

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1900-1900 00/2

3228

HHESS

HB

636

-

HB

640

104

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of Proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Hydaburg</u>										'86
Hydaburg Head Start	X		X							
<u>Haines</u>										'87
Chilkat Valley Preschool		X				X	6/85			
Haines Head Start Program	X		X			X	6/85			
<u>Hoonah</u>										'86
Hoonah Head Start	X		X			X	6/85			
<u>Iditarod</u>										'87
Anvik Early Childhood Development/Blackwell	X			X-Chap I	X	X	6/85			
Holy Cross Head Start		X		X						
McGrath Preschool	X			X-Chap I	X	X	6/85			
Nikolai	X			X-Chap I /JCM	X	X	6/85			
Shageluk Preschool	X				X					
Takotna	X			X-Chap I	X					

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Juneau</u>										'87
Auke Bay Cooperative Preschool, Inc.		X					X	6/85	1/5/85	
Children's Community Ctr		X					X	8/87	1/5/85	
Ever Growing Child Center		X								
Faith Lutheran Preschool		X					X	7/87	1/8/85	
Juneau Christian School		X								
Juneau Head Start	X		X				X	6/85		
Juneau Preschool Co-op		X					X	6/85		
Life Covenant Fellowship		X								
Sonshine Day Care Center		X								
St. Ann's Day Care/ Preschool		X	X-USDA				X	7/87		
St. Jude Center, Inc. - Spec Ed.		X	X-USDA	X			X	6/85		
Valley Baptist Academy		X								
Valley Cooperative Presch		X					X	6/85		
<u>Kake</u>										'86
Kake Head Start	X		X	X						

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
Kenai Peninsula										'86
Gateway Children's Center		X								
Kenai Peninsula Montessori		X								
Kiddie Korner Day Care and Preschool		X								
North Star Coop		X								
Port Graham Preschool		X								
Quida's Child Development Center		X				X	6/85			
Redoubt Elementary	X				X					
Sears Elementary	X				X					
Seward Elementary	X				X					
Seward Head Start		X	X							
The Children's Center		X								
The Children's House - A Montessori Center		X								
Ketchikan										'87
Head Start - Ketchikan		X		X-USDA						
Ketchikan Christian Academy		X								
Montessori Development Ctr		X				X	6/85	1/23/85		

1984-85

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of Proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Ketchikan (cont.)</u>										
Totenland Preschool			X							
White Cliff Elementary - Special Ed.	X			X	X					
<u>King Cove</u>										
King Cove City Schools	X				X					'87
<u>Klawock</u>										
Klawock Head Start		X		X	X		X	6/85	4/25/?	'86
<u>Kodiak</u>										
Karluk			X	X-JOM						'87
Kodiak Base Day Care			X							
Kodiak Day Care Center and Preschool			X				X	6/85		
Kodiak Head Start		X		X	X					
Larsen Bay Preschool			X							
Main Elementary	X				X					
Old Harbor Preschool			X							
Teensy Bear Preschool			X							

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
Kuspuk										'85
Aniak Preschool	X			X-JOM/ JTPA	X	X	6/85	3/21/85		
Chuathbaluk Preschool	X			X-JOM/ JTPA	X					
Crooked Creek Preschool	X				X					
Lower Kalskag Preschool	X			X-JOM/ JTPA	X			3/21/85		
Red Devil Preschool	X			X-JOM/ JTPA	X	X	6/85	3/21/85		
Steelmute Preschool	X			X-JOM/ JTPA	X	X	6/85	3/21/85		
Stony River Preschool	X			X-JOM/ JTPA	X			3/21/85		
Upper Kalskag Preschool	X			X-JOM/ JTPA	X	X	6/85	3/21/85		
Lake & Peninsula										'86
Chignik Bay Dist Preschool	X				X					
Chignik Lake	X				X					
Kokhanok	X				X					
Newhalen	X				X					
Nondalton	X				X					
Perryville	X			X-Chap I	X					

Update
1985-86
Chap I -
Admin (for last
year)

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Lower Kuskokwim</u>										'85
Aklachak Head Start (BIA)		X	X							
Aklachak P/C H.S. (BIA)		X	X							
Aklak Native Community (no program '84-'85) (BIA)										
Akula Elitnaurvik Preschool	X				X		X		4/3/84	
Atmautluak Preschool	X			X-JCM	X		X	6/85	4/3/84	
Ayaprun Preschool - Newtok	X				X		X	6/85		
Bethel Head Start		X	X							
Bethel - Mike Inguut Elitnaurviat	X				X					
Chefornak - Chaputnguak High School	X				X		X	6/85		
Eek Head Start		X	X				X	6/85		
Involved Parents Preschool Inc. <i>Kasigiuk</i>			X							
Kasigiuk Head Start		X	X							
Kongiganak - Spec Ed	X				X		X	6/85	4/4/84	
Kipnuk Preschool (BIA)			X	X						
Kwethluk		X	X							
Kwigillingok Preschool	X				X		X	6/85		

