

1969
KUNHAL SCHELS
THE

Table 2

Response to the Question:

"WHAT IS YOUR GENERAL IMPRESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA?"

Number of Responses	Comments
16	No impression.
12	University is not sensitive to Native cultures. Out of touch with reality, ivory towered. Course offerings not relevant to Native interests.
9	University is slow to change, bureaucratic, institutionalized.
7	Community colleges are meeting our needs.
7	University is not serving rural areas of the state.
6	Not enough Native input. University is unresponsive, doesn't listen to Natives.
6	University is beginning to try to meet our needs.
5	University is not meeting the education needs of Natives.
3	There are too many dropouts.
3	Good. Teachers are not paternalistic.
3	Too far away.
2	Bad attitudes towards Native students.
2	Good school.
2	Wide variety of resources and courses are available.
2	Beautiful campus (Fairbanks).

Bristol Bay, and Chugach Regions indicated either that no courses are being offered in their region or that courses being offered are not suited to the needs of the Native people in the region. On this point a common complaint was that most courses being offered are graduate courses, designed to allow teachers and nurses in the region--most of whom are not Natives--to upgrade their skills, but that few or no courses are being offered which cover subjects of interest to the majority of the people in the region or are offered in locations convenient for them. In these regions there seems to be a serious lack of communication between the university and the Native people.

In the Bering Straits, Sealaska and NANA regions the corporation leaders seem to be aware that the university is available to help develop education programs, but so far neither the Native groups nor the University have made serious attempts to work together.

In the Doyon and Arctic Slope Regions the Native leadership has entered into agreements with Antioch College West and Sheldon Jackson College to develop higher education and training programs. The Tanana Chiefs Conference Land Claims College (Doyon Region) opened this fall, offering

eight courses in Fairbanks with videotapes of the classes being made for persons who have enrolled in the region's 53 villages.^{6/} The North Slope Borough (Arctic Slope Region) post secondary program is still in the planning stages. Because of these developments, which seem to have grown out of dissatisfaction with the response of the University of Alaska to education needs in those regions, the Native leadership is looking towards the University of Alaska only to complement their own programs.

The leaders of the Cook Inlet, Koniag, and Calista regions are all aware of and taking advantage of higher and adult education programs in their regions. In the Koniaga and Calista regions close and productive working relationships have been developed with the Kodiak and Kuskokwim Community Colleges. Local advisory committees with a good representation of Native residents have been established and sometimes have been encouraged to go beyond advising to making policy decisions. Courses have been developed and offered in response to needs expressed by Native groups. Such statements by Native leaders as, "They have been our salvation," and, "No one has tried harder to meet our education needs," speak of the very positive contributions which community colleges can make. In the cases where the community colleges are highly thought of by the Native leadership it seems that a strong and implemented personal commitment to meet Native

education needs by the director of the college is the major factor in developing a positive response on the part of the Natives.

The Cook Inlet Region, most of whose enrolled members live in Anchorage, is unique in that there is a full university program available locally. There is also a strong feeling on the part of the leadership of the profit-making corporation that its shareholders, if they want any education at all, must obtain it according to the standards of the dominant culture in the region. The Cook Inlet Native association, Cook Inlet's non-profit corporation, is, however, interested in the idea of making arrangements with the University to present special interest courses (such as consumer education or a course on the Settlement Act) for Native people in the Association's own facilities.

The number of "no impression" responses to the question on the University of Alaska was increased by a solid "no impression" response from the five reserve village representatives interviewed. It is probable that their response is a reflection of the isolation of those villages from university programs. Since the other 225 or so villages in Alaska are similarly isolated, their people would probably

give a similar "no impression" response. Therefore, despite the fact that some of the respondents were just being polite when they answered that they had "no impression" of the university, it seems to be safe to say that the University of Alaska has made neither a positive nor negative impression on most of Alaska's Natives.

On the other hand, most of the respondents who did express an impression of the university spoke negatively of it. Their complaints were founded on the university's insensitivity to Native cultures and needs and failure to involve Natives in the development of programs. A sampling of the comments follows:

"People at the university live in a dream world, but they are making decisions for us."

"They're trying to meet the needs of Natives. Unfortunately they're trying to do it in a centralized way when they should be de-centralizing. There are important and dedicated people on faculty, but now instead of growing like an amoeba in one spot the university should spread out and bring education to the people instead of bringing the people to the University. When the University was founded in Fairbanks it was a very unfeasible location. They should be looking at some more unfeasible locations now."

"The university is such a huge, slow-moving thing it would be like trying to push an elephant off its path to make changes in university attitudes or systems."

"Their involvedness is limited as far as our rural areas are concerned. The University of Alaska needs sensitive faculty to work with policy-making people in rural areas. As of now, my impression of the University of Alaska is their insensitive lack of cultural understanding, etc."

"The university does not seem to work with our local advisory board."

"Generally speaking, the university has remained a traditional institution with science priorities. They are very conservative in their social sciences, particularly concerning the social changes in rural Alaska."

Despite the above-cited negative feelings about the University of Alaska, responses to the question, "What prevents Alaska Natives from getting a college education?" (see Table 3) did not indicate that Alaska Natives think that the University of Alaska or any other university is the major deterrent to higher education for Natives. Instead, the most frequently mentioned problem for Natives seeking higher education was finances. Numerous respondents indicated that it is difficult to find out what Bureau of Indian Affairs or other scholarship monies are available and where to apply for them.^{7/} Complaints were also registered that

Table 3

Response to the Question:

"WHAT PREVENTS ALASKA NATIVES FROM GETTING A COLLEGE EDUCATION?"

Number of Responses	Comments
20	Finances: It's a hassle getting money from the BIA and they don't give you enough. Many people must support, or help support, a family.
19	Fear of failure. Lack of self confidence, motivation, goals. Parents don't care.
16	Poor academic preparation. Bad study habits.
13	Strong ties to home, family. College too far away. Homesickness. Fear that you may not return home once you leave.
11	Social, emotional dislocation in adjusting to urban and academic life. Alien environment, different values. Difficult to adjust to rigid time schedules.
11	Lack of pre-college counseling, information on options available.
4	Native manpower is spread too thin. Capable people cannot be spared to attend college.
4	Transportation, housing, child care difficulties.
4	Courses are not relevant to Native concerns. No Native input into curriculum. White middle class values are taught.
4	Teachers are insensitive. Don't understand "where students are coming from."
2	Lack of Native role models who have succeeded at college.
2	Social isolation (especially at colleges outside Alaska).

getting money from the BIA is a big hassle and that the money often does not come through until just a day or two before the semester starts, and many young people who had been hoping to go to college have, by that time, had to make other commitments. Some feelings were also expressed that the BIA funds for college students are just barely enough for the necessities of life and leave no latitude for any emergencies which might arise or even for the purchase of an occasional piece of clothing.

It should be noted that payments to individual shareholders under the Settlement Act have been and will continue for some time to be small. (Each shareholder enrolled to a village received a total of about \$275 during 1974.) Therefore it would seem that increasing the amounts and improving the delivery of financial aids to students are important to achieving the maximum possible Native enrollment in college programs.

Fear of failure, or lack of self confidence and motivation was the second most frequently mentioned deterrent to education for Alaska Natives. Hank Eaton of the Koniag Corporation expressed these factors well when he said, "For at least five generations the BIA has bred an inferiority complex into our people. The hell of it is most

of them believe it." Fear of failure is heightened by the fact that going to college is a tremendous step in the life of an Alaska Native. It entails a conscious decision to leave home, to subject oneself to rigorous academic demands (for which you are not properly prepared) and to face the social and emotional dislocations of new ways of living and new values. These factors were also frequently mentioned reasons why Natives don't get a college education. Small wonder, then, that, in response to the question, "How can the university improve its services to your region?" an overwhelming number of people called for the establishment of higher or adult education programs in the regions and the villages. (See Table 4.) (One respondent put it this way: "Any service at all would be an improvement.") Such programs, simply by being close to home, and especially if they are combined with strong local input into the design of curricula (the second most frequently requested improvement in university service), would eliminate or mitigate many of the factors which were mentioned as preventing Alaska Natives from getting a college education, or as undesirable features of the University of Alaska.

A number of respondents mentioned counseling and recruitment programs for high school students as a desired university service to their region. There seems to be a real dearth of information in rural Alaska on post secondary

Table 4

Response to the Question:

"HOW CAN THE UNIVERSITY IMPROVE ITS SERVICES TO YOUR REGION?"

Number of Responses	Comments
49	Establish education programs available to people in Native regions and villages.
40	Structure programs to meet local needs and conditions. Obtain local advisory or policy-making input.
10	Counsel and recruit high school students.
5	Improve on-campus orientation programs.
5	Hire more faculty. Make sure they are effective teachers.
2	Speed up degree programs.
2	Work to upgrade academic standards of rural elementary and secondary schools.

vocational and educational opportunities and options. The Aleut League's recently published handbook is a good compendium, but rural high school students also need the personal interest and support of counselors as they try to decide what to do after finishing high school.

Table 5

Response to the Question:

"SHOULD CLASSES BE HELD IN YOUR REGION? IF SO, WHY?"

Yes: 44

No.: 0

Reasons	
14	Students learn faster in a familiar environment. (Self image enhancement, among friends, community of interest, learn together.)
12	People don't want to leave home, or they can't leave home because of family responsibilities.
9	Courses should be accessible to corporation employees. (The manpower needs of the corporations are so great that corporations can't spare people to go away for whole semesters.)
9	Students would not experience dislocation trauma as they do on campuses in Anchorage and Fairbanks.
8	Courses can be relevant to local job opportunities or issues.
7	People who leave to go to school often don't come back.
6	Going to school close to home would be financially easier than going to Anchorage and Fairbanks.
4	Teachers can (should) learn about our needs.
4	Courses can be scheduled around seasonal or subsistence work.
3	Travel to and from Anchorage or Fairbanks is difficult.
2	More people will enroll.

