

H B

238

A M E N D M E N T

Offered in the HOUSE

By Adams

TO: House Bill No. 302

Page 1, lines 10 - 12:

Delete all material and substitute the following:

"(10) provide housing for rental to teachers, by leasing existing housing from local agencies or individuals, or by entering into contractual arrangements with local agencies or individuals to lease housing which will be constructed by the local agency or individual for that purpose."

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TWELFTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. House Bill 238
 Title An Act relating to transfer or reassignment of teachers.
 Requested by House Hess Date 4/10/81

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Department of Education
 Program Category Affected Elementary and Secondary Education
 BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected _____
 (Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

TOTAL

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)						

POSITIONS N/A

FULL TIME						
PART TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

No fiscal impact.

IV. DATE 4/10/81 PREPARED BY Steve Lule
 AGENCY Department of Education
 PHONE 465-2800


Original: Legislative Finance
 cc: Budget and Management
 Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

POSITION PAPER HB 238

February 26, 1982

The State Board of Education is opposed to this bill.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Marshall L. Lind", written over a horizontal line.

Marshall L. Lind
Commissioner



ASSOCIATION OF ALASKA SCHOOL BOARDS

SUITE 5, 204 NORTH FRANKLIN STREET * JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801 * PHONE 948-1063

HIS 302

ASSOCIATION OF ALASKA SCHOOL BOARDS
STAFF (TEACHER) HOUSING SURVEY
OF ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS
IN ALASKA

MARCH 1981

SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF (TEACHER) HOUSING

A. Definition of the Problem:

Before addressing what has commonly been referred to as the "Teacher Housing Problem," some definitions must be cleared up first. For example, as the Iditarod School District stated in their response to our questionnaire, "All staff housing is a problem, not just teacher housing." Principals, highly skilled maintenance personnel, and central office administrators have also found it difficult to obtain housing and several districts have also provided these employees with housing, over 90% of the housing provided is for teachers, however.

Attempting to define each district's involvement in staff housing is often a confusing exercise. Some districts actually own housing units, some lease housing from local residents for staff, some simply subsidize staff members by paying them so much per month to find and rent their own housing, and many use a combination of all three. Consequently, for the purposes of this study, AASB defined "staff housing" as any housing and/or housing related benefits, i.e. actual housing, subsidies or stipends, payment of utilities and other costs, payment of part or all of rent, any maintenance and operation, and/or any other related costs and/or benefits involved with staff housing.

B. Scope of the Problem:

Of the 52 school districts in the State of Alaska, 21 school districts do not provide any housing related benefits to employees, and 31 school districts provide some housing benefit(s) to at least one employee. Only 27 school districts actually provide housing benefits to more than one employee. Of those 27 districts, 18 are REAAS and 9 are municipal school districts.

In providing housing benefits to employees, school districts, almost without exception, absorb some or all of the costs in providing such benefits. These costs must come out of the districts' educational budgets. Trying to determine how much districts are spending in this area is again a very difficult task to define and determine. For example, many of the REAAS inherited BIA constructed schools where the teachers' quarters are part of the school building, a school building that has its own generator plant. How does the district estimate the cost of the heating, maintenance, and electricity for teacher housing in such cases? In addition, when a maintenance person goes out to a

village to work on school facilities, he/she will often work on the teachers' quarters. Unless the district has a fairly sophisticated work order system of maintenance, then trying to determine how much the district is spending on staff housing maintenance is guesswork, at best. Consequently, in responding to our survey, almost all of the districts remarked that the figures they put down for staff housing were actually estimates and the actual costs were undoubtedly much higher.

For our survey we defined the "actual cost" of staff housing to the district as:

The total annual cost to the district for teacher (staff) housing, i.e., expenses for maintenance and operation, utilities, rent, subsidies to staff, and etc.; that are not covered by the revenues generated by teacher housing, for example, rent collected by the district. In other words, the actual costs that the district must absorb for teacher (staff) housing.

Different districts estimated different annual costs for staff housing. The North Slope School District estimated spending \$904,200 per year on staff housing. This is probably a fairly accurate estimate as the district has a very sophisticated maintenance and general accounting system. Some districts, however, reported that they had just begun to break these costs out and really had no way of determining costs for staff housing at this time.

The total for all the districts who could report actual costs was \$2,585,160 state-wide. This two and a half million dollars is recognized as being a very low figure. The actual costs are much higher. Thus, the actual total annual state-wide cost for teacher (staff) housing--which does not include costs for capital construction and renovation to provide new housing--is well over 2.6 million dollars per year for providing present housing.