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
Lower Kuskokwim (cont.)										
Nuniuarmuit Preschool	X				X		X	6/85		
Napaskiak	X	X		X						
Nightmute Preschool	X				X		X	6/85		
Quinhagak Preschool	X				X		X	6/85	10/30/84	
Toksook Bay Head Start		X		X						
Tuntutuliak Head Start		X		X						
Tuntutuliak Preschool	X				X		X	6/85	10/30/84	
Tununak Preschool		X		X						
Lower Anvik										
Alakanuk Head Start		X		X						'85
Chevak Head Start (BIA)		X		X						
Enonak Head Start		X		X						
Hooper Bay Head Start		X		X						
Kotik		X		X						
Marshall Head Start		X		X						
Mt. Village Head Start		X		X						

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of Proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
Lower Yukon (cont.)										
Pilot Station Head Start		X		X-JOM						
Pilot Station P/C H.S.		X		X						
Russian Mission		X		X						
Scammon Bay Head Start		X		X						
Mat-Su										
Arctic Angels Child Care			X				X	6/85		'85
Butte Elementary	X				X					
Christian Ministries Day School			X							
Cottonwood Creek Elementary	X				X					
Farm Loop Christian School			X							
Rolling Hills Academy for Super Kids			X				X	6/85	5/16/84	
Wasilla Elementary	X				X					
Nenana										

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Nome</u>										'86
Kawerak Head Start		X	X							
Nome Child Care, Inc.			X	X-USDA						
Nome Preschool Assoc., Inc.	BA			X-JOM	X					
<u>North Slope</u>										'89
Cully School	X				X		X	6/85	4/9/84	
Fred Ipalook Elementary	X			X-Chap I	X		X	6/85	4/10-11/84	
Kaveolook Preschool	X			(no program '84-85)			X	12/84	X	
Meade River School/Atqasuk	X				X		X	6/85		
Nuqsut Trapper School	X				X		X	6/85		
Nunamiut School ECE Prog	X				X		X	6/85		
Tikigaq Preschool	X				X		X	6/85	4/9/84	
Wainwright Preschool/ Alak Elementary	X				X		X	6/85	4/9/84	
<u>Northwest Arctic</u>										'85
Ambler Elementary School	X			X-JOM	X					
Buckland School	X				X					

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
Northwest Arctic (cont.)										
Deering School	X				X					
Kiana Elem. School (ECE)	X									
Kobuk School	X									
Kotzebue Elementary	X									
Kotzebue Day Care Center										
McQueen School	X									
Noatak Elementary	X									
Noorvik Elementary	X									
Selawik Elementary	X									
Shungnak Preschool	X									
<p><i>1985-85 update</i> <i>North west arctic</i> <i>Chap I Kotzebue, Ambler, Buckland,</i> <i>Deering, Kiana, Kivalina, Kobuk, Noatak,</i> <i>Noorvik, Selawik, Shungnak</i></p> <p><i>w/ Ed Olive</i> <i>10/22/85</i></p> <p><i>(11)</i></p>										
Pelican										
Petersburg										
Johnson O'Malley Preschool			X	X-JOM						'85
Petersburg Children's Center, Inc.			X	X-USDA			X	1/87		
Petersburg Preschool			X			X				

1984-85

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Pribilof</u>										'85
<u>Rainbelt</u>										'85
<u>Saint Mary's</u>										'89
St. Mary's Preschool	X			X-Chap I	X					
<u>Sand Point</u>										'85
Sand Point Elementary	X			X-JOM	X					
<u>Sitka</u>										'86
Betty Eliason Child Care Center			X	X-USDA						
Montessori Children's House			X							
Mt. Edgecumbe Preschool	X				X		X	6/85		
J-5 Preschool			X							

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source				Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local	DOE Certified			
<u>Skagway</u>										'85
Skagway Elementary	X			X-JOM	X					
<u>Southeast Island</u>										
<u>Southwest Region</u>										'85
Aleknagik	X			X-Chap I	X					
Clarks Point	X			X-JOM	X					
Levelock	X			X-JOM	X					
Manokotak	X			X-Chap I	X					
New Stuyahok	X			X-Chap I	X					
<u>Tanana</u>										'85
Grayling Head Start		X		X						
Tanana Head Start		X		X						

1984-85

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Unalaska</u>										'85
Unalaska/Dutch Harbor Coop Preschool		X					X	6/30/86	10/11/84	
<u>Valdez</u>										'87
'Growden-Harrison Elem - Spec. Ed.	X				X					
Valdez Coop Preschool			X				X	9/86	2/22/84	
<u>Wrangell</u>										'85
<u>Yakutat</u>										'85
<u>Yukon Flats</u>										'86
Arctic Village	X			X-JOM	X					
Ft. Yukon Preschool	X				X					
Stevens Village School	X				X					
Venetie Elementary	X				X					

Variable
Circle
Program

X
X
X

1985-86 Update '86

Capita I Venetie, Ft. Yukon

Arctic Village, Chalkyitsik

Seaman, Stevens Village, Rampart

District/Program	District Preschool	Head Start Preschool	Private Preschool	Funding Source			DOE Certified	Certificate Deadline	Date of last on-site review	Date of proposed on-site review
				Federal	State	Local				
<u>Yukon/Koyukuk</u>										'87
Allakaket	X			X-Chap I	X					
Hughes	X			X-JOM	X					
Hustla		X								
Koyukuk Preschool	X				X					
Minto	X			X-Chap I	X					
Nulato Preschool	X				X					
TOTAL	101	54	125				85			

