

SB

1999

SB 199

By: Sandwood, Stinson
& Sturgulewski

S. HESS 79-90
"An Act relating to the public
school foundation program;
and providing for an effective
date."

3/14 NOF/N. Law requesting

Introduced 2-13-79

Logged

Referred Finance

Comm. Meeting 3-14-79 - Made as CS adding SB 233 - taken private flag @ 11:30 AM.

Com " Passed as CS-

COMMITTEE REPORT
SENATE

3/2/79

FURTHER: Finance and
Labor & Management

Date: _____

Mr. President:

The Committee on HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES has had ¹⁹⁹ ~~SB 225~~ relating to the public school foundation program; to educational assessments of children; to correspondence study

under consideration and (a majority of the committee) (the committee) reports it back with the following recommendations:

- do pass do not pass
- do pass with attached amendments(s)
- replace with CS for _____ same title
- and recommends _____ new title
- AND attaches a "Letter of Intent" New Fiscal Note
- reports it back without recommendation
- referred to the _____ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING
DO PASS

MEMBERS HAVING
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

Allen Hadley
CHAIRMAN

NO REC

3/14/79

SB 199/SB 233

Sen. Ferguson. I introduced SB 233 but the problem I had is at the time it got drafted it didn't meet the 30 day deadline. I am requesting that SB233 be attached to SB 199. I've talked to the sponsor of SB 199 and he is amenable to that provision. I think it would be best to have the commissioner and anyone else testify on the bills.

Commissioner Lind. The comments I will be making with reference to various portions of SB 233 will be based on the areas that we have discussed with the State Board of Education. We do have positions on certain parts of it, but not a position on the entire bill. We are meeting next week and will be spending quite a bit of our work session dealing with this bill and some others at that time.

The author of the bill attempted to address some of the problems (SB 233) that we recognized should be addressed. First of all, the change for the correspondence study students, the proposed changes would place correspondence study students on a different formula. One that would result in less money to the local school districts. It is our feeling that that change is necessary and we support the proposal that is offered. It does pick up the schedule over on page 3, the new subsection for the units. We are in agreement with that portion of it.

Sec. 2, part B, talks to the computation of the instructional units for each elementary and secondary school, as it now reads it is strictly on a secondary basis; however, in the remote areas of the state it is possible to compute the attendance of the instructional units on a separate building by building count. We feel that this change for the elementary schools is appropriate. It is expensive, but we feel there are some additional costs involved with operating separate schools, therefore this does address that. The fiscal note does provide for you a detailed analysis section by section.

Sec. 3, is a section that we recommend and support. It does clean up some things that we feel are necessary. There is no fiscal impact attached to that section.

Sec. 4, is very important to us. There is no fiscal impact. The recommendation that we would have is that that become effective immediately. Somewhere along the line that was left out about two years ago, inadvertently from the best of our research, as we made some other changes in the foundation formula. We would highly recommend that that be included and become effective immediately.

Sec. 5, we have also recommended this change regarding some adjustments in the vocational education schedule. The cost of that is approximately \$578,000 and there is an accompanying

2

memo attached to your fiscal note that clarifies where that money would go. One of the problems that we are running into is the adequacy of the funding for very small vocational education programs. We've got quite a good formula basically for vocational education but it is not doing what we think it should be doing. It's a very small school. These are expensive programs. We also feel that one of our responsibilities is to make sure that the vocational education programs that are in existence are truly vocational education in nature and are doing what they purport to do as far as vocational education training. We have recognized of the past couple of years that for small schools to have a very meaningful voc/ed program, the present form is just not adequate. This does have that \$578,000 impact.

Sec. 6. I addressed earlier regarding correspondence study. This is the portion that outlines the formula for correspondence study. That is a reduction.

The State correspondence study is out of a separate fund so this does not effect that. What it might mean that some school district if they are not getting as much through the foundation program for correspondence study may choose to no longer offer a local program and those youngsters then would be picked up at the state program. How much that might be is hard to say.

