addressing private schools, he said that Alaska has one of the lowest participation rates in the country. Pointing out other types of schools, he described hybrid schools as students being taught partially in homeschool and partially in correspondence school. He described micro schools, or podding, as where parents work together to hire a teacher. He added that leveraging technology will be an asset to schooling in rural communities. He moved to slide 3 and pointed out the low poverty rate in Alaska compared with other states. He stated that there is the idea that this contributes to disappointing school rankings.

[8:19:20 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY commented on the restricted laws for charter schools in Alaska and requested an elaboration of this point.

MR. GRIFFIN replied that the National Alliance of Charter Schools ranks charter schools by their state laws, as seen on slide 3. With the top state scoring 240, he stated that Alaska is ranked 83. He stated that this score has to do with Alaska's requirement for multiple authorizers. In response to a follow-up question, he expressed agreement that this is because Alaska authorizes its charter schools through the school districts or through the Department of Education and Early Development. He discussed the alliance's process of rating schools and gave more details of why Alaska does not score better.

[8:21:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT, in reference to slide 3 concerning poverty rankings, questioned the number of Title I schools in Alaska.

MR. GRIFFIN expressed uncertainty. He suggested that the number of students receiving a free or reduced lunch would be a similar result.

[8:22:52 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:22 a.m. to 8:24 a.m.

[8:24:01 AM](#)

BEN DEGROW, Policy Director, Education Choice, Foundation for Excellence in Education (ExcelinEd), gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Education Choice: Overview and Trends" [hard copy included in the committee packet]. He shared that ExcelinEd has 15 years of experience of providing policy solutions for education systems in the country. He moved to slide 2, which demonstrated the broad range of policy solutions for educational choice. He expressed the opinion that this choice should begin and end with the needs of students and families. He pointed out that this range of choices begins with the "most overlooked," which is residentially assigned public schools, as parents would be able to choose these schools by purchasing a house in the district. He pointed out some of the other options listed, such as open-enrollment public schools, magnet schools, public charter schools, and the multiple types of private schools, of which will be the focus of his presentation.

[8:26:26 AM](#)

MR. DEGROW advised the committee that not any one system will meet the needs of every student. He pointed out that students assigned to residential school districts often have no other options, and when the school does not work for them, these students need an alternative option. The reasons for parental school choice were listed on slide 3, as student safety, personalization, experiences with faculty, opportunities to achieve, and climate and culture of the school. He added that very few schools excel in all of these areas.

MR. DEGROW moved on to slide 4, which laid out the three main varieties of private education: state-funded coupons; tax credit scholarships funded by businesses and donors; and education scholarship accounts, also known as education savings accounts (ESAs). He added that ESAs are issued in the student's name and can be used for private school tuition, tutoring, curricular materials, and much more. He moved to slide 5, which addressed the international trends for education choice and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). He stated that voucher tuition tax credits are widespread in developed countries.

[8:32:33 AM](#)

MR. DEGROW moved to slide 6, which exhibited data on the growth of programs supplying private school choice across the country.

He stated that slide 7 looks at this data from the perspective of student enrollment in private schools. Moving to slide 8, he pointed out the graph showing K-12 spending for state-funded coupons, tax credit scholarships, and ESAs and said this data shows that the amount of money spent on a student's education in a private school is less than it would be in the K-12 public school system. Research supporting this was shown on slide 9. He pointed out the negative findings on the slide and explained that these came from Louisiana, and it was determined this was because of its rigid program design. He concluded with a map of the country showing the states which have introduced ESA legislation. He suggested that more parents are opting to use their education dollars in creative ways. He expressed the opinion that this is in response to school closings during the pandemic, as families were frustrated. He said that opening new school models has helped students thrive.

[8:41:25 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT referred to slide 2 which showed the nine different choices for K-12 education. She questioned whether there is a state that has all nine of the choices.

MR. DEGROW estimated that maybe a handful of states would have all nine choices. He stated that around 45 states have both charter schools and open-enrollment public schools, while every state allows home schooling. Of the three types of private schools, only a hand full of states have all of these, with Indiana possibly having all nine.

[8:42:29 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT, with a follow-up question, pointed to slide 4 and the list of eight items ESAs can be used for. She stated that public schools are mandated to supply six of these eight items, and correspondence schools can do six of these eight things. She requested a clarification why something different would need to be done.