Compiled by: Kathi Wineman
 Alaska Department of Education
 (907) 465-2841

Addendum: A

Head Start Home-Based Programs
1984-85

Alaska Gateway

Northway Head Start
Tanacross Head Start
Tetlin Head Start
Tok Head Start
Mentasta Head Start
Eagle Head Start
Dot Lake Head Start

Anchorage

Home Base 1
Home Base 2
Home Base 3
Home Base 4

Bering Strait

Kingikme Home Start

Juneau

Juneau-Douglas Home Base Program

JOM Funding

Ketchikan

Home Base Program

JOM

Nome

Kawerak

Compiled by:
Kathi Wineman
Alaska Department of Education

Public Programs

1. School District Operated Preschools:

Thirty one of Alaska's 55 districts are now offering programs for 4 year olds. Some of the 127 programs are for children identified as those with special needs, while others serve all 4 year olds in the district. Thirty two of these programs are certified by The Department of Education.

2. Head Start

Head Start offers a comprehensive early childhood program to economically disadvantaged and/or handicapped Alaskan children. Head Start is serving 1,701 children, aged 3-5 in 66 sites in Alaska. Eight programs are certified by The Department of Education.³³

3. Infant Learning programs

The eighteen Infant Learning Programs in Alaska are administered through The Department of Health and Social Services and are operated in several regions of the state. Their purpose is to identify handicapped and potentially handicapped infants aged 0-3, and to work with both children and parents in the home setting.

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
(313) 485-2000

David P. Weikart, Ph.D.
President

THE YPSILANTI PERRY PRESCHOOL PROJECT IN SUPPORT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Basic Findings

High quality early childhood education enables families and communities to improve the life chances of their children. Long-term research shows that young adults, now 19 years old, who attended a high quality preschool program made greater gains in education, employment and social responsibility than similar young adults who did not attend preschool.

- In Education

- Fewer classified as mentally retarded (15% vs. 35%)
 - More completed high school (67% vs. 49%)
 - More attended college or job training (38% vs. 21%)

- In Employment

- More support themselves by their own or their spouses' earnings (45% vs. 25%)

- In Social Responsibility

- Fewer were arrested (31% vs. 51%)
 - Lower birth rate (64 vs. 117 per 100 women)
 - Fewer on public assistance (18% vs. 32%)

These gains lead to substantial economic benefits for the community. An investment in preschool returns \$7 for every \$1 invested (after adjusting for inflation and discounting at 3% to estimate present value).

High quality early childhood education helps children become successful adults. It also reduces major social and economic problems within a community. Preventing lifelong problems in high-risk children is a better community investment than attempting to correct them.

* * * * *

Supporting High/Scope Monographs (available from the High/Scope Press):

The Ypsilanti Perry Preschool Project: Preschool Years & Longitudinal Results Through Fourth Grade. D.P. Weikart, J.T. Bond & J.T. McNeil, 1978 \$8

The Ypsilanti Preschool Curriculum Demonstration Project: Preschool Years & Longitudinal Results. D.P. Weikart, A.S. Epstein, L. Schweinhart & J.T. Bond, 1978 \$8

An Economic Analysis of the Ypsilanti Perry Preschool Project. C.U. Weber, P.W. Foster & D.P. Weikart, 1978 \$8

Young Children Grow Up: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 15. L.J. Schweinhart & D.P. Weikart, 1980 \$8

Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 19. Available September 1984. \$15

HIGH / SCOPE PRESS PUBLICATIONS

General Interest Books for Early
Childhood Educators *

YOUNG CHILDREN IN ACTION

M. Hohmann, B. Banet & D.P. Weikart
4th Printing, 1983 \$15

The High/Scope curriculum manual for early childhood educators. Extensively used as a guide for teacher training.

STUDY GUIDE TO YOUNG CHILDREN IN ACTION

M. Hohmann, 1983 \$6.95

A workbook of active learning experiences to be used in conjunction with the text Young Children in Action.

GOOD BEGINNINGS: PARENTING IN THE EARLY YEARS

J. Evans & E. Ilfeld, 1982 \$9.95

A guide to infant/toddler care for parents, caregivers and professionals working with parents. A wealth of information about the stages of development from birth to age three.

WOMEN AND CHILDREN FIRST: HOME LINK - A NEIGHBORHOOD EDUCATION PROJECT

S. Bell, C. Birch, C. Burn, E. Conner, S. Cronin, E. Filkin, E. Hamilton, M. Quiery, A. Wornald \$10

First-hand accounts of the Netherley project outside Liverpool that relate lessons learned about grassroots community work, project development and program management in child-rearing, education, health, welfare, and public housing. The Home Link project was supported by the Bernard van Leer Foundation.

JOURNEY INTO LIFE

Lamaze Childbirth Preparation Association of Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Outlines a family-centered approach to childbirth including accounts of actual birth experiences by couples who have used the Lamaze method of delivery.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION IN THE PRESCHOOL: A CANADIAN APPROACH

M. Wright, 1983 \$12

Wright and her colleagues launched the University of Western Ontario Preschool Project, a study of the effects of compensatory education on low-income children. Curriculum used in the project is discussed in sufficient detail to permit replication in other preschools.