SECTION III

Considerations in Planning Higher or Adult Education Programs

As mentioned in Section I, there is very great concern that higher or adult education programs be available to village people without disrupting the pattern and values of village life. Therefore it was not surprising that the responses to the question, "Should classes be held in your region?" was universally "Yes." (See Table 5.) The seven most frequently given reasons for the "yes" answer showed the opposite side of factors often mentioned as preventing Alaska Natives from getting a college education (as discussed in Section II and depicted in Table 3).

Mentioned as part of the frequent general comment that students learn faster in a familiar environment were such elements as being among friends, sharing a community of interests and the satisfaction of learning together. Other reasons given for having courses offered in the regions are listed in Table 5. They add up to a very forceful argument for offering higher or adult education programs in rural Alaska.

A strong contributing factor to the universal response that courses should be offered in the regions was the concern that courses be available to village people, as

Table 6

Response to the Question:

"WHAT FACTORS WOULD INTEREST PEOPLE IN YOUR REGION IN PARTICIPATING IN CLASSES?"

Rank		Raw Score
1	Course available close to home	159
2	Possibility of a job on completion of course	178
3	Possibility of better pay or promotion on completion of course	180
4	General interest in subject area	217
5	Use of community members as resource people	243
6	Use of local examples and problems as learning devices	248
7	Obtaining a certificate of training	250
8	Course of short duration	254
9	Progress towards a degree	263
10	Obtaining college credit	273

How was New York instructed

well as people in the regional centers (such as Dillingham or Kotzebue). For the reasons outlined in Section I the corporation leaders recognize the need to educate a great number of Alaska Native people, and not just the few who can leave home regularly for classes of varying lengths. Often the request was made that classes be held in the villages rather than in the regional centers or that classes in the regional centers be of short duration and scheduled so as not to interrupt the subsistence activities of the villages in the region, so that village people could participate.

A few of the respondents qualified their request that classes be offered in the regions with comments that some courses should be taught on campuses to provide the stimulation of a professional atmosphere or if the resources needed to teach a subject are available only on a campus.

The response to the question asking respondents to rank ten factors which would interest people in participating in classes confirms the desire that courses be available in the regions. Having the course available close to home was ranked as the most strongly motivating factor of the ten listed. (See Table 6.) The second and third ranked factors

(possibility of a job on completion of course, and possibility of better pay or promotion on completion of course), are a reflection of the desire and need to earn money, as was shown in the large number of requests for skill training discussed in Section I.

+ + + + +

Four strong concerns emerged when respondents were asked a very general question about what factors should be considered in planning courses. The two most forcefully expressed concerns were for finding effective teachers and for making course content relevant to Native concerns. Other comments concerned the academic level at which courses should be taught and the structure of courses to be offered.

Since tabulation of the comments received on these subjects is difficult and would at any rate take the force out of the comments, all of the comments made are reproduced in Appendix IV. It will be noted that comments on teachers are strongly interrelated with comments on relevance. The feeling seems to be that hiring teachers who are familiar with village concerns and can relate to village people will do much to satisfy the need for relevance in courses. Such

teachers would naturally use local examples and cases and resource people, which would build relevance into any course.

Comments on course level illustrate clearly a desire that courses be taught to normal academic standards, though the statistic from the Calista region on the average number of grades finished by adults indicates that the reading level of course materials must be very basic. (The Calista Region also is one in which bilingual classes would be desirable.) However, Natives do not want "watered down" or undemanding courses. They recognize that Native people must (especially in the administration of the Settlement Act) be able to function according to non-Native values and standards. The requests for relevance in course offerings and basic level courses were not therefore requests for easy courses. They were instead requests that foreign subject matters be taught in ways that make them understandable and useful to Native people.

The comments on course structure emphasized the desirability of offering courses in ways which will enable village people to enroll in them. Flexibility seems to be the key word. Courses could be scheduled as short workshops in central regional locations in order that people from a

Table 11

Response to the Question:

WHAT ASPECTS OF PLANNING THEIR OWN EDUCATIONAL
PROGRAMS ARE PEOPLE IN YOUR REGION INTERESTED IN?

	Comments
15	A local advisory or policy-making board for local programs.
12	Choose courses to be offered.
10	100% local control.
6	Program philosophy and planning, curriculum development.
5	Choose teachers.
4	Student recruitment.
4	Needs identification.
3	Course evaluation.
3	Course timing and length.
2	Choose program director.
2	Budgeting.

SECTION IV

Summary and Recommendations

Four major findings emerged from this study. They are:

1. There is a need for higher and adult education programs in rural Alaska.
2. The programs must be developed with special attention to factors which are not usually part of academic program planning.
3. The programs should be developed with maximum local involvement in planning and implementation.
4. The University of Alaska has not to this date responded in a satisfactory way to these needs.

It is obvious to us that a clear recognition of the need for innovative thinking in meeting these needs and strong commitment to meet the needs are needed if the University of Alaska is to respond in a useful way. We therefore recommend that the University of Alaska establish a new statewide division of the University to meet rural higher and adult education needs. Such a division might be called the College of Village Instruction. We recommend that the

College of Village Instruction have an advisory board with strong Alaska Native representation. We further recommend that the College of Village Instruction contract with the non-profit corporations in the Native regions of the state to represent the University in the rural areas of the state.

A separate and statewide division of the University is needed for several reasons. First, as mentioned above, it is essential that education programs for rural Alaska be developed with special attention to factors which are not usually part of academic program planning, such as building local or cultural relevance into courses, scheduling courses around the living patterns of each rural area, planning for bilingual instruction if needed and using teachers who can work effectively with Native students. The College of Village Instruction must address itself to determining what information is needed and how it can be presented. New courses and materials must be developed and methods of delivery must be devised. The university cannot hope to meet the needs of rural Alaska by exporting normal university courses (at any level) and teachers who have not been chosen carefully for teaching in rural Alaska. In order to use these teachers full time, the College of Village Instruction should be able to use their services throughout the state. A new commitment is called for and an administrative structure which will allow the commitment to be carried out must be established.

The College of Village Instruction would carry out three major functions. First, it would develop courses, curricula and course materials. Second, it would identify and hire teachers. Third, it would coordinate the scheduling of courses to be delivered in rural Alaska. In carrying out these functions it would receive the advice and draw on the knowledge of the advisory board. This board would provide a strong voice of rural Alaska at the policy-making level, such as has been called for by the Native people.

The proposed contracts with the non-profit corporations would provide the local involvement which was asked for by the Natives whom we interviewed for this survey. Such liaisons would also provide the university with the support services which it will need in the rural areas to carry out the village instruction program. Such services would include identifying desired courses and suggesting elements of curricula; supplying local resource people and orienting teachers to local conditions; identifying any need for bilingual instruction; recruiting students and planning for their transportation, room and board; scheduling courses at times when people in the region or village can attend them; and course evaluation. As discussed in the Preface, the nonprofit corporations now know the education needs in their regions and are developing the expertise to administer courses and training sessions. In response to the fact of the nonprofit corporations' knowledge and expertise the university should discontinue its practice

of sending non-local representatives to the rural areas of the state and instead develop formal relationships with the non-profit corporations.

The proposal for a College of Village Instruction does not deny that there is also a need for community colleges in the smaller Alaska communities. They can provide more formal academic training and associate of arts degrees for those who desire them. Also, we recognize that there will always be (and should always be) Native students who will want to enroll in a full four-year program on a campus in Anchorage, Fairbanks or Juneau. The College of Village Instruction should be designed to meet the needs of those who cannot, or do not want to, use community colleges or large campuses. It can produce and deliver courses in a variety of modes to meet specific and immediate needs. If, as seems likely in the near future, the State of Alaska purchases a communications satellite, the College of Village Instruction could serve as the headquarters for the production of video and audio courses for students in villages. The College could also develop external degree programs for students who wish to pursue a degree without leaving their jobs and/or homes in rural Alaska. (In the course of our interviews for this report we met or heard of a number of people who would be interested in an external degree program.)

The College of Village Instruction should be founded on the philosophy that village community life should be strengthened by the education process. It should be administratively structured with maximum local input and control.

It should be noted that the findings of this survey are not startlingly new or different from concerns which have been previously identified by researchers in education, particularly at the University of Alaska (see Bibliography). Previous research has usually been directed to elementary or secondary education, but now the Native people are telling us that some of the same issues are of concern in the development of higher or adult education and training programs. The need for effective teachers, the need for local control, the need for education to be available close to home, the need for adult basic education programs, and the need for counseling programs for high school students have all been previously identified. Our research confirms all of these needs. Since the same findings have been confirmed several times, it behooves the University of Alaska, a statewide institution which bears the statutory responsibility to provide higher and adult education to all of the citizens of the state, to act now to establish the needed programs.

The Natives of Alaska are eager to take up the challenge of learning new things. They ask only that the learning take place within the physical and philosophical framework of their own communities. We hope that the University of Alaska will eagerly meet the challenge of providing such learning environments for them.

HB-24

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Senator George Hohman, Jr., Chairman
Senate Health, Education & Social Services Committee

Senator Genie Chance, Vice Chairman
Senate Health, Education & Social Services Committee

Rep. Susan Sullivan, Vice Chairman
House Health, Education & Social Services Committee

FROM: Stuart C. Hall, Legislative Counsel
Ronald W. Lorensen, Assistant Attorney General

SUBJECT: Amendments to CSSB 35 (Public Education in the Unorganized
Borough)

We recommend consideration of a series of amendments to the legislation presently under consideration that would decentralize the State-Operated Schools into regional educational attendance areas. In some instances we have prepared specific language to take care of particular problems which we see in the pending legislation; in others, we recommend that the respective committees consider the policy questions involved, and then we will draft the specific language required to carry out the policy decision.