MR. DEGROW responded that the fact families have signed up for ESAs means these students have not been well served by the public school assigned to them. He pointed out that ESAs originated by serving students with disabilities, as these parents were frustrated by not receiving adequate services. These families sought out alternatives from a broader range of providers.

[8:44:59 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE, concerning tax credit scholarships, requested an example of an organization doing this at a high rate. He questioned whether there is an organization doing this in Alaska.

MR. DEGROW replied that about 20 states are operating these tax credit programs, with each state's program being different. He offered that a nonprofit in Florida is administering a program which is the largest in the nation, serving about 100,000 low-income students. He mentioned that some organizations operate in multiple states, and there are those which work with certain groups and types of schools.

MR. GRIFFIN added that this is not available in Alaska, as per statute, Alaska is not recognized as a school choice state.

[8:46:53 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY expressed the understanding that the Constitution of the State of Alaska prohibits the state from spending money for private schools, tuition, and religious organizations. She questioned whether any state has changed its constitution to implement school choice.

MR. GRIFFIN deferred the question to Leslie Hiner.

[8:47:30 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:47 a.m. to 8:48 a.m.

[8:48:36 AM](#)

LESLIE HINER, Vice President, Legal Affairs, EdChoice, gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Educational Choice: The Future of Education and Its Constitutional Foundation" [hard copy included in the committee packet]. She shared that she has been advocating for school choice since the mid-1980s and has been involved with all types of litigation surrounding school choice. She moved to slide 2. She stated that the core issue involving school choice is "always keep the interest of the child out in front of you." She made the point that bullied children have motivated parents to look for different education systems as places for their children to thrive. Moving to the next slide, she stated that a strong legal foundation supports that parents have the primary authority to decide how and where their child

is educated. Reviewing decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States which support this, she began with the 1925 decision upholding the idea that "the child is not the mere creature of the state."

[8:54:11 AM](#)

MS. HINER, continuing with the history of school choice, discussed Dr. Milton Friedman, as seen on slide 4. She stated that in 1954 he wrote an article, titled "The Role of Government in Education." She stated that in this article he defined a way to fund education to have the "best results," which is giving parents the funds to choose the educational resources which would be best for their child. She moved to slide 5 and spoke about the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 2002, which reiterated that a child's educational funding should be directed to the parent for the parent to decide. In result of this decision, she said that there was a break between government and religion concerning education. She referred to the court case in Alaska in 1978 where the Alaska Supreme Court ruled that no private schools can receive state funding.

MS. HINER moved to the next slide and discussed the U.S. Supreme Court case which ruled that states are not required to subsidize private education, but if a state decides to do so, it cannot disqualify a private school solely because of its religion. She moved to slide 7 and pointed out the 2022 U.S. Supreme Court case which ruled that its previous decision applies to every state in the country. In other words, a state's constitution can not be used to deny the federal constitutional right of any parent. She pointed to this case in addressing Representative Story's previous question concerning the necessity to change a state's constitution. She stated that this case supports the edict that violating the rights of parents control over their child's education is against the Constitution of the United States. In conclusion, she moved to slide 8 which shows school choice programs by state. She called attention to the litigation in Alaska and across the country which is against state funding for school choice programs. She remarked that out of 48 recent cases, only 5 were lost. She further discussed how quickly school choice is being allowed across the country.

[9:06:58 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT stated that using Alaska Policy Forum's website she collected data on top performing states per the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). She pointed

out that six top-rated states are not on the chart on slide 8 of schools with educational choice. She questioned this.

MS. HINER answered that in any one of these states, the percentage of children participating in school choice programs is small. She stated that because NAEP is so broad, the vast majority of these scores are from students currently enrolled in public schools. She argued that the children doing well in public schools are not the ones moved to other school choice programs.

[9:09:26 AM](#)

MR. GRIFFIN commented on the NAEP data for low income fourth graders. He stated that Florida is first in reading with five school choice programs and Mississippi is second with three programs.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT commented that she is not looking at low-income students, but rather overall scores on the Alaska Policy Forum's website. She reiterated that the top-rated districts are not represented on the chart of states with school choice.

MR. GRIFFIN responded that when looking at overall statistics, the numbers are not stratified by economic status; therefore, the data can be inaccurate, with wide variations on poverty rates between states. He added that lower income children tend to score lower on NAEP.

[9:10:52 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT, if a private school is publicly funded, questioned whether families in private schools would still have 100 percent of their educational rights, including free lunches, the right to free speech, and the right to transportation.