INVOLVING PARENTS IN NURSERY AND INFANT SCHOOLS

B. Tizard, J. Mortimore, B. Burchell, 1983 \$8

Based upon experience in England, this book addresses a series of practical issues that every educator interested in parent involvement has faced.

SUPPORTING THE CHANGING FAMILY: A GUIDE TO THE PARENT-TO-PARENT MODEL

B. Reschly, 1979 \$8.50

A manual useful for programs interested in developing or adapting a program to support parents.

HOME TEACHING WITH MOTHERS AND INFANTS: THE YPSILANTI-CARNEGIE INFANT EDUCATION PROJECT - AN EXPERIMENT.

D. Lambie, J.R. Bond & D.P. Weikart, 1980 \$8

THE LONGITUDINAL FOLLOW-UP OF THE YPSILANTI-CARNEGIE INFANT EDUCATION PROJECT.

A.S. Epstein & D.P. Weikart, 1980 \$8

These monographs report on High/Scope's experimental home visiting program for parents and infants, conducted from 1968 to 1971. Impacts of the program are explored in depth.

All Titles on this page are available from:
HIGH/SCOPE PRESS, 600 N. River Street,
Ypsilanti, Michigan, 48197, U.S.A.
Telephone: 313/485-2000.

* All Prices in U.S. \$

A Special Report on the

Fourth Annual Policy Conference

of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

Reported by Lawrence J. Schweinhart
John E. Kyle, Conference Coordinator
August 8-11, 1983
Clinton, Michigan



**Who Should Receive Early
Childhood Education?**

**Who Should Pay for Early
Childhood Education?**



**Who Should Provide Early
Childhood Education?**

**How Should We Market Early
Childhood Education?**



**Where Do We
Go From Here?**

A Special Report on the

Fourth Annual Policy Conference

of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

Fifty-four advocates of early childhood education from around the country—including representatives of public and private child care centers, Head Start programs, public schools, non-profit early childhood groups, city and state governments—came to Clinton, Michigan, in August 1983 to join with staff of the High/Scope Foundation's Center for the Study of Public Policies for Young Children and several guest speakers in a conference sponsored by Carnegie Corporation of New York. The conference was the first in a series of meetings that will address issues involved in institutionalizing high quality early childhood programs for America's children.

Institutionalization issues are especially timely in this period of enormous growth for early childhood programs. In the last decade the percentage of three- and four-year-olds in the U.S. enrolled in preschool programs nearly doubled, growing from 21% to 37%. It is anticipated that this trend will continue, and it is the responsibility of those in the early childhood field to help shape this growth in directions appropriate to children, families, and society.

The conference addressed this question by posing a series of questions. The first question

discussed was who should receive early childhood education—because of need, potential benefit, or want. The second question was who should pay for it, especially if those who most deserve to receive it are unable to pay for it. The third question was who should provide it, a rich question for early childhood education because there are now many types of providers. Once these issues of substance were determined, we moved to issues of public opinion. What does the public think about early childhood education? What **should** the public think of it, and how can we help the public to think that way? Another substantive question, not addressed fully at this conference but to be addressed in future meetings, is the issue of maintaining high quality in early childhood programs. The final presentation touched upon this issue, while asking early childhood educators, "Where do we go from here?"

Besides this report, there were other concrete outcomes of the conference. Two Michigan newspapers, **The Ann Arbor News** and the **Lansing State Journal**, reported on the conference, and the national newsletter **Report on Preschool Education**, published in

Washington, D.C., devoted most of an issue to a special report on the conference.

Another outcome of the conference that deserves mention is the networking that occurred among individuals. For example, the person in charge of the media task force for early childhood care and education in South Carolina got to know the person responsible for the Mormon Church's public service announcements on family life. A child care leader from Florida learned how certain child care regulations have been handled in Massachusetts. A Michigan state government official met the new Head Start handicapped services advocate for the state. And High/Scope staff gained additional contacts with key early childhood advocates from around the country.

This report is intended as an objective summary of the proceedings of the conference. Each of the major topics was discussed first by a presenter or a panel of presenters; questions and answers followed each presentation, then participants broke into small groups for extended discussion. Following are summaries of each major presentation, each closing with a summary of the group discussions on that particular issue.

Presented by John Clement
and Ann Epstein
High/Scope Educational
Research Foundation

Should anyone receive early childhood programs? This question has been raised by a political group that we will call the "family traditionalists." It has also been raised by several respected researchers, most notably psychologist Burton White. We need to consider what these people are saying and, if we disagree, we need to muster our counter-arguments.

Family traditionalists see maternal love in the home as the cornerstone of all early childhood experience. Any change from the traditional nuclear family—intact, father working, mother home with the kids—is seen as undesirable. Data about change are branded "negative statistics."

Burton White's article in the November 1981 issue of *Young Children* posed the question: Should a mother stay home with her baby? White answered yes. He based his conclusion on the research literature on maternal care and child outcomes, focusing primarily on the institutional research and animal studies done by Bowlby in the early 1950s. This research did show severe developmental deficits in children deprived of maternal care. But these were cases of extreme deprivation, social isolation, and absence of any environmental stimulation—not just lack of maternal care, but lack of care by any constant, nurturing, interactive adult. It is reasonable to question whether these studies apply to the issue of day care under normal conditions.