SEC. 7. Has fiscal impact of \$1.8. I cannot say very much about the area differentials that are included here, we have not taken a firm position on all of these at the State board level. At the department level our recommendation would be to change only two, Annette and Skagway. And the placement of the newest district in the State, Sandpoint, . . .

Sec. 8. This one has a bit of an impact of \$21 million. We don't have a position supporting that much of an increase. We supported a 10% increase for FY 80, but I am not prepared to say that this is an appropriate increase for FY 81.

Sen. Fahrenkamp. What would happen if we maintained same level.

Sen. Hackney. It's like the old story, the truth probely lies somewhere inbetween.

Sen. Ferguson. I don't have a problem going down to whatever the giture should be, but I included 10% because things are costly and I can understand you having a problem with 10% and I recognize that.

I would move that we reduce that to 7%. So ordered.

Com. Lind. Sec. 9. We are hopeful that correspondence study can be more clearly defined then what we have now. We suggest that the word "appropriate" in line 21 be stricken.

It is our feeling that any youngster that is presently in a centralized program should be able to stay in the centralized program to complete their particular courses

3/

Sec. 11. Speaks to clean up to remove some redundancy and some other parts of law. We like it the way it is.

Sec. 12. Does have fiscal impact. The establishment of an assessment fund which would assist school districts in the diagnosis for exceptional youngsters. Most of the school districts are letting us know through the school boards and superintendents regarding the problems they are running into in the funding for the initial assessment, particularly of exceptional youngsters. We feel there is a need for this, especially in the next couple of years in trying to deal with all of the implications of the federal requirements of the handicapped plus our own state requirements, they need some help in doing the adequacy of assessment. We are running into teachers probably not fully prepared or assisted to do the assessment, they have other classroom kinds of things they should be doing, youngsters are not being assessed properly, there is an additional paperwork burden on the classroom teachers, Their time should be spent doing other things. The fact that a number of the districts to go through the assessment process then if the youngsters are eligible for special ed services, they have to spend the money going through the process and may not be able to afford the additional dollars. This bill as presented has fiscal implications for 79 and 80. It is our feeling this should be put off until FY 81 at which time you deal with the total increases unless there were some way to see how an additional 1.9 million could be paying for FY 80.

Heather Flynn. Marshall expressed it very well.

Sen. Fahrenkamp. I move to substitute the body of 233 for the body of SB 199 with the amendments that were discussed here today

No obs so ordered.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Glenn Hackney, Chairman
Senate HESS Committee
Alaska State Senate

DATE: March 15, 1979

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: *mil*
Marshall L. Lind, Commissioner
Department of Education

SUBJECT: CSSB-199

It is the feeling of the Department that the following amendment to the above bill, properly introduced in the Senate Finance Committee, is needed to permit parents who see correspondence programs as an alternative to public schools, and who reside in districts that do not offer correspondence study programs, to continue to have access to centralized correspondence study. Section 9 of SB-233 is changed as follows:

Section 9. AS 14.17.250 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

(20) "correspondence study [PROGRAM]," as that term is used in AS 14.17.041(h), means a district educational program serving elementary or secondary students who do not have daily access to a [AN APPROPRIATE] public school program.