MS. HINER replied that the school would not be publicly funded, rather the child is funded, with the parent deciding how to use the funds; therefore, whatever choice the parent makes will define the benefit that the child would receive. She stated that public schools and private schools are not the same, so the benefits would be different.

[9:12:42 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE questioned whether any state has altered its constitution to avoid litigation.

MS. HINER replied that some states have considered altering their constitution; however, the supreme courts in these states concurred with the U.S. Supreme Court. She pointed out that Oklahoma, with one of the most restrictive constitutions in the country, had attempted this. She reiterated that the funding for school choice goes to the family, and it is the parents' choice, not the state. She further discussed this type of litigation. In response to a follow-up question in regard to the cost to states for this litigation, she stated that these cases are handled by the attorney general's office. She added that the Institute for Justice, which is a nonprofit organization, will often intervene in these types of cases, defending the rights of parents.

[9:17:52 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX questioned whether Alaska's constitution would allow private schools to be subsidized.

MS. HINER replied that she has looked at the state's constitution. She pointed out that the section on education has similar language as other states; however, there was an amendment to the constitution which says that "no money should be paid from public funds for the direct benefit of any religious or other private educational institutions." She further discussed this issue and concluded that with the U.S. Supreme Court's decision, there would be multiple ways to provide different educational resources, while maintaining the basic principle which prevents the state from establishing any kind of religion.

[9:21:38 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY, in a comment to the committee, suggested that the question should be put to Legislative Legal Services.

[9:22:49 AM](#)

MATTHEW LADNER, PhD, Director, Arizona Center for Student Opportunity, Arizona Charter Schools Association, gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "The Future of Public Education is...Excellent" [hard copy included in the committee packet]. He discussed the history of school choice in Arizona, pointing out it has more options than any other state. He moved to slide

2, which was a duplicate of slide 8 from Mr. DeGrow's presentation. He reiterated that the chart covers the outcomes of private school choice programs. He added that the effect on public schools is a very important question. He moved to slide 3, which showed a map of the percentage of students across the country with access to a charter school in 2014 to 2015. He pointed out that while Arizona has the highest percentage of charter schools, Alaska has the third highest. He moved to slide 4 and slide 5, which showed a study from the Stanford University Educational Opportunity Project. He stated that the data in this study is different from NAEP, as it has data on academic growth. He stated that within the community of scholars on this subject, there is a consensus that the progress of education over time is the best measure of school quality. He continued that NAEP measures proficiency, which is correlated with student demographics, but it does not address achievement gaps. To overcome achievement gaps, he said there needs to be a fast rate of academic growth. On slide 5 which charts academic growth, he explained that most of the country falls into the quadrant which has a faster growth rate for the non-low-income students and a slower growth rate for low-income students. He pointed out that Alaska has the second fastest academic growth rate in the country for low-income students.

[9:31:51 AM](#)

MR. LADNER moved to slide 6. He explained the map of Ohio by pointing out the shaded [urban] school districts with open enrollment, as these students are allowed to attend any school within the shaded areas. He pointed out that outside of the urban areas there is little shading, representing few open-enrollment choices. He deduced that this restricts the [low-income] urban students from choosing these schools. He explained this exemplifies most of the education systems in the country. On the same slide, he pointed out the map of the Scottsdale Unified School District in Arizona. He stated that most of the students enrolled in this district do not live within its boundaries. He contributes this to an open-enrollment law that Arizona passed in 1994 and the amount of school choice the state provides. He expressed the opinion that the result of this is the positive academic growth in Arizona.

MR. LADNER moved to the next slide and addressed a study that looks at rural schools. He stated that opponents of school choice make two arguments. The first argument is there are no options for rural students. The second argument is that school choice will destroy rural school districts. He stated that the

study on the slide shows that both of these arguments cannot be true at the same time; however, they both can be false. He expressed the opinion that both arguments are false. He discussed this using Arizona as an example which supports the study's findings. He concluded the presentation by discussing micro schools, suggesting that these schools have more to offer smaller communities, and he gave examples.