At the same time, White ignores relevant research of the 1970s and 1980s concerning child care, such as that reviewed by Alison Clarke-Stewart in her 1982 book, *Day Care*. This more recent research suggests that children are certainly not hurt by early childhood programs and that children at risk may indeed be helped cognitively and socially.

There are five reasonable answers to the question of who needs early childhood education programs the most: children at risk of educational failure, the handicapped, children whose parents work, children of teenage parents, and children at risk of abuse or neglect.

The risk of educational failure is greatest for those who live in poverty. These children's families are least likely to be able to pay for early education services. Of the 17.7 million youngsters under age five in this country, 24%—4.2 million children—live in poverty. In spite of our efforts as a nation to help these youngsters, especially through Head Start, the disadvantaged are underserved: 81% of three-year-olds and 81% of four-year-olds from families with incomes under \$10,000 did not receive early education in 1980.

Many believe that the handicapped, those who need special education, deserve priority in receiving early childhood education. However, early handicapping conditions are difficult to define and identify. In the 1981-82 school year, there were nearly 228,000 children aged three to five receiving special education services through Public Law 94-142, with 40,000 more served by Project Head Start. This represents only about 2% of this age group. Twenty-seven states have no mandated legislation for the provision of educational services to handicapped children under age five.

The demand for child care for working parents far exceeds the capacity of the services available. Though we do not have the data to

Who Should Receive Early Childhood Education?



make an accurate estimate of the unmet need, a few rough figures suggest the extent of the gap. Today, in single-parent families, one-half of all children under age six have their mothers in the labor force; in two-parent families, the comparable figure is 42%. In the mid-1970s there were 1.2 million licensed spaces for children in center- and home-based care, while there were 13 million children of full-time working mothers. The Reagan administration has cut federal support for child care through a variety of programs.

Children born to teenage mothers have a special need for early childhood education; the child care provided can also permit parents to continue and complete their schooling. About 580,000 infants are born to teenage mothers each year; over half of these mothers have not completed high school.

Children who are at risk of abuse or neglect have a need for early childhood education; the service offers respite for the parents, helps prevent out-of-family placements, and can be a starting point for parental training and support services. In 1978 there were 600,000 cases of child abuse and neglect reported, with child care outside the home available in only 8% of the cases.

Findings from research support the notion that certain "high risk" groups can benefit from early childhood education. There is clear evidence of both short- and long-term positive impact of early education for disadvantaged populations. The evidence includes High/Scope's Perry Preschool Study, the research reported by the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, the New York State Experimental Prekindergarten evaluation, and the long-term study of the Head Start program in Rome, Georgia. A key finding across studies is that early childhood education leads to a reduction in the need for special education and/or grade retention.

There is also evidence of early education impact for populations at risk of later placement

in special education. The Perry study documented effects for youngsters who tested as educable mentally retarded. Other studies have found short-term benefits for children with sensory impairments, language problems, Down's Syndrome, and behavior disorders.

Another way to consider the question of who wants early childhood education is to consider who receives early childhood education today. More and more children are being enrolled in early childhood education. The number of three- and four-year-olds enrolled in early education programs, excluding custodial day care, increased by 58% from 1970 to 1980—from 1.5 to 2.3 million. The percentage of all three- and four-year-olds enrolled increased from 21% to 37%. There are more and more early childhood educators as well. Membership in the National Association for the Education of Young Children has increased by 10,000 in the past six years to a total of over 38,000 members in 1983.

Who Should Receive?

Small Group Discussions

The most common answer by conference participants to the question of who should receive early childhood education was: all children whose parents choose to have them receive it. A second type of answer recognized some of the limitations of parental choice—children of abusive parents should receive early childhood education whether parents want it or not; early childhood programs are good for disadvantaged children whether parents know it or not. One response to this situation, short of making programs compulsory, is to educate people about the benefits of early childhood education.

While conference participants believed that the disadvantaged should have access to early childhood education, no one wanted to limit early childhood programs to the disadvantaged. People favored socioeconomically integrated programs with subsidies for the poor. ■

Presented by Steven Barnett
High/Scope Educational
Research Foundation

The purpose of this presentation is to introduce early childhood professionals to a different perspective on the question of who should pay for early childhood programs—that of economics and benefit-cost analysis.

To paraphrase Paul Samuelson, economics is the study of how people choose to employ scarce resources to produce and distribute goods and services, now and in the future.

It is worth considering exactly how economics is relevant to the question of who should pay for early childhood education. After all, most of the time we make economic decisions without any explicit economic analysis. Whether we buy a candy bar or an automobile, the market provides a fairly good guide to the relative value of resources, and most of the consequences affect only ourselves. Notice, however, that in the case of the automobile, complications begin to arise. The type of car we can buy is constrained by safety and environmental standards. If we borrow money to pay for the car, the cost is subsidized by tax deductions. In this case, a significant divergence arises between the consequences of an economic choice for an individual and for society as a whole. Society has intervened to protect its interests. The tool that economists use to assess the grounds for such public intervention is benefit-cost analysis. In what follows, the steps in benefit-cost analysis are outlined and then applied to early childhood education.