Amendment No. 1

The Director of Elections, Mrs. Patty Ann Polley, points out that as presently conceived the three-year term for regional school board members will complicate the administration of elections during the regular election year (even-numbered years) because it would require the state to administer a school election between the Primary and the General Election. She suggests consideration of a four-year staggered term with elections being held in the odd-numbered year. This would require an amendment to page 6, line 21, or therabouts. Also she points out it is unclear when the redivision of a regional educational attendance area into sections becomes effective (page 4). On page 6, line 18, some adjustment in the reference to the number of days in which the Lieutenant Governor's office has to prepare for an election after the statute is effective must be made. She suggests 90 days, instead of 60, after the effective date of the Act; or, ^{within} 60 days *Amel# 1* after the establishment of the regional educational attendance

areas, a recommendation of the Department of Education.

Amendment No. 2

Expiration of terms of office. Some modification in the present language (p. 6, proposed AS 14.08.061(b)) should be made, with a possible cross-reference to AS 14.14.070 and 14.12.000, with respect to the expiration of terms of office following the next regular school board election. We will draft whatever language seems appropriate to accomplish this.

Amendment No. 3

School construction. The committee should address the question as to whether the Department of Public Works or the regional educational attendance area is to be charged with the responsibility for school construction. It is presently lodged in the Department, per sec. 33, ch. 46, SLA 1970, which established the State-Operated Schools. If you decided to retain the Department of Public Works for that purpose, then the language in that section should be repealed and codified in the body of AS 14, as amended by this bill, by adding a new section: AS 14.08.161. The committee might also want to consider incorporation of HB 319 or some variant of that scheme in this bill.

Amendment No. 4

The committee should address itself to the question of whether the residents of military reservations whose schools are contracted to a city or borough school district should be permitted to vote for members of regional educational attendance area boards. If the answer is "no", they should not be able to vote, then an amendment to AS 14.08.031(c) (page 2, line 17, after "14.14.110", insert the following new sentence) ~~XXXX~~ "Where the operation of the military reservation schools in a regional educational attendance area by a city or borough school district is required by the

department, the military reservation shall not be considered part of the regional educational attendance area for the purposes of regional school board membership or elections."

In this same subsection, it may be necessary to exempt military reservations from the requirement of contiguity that appears in the previous subsection (b). E.g., both Elmendorf AFB and Ft. Richardson are entirely surrounded by either the Kenai, Mat-Su or Greater Anchorage Area Boroughs; thus it may become necessary to attach those bases to another regional educational attendance area, or one would have to be established for those bases alone. If the former, an amendment to page 2, line 15, after "area", insert the following:

"that need not be contiguous to the reservation notwithstanding the provisions of (b) of this section"

Amendment No. 5

A technical correction: On page 2, line 7, strike out "school" and insert "educational"

Amendment No. 6

If you exclude military reservations from the regional educational attendance area for electoral purposes, their population should be excluded for redistricting purposes: thus an amendment to page 4, line 1 would be necessary.

Amendment No. 7

A provision should be made in AS 14.08.051, which relates to sectioning of regional educational attendance areas, to make it possible for the voters in an area to eliminate sectioning altogether if it exists in the area, as well as voting for sectioning or for changing section boundaries. An amendment to accomplish this would read as follows:

page 4, line 17 - after "sections," delete "or" and insert "the"
- after "section boundaries," insert "or the
elimination of all sections in the regional
educational attendance area"

Page 4, line 21 - after "sections," delete "or"

page 4, line 22 - before "is subject" insert "or the elimination
of all sections in the regional educational
attendance area"

Amendment No. 8

A technical correction of a typographical error: On page 4, ^{line 10} ~~line 23~~,
strike out "questions", and insert: "question"

Amendment No. 9

Due to an amendment made on the Senate floor to SCSHB 188 am S
(ch. 13, SLA 1975), an amendment to AS 14.12.030(d) is required
to clarify the legislature's apparent intent. The legislature
desired to eliminate the mandatory on-base advisory school board
where the schools were contracted; however, as now written the
only individuals eligible for appointment as the non-voting dele-
gate to the city or borough school board are members of those
advisory boards. This creates problems where, as in Anchorage,
there are two separate bases. Was the intention that there be
one advisory board for both bases, or could there be one board
on each base? What if one base has a board and the other does
not, who then is eligible for appointment as the delegate? As
we see it, it's a matter of reconstructing the syntax, and we
propose an amendment to page 11, between lines 4 and 5, inserting
the following:

Amendment 9
"* Sec. 6. AS 14.12.030(d) is amended to read:

(d) Each city or borough school district that is
operating schools on a military reservation under sec. 20(a) of
this chapter has one nonvoting delegate from the military reser-
vation or reservations to the school district board to advise and

assist the board in matters relating to the military reservation schools and assist the board in matters relating to the military reservation schools operated by the school district and to act as liaison between the board and the military community. The nonvoting delegate shall be appointed by the state Board of Education [FROM AMONG THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY SCHOOL BOARD IF THERE IS AN ELECTED ADVISORY BOARD], shall serve at the pleasure of the state Board of Education, and shall be an inhabitant of the area served by the military reservation schools operated by the school district by contract. If an elected community school committee is established on a military reservation, the only inhabitants of that military reservation who are eligible for appointment as the nonvoting delegate are those inhabitants who are members of the elected school committee."

) Amd #9

Remember bill sections accordingly.

If this wording does not correctly set out the intention of the legislature, we will, with your direction, draft language to do so.

Amendment No. 10

The Department of Education and the Attorney General find difficulty with the formulation of language amendatory of AS 39.25.110(8) which, at present, exempts the certificated employees of the State-Operated Schools, but which as proposed for amendment in Section 35 of the bill would complicate administration of personnel employed at the department-operated school at the Seward Skill Center. Accordingly, we propose deleting the entirety of Sec. 35, and replacing it as follows: On page 23, strike out lines 23-27, inclusive, and insert:

Amd #10

"* Sec. 37. AS 39.25.110 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

(16) certificated teachers and noncertificated employees employed by a regional educational attendance area organized under AS 14.08.031 to teach in, administer or operate schools

operated by a regional educational attendance area.") *Amd #10*

Amendment No. 11 *Check w Hall*

A technical amendment to ensure the applicability of the Elections Code (AS 15) to regional educational attendance area elections:

On page 22, between lines 19 and 20, insert:

"* Sec. 32. AS 15.60.010(2) is amended to read:

(2) "local election" means an [ANY] election held by a borough, city, or by or in another [OTHER LOCAL] unit of local government, including a service area or regional educational attendance area.

Amd #11
* Sec. 33. AS 15.65.050 is amended to read:

11(b) pg. 22 before line 12 - renumber sections
Sec. 15.65.050. APPLICATION OF SECTION 40 OF THIS CHAPTER. Section 40 of this chapter applies to all elections, general or special, held in a [ANY INCORPORATED] city, organized borough, [INCORPORATED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR] school district or regional educational attendance area in the unorganized borough [OUTSIDE OF AN INCORPORATED CITY].) *Amd #11*

Renumber bill sections accordingly.

Amendment No. 12

A technical amendment to correct a drafting error; no change in substance.

On page 19, line ¹¹10, after "the", insert: "certificated"

On page 19, line 19, ~~strike out "districts and the respective district boards", and insert: "boards"~~

On page 19, line ²⁰20, after "districts", insert: "or regional"

educational attendance areas"

Amendment No. 13

A technical amendment to ensure that all of the provisions of this Act relating to elections are effective immediately, on page 25, the following series of amendments: *(to the final enactment section)*

On page ²⁴~~25~~, line ²⁹3, strike out ", 14.08.051 and", and insert a dash (" - ").

On page 25, line ²1, strike out ", 14.08.041, 14.08.061," *accepted*

"An Act relating to public education in the unorganized borough; and providing for an effective date."

COMMITTEE REPORT

3/5/75

HOUSE

FINANCE

Mr. Speaker:

Date

April 2, 1975

The Committee on NESS has had SSFB 24

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

() recommends it DO PASS

() recommends it DO NOT PASS

() recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

() recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR SHB 4 AND THAT

CS FOR SSFB 24 DO PASS

() "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE _____

COMMITTEE

() reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

() "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

Susan Sullivan _____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

_____ recommends: NO REC.

_____ recommends: NO REC.

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

Susan Sullivan Chairman



CAMP ALASKA

ALASKAN WILDERNESS EXPERIENCES
AND CONSERVATION LEADERSHIP SCHOOL

HB
24

Wood River, Alaska
Mail: P.O. Box 1516
Fairbanks, Alaska 99707

March 6, 1975

Mr. Sullivan,
Chairman, Health, Education and Social Services Committee
House of Representatives
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Mr. Sullivan,

REFERENCE: HB 24
SB 35 and 95

What an unwieldy quagmire this set of bills would create. + understand the principles involved and feel that they are noteworthy, i.e., so that the educational system would be accountable to the constituency it serves. However, to those of us who care about education directly, it already is accessible and reasonably accountable. If you create a series of regional and advisory boards, you have too many amateurs trying to do the work of paid and responsible professionals. Not to mention the expenses and logistical problems of such a series of regional boards!

KEEP EDUCATION CENTRALIZED and controllable. One State Advisory Board (public) is control enough. We already have a Borough School Board in areas of major utilization. Perhaps a better solution to the rural and unorganized borough "communication" problems would be to see that the State Board adequately represents these needs.

Samantha Castle

Samantha Castle



Alaska State Legislature

House

JUNEAU ALASKA

HESS COMMITTEE MEETING

3-26-75

Members Present:

Ose	Parr
Hackney	Sullivan
Osterback	Swanson
Ostrosky	

Chairman Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. to take up a continuation of HB 24. HB 78 was also briefly considered.