[9:42:26 AM](#)

MR. LADNER, in response to Co-Chair Ruffridge, stated that the data on slide 5, which shows Alaska's positive educational growth, is from Stanford University's website. He stated that test scores from each state have been linked to allow the comparisons, and this was linked to NAEP. He stated that this is only for the third grade to the eighth grade, as there is no high school data. He further explained the study. He reiterated that the measure of academic growth is a measure of school quality. He expressed the opinion that this is better than measuring proficiency. In response to a follow-up question he stated that the Stanford University Educational Opportunity Project has data for a number of different subgroups, but it does not have data for every single school. He stated that the data from this is a complement to NAEP data.

[9:48:28 AM](#)

JODI TAYLOR, representing self, gave invited testimony on school choice from the perspective of a parent. She read from a written statement [copy included in the committee packet.] She stated that she had volunteered in the public school system, but has since moved away from this, in part because her child was shamed for her religious beliefs. She referenced involvement with a charter school and described the administration as rigid, with an unwillingness to change in the light of low performance. She continued that she enrolled her younger child in a correspondence school, but this school did not provide proficient educational outcomes. She provided examples of others' dissatisfaction with the public school system. She continued with a discussion focusing on vocational education opportunities. In conclusion, she stated that the point of educational choice is that parents should have options; they can choose what best fits their child, and this can change, "which is just fine."

[10:02:41 AM](#)

DR. LADNER, in response to Representative Himschoot, expressed doubt that Arizona and Ohio have schools only accessible by boat or plane.

MR. GRIFFIN, in response to Representative Himschoot, stated that according to the 2019 PEAKS English Language results for Alaska, Skagway had the highest rating. He stated that he would follow up to the committee with more information on this. He expressed the understanding that the higher ratings tended to be in the coastal towns of Alaska. He stated that he would follow-up to the committee with a chart showing the corresponding poverty rates.

[10:05:34 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT questioned whether there is a correlation between high test scores and low-poverty rates.

Mr. Griffin replied "absolutely," as this is a common trend. He stated this is the reason Alaska Policy Forum disaggregates its data by economic status. In response to a follow-up question, he expressed the understanding that the poverty levels between Anchorage and Skagway are not very different.

[10:06:32 AM](#)

DR. LANDER, in response to Representative Prax concerning the data used in the study, stated that the Stanford University Educational Opportunity Project's website contains data on individual school districts and on county and state levels. He stated that specific year by year data is also available for download.

[10:08:39 AM](#)

[Mr. DeGrow was unable to respond during the hearing because of technical difficulties. The following two questions have been put on the record for follow-up responses.]

REPRESENTATIVE STORY expressed the understanding that there were negative effects in reading and math scores after the voucher program in Louisiana, as discussed on slide 10 of Mr. DeGrow's presentation. She expressed the understanding that he had said this was because private schools needed to teach to the state's test. For the record, she questioned whether Mr. DeGrow sees this as a negative thing. She questioned the meaning of "teach to the state's test."

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT, for the record to Mr. Degrow, questioned why the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program did not produce the expected results.

[10:10:15 AM](#)

MR. GRIFFIN, in reference to an earlier question concerning free or reduced lunch rates, stated that Alaska is ranked thirty-sixth in the country for free and reduced lunch rate, with 43 percent. He stated the New Hampshire is the lowest at 29 percent and Mississippi is the highest at 73 percent. In conclusion to the presentations, he reiterated that there are 21,000 students and parents in Alaska who are choosing something different than public school. He argued that the easy thing for parents to do is send their children to public schools.

[10:12:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT commented that Finland is a top performer in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). She stated that it does not have school choice programs; however, it "doubled down" on public education in the 1950s. She suggested that its high performance is the result of this. If the goal is student achievement, she said, when public schools are well funded, this provides a wide range of opportunities. She pointed out that public education may not be the right choice for everyone, but Alaska does have six of the nine options for school choice. She argued if this same effort is put into the public schools, outcomes would be better.

[10:13:35 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX commented that legislators need to consider core concepts. He argued that the choice for education should be the parents.

[10:14:27 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY addressed the issues of sending children to public school and the difficulties parents face. She reiterated that the Legislative Legal Service's opinion needs to be on the record concerning some of the school choices and the state's constitution.

[10:15:59 AM](#)

MS. HINER offered consultation, as school choice is complex litigation, and some local attorneys may not know the details of this. She expressed the importance of understanding that school choice is not a battle between private schools and public schools. She suggested that it has been positioned this way. She gave examples of public and private school teachers working together, as this is about how students learn. She expressed the opinion that just because a student and parent choose another option, it does not mean public school is "bad."

[10:19:29 AM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Education Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.