Benefit-cost analysis is, very simply, the application of economic theory to a policy choice. As commonly practiced it has two goals: to determine if the policy choice is a good investment for society as a whole and to determine how it affects different groups within society. Economists refer to these goals as efficiency and equity, respectively.

Benefit-cost analysis can be divided into eight steps, each related to key concepts in the definition of economics. These steps are:

1. Identify the decision makers and their values.
2. Identify the alternatives.
3. Identify the costs.
4. Identify the benefits.
5. Value the costs and benefits monetarily.
6. Discount all monetary values.
7. Aggregate all discounted monetary values.
8. Assess the effects on efficiency and equity.

The first two steps relate to choice—identify the decision makers, their values and alternatives. The third—identify the costs—requires that we quantify the scarce resources used in each alternative. It identifies what society gives up for each alternative. The fourth—identify the benefits—can only be performed if we understand the production process. We must specify the actions that are part of the process and the consequences of those actions.

The fifth step is to place monetary values on all effects, both costs and benefits. This step is crucial because without it there is no way to value costs and benefits relative to each other. This step is also the most controversial because people object to placing a monetary value on many things. The economists' counterargument is that in practice we do place monetary values on everything—because everything we do has a cost. When we buy a car, we forgo buying a

Who Should Pay for Early Childhood Education?



dialysis unit. When we buy a dinner, we forgo feeding a hungry person somewhere. The economist only seeks to make explicit the choices people already make by estimating monetary values. Realistically, this step is rarely, if ever complete. However, even a partial valuation of costs and benefits is often sufficient to produce an informative benefit-cost analysis.

The sixth step—discounting—continues the process of making costs and benefits comparable. Monetary valuation alone is not adequate because costs and benefits generally occur at different times. Even in the absence of inflation (which is controlled for in other ways), the time that a cost or benefit occurs makes a difference. A discount rate, roughly equivalent in concept to the rate of interest, is used to translate all costs and benefits into their values at a single time. Most often this time is the beginning of the investment, and the results are called "present value."

When all costs and benefits have been expressed in terms of present value, two steps remain. The present values are aggregated to yield total costs and benefits for groups and for society as a whole. The economist can then pose two questions: Is the choice a good investment for society as a whole? Is it fair to various groups? The first question is easily answered. If the present value of benefits exceeds the present value of costs, the answer is yes. The second question is less easily answered because people differ in what they consider to be fair. However, if all groups in society are made better off in absolute terms, most economists would consider the results unambiguously positive.

The economic perspective on early childhood education may be illustrated by the benefit-cost analysis of the Perry Preschool Program. This program provided high quality early childhood education to a group of low-income children. Research has traced their experiences from preschool to young adulthood. The most recent

report of this research is *Young Children Grow Up: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 15*, by L. J. Schweinhart and D. P. Weikart (High/Scope Press, 1980). A benefit-cost analysis has been conducted using findings from this research, and the most recent economic results are to be published in detail later this year. We can consider the general results and their implications at this time. Categories of costs and benefits are identified as follows, along with the primary bearers of costs and recipients of benefits.

Costs	Paid by
Program	Public
Time	Parents and children
Later schooling	Parents and children
Benefits	Received by
Participation	Parents and children
Child care	Parents and children
Socioeconomic success	Children and the public
Social responsibility	Children and the public

The greatest part of costs that resulted from the Perry Preschool are program costs. These were paid for by the public through government funding. The families of the children who attended were not required to make any expenditures for the program. The only other cost worth noticing is that of later schooling. Children who attended preschool stayed in school longer (including college attendance). Again the program cost (high school and college) was borne almost entirely by the public.

Benefits accrued to parents, children, and the public. Parents benefited directly from their participation in a program that enhanced their lives and provided child care. The market value that can be placed on this is relatively small. Children benefited immediately from a program that enhanced their lives, and later from the long-term benefits: less trouble in school, higher earnings, less welfare dependence, and less

involvement in crime. Their lives are better because of these things. However, it is projected that the increase in after-tax earnings is roughly offset by the loss to individuals in welfare payments not received. Monetarily, the gains to children who attended preschool may be rather small. The greatest beneficiary, monetarily, is the public. School costs are reduced, taxes paid by program participants later in life are increased, crime and criminal justice system costs are reduced, and welfare costs are reduced.



Economic analysis of Perry Preschool Project results found a four-fold return on the original investment.

When all the steps of benefit-cost analysis are completed, the implications of the Perry Preschool study are quite clear. The present value of benefits exceeds that of costs for society. Thus preschool for low-income children is a good public investment. Also, both the low-income families who participated and the public who paid for the preschool program gained more than they lost. Thus, when the public pays, preschool for low-income families is fair. Of equal importance, if the public did not pay, monetary benefits for low-income families would not provide sufficient incentive for the private purchase of preschool programs. So, from an economics perspective, the public should pay for early childhood programs for low-income families because it is a good investment for all concerned and might not take place unless the public pays.



The Perry Project found that preschool saved society money by reducing future needs for special education.

The economic analysis of the Perry Preschool Program provides a clear but limited answer to the question of who should pay. It leaves out middle- and upper-income families. It cannot provide a definitive answer for these others; however some inferences can be made. First, most public benefits are likely to be less for

HELP! We Need to Hear From You!