HB 78

Mr. Wesley from SOS gave briefing of the bill. SOS classifies income as restricted income. The problem we have is that in order to honor our contracts (pupil teacher ratio) the commitments have to be able to be made in advance. It is impossible to reduce the program to 2.2 million because of contracts already made.

Hackney You say \$300,000 was found in the budget? If you had gotten the shortfall for this year would you still have found the \$300,000?

Wesley No, we would not have been able to reduce the costs, or have reasoning to do so. 75% of this budget is under Federal regulation 874. 7 or 8% of 874 appropriations are included in present SOS.

Hackney AVEC utilities did not go up this year?

Wesley Yes, they remained at the same rate of fiscal 74.

Hackney I don't understand why the utilities go up on the Bases?

Wesley The military command has the power to raise the utilities and did so of about 30%. AVEC changes their structure, the utilities went up only at the sites where there were multiple buildings.

Swanson I find it strange that under the sale of electricity to AVEC by SOS.... at one time the Legislature had to set the regulations by resolution, it seems to be changed to what it was three years ago.

Wesley AVEC did not raise the rates, when a new building was added the utility costs were increased.

HB 24

Senator Ferguson:

These are feelings of my own concerning the SOS Program. One problem I see is that there is not sufficient time for the transition. At least one years time

fall to let all Region 10 areas take care of themselves. I think we should allow SOS to continue to run for exactly one more year. Commissioner Lind in consultation with CRA could change regional attendance areas into sections allowing them to run their own schools. My amendments to the bill are as follows:

- 1) Pg. 1 Line 9 - Delete Repealer and put it on the last page where it would repeal it on July 1, 1976.
Line 29- Using Boundaries
- 2) Pg. 2 Line 5 - Delete 'may' and include 'shall'
Line 9 - Delete everything after control and add on 'July 1, 1976'. Propose that no area take over their own schools until that date.
- 3) Pg. 3 Line 11- Add 'only' after into sections'
Line 21- Add Sect. B after period
- 4) Pg. 6 Line 5 - Delete '60 days' and add 'Oct. 1976'
- 5) Pg. 23 Sec. 36 - Add 'remain in the regional educational attendance areas...'

Clark Do you propose that this is mandatory to wait a full year before the districts can transfer over?

Ferguson Yes, with the Oct. 76 date in mind. I fear that if we allow small regional attendance areas to be created all over the state there will be problems.

Hackney How would you propose to handle the chain?

Ferguson That could be done by the ALeut, their boundaries would be a Regional Board and set up subsections where the Regional School Board could delegate the powers. It is my understanding that first class cities can^{not} participate in the regional attendance areas.

Mr. Files Representing SOS Teachers from District I
Submitted amendment to the bill. (see attached)

Hackney Do any of the SOS representatives have any comments about extending the phase out for one more year?

Clark The only problem I see is when you try to have people phase themselves out. Working members now in SOS will be abit reluctant to phase out their own positions. The statewide trend is using the existing regional boundaries.

Parr On page 21, you mentioned Statewide Resource Center, what is that?

Clark One thing they may do is provide bilingual education type services.

Parr Does not mean that they will deal only with bilingual education services?

Clark Correct. I will go over all of my proposed amendments one more time for clarity purposes. (See attached)

Parr In the resource centers we're talking about three or four of them across the state.

Hackney I would like to request that we ask Rich Guthrie to check on AVEC situation to find the possible problems there.

Page Three
HESS Meeting
3-26-75

SOS continued

Van Houte At the top of page 24, We can not drop this out because of the existing contracts. This would make us liable for law suits.

Parr Who pays AVEC bills now?

Clark SOS does, they have contracts out on all these.

Sullivan Some SOS contracts include things such as buildings, etc. and I'm sure they don't expire on July 1?

Van Houte If the State has a lease they are their responsibility. The leases would have to be examined on an individual basis.

Mr. Hayes SOS Representative

The lease agreement, for example, on the SOS building in Anchorage is for three years. We have talked to the owner and he has made it clear that he is willing to compromise. Based on your bill it would be a year before these buildings would be evacuated. I personally don't see this as a problem to this bill.

Sullivan My intentions are to give Stu Hall all the proposed amendments and get his opinion in the legal area, then meet again to put it all together and complete this bill.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:30. Bill will be reconsidered on April 1, 1975.



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature
House

January 31, 1975

Mr. Robert Van Houte
Executive Secretary
H.E.A. Alaska, Inc.
207 Seward Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Bob:

We have in the House Health Education and Social Services Committee the following bills; HB 24, HB 56, HB 59, and HB 83. These bills concern your organization and we hope to have them on our agenda in the next few weeks.

We would appreciate any background information that you feel would be relevant in our hearings.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Sullivan".

Susan Sullivan, Chairperson
Health Education & Social
Services

Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801

SS/lm



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature House

January 31, 1975

Jeff Jeffers, Director
Educational Program Support
Pouch F
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Mr. Jeffers:

We have in the House Health Education and Social Services Committee the following bills; HB 24, HB 56, HB 59 and HB 83. We feel that these bills concern your Department and hope to have them on our agenda in the next few weeks.

We would appreciate any background information that you feel would be relevant in our meetings.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Sullivan".

Susan Sullivan, Chairperson
Health Education & Social
Services

Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801

SS/ln



Alaska State Legislature

House

JUNEAU ALASKA

HOUSE HESS MEETING

3-25-75

Members Present:

Beirne	Ostrosky
Davis	Parr
Hackney	Sullivan
Osterback	Swanson

Chairman Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

SSHB 24

Chairman asked Mr. Van Houte if he wanted to testify and he answered that he would be available for any questions of the Committee

Mr. Clark Our changes to this bill correspond pretty much with SB 35.

1) Pg 2 Line 14 (b) delete ' in each regional' and add 'of the communities receiving educational service from an attendance area' etc.

2) Pg 14 Sect. 14.14.200 - to read- shall review and make recommendations to the Board of Regional Educational attendance area concerning the curriculum, program and general operation of the local schools and shall exercise additional responsibilities and function as may be delegated by the regional school board.

3)Pg. 20 Line 4 - delet (or State Operated School) and insert 'or regional educational attendance area'.

Line 6, 9, 10, same as above.

4)Pg. 20 Line 26 - delete through line 27 to (.)

5)Pg. 21 Line 12 - After 'areas' add ' and a State wide Center.'

6)Pg. 24 Line 5 - After(.) delet rest of paragraph through Line 8.
Sect. 37 - Delete Lines 12 through 16

Hackney Could we hear from Commissioner Lind on this last deletion of Sect. 37?

Lind The foundation program might not cover AVIC contractsⁱⁿ smaller schools, we would have to find some way to cover this.

Hackney The money is available through SOS but not through the school foundation Program?

Lind Yes, we can't drop those contracts but the foundation monies won't cover them in smaller schools.

Page Two
HESS Meeting
3-25-75

Chairman Can we hold this amendment over until tomorrow when we will have more information available? (No Objection)

Clark Pg. 1 at the bottom , addresses itself to the same thing as pg. 24, Sect. 37, lines 5-8.

Swanson They address two different things.

Clark It depends on how you interpret this section, my people say they are the same.

Sullivan I have to agree with Mr. Swanson, but my question is do we want to make these restrictions?

Swanson I don't think I want to delet that section.

Clark SB 35 struck this but added at the top of page two and inserted ' an educational service area....' that would cover sect. 37, Lin es 5-8.

Swanson No, that doesn't cover the same material.

Sullivan Mr. Clark recommends that Sect. 37 be moved and be placed at Sect. B.

Parr I never minded it being deleted, only wanted to know why?

Swanson I didn't want to follow line by line SB 35 because it wouldn't fit into HB 24, I would like to think we were here to work on HB 24 since it is the bill before our Committee.

Beirne Mr. Clark, I would like to ask a question on military reservation schools.

Sullivan Excuse me Dr. Beirne but I don't think that applies at this time.

Beirne Does this wording negate what has already been done for the military erserv?

Commissioner Lind Yes, more work might have to be done on this bill considering HB 188. Mr. Hall can advise us on this.

Sullivan 'Military reservations shall' what is this intended to mean and how many are we talking about?

Lind Two primarily, but then we can wait for legal council on this by Mr. Hall.

Swanson There are three principle areas in my district, Ft Greeley, and the city manager want to annex the base and so there will be no trouble.

Van Houte We need some language to cover HB 188 so as not to undo what has already been done.

Chairman Mr. Clark, do you have any other explanations of the amendments?

Clark Alright, with the insert of "B" are there any problems there?

Page Three
HESS Meeting
3-25-75

Swanson Yes, I don't want SB 35 inserted in the middle of this bill.

Chairman Do we want to move Sect. 37 to a forward part of the bill and expand SEct. B?

Parr I am in favor if we take out the "shalls" and insert 'if practicle'.

Chairman We will bring in some legal advice on this matter and let Sect. 041 B go for now.

Clark Line 14 B, delete and add, 'voters of the Community shall receive' this makes more sense.

Sullivan That doesn't make much sense, it might not cover everyone.

Clark The BIA schools may be included in regional educational areas but shouldn't be any trouble because they can still contract.

Parr I am wondering what the need or change is?

Beirne BIA can choose not to be part but can still vote and with an amendment they won't be able to vote.

Parr Are you saying that the village with SOS School and BIA would vote?

Beirne I move to accept this amendment.

Parr Object

Swanson Before we accept this amendment, let's bring in some legal advice.

Clark I agree.

Parr We also need legal definition of community.

Clark A possible problem area is on Pg. 8, Lines 26-28 Sec. 14.08, deleted and reworded.

Van Houte This amendment was written by an express request by Senate Hess Committee.

Parr This amendment will help us to equalize education in this State.

Sullivan Mr. Swanson, do you want to move this amendment?