S	31,900	'80
C	29,000	'79
A	27,500	'78
115	25,000	'77
	23,500	'76
	<u>19,250</u>	

Increases

CITY & BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

FY-78 Audited

	Regular Instruction	Vocational Education	Special Education	Corres- pondence	Support Services Pupil	Support Services Instr.	General Admin.	Operation & Managemt.	Pupil Trans.	Boarding Home	Other Non-Prog.	Fund Balance FY-78	Fund balance FY-77
Anchorage	46,916,208	3,146,750	4,785,094		1,461,107	1,310,980	10,452,233	14,327,599	4,990,316		1,190,197	10,764,926	10,145,331
Bristol Bay	383,469	103,260	66,085		40,426	46,004	195,784	252,163	73,024		64,237	159,622	240,497
Cordova	661,774	139,049	172,278		69,840	106,805	304,220	258,733	18,918		9,238	(41,330)	1,630
Craig	228,950	58,205	54,682		1,920	42,537	118,030	80,549	23,147		28,111	219,771	131,627
Dillingham	625,192	181,427	159,924		66,371	43,007	367,520	291,264	68,954		60,649	415,858	202,611
Fairbanks	10,680,671	1,203,898	1,775,702	110,149	820,314	902,697	2,796,409	5,575,082	3,369,353	26,500		-0-	-0-
Galena	216,391	81,774	56,051		43,555	13,826	111,272	152,642	14,229		70,072	450,985	249,054
Haines	654,773	82,465	139,044		46,169	14,307	172,350	217,341	65,974		15,499	350,397	160,474
Hoonah	307,312	101,985	88,028		35,771	43,947	147,560	158,152			57,570	211,268	212,276
Hydaburg	139,804	49,880	35,164		238	---	89,783	73,694			54,420	136,082	50,521
Juneau	5,533,157	577,082	646,917	40,324	527,565	439,445	1,659,893	1,669,457	610,065		128,219	400,481	559,548
Keke	255,439	96,281	81,779		7,524	7,663	160,659	121,590	12,020		70,515	220,544	210,533
Kenai	7,324,371	834,480	907,528	201,381	561,366	619,702	1,871,133	1,902,968	1,844,294	45,896	502,165	1,401,921	801,122
Ketchikan	2,919,636	460,944	424,845	68,889	455,090	256,809	554,097	1,152,667	380,605		237,746	109,645	109,645
King Cove	211,276	64,205	41,814			15,732	146,767	88,458	253	4,004	35,848	306,429	254,505
Klawock	85,023	---	17,135		5,831	3,105	61,852	33,217			22,644	169,942	26,469
Kodiak	2,675,015	298,053	452,457	81,518	188,924	253,636	752,180	1,148,482	164,292	110,540	370,832	---	---
Mat-Su	4,800,288	682,903	384,351	263,985	416,040	378,750	1,502,961	1,978,965	1,784,714		19,641	5,400	322,399
Nenana	269,297	162,756	83,348	---	23,302	14,084	154,545	177,304	26,365		76,267	139,405	150,541
Nome	1,326,242	197,752	259,997		101,813	1,075	424,772	977,463	71,588		131,520	412,181	244,502
North Slope	2,846,384	713,764	644,011	0,538	377,875	91,538	1,962,592	3,533,431	260,828		934,603	520,173	231,703
Pelican	90,974	15,783			522	2,133	24,173	31,716			2,025	31,071	37,561
Petersburg	745,227	103,770	161,227		37,900	43,455	189,221	287,630	55,127		109,106	80,998	29,548
Sitka	2,317,255	246,168	278,437	16,802	124,353	214,455	533,082	702,865	174,838		322,665	571,041	400,213
Skagway	332,216	55,225	50,402		15,358	14,006	75,850	69,328	1,119		22,343	165,797	140,265
St. Mary's	125,549	104,591	175,364		17,447	140,508	140,508	148,758			64,867	242,427	79,186
Unalaska	315,310	73,141	72,929		3,387	40,673	108,441	112,028	65,833	6,392	40,835	83,656	65,637
Valdez	1,157,845	211,985	437,557		13,573	203,299	525,354	983,294	135,868		99,399	454,109	672,318
Wrangell	774,885	117,183	117,837		46,025	40,412	206,035	155,649	47,789		20,875	59,770	126,051
Yakutat	215,215	79,675	74,456				95,099	87,222	29,974		36,137	6,717	(26,754)
TOTALS	95,143,148	10,243,934	12,644,443	791,586	5,493,659	5,181,609	25,904,375	36,789,711	14,280,487	193,332	4,798,239	18,094,616	15,854,777