If you have used High/Scope's longitudinal research on preschool education, please respond to this simple questionnaire.

High/Scope's longitudinal research on the cost-effectiveness and lasting benefits of the Ypsilanti Perry Preschool Program makes a strong argument in support of high quality early childhood programs. The High/Scope Center for the Study of Public Policies for Young Children has been working hard to make these research findings readily available to you and to all concerned citizens. We think these efforts have had a positive impact on early childhood programs throughout the country.

Now we need your help. We need concrete evidence that our work has

been worthwhile. If you have used the research to help you make a case for early childhood programs, we need to hear from you.

Please send us answers to the following questions on your own letterhead or on the form below. If you wish, you may phone Policy Center staff at (313) 485-2000. Please mail your responses to

Policy Center
High/Scope Educational
Research Foundation
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, MI 48197-2898

1. From what sources have you learned about High/Scope's longitudinal research on preschool? Include specific professional publications, news articles, and speeches. _____

2. How have you made use of High/Scope's longitudinal research on preschool? To what audiences have you presented the research findings? _____

3. Do you know of any specific decisions—such as increasing or sustaining funding, initiating a program, or passage of legislation—that were influenced by the presentation of the High/Scope research? Please be specific about who made the decision, the forum in which the research was used, the amount of money involved, and the current status of the project. _____

middle- and upper-income populations. School, crime, and welfare cost savings are likely to be considerably smaller. Earnings and thus increases in taxes paid might also be less. Second, middle- and high-income families have more resources available for their children and a greater ability to pay for early childhood education. Together these suggest that it may not be in the public interest to pay for early childhood education for middle- and upper-income families. It must be emphasized, however, that this is not a definitive conclusion.

Who Should Pay?

Small Group Discussions

Who should pay for early childhood education? The most common response to participants was

that the ideal is a free market situation, with subsidies for families that cannot afford early childhood education.

Whether public funding of early childhood education ought to be provided for the middle class was seen as a major question by conference participants. The middle class can receive some of the same benefits of early childhood education that are received by low-income families. Middle-class children can also be at risk of scholastic failure, placement in special education, delinquency, and future lack of employability. Early childhood education can help middle-class children avoid these problems. Another major consideration is that the large American middle class is the primary political constituency—the major determinant of the political process in the nation. ■

Three kinds of providers are important to consider: the schools, proprietary agencies, and religious institutions.

The Schools

Presented by William Isler
Pennsylvania Department of Education

No institution should be the sole provider of early childhood programs. Public schools have both advantages and disadvantages as providers; so do many other institutions.

In analyzing a problem, the Pennsylvania Department of Education considers four things: need, resources, public policy, and image. The need for early childhood programs is primarily in programs for four-year-olds. As of 1979 in Pennsylvania, 84% of five-year-olds were enrolled in early childhood programs, while 45% of four-year-olds were enrolled. Public schools are loaded with potential resources for early childhood programs. Public policies regarding young children are rapidly changing. Early childhood education elicits a mixed bag of public perceptions. Too many promises of quick education fixes have been made to parents. However, in general, this is a great time to press forward the case for early childhood education. The public has focused its attention on the "rising tide of mediocrity" in the public schools and wants to see something done about it.

Early childhood education must be recognized as more than a babysitting service for parents who work. Nor should it be seen as a shifting downward of the elementary school curriculum. Placing early childhood programs in elementary schools would help to increase the continuity of experience between early childhood and the elementary school years. Another possible advantage of the public schools is that they can take responsibility for child care, as some schools are already doing, especially after-school care for elementary school children.

For-Profit Child Care

Presented by Carole Rogin
National Association of Child Care Management

The National Association of Child Care Management represents one-fourth of the 10,000 to 12,000 private proprietary child care centers in the country, which constitute 40% to 45% of licensed child care centers (the remaining 55% to 80% are non-profit). A third of the membership are the big child care chains; the other two-thirds are single-center operators.

The chains believe that child care provision must be more responsive to the marketplace. The changing customer profile from low-income to middle-income means that the orientation of child care providers must change from that of a social service to that of a work-related benefit for families. Changes in government funding are prompting a greater focus on the employer as a funder for child care. Proprietary center entrepreneurs want to meet people's needs at a fair price and to create additional need for their services. For example, it has been found that when a chain-operated day care center comes to town, the number of children in licensed care increases.

Proprietary operators have an interest in the government's role in child care. Seventy percent of them receive some funding from the government, but it is generally less than 5% of their income.

Who Should Provide Early Childhood Education?



Religious Institutions

Presented by The Reverend Eileen Lindner
National Council of Churches of Christ

The National Council of Churches of Christ has 32 church groups with a combined membership of 41 million people. Should the churches provide child care? The fact is that a whole lot of them do now. Early in 1982 we mailed questionnaires to 89,000 churches of 15 NCC member denominations. Of the 25,000 churches responding, about one third reported that day care services were housed on their property. Approximately half of these programs were operated by the church; the other half were independently operated under a rental or use agreement. Of all programs, 55% received indoor space free of charge, and fully 94% received some subsidy either of program operation or tuitions. An in-depth follow-up survey of 1,500 church-housed day care centers revealed that the majority of infant, toddler, and preschool programs offered full-time care, of 45 or more hours per week. The average enrollment was 54 young children. Only 9% of programs had a religious education component.