Swanson No I don't. When we worked on this bill our idea was to give these people the beginnings of local control of their government and we might be getting into people getting into 3rd Class Boroughs. If you want to hasten this than you can adopt this amendment.

Chairman Is there a motion to this amendment?

There was no motion to this effect and the meeting was continued.

Page Four
HESS Meeting
3-25-75

Clark Pg. 14 Sec.14.14.200 - Community School Committee shall review and....
This amendment gives more teeth to local communities to let them take on as much responsibility as they can handle.

Swanson I have no objection to that amendment.
(add)

Clark Pg 20 Line 4) a school district or regional educational attendance area
Line 6-7 " " " "
Line 9 & 10 " " "
Line 26 & 27 after area, delete rest of line to English.

Pg 21 Line 1 = After Department, delete ' this follows Federal legislation on Civil Rights Act.

Parr Is 14.34.400 covering regular schools now?

Lind No, this extends what we now have.

Beirne Deleting these lines will not do what Mr. Van Houte wants.

Chairman Do I have a motion on the amendment?

Beirne There may be another one so maybe we could sleep on it because we just don't want to lose it.

Chairman Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:30pm. SOS will be taken up again tomorrow evening, Wed. 25th, at 7:00pm.

H/B - 28

"An Act relating to the scholarship loan program: and providing for an effective date."

1/20/75

COMMITTEE REPORT

FINANCE

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date Feb 5, 1975

The Committee on HESS has had House Bill 28

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

() recommends it DO PASS

() recommends it DO NOT PASS

() recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

() recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR _____ AND THAT

CS FOR _____ DO PASS

() "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE _____

COMMITTEE

() reports it back ^{without} WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

() "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>John Adams</u>	<u>Sam</u>	<u>John</u>
<u>John Adams</u>	<u>NO REC</u>	<u>John</u>
<u>John</u>	<u>NO PASS</u>	<u>John</u>
<u>John</u>	<u>John</u>	<u>John</u>

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

John recommends: John

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

John Adams Chairman

A M E N D M E N T

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE:

By: 1926S Committee

To: _____ HOUSE BILL No. 28

SENATE BILL No. _____

PAGE: 1

LINE: 27 - 29

Change lines 27 through 29 to read.

- (1) one - two years residency 20 per cent
- (2) two - three years residency 40 per cent
- (3) three - four years residency 60 per cent

Change lines 1 and 2 to read:

- (1) one - two years residency 20 per cent
- (2) two - three years residency 40 per cent



Alaska State Legislature

House

JUNEAU ALASKA

HOUSE HESS MEETING

2-5-75

Members All Present

Chairman Sullivan called the meeting to order at 3:00
We will begin where we left off yesterday with HB 28.

Jac Carruthers gave his testimony to the bill.

Carruthers - From an administrative point of view, the 100% forgiveness as presently set up has a very serious flaw in it. At the end of the first year grace period, the student begins making his payments. If at the end of 2 years, we have forgiven 25%, do we give him back the money he paid during the second year? Or the other side would be that it looks as if the student was going to be forgiven so you decided not to collect that first years money because eventually he was going to be 100% forgiven, and then after 22 months in the State he decides to move south and then suddenly he would be almost 1 year in arrears in his payments. The only way around this would be to start the forgiveness at the end of the first year. With the 100% we will just have to do something about when the forgiveness starts. Otherwise its an administrative headache.

The other thing about the 100% forgiveness is the immense amount of paperwork that would have to go through. You would have the student, every year, certify that he is still an Alaskan resident, we go through all the paperwork each year for every student just to tell them they have gotten 25% again that year. But if you want the hold on them to make sure they stay in Alaska I don't see any other way around it. Psychologically to the problem, as you may recall the 68-69 and 70-71 loans were 100% forgiven to residences in Alaska, then the students attitude tends to be why go through all this paperwork, I'm still here in Alaska and I'm 100% forgiven so don't bother me. We send out the forms - they are not returned - we send follow up forms etc. One idea is that a student must, by June 1 of each year, certify to us that he is an Alaskan resident and if he fails to do so he loses the given per cent for that year. That could possibly be one approach.

Parr - You gave me the figures that roughly 62% of the students overall were out of state. 206 graduates and 1459 undergrad. How much money are we talking about that these students are spending at out of state universities?

Carruthers- Out of state undergrad student - \$1,408,978. Inside the state for undergrads - \$895,000. \$514,000. for out of state graduates and \$106,000. for inside state graduates.

Parr How many students are going out of state to take programs which are adequately offered here?

Page Two
HESS Meeting
2-5-75

Carruthers Every year we do a survey of the students and about 40% of them are returned. On that form we ask their major. So that 40% is just a cross section and there is no way of any accurate information in that area. We do have them broken down to what state they are going to. We have 16 international students.

Ose - Why is it going to be so much more paperwork on this 100%?

Carruthers - I was talking in the sense that there is no return for all this work we do. With a revolving fund when we get payments from the students why then it seems worthwhile to go thru the paperwork. If they are 100% forgiven, psychologically I think they are harder to trace down. There are 622 total in state students. Outside students is 1,043.

We have only had a positioned staff for repayments since the first of September. It will be another six months before we can say exactly how many people.

Hackney - Have you done any kind of survey among the students to see whether or not it does keep them in the state? And particularly if it does keep them in Alaska?

Carruthers - Yes, I have. We asked them the question that if the forgiveness clause influenced their plans to stay in Alaska. We asked three categories; totally based on that, partially, or if it made no difference at all. Roughly the split was 40-40-30. Wasn't quite 1/3. A lot of them that said it didn't influence them at all, in the comment section they put 'I love Alaska whether I'm forgiven or not I'm going to come back.'

Beirne - How much money has flown through the loan program at this time and how much have you received back?

Carruthers - In the neighborhood of 8 million that has gone out over the last six years and our repayments last year was approx. \$124,000. the year before that was about \$60,000. So far this year we've collected about \$80,000. (fiscal 75) Our projected estimate for this year was about \$200,000.

Beirne - Since we changed it last year so the money now is supposed to come back into the loan fund and make it a truly revolving fund rather than into the general fund, is that working?

Carruthers - What happened was that the Legislature tempered the amount of general funds. If I asked for a certain amount of money they then subtract from it my expected return and give me a lesser amount. And of course the people we forgive keep it from ever being a 100% revolving fund. From about 4 or 5 years from now the payment schedule gets up to where there is about $\frac{1}{2}$ the funds needed. It goes into the revolving fund but my budget statement, they take the amount anticipated in collections and subtract that from the amount asked so that the amount of the general fund plus the amount of program receipts add up to the total on hand.

Parr What is the average amount of money per year for the student in either paying or being forgiven?

Page Three
HESS Meeting
2-5-75

Carruthers - The average loan last year was about \$1,800 and about \$2,000 this year if we hadn't had that roll-back to make the funds stretch to every student. If a student had a \$10,000 loan, the payments would be \$170 per month.

Beirne Theoretically, they are to begin paying back in one year. Do you have any idea how many actually do pay back in one year?

Carruthers

- At the end of the one year grace period they have to start paying. I don't know how many of them actually do pay.

Beirne How many have asked for the 5 year hardship which would make it six years before they even start paying and 11 years before they finish paying.

Carruthers - They start paying at the same time but merely at a reduced amount. I don't believe there are more than 5 or 6. We have them furnish us with notarized proof of expenses.

Ostrosky How is the size of the loan determined from the individual student?

Carruthers - Determine first what the tuition fee, board and room and books cost. Then we have a column for complete education expenses, supplies etc. Then list the sources of funds available to the students for all the expenses. We subtract one column from the other and that is the financial need. Then is the statutory ceiling of \$2,500. Of those three figures, whichever one is the lesser is the amount of the actual award. \$2,500 is the maximum amount for an undergraduate, for a graduate it is \$5,000. It works out to about \$17 per thousand per month for the repayments.

Hackney - Your major objection to it is the bookkeeping involved?

Carruthers My personal objection to it is having two kinds of Alaskans-40% and 100%. Eventually they'll say there will be 100% forgiveness for people who go outside providing they're taking a major that is not offered in the state. And I don't think anybody would want to be in the position of saying that this major is adequate and this one is not.

Beirne - How much is left in your revolving fund?

Carruthers - About \$250,000 uncommitted. The total number of awards is 2,149 for just this year. There are several hundred that have dropped out of the program. There is no more than about a 2 week delay in backlog due to the paperwork. We met the requirement of awarding to all eligible students. What we have left will take care of us through summer school which has never happened.

Fink - I think in some ways you've given the impression that you have enough money to go around but really you're 30% short on that money when you cut everybody back to 70%. I think you're way short in funds. Some people just can't go when they are cut back that much. My impression is that you're misleading the committee.

Page Four
HESS Meeting
2-5-75

Beirne Do you have a staff now to get notifications out, bring the money back in, interest which is due etc?

Carruthers I have also asked for additional people for this fiscal year. I had two new positions this year so we are better off then ever before so that gives us four girls now. We aren't falling as far behind as we used to be.

My solution to this bill would be at the end of the first year, give 20%, 2nd year 40% and so on until you reach 100%. Then it gets away from the whole bit about the four years forgiveness.

Ose I would recommend there be an amendment to this bill with starting the end of the first year of 20% forgiveness etc.

Miller Mr. Carruthers suggestion makes total sense to me. He has pointed out a mechanical deficiency and also suggested an amendment so I'd be delighted to go along with an amendment.

Ose - I move that we add this amendment to this bill.

Ostrosky Second

Chairman - All in Favor 9 Opposed 0

Amendment passes. Is there a motion yet in regard to the bill as amended?

Ose I move we pass it out with individual recommendation.

Hackney Second

Chairman All in favor 9 Opposed 0

Bill passes.

Mr. Sam Trivett gave a brief orientation of his Dept. and the Div. of Corrections. It has been taped and is available upon request.