C. Future of the Problem:

In our survey we asked each district if they would wish to discontinue their involvement in providing staff housing if a workable alternative became available. All 27 responses from the 27 school districts providing housing stated a definite preference for getting out of the housing business. Seven of those 27 district responses stated that the district was already phasing

out of the business of providing staff housing. Of those, all but one was turning over the staff housing to private enterprise. The other district, Copper River, was providing mobile home trailer hook-ups on school sites so that teachers could purchase their own trailers. (This district is on a road system.) Thus, by 1983, only 21 districts will be providing staff housing as private enterprise is slowly replacing school district involvement.

D. Possible Solutions to the Problem:

Each district was also asked what alternatives to district owned housing they had tried in the past and/or anticipated using in the future. Five districts reported purchasing trailers and two districts reported they had built teacher housing. With varying degrees of success, 19 districts reported renting privately owned housing in smaller communities. In some districts, the district leased the housing year around and sub-leased it to teachers. (Several districts reported problems with district owned and/or leased housing in that some staff, particularly single teachers, did not want to live in the more expensive district housing if they could rent a cabin for much less money.) In other districts, teachers rent their own housing.

Eight districts reported entering into long-term leases with village corporations and private individuals. Thus, the owners could get financing to build housing and the district was assured of obtaining housing.

Almost all districts reported having periodic housing shortages. No single solution seemed to work best as one solution might work well in one community and be totally dysfunctional in another -- all in the same school district.

E. Closing Remarks:

All of the school districts that provide staff housing in the state want to get out of the staff housing business. Seven districts, or over one quarter of the 27 districts now providing housing, will be phased out of the housing business by 1983. Private enterprise is taking over that function.

For the other 21 school districts, phasing out of the housing business is not a realistic alternative at this time, however, that day may come. The key may be to allow districts to make that determination for and by themselves, otherwise, school districts and the State

may assume that responsibility for an unduly long time period, thus, monopolizing and thwarting the gradual involvement of private enterprise.

DISTRICT

DISTRICT	Does it and/or	Boa like busi	Distr workab availab	Annual Distric	Is th the ho	If so,	Phas
1. Adak		Yes	Yes	Yes	-0-?	No	
2. AK Gateway	No						
3. Aleutian Region		Yes	No	Yes	52,000+		
4. Anchorage	No						
5. Annette Island		Yes	Yes	Yes	-0-?	No	
6. Bering Strait		Yes	No	Yes	190,825	No	
7. Bristol Bay *		Yes					
8. Chatham		Yes	Yes	Yes	48-50,000	No	
9. Chugach *		Yes					
10. Copper River		Yes	Yes	Yes	25,000	Yes	ASAP
11. Cordova	No						
12. Craig		Yes	No	Yes	1-2,000	No	
13. Delta/Greely	No						
14. Dillingham	No						
15. Fairbanks	No						
16. Galena		Yes	Yes	Yes	100,000	Yes	by 1982
17. Haines	No						
18. Hoonah *		Yes					
19. Hydaburg		Yes	Yes	Yes	8,000+	No	
20. Iditarod		Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	by 1982
21. Juneau	No						
22. Kake	No						
23. Kenai Peninsula**		Yes	Yes	Yes	?	No	
24. Ketchikan	No						
25. King Cove **	No						
26. Klawock		Yes	Yes	Yes	5,000	No	
27. Kodiak Island ***		Yes	Yes	Yes	47,579+	No	
28. Kuspuk		Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	Local Private Re
29. Lake-Peninsula		Yes	No	Yes	90,000+	No	
30. Lower Kuskokwim		Yes	No	Yes	-0-?	No	
31. Lower Yukon		Yes	No	Yes	256,790	No	
32. Mat-Su	No						
33. Nenana	No						
34. Nome	No						
35. North Slope		Yes	Yes	Yes	904,200	No	
36. Northwest Arctic		Yes	Yes	Yes	475,000	Yes	Private Enterpri
37. Pelican **	No						
38. Petersburg	No						
39. Pribilof Island		Yes	No	Yes	28,000+	No	
40. Railbelt		Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	82-83
41. Sand Point	No						
42. Sitka *		Yes					
43. Skagway	No						
44. SE Island		Yes	No	Yes	127,366	No	
45. St Marys		Yes	No	Yes	86,400	No	
46. SW Region		Yes	No	Yes	?	No	
47. Unalaska	No						
48. Valdez	No						
49. Wrangell	No						
50. Yakutat		Yes	Yes	Yes	?	No	
51. Yukon Flats		Yes	Yes	Yes	27,000	No	
52. Yukon Koyukuk		Yes	Yes	Yes	110,000	Yes	
TOTALS	21	31 ****	17-Yes 10-No	27 or 100%-Yes	2,585,160 for 18 dists, ****	20-No 7-Yes 1-?	