Churches bring to child care both convenience and conviction. The convenience comes from the neighborhood locations of churches, their facilities, and their tax exemptions. The conviction, despite wide variation in theologies, comes from some belief in community assistance or social justice.

The churches backed into child care without a great deal of organized reflection. Now they need to reflect on why they do these things. Churches can provide the infrastructure for much child care. We do believe, however, that it

continues to be the government's role to provide for the common welfare.

Who Should Provide?

Small Group Discussions

There is great diversity in the arrangements and settings now used for early childhood care and education: families, other home arrangements, center and classroom arrangements, and others. There is strength in this diversity. On the other hand, sometimes parents must deal with as many as three paid providers; from this perspective some consolidation of services is desirable.

The public schools appear to be a candidate to assume expanded leadership in early childhood education. The advantages are that schools—in a time of declining enrollment—have resources (libraries, gymnasiums), extra space, and teachers, plus the advantage of neighborhood convenience. Such settings could offer early childhood educators an opportunity to influence the elementary school curriculum, enhance program continuity for children, and provide a good introduction to the schools for parents. Locating in schools would assist early childhood educators in achieving higher pay and professional status.

Disadvantages of locating in the public schools are the danger of a downward press of scholastic expectations and the possibility that teachers untrained in early childhood education would move into the programs. There is a general fear that public schools may be unresponsive to students and their families, particularly those from minority groups. ■

How Should We Market Early Childhood Education?



How to Get Your Message Across

Presented by Steve Swanson
Bonneville Productions

Bonneville Productions is the organization that does public service announcements for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (the Mormon Church) and several other clients. About ten years ago, the Church administration became interested in using public service announcements as a vehicle to become better known and to express in a positive way a concern with the deterioration of family life. Based on this experience and other marketing experiences, following are some suggestions on how the early childhood field can market its message.

If an organization's efforts seem disjointed, a media campaign can help pull things together. The General Electric media campaign of the last few years is a prime example of an effort that helped customers become aware of the company's product line and gave cohesiveness to the organization.

A marketing effort for early childhood education would consist of research, planning, and communication activities that stimulate awareness, interest, support for, and use of early childhood education. Before engaging in marketing, an organization must be clear about its mission. There is beauty in diversity, but not if the central purpose doesn't come through. Goals should be set. Then research should be carried out. Research in all its forms is the most effective tool for convincing people.

Bonneville Productions does marketing research—regional, national, and local surveys of consumer attitudes. "Focus group research" brings together a dozen or so demographically similar people to check their reaction to some message. This kind of research helps you find out who and where your markets are. You also need to identify the gatekeepers, such as politicians or those who provide access to the media.

In planning, desired audience changes should be identified. Cognitive change means that you want the audience to have new information. Action change means that you want people to take a specified action within a set period of time. Behavioral change is a change in some habit, such as drinking or smoking. Value change, the hardest type of change to produce, must take place in small steps—you should never attack someone else's values directly.

Dissemination can take place through paid media, public relations, or public service announcements. The paid media route provides maximum control over the message, but is very expensive. Public relations consists of press releases, talk show appearances, and tying in with prominent people or popular events. Such multiple activities take lots of work. Public service announcements must be done well, or they won't be used. To be cute is to be remembered. In addition to high quality productions, you need to develop good relationships with the media gatekeepers. The benefits of public service announcements are the same as with paid media, but at no exposure costs.

[Following his presentation, Swanson showed some of the Mormon public service announcements on family life that he discussed in his presentation. These announcements have been widely used by television stations because of their high quality and pithy messages. They movingly portray basic concepts about communication within families.]

Early Childhood Education, Newspapers, and the Public

Presented by Jane Myers
Ann Arbor News

The public thinks that newspapers should provide a public service. But newspapers are businesses that operate for profit—and receive powerful competition from television.

How do you get into the papers? You make news. Wherever many people speak with one voice, you have news. For example, the number of people in the women's movement gives it credibility. There is competition among news sources, not directly in terms of money, but rather in terms of newsworthiness. By newsworthiness we mean the question of whether people will read a story and buy a newspaper, so that advertisers will pay for ads in the paper.

How do you increase your chances of getting into the papers? One way is to become friends with newspaper people. Press releases are rotated quickly. Personal contact helps greatly in ensuring that a press release will be used. Don't forget to thank reporters and their editors when they give you coverage. You are competing for space in the paper. In newspaper offices, you compete for people's time. Be persistent. Recognize that there are slow news days (like Saturday) and slow news months (like August). In communicating with the press, use English, not gobbledegook. A reporter must understand a story to tell it to others.

It is pointless to talk about distorted press coverage to press people. News is necessarily a distortion of life. As Walter Cronkite has said, "I don't have time to tell about all the ships at sea that do not collide."

Newspapers have no position on early childhood education. But animal stories sell more papers. Papers want to talk about what the public wants to hear about.

What does the public think about early childhood education? To find out what the

public can easily find out about early childhood education, I visited the Ann Arbor Library. I found out very little. A 1976 textbook told me that play is important, and not a whole lot else. The library has few books on early childhood education. Apparently