HB 27

Swanson This bill came to me by request of a pilot who also works and drives a school bus. It isn't anything more than a vehicle where a pilot or anyone holding a valid first or second class medical certificate under the FAA would be exempt from taking another medical exam. when he asks for a permit to run a school bus. In rural Alaska there are many times where you might have to go 100 miles for the examination which would cause an extreme hardship.

Ostrosky Is that a regulation or is that a statutory requirement?

Swanson I'm sure it is a statutory regulation.

OSe Is a TB test required?

Page Five
HESS Meeting
2-5-75

Mr. Ose's question could not be answered and it was suggested that the bill be held over until Thursday's meeting in order that there may be further witnesses to testify in regards to HB 27.

Chairman Sullivan adjourned the meeting until 3:00 Thursday.

TO: HESS Committee FROM: Mike Bradner
Susan Sullivan, Chairman

SUBJECT: Scholarship Loan Program DATE: February 13, 1975

The attached materials are intended to assist you and your committee with a study of the Student Scholarship Loan Program.

The Student Scholarship Loan Program was started in 1968-69 with a maximum \$500.00 award granted. The same program was continued in 1969-70. These loans were forgiven in their entirety for all recipients who remained in the state for six months.

The program was then changed to a revolving fund which allows for a maximum \$2500 scholarship for undergraduates, and \$5000 for graduate students. Students pay 5% simple interest annually. There is provision for 40% forgiveness of the loan if the student remains in the state for five years. The first year following graduation and/or completion of military service is a period of grace. The loan recipient then has five years in which to repay the loan.

The Loan Program has been functioning for several years. For the first time, scrutiny of the system for repayment of loans seems in order by the HESS Committee. I hope the attached materials will prove useful to you in such a study of the Loan Program and repayment system.

MB

SG/kb

SCHOLARSHIP LOAN PROGRAM

FY 1975

No figures available until the end of the fiscal year. Loans are constantly changing as students drop out during the year or change colleges. In the latter case, students must reapply for a loan.

Repayments

From the beginning of the Student Loan Program in 1968 to June 30, 1974, 10,379 separate payments have been made. One student may have received several payments. These payments represent a total of \$7,653,939.33.

Complete figures are not available regarding repayment of loans. Legislative Audit is now completing an internal audit of the loan program, and anticipates a full report before the end of the 1975 legislative session. They will be strongly recommending that a better record be kept of outstanding loans and corresponding repayments.

7/1/74 - 1/31/75

Principal	\$72,512.21
Interest	\$31,588.16

\$104,100.37 *

* 350 loan recipients have paid this amount.

TABLE I

1972-73 STUDENT LOANS

COLLEGE OR STATE OR REGION	GRADUATE STUDENT		UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT		COMBINED	
	NO.	\$	NO.	\$	NO.	\$
U of A - FAIRBANKS	31	67,725	437	537,020	468	604,745
U of A - ANCHORAGE	15	44,200	214	269,959	229	314,159
AMU	2	2,550	43	48,475	45	51,025
SJC	-	-	12	19,550	12	19,550
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	-	-	14	20,000	14	20,000
AK. BUSINESS COLLEGE	-	-	31	64,450	31	64,450
OTHER AK. SCHOOLS	-	-	10	11,950	10	11,950
WASHINGTON, STATE OF	27	98,900	252	403,887	279	502,787
OREGON, STATE OF	25	73,700	115	209,275	140	282,975
CALIFORNIA, STATE OF	11	40,600	56	92,270	67	132,870
HAWAII, STATE OF	2	5,800	18	26,775	20	32,575
MIDWEST REGION	25	90,000	60	100,450	85	190,450
ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION	5	13,250	176	303,197	181	316,447
SOUTHWEST REGION	13	42,500	65	101,400	78	143,900
NORTHEAST REGION	12	43,850	34	60,675	46	104,525
SOUTHERN REGION	15	47,850	20	30,825	35	78,675
FOREIGN COUNTRIES	3	11,500	5	9,100	8	20,600
SUB-TOTAL - IN-STATE	48	114,475	761	971,404	809	1,085,879
SUB-TOTAL - OUT-OF-STATE	138	467,950	801	1,337,854	939	1,805,804
GRAND TOTAL	186	582,425	1562	2,309,258	1748	2,891,683
				APPROPRIATION		2,904,600

TABLE I

1973-74 STUDENT LOANS

COLLEGE/STATE/REGION	GRADUATE STUDENTS NUMBER	GRADUATE STUDENTS DOLLARS	UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS NUMBER	UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS DOLLARS	COMBINED GRAD/UNDERGRAD NUMBER	COMBINED GRAD/UNDERGRAD DOLLARS
U OF A - FAIRBANKS	19	37,725	312	438,377	331	476,102
U OF A - ANCHORAGE	16	60,420	202	356,955	218	417,375
ALASKA METHODIST UNIVERSITY	2	7,950	36	55,690	38	63,640
SHELDON JACKSON JUNIOR COLLEGE	-	---	5	5,550	5	5,550
OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGES	-	---	15	14,030	15	14,030
ALASKA BUSINESS COLLEGE	-	---	8	19,690	8	19,690
OTHER ALASKA SCHOOLS	-	---	7	5,275	7	5,275
STATE OF WASHINGTON	36	102,525	227	375,484	263	478,009
STATE OF OREGON	26	68,050	150	236,072	176	304,122
STATE OF CALIFORNIA	21	67,805	72	117,816	93	185,621
STATE OF HAWAII	1	2,400	26	28,968	27	31,368
REGION - MIDWEST	25	73,800	65	103,229	90	177,029
REGION - ROCKY MOUNTAIN	11	31,590	185	313,508	196	345,098
REGION - SOUTHWEST	13	44,425	74	111,592	87	156,017
REGION - NORTHEAST	13	47,850	42	75,364	55	123,214
REGION - SOUTHERN	16	50,800	24	31,465	40	82,265
FOREIGN COUNTRIES	7	25,700	9	15,480	16	41,180
SUB-TOTAL IN-STATE	37	106,095	585	895,567	622	1,001,662
SUB-TOTAL OUT-OF-STATE	169	514,945	874	1,408,978	1043	1,923,923
GRAND TOTAL	206	621,040	1459	2,304,545	1665	2,925,585

1973-74 STUDENT LOANS

	\$	Number of Students	
APPROPRIATION	\$2,952,900	awards	1454
WAITING LIST	\$1,124,250	waiting	665

CANCELLED AND RE-AWARDED	\$755,200	awards	416
STILL ON WAITING LIST	\$369,050	waiting	249

STUDENTS NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING LOANS

TO BE CONTACTED	750
PENDING REPAYMENT	400
STILL ATTENDING OR MILITARY	500
IN GRACE PERIOD	<u>375</u>
TOTAL	2025

ACTIVE REPAYMENTS	179
-------------------	-----

(WILL COLLECT ABOUT \$104,000 IN FY 73-74)

PAID IN FULL	37				
Principal	\$28,700.00	Interest	\$1,050.38	Total	\$29,750.38

DECEASED	14 (1969-74)	\$20,659.95 forgiven-	in-full
----------	--------------	-----------------------	---------

BANKRUPTCY	1	Total	\$1250.00
------------	---	-------	-----------

Table IV is a comparison chart for student loans for the years 1971-72 through 1973-74 with graduate and undergraduate students reported separately.

The table contains number of students, average dollar amount, percent of dollars, and percent of students in and out-of-state for the first three (3) years of the program.

It is quite apparent that the percent of students attending in-state has shown a decline while the out-of-state students show a steady climb. Obviously, the student loan program has given the Alaska students a wider choice in selection of a college by lessening the financial barrier. Also to be considered in this shifting is the likelihood that our publicity has been within Alaska primarily and upper class students may have been a bit slower in learning of the program than were their counterparts attending college within the state. The dramatic increase in the total of graduate students indicates that the loan program has opened the fiscal doors for graduate degree candidates. Of course in addition, we would expect graduate degree candidates to seek education out-of-state for the most part due to the limited offerings in-state. Economically, it is sounder to finance student attendance out-of-state than to try to duplicate programs in Alaska.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON CHART
STUDENT LOANS
1971-72 through 1973-74

YEAR	NUMBER UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS		AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT		PERCENT DOLLARS		PERCENT STUDENTS	
	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE
1971-72	570	420	\$ 1194	\$ 1587	50.5	49.5	57.6	42.4
1972-73	761	801	1276	1670	42.1	57.9	48.7	51.3
1973-74	585	874	1531	1612	38.9	61.1	40.1	59.9

YEAR	NUMBER GRADUATE STUDENTS		AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT		PERCENT DOLLARS		PERCENT STUDENTS	
	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE
1971-72	31	60	\$ 2407	\$ 3028	29.1	70.9	34.1	65.9
1972-73	48	138	2385	3391	19.7	80.3	25.8	74.2
1973-74	37	169	2867	3047	17.1	82.9	18.0	82.0

-- PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENT PLAN 1973-74

MEASURE	PRIOR YEAR 74		74-75 CURRENT YEAR PLAN (CY)	MAINTENANCE	REQUEST	EXPLANATION
	PLAN	ACTUAL				
1. <u>STUDENT LOANS</u>						
(a) number of loan awards	1700	1986*	2200	2450		* does not include waiting list
(b) average amount of award	\$1800.	\$1856.	\$1400	\$1950		** with 30% reduction to reach all eligibl
2. <u>TUITION GRANTS</u>						
(a) number of tuition grants awarded	900	962	800*	850		* reduction due to fewer part-time students
3. <u>REPAYMENT OF LOANS</u>	\$84.8	\$114.6	\$216.4	\$308.5		

SCHOLARSHIP LOAN PRINCIPAL (REPAYMENTS)