* Only one unit for one teacher or Superintendent

** City provides housing

3

P. O. BOX 170 SITKA, ALASKA 99835

JOHN E. COFFEE
SUPERINTENDENT

March 9, 1981

The Honorable Bill Ray
Alaska State Senate
Pouch V/State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Bill:

I am writing regarding H.B. 238. This bill would eliminate management's prerogative to assign teachers to whatever position within the school district they are qualified to handle. This would take away part of management's ability to manage the school's effectively. I am sure that most reasonable people would feel that the employer in any business should have wide latitude to assign employees so that the organization can function well. Certainly this prerogative is needed by school administrators and school boards.

Many administrative prerogatives have already been lost through negotiations with teacher unions. So far, at least the prerogatives to assign personnel has not been lost. I am alarmed that the Legislature would even consider such a move. I urge you to oppose H.B. 238.

Sincerely,

John E. Coffee
Superintendentcc: Robert Greene, AASB
Executive Secretary

JEC:vhv



Official Business

Alaska State Legislature

House of Representatives

Committee on

Health, Education & Social Services

March 1, 1982

Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Agenda

SCSB 119(Fin) Teacher Housing

Witnesses:

Sen. Terry Stimson
Bob Cooksey, NEA
Steve Hole, Dept. of Ed.

HB 353 School Class Size

Witnesses:
Marcel Borsalup
Rep. Mike Miller
Steve Hole, Dept. of Ed.
Bob Cooksey, NEA

HB 238 Transfer/Reassignment of teachers

Witnesses:

Rep. Pappy Moss(?)
Steve Hole, Dept. of Ed.
Bob Cooksey, NEA

HB 512 PTA approval Hiring/Dismissal of Teachers

Witnesses:

Steve Hole, Dept. of Ed.
Bob Cooksey, NEA



Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Transportation

Senator Bill Ray
Chairman

Official Business
Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

March 12, 1981

Mr. John E. Coffee
Superintendent
Sitka School District
P.O. Box 179
Sitka, Alaska 99835

Dear Mr. ~~Coffee~~ *John*

This is to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence concerning House Bills 238 and 268.

Thank you for sharing your views on these bills. They are presently in the House Health, Education and Social Services Committee. I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letters to the Chairman, Representative Clocksin, for the committee's consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bill".

Bill Ray
Senator
District C

cc: Representative Clocksin

P. O. BOX 179 SITKA, ALASKA 99835

JOHN E. COFFEE
SUPERINTENDENT

March 9, 1981

The Honorable Bill Ray
Alaska State Senate
Pouch V/State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Bill:

I am writing regarding H.B. 238. This bill would eliminate management's prerogative to assign teachers to whatever position within the school district they are qualified to handle. This would take away part of management's ability to manage the school's effectively. I am sure that most reasonable people would feel that the employer in any business should have wide latitude to assign employees so that the organization can function well. Certainly this prerogative is needed by school administrators and school boards.

Many administrative prerogatives have already been lost through negotiations with teacher unions. So far, at least the prerogatives to assign personnel has not been lost. I am alarmed that the Legislature would even consider such a move. I urge you to oppose H.B. 238.

Sincerely,


John E. Coffee
Superintendent

cc: Robert Greene, AASB
Executive Secretary

JEC:vhw

P. O. BOX 179 SITKA, ALASKA 99835

JOHN E. COFFEE
SUPERINTENDENT

March 9, 1981

The Honorable Bill Ray
Alaska State Senate
Pouch V/State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Bill:

I am writing to urge you to oppose H.B. 268. It is an act relating to the protection of the health and safety of teachers and other school employees. This bill provides for the following:

- 1) Injury leave for a teacher who is physically or mentally incapacitated as a result of an injury. A physician's certification is required. However, the teacher does not have to take sick leave before taking injury leave and is entitled to full salary and benefits.
- 2) A teacher may refuse to undertake duties which the teacher believes to be a danger to personal health or safety. A teacher may not be disciplined, dismissed, deprived of any professional advantage, suffer loss of salary or benefits, or in any other way be penalized for refusing to undertake duties allowed by this section.

This bill leaves much to the imagination. Please consider how it could be abused and/or taken advantage of by those who are looking for an excuse. Any teacher could refuse transfer or reassignment alone on the grounds that it may be dangerous to his or her personal health or safety. The confusion in regards to sick leave versus "injury leave" is another area of ambiguity. I believe this is a bad piece of legislation which should be rejected. I hope you agree.

Sincerely,


John E. Coffee
Superintendentcc: Robert Greene, AASB
Executive Secretary

JEC:vhw