Fiscal Year 1974

Actual: 89,178,000

FISCAL YEAR	BUDGET ESTIMATE
1975	\$168,800
1976	\$240,600
1977	\$428,300
1978	\$634,500
1979	\$841,800
1980	\$990,800

SCHOLARSHIP LOAN INTEREST (REPAYMENTS)

Fiscal Year 1974 Actual: \$25,479,000

FISCAL YEAR	BUDGET ESTIMATE
1975	\$47,600
1976	\$67,800
1977	\$120,800
1978	\$179,000
1979	\$237,400
1980	\$279,500

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Amount available for student loans increases at 5% per year
2. 70% of students remain in Alaska and 40% is forgiven
3. 30% leave Alaska and repay 100%
4. 5% simple interest
5. 5% default rate
6. Estimate drop-outs at 20% between freshman and sophomore years; 10% between sophomore and junior years; 5% between junior and senior years; and 5% between senior and graduate years

ANALYSIS OF MAINTENANCE

ITEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE		EXPLANATION
<p>A. SCHOLARSHIP LOAN PROGRAM</p> <p>Fiscal Year 1975 Authorized <u>\$3,322,000</u></p> <p>Fiscal Year 1976 Budget Request ----- \$4,334,200</p>		<p>General Fund Program Receipts</p> <p>General Fund Program Receipts</p>	<p>\$3,105,600 \$216,400</p> <p>\$4,025,700 \$308,500</p>	<p>Loan repayment</p> <p>Reflects increase in number of students and rising educational costs; an increase of \$1,012,200</p>
<p>B. ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>Adjusted Fiscal Year 1975 Authorization <u>\$139,400</u></p> <p>Increased Costs \$16,300</p> <p>Increased Costs \$155,700</p> <p>Increased Costs \$37,400</p>		<p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p>		<p>Personal services</p> <p>Reflects need for larger staff as repayment volume is increasing plus the student loan and tuition grant programs are growing.</p>
<p>FISCAL YEAR 1976 MAINTENANCE LEVEL ----- \$193,100</p>		<p>Personal services \$26,300 (2 new positions plus merit increase)</p> <p>Travel \$700</p> <p>Contractual services \$11,100</p> <p>Commodities \$1,300</p> <p>Equipment ----- (\$2,000)</p>		<p>\$37,400</p>

H/B - 71

POSITION PAPER
ON
HOUSE BILL 71

An Act relating to foster care custody of children committed to the custody of the Department of Health and Social Services.

Prior to placement of a child it is the Social Worker's responsibility to gather as much information as possible regarding the child and it is Federally required to have a casework plan for every child which includes a diagnostic service and treatment plan. Generally this plan, insofar as possible, includes the wishes of the legal parents of the child.

When a child is removed from the home by court order there is generally a degree of animosity and hostility toward the petitioning agency personnel and also toward the foster parents. The agency personnel can and do act as a buffer between parents and foster parents as well as arrange and supervise visits between parents and their children. It would appear to be an imposition to place foster parents in a direct involvement with legal parents and thereby establish an involvement which could hamper the relationship of the foster parent to the child.

As court orders are written, the petitioning agency is given the authority to consent to medical procedures and make decisions for the wellbeing of the child, including, but not limited to, social and educational factors.

It is not within the purview of the Department of Health and Social Services to place custody; this is a prerogative of the court. It is the responsibility of the Department to provide for appropriate care for the child in custody. In the case of the dependent child this would most often be foster care. It is also the responsibility of the Department to work with the child and the legal parents toward returning the child to the family unit. To accomplish this goal it is necessary for the Department to have authority and latitude to make decisions affecting the child.

It is the responsibility of the foster parent to provide the day by day care to the child that will provide the child with an atmosphere conducive to healthy emotional and physical growth with the supervision of the placing agency.

The concerns of the Department regarding House Bill 71 are as follows:

1. If the foster parent has legal custody of the child, the child, it appears, could be taken out of the State with no supervision, or handed on to other unknown persons without knowledge or permission of either the legal parents or the Department.
2. The foster parents could provide or deny medical care to the child according to their desires, thereby leaving themselves open to suit by the legal parents.
3. The foster parents could petition the court for termination of parental rights, although it might not be in the best interest of the child.
4. Custody implies financial obligation. The Department could not provide financially for care of a child for whom it has no legal responsibility.
5. Revocation of license is only accomplished through administrative action which, if appealed through court hearings, could lead to a time-consuming process.

In summary, it appears to be in the best interest of the child, the legal parent, and the foster parent for custody of the child to remain with the Department of Health and Social Services.

As the bill is written, there appears to be no additional expense to the Department of Health and Social Services.

The Department does not favor passage of the Bill.

Recommended By:

Stanley P. Harris
Stanley P. Harris, Director

2-25-25
Date

Approved By:

Frederick McGinnis
Frederick McGinnis, Commissioner

2/6/25
Date

Comments by Governor's Office:

By: _____

_____ Date

TELEGRAM

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

PHONE: 586-6440

UNEAU, ALASKA 99801

1975 FEB 6 AM 12 58

02155 WL ANCHORAGE ALASKA 51 02-05 1041P AST

PMS HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

ALASKA STATE HOUSE SUSAN SULLIVAN CHAIRMAN

POUCH V

JUN

ALASKA CHAPTER NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS SUPPORTS
THE CONCEPT EMBODIED IN HOUSE BILL 71 BUT BELIEVES SERIOUS
QUESTION EXISTS AS TO THE LEGALITY OF MANY OF ITS PROVISIONS
ESPECIALLY LINES 5 TO 8 PAGE TWO. WE URGE THE COMMITTEE
TO CONSIDER APPROACHING THE CONCEPT VIA THE GUARDIANSHIP
STATUTES

LUCIEN POUSSARD CHAIRMAN ALASKA CHAPTER NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF SOCIAL WORKERS

TO: The Honorable Suzan Sullivan
Chairperson
The Committee on Health, Education
and Welfare
State of Alaska
House of Representatives

DATE: February 7, 1975

FROM: Ken Fallon
Office of Comprehensive Health Planning

SUBJECT: House Bill No. 71

SYNOPSIS = House Bill No. 71 provides for the following:

1. Provides for the Department of Health and Social Services to grant custody to a foster home when the Department has custody.
2. Provides that foster homes may have custody granted to them by the Department for a specified period of time.

CONTRA INDICATION:

1. The bill provides that the Department will have the authority to grant custody. Heretofore that has not been the privilege of the Department but the responsibility of the court. The court has provided an objective forum where the rights of the legal parents and the child are considered in making decisions about legal custody. Often the Department is in an adversary position with the legal parent which would call into question decisions made by the Department in matters of custody.
2. Once foster care custody is granted it is not clear what the responsibility of the Department would be in assisting the foster parents with support services such as counselling, training and other support functions.

IMPRESSIONS:

I am not certain as to the reasons for this bill. I would suspect that the bill is an attempt to deal with frustrations that foster parents experience in working with the Department by granting them more responsibility thru legal custody.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. If in fact this bill is written in response to grievances by foster parents, these grievance should be heard in order that the Department can become more responsive to their needs.
2. The matter of legal custody is best left with the court in order that the legal rights of all affected are protected.
3. Bob Gin, Foster Home Coordinator, Helen Waley Center 2220 Nichol Street, Anchorage, Phone: 274-4586 has a most exemplary program in foster care and would be an expert resource to your committee.

A/B-28

"An Act making a supplemental appropriation to the State-Operated School System; and providing for an effective date."

1/27/75

COMMITTEE REPORT

FINANCE

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 4/16/75

The Committee on WESS has had HB 78

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

recommends it DO PASS

recommends it DO NOT PASS

recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR _____ AND THAT

CS FOR _____ DO PASS

"and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE _____

COMMITTEE

reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

"other"

Members signing the Majority report:

[Signature] _____
[Signature] _____
[Signature] _____
[Signature] _____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

[Signature] Chairman



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

HESS COMMITTEE MEETING

3-26-75

Members Present:

Ose	Parr
Hackney	Sullivan
Osterback	Swanson
Ostrosky	

Chairman Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. to take up a continuation of HB 24. HB 78 was also briefly considered.

HB 78

Mr. Wesley from SCS gave briefing of the bill. SOS classifies income as restricted income. The problem we have is that in order to honor our contracts (pupil teacher ratio) the commitments have to be able to be made in advance. It is impossible to reduce the program to 2.2 million because of contracts already made.

Hackney You say \$300,000 was found in the budget? If you had gotten the shortfall for this year would you still have found the \$300,000?

Wesley No, we would not have been able to reduce the costs, or have reasoning to do so. 75% of this budget is under Federal regulation 874. 7 or 8% of 874 appropriations are included in present SOS.

Hackney AVEC utilities did not go up this year?

Wesley Yes, they remained at the same rate of fiscal 74.

Hackney I don't understand why the utilities go up on the Bases?

Wesley The military command has the power to raise the utilities and did so of about 30%. AVEC changes their structure, the utilities went up only at the sites where there were multiple buildings.

Swanson I find it strange that under the sale of electricity to AVEC by SOS.... at one time the Legislature had to set the regulations by resolution, it seems to be changed to what it was three years ago.

Wesley AVEC did not raise the rates, when a new building was added the utility costs were increased.

HB 24

Senator Ferguson:

These are feelings of my own concerning the SOS Program. One problem I see is that there is not sufficient time for the transition. At least one years time

fall to let all Region 10 areas take care of themselves. I think we should allow SOS to continue to run for exactly one more year. Commissioner Lind in consultation with CRA could change regional attendance areas into sections allowing them to run their own schools. My amendments to the bill are as follows:

- 1) Pg. 1 Line 9 - Delete Repealer and put it on the last page where it would repeal it on July 1, 1976.
Line 29- Using Boundaries
- 2) Pg. 2 Line 5 - Delete 'may' and include 'shall'
Line 9 - Delete everything after control and add on 'July 1, 1976'. Propose that no area take over their own schools until that date.
- 3) Pg. 3 Line 11- Add 'only' after 'into sections'
Line 21- Add Sect. B after period
- 4) Pg. 6 Line 5 - Delete '60 days' and add 'Oct. 1976'
- 5) Pg. 23 Sec. 36 - Add 'remain in the regional educational attendance areas...'

Clark Do you propose that this is mandatory to wait a full year before the districts can transfer over?

Ferguson Yes, with the Oct. 76 date in mind. I fear that if we allow small regional attendance areas to be created all over the state there will be problems.

Hackney How would you propose to handle the chain?

Ferguson That could be done by the ALeut, their boundaries would be a Regional Board and set up subsections where the Regional School Board could delegate the powers. It is my understanding that first class cities can participate in the regional attendance areas.

Mr. Files Representing SOS Teachers from District I
Submitted amendment to the bill. (see attached)

Hackney Do any of the SOS representatives have any comments about extending the phase out for one more year?

Clark The only problem I see is when you try to have people phase themselves out. Working members now in SOS will be a bit reluctant to phase out their own positions. The statewide trend is using the existing regional boundaries.

Parr On page 21, you mentioned Statewide Resource Center, what is that?

Clark One thing they may do is provide bilingual education type services.

Parr Does not mean that they will deal only with bilingual education services?

Clark Correct. I will go over all of my proposed amendments one more time for clarity purposes. (See attached)

Parr In the resource centers we're talking about three or four of them across the state.

Hackney I would like to request that we ask Rich Guthrie to check on AVEC situation to find the possible problems there.

Page Three
HESS Meeting
3-26-75

SOS continued

Van Houte At the top of page 24, We can not drop this out because of the existing contracts. This would make us liable for law suits.

Parr Who pays AVEC bills now?

Clark SOS does, they have contracts out on all these.

Sullivan Some SOS contracts include things such as buildings, etc. and I'm sure they don't expire on July 1?

Van Houte If the State has a lease they are their responsibility. The leases would have to be examined on an individual basis.

Mr. Hayes SOS Representative

The lease agreement, for example, on the SOS building in Anchorage is for three years. We have talked to the owner and he has made it clear that he is willing to compromise. Based on your bill it would be a year before these buildings would be evacuated. I personally don't see this as a problem to this bill.

Sullivan My intentions are to give Stu Hall all the proposed amendments and get his opinion in the legal area, then meet again to put it all together and complete this bill.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:30. Bill will be reconsidered on April 1, 1975.

The Legislature of the State of Alaska
FISCAL NOTE

First Session - Ninth Legislature

I. REQUEST
 Bill No. HB 78
 Title: SOS Supplemental Appropriation
 Requested by: _____ Date: _____
 Return Date Requested: _____
 Agency: _____ Program: _____

II. FISCAL DETAIL
 Budget Request Unit(s) Affected: State-operated Schools
 A. EXPENDITURES: (Thousands of dollars)

OBJECT	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.						
TOTAL						

B. FUNDING: (Thousands of dollars)

GENERAL FUND	1809.4					
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						

C. POSITIONS:

PERMANENT/TEMPORARY	/	/	/	/	/	/
MAN MONTHS (P./T.)	/	/	/	/	/	/

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

see attached

IV. ATTACHMENTS

V. DATE: 2/28/75 PREPARED BY: T. E. Emsman

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

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: File

DATE: February 3, 1975

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: Richard Emerman, Budget Analyst
Division of Budget and Management
Department of Administration

SUBJECT: SOS Supplemental Appropriation

SOS has submitted the following computations in support of their FY 75 supplemental request:

P.L. 81-874 Appropriation	\$30,234,500
Current Revenue Estimate - P.L. 81-874	28,025,108
Estimated Shortfall in P.L. 81-874 Revenue	\$ 2,209,392
Estimated Cost Savings due to Enrollment declines	\$ 400,000
Net Deficit Applicable to SOS Operations	\$ 1,809,392

The \$400,000 in cost savings is comprised of the following:

Estimated 15 teacher positions	\$ 300,000
Decline in tuition payments due to anticipated declines in military student enrollments at borough schools	\$ 75,000
Miscellaneous variable costs	\$ 25,000
	\$ 400,000

The attached analysis indicates that the original 874 estimate was \$30,558,533, in contrast to the actual 874 appropriation of \$30,234,500. This discrepancy is due to the removal of Selawik from the SOS computation midway through the FY 75 budget process.

P.L. 81-874 funds are not identified with any specific program or operation within SOS - neither surpluses nor shortfalls in collection of 874 funds affect the scope of SOS activities. In other words, 874 funds have been treated simply as a General Fund offset in whatever amount they are received. In the case of higher than anticipated 874 revenues, the surplus funds would be deposited in the General Fund without increasing SOS expenditure authorization. Conversely, a shortfall does not automatically reduce spending requirements but means instead that less General Fund money will be supplanted by federal receipts than was initially projected. In this case, unexpected enrollment declines do result in some cost savings as well as a reduction in 874 reimbursement.

Most of the problem in enrollment declines has occurred in the on-base schools:

	ADM estimate in FY 75 budget	1st Quarter enrollment
Adak	666	680
Eielson	2,248	1,946
Elmendorf	1,886	1,758
Greely	318	277
Richardson	1,452	1,355
Wainwright	902	928
	<u>7,472</u>	<u>6,944</u>

Alaska State-Operated School System
 PL 81-874 Supporting Computations
 FY 1975

	<u>Original FY 1975 Estimate (Para 22)</u>			<u>Revised FY 1975 Estimate</u>		
	"A"	"B"	Total	"A"	"B"	Total
Rural Schools	4,388.	1,612.	6,000.	3,954.	1,291.	5,245.
Military Schools	6,880.	1.	6,881.	6,880.	-0-	6,880.
District Schools (Totals)	<u>2,805.</u>	<u>221.</u>	<u>3,026.</u>	<u>3,357.</u>	<u>148.</u>	<u>3,505.</u>
	17,073.	1,834.	18,907.	13,814.	1,439.	15,253.
Cost (cost per pupil)	<u>\$1,895.64</u>	<u>\$1,628.64</u>		<u>\$1,938.27</u>	<u>\$1,078.27</u>	
	\$29,000,680.72	\$3,115,305.76		\$27,055,885.98	\$2,331,241.12	
Collection Factor	<u>100%</u>	<u>80%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>80%</u>	
Adjusted PL 81-874 Totals	<u>\$29,000,680.72</u>	<u>\$3,115,305.76</u>	<u>\$32,115,986.48</u>	<u>\$27,055,885.98</u>	<u>\$2,331,241.12</u>	<u>\$29,387,127.10</u>

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT(S) MAY NOT FILM
LEGIBLY BECAUSE OF POOR QUALITY OF THE
ORIGINAL.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Region	Area Category			Total
	A	B	C	
Aleutian	71	23	151	245
Fort Yukon	107	78	60	245
Adelphi Island	408	-0-	-0-	408
Northwest and King Street	644	47	28	713
Glennallen	114	77	315	506
Delta/Tok	192	251	316	739
Southwestward	682	97	55	834
Bethel	636	286	321	1243
Southwestward	304	47	90	423
Upper Fairbank	70	180	59	309
Tanana	410	113	58	581
Lower Yukon and McGrath	298	102	152	552
Bethel - Special Education	13	8	8	29
Southwestward (Paul Alice - Correspondence)	5	-0-	-0-	5
	<u>2954</u>	<u>1291</u>	<u>1589</u>	<u>6832</u>

40
39
38
37
36
35
34
33
32
31
30
29
28
27
26
25
24
23
22
21
20
19
18
17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

Illinois State-Operated School System
Estimated 1971-72 - Students Attending Military Schools
F-11715

Military Base

Min. by Category

ADAK	658	-0-	-0-	658	
EILSON	1,705	-0-	-0-	1,705	
EMERTON	1,694	-0-	-0-	1,694	
FORT CREEK	271	-0-	-0-	271	
FORT LEONARD	1,287	-0-	-0-	1,287	
FORT WASHINGTON	828	-0-	-0-	828	
EILSON - Special Education	171	-0-	-0-	171	
EMERTON - Special Education	66	-0-	-0-	66	
Total	6,503	-0-	-0-	6,503	

Estimated ADA - Students Attending District Schools
FY 1975

District	ADA by Category			Total
	A	B	-0-	
Anchorage	2,132	18	66	2,216
Bristol Bay	1	1	-0-	2
Cordova	17	6	32	55
Dillingham	133	20	14	167
Fairbanks	192	10	10	212
Galena	14	2	-0-	16
Haines	12	4	-0-	16
Juneau	-0-	-0-	2	2
Kenai	144	-0-	-0-	144
Ketchikan	10	2	2	14
Kodiak	519	5	3	525
Malakuska - Susitna	20	4	7	31
Nenana	16	34	12	62
Nome	102	9	10	121
Palmdale	-0-	-0-	8	8
Peaseburg	2	15	87	104
Sitka	1	1	1	3
Umanak	8	25	165	198
Yakutat	36	9	24	69
Total Estimated ADA-FY 1975	3,357	165	443	3,965

1974-75 Rate
Per capita Cost for Current Expenditures
Alaska State Operated School System

Statistics for 1972-73 school year

Schools outside incorporated districts and on-base	\$39,059,927
Non-resident tuition to districts	1,546,491
State aid to districts for non-resident pupils	4,175,313
State aid to ASOS - Administration	511,000
	\$45,292,731

ADA for schools outside incorporated districts	\$ 7,026
ADA for on-base schools	9,357
ADA for non-resident tuition pupils	3,602
Total ADA	20,085

Cost per pupil in ADA - 1972-73 \$1,958.27

I hereby certify that the above information
is correct and complete and verifiable from
records in the Alaska Department of Education.

Richard L. Cole
Chief, Alaska Department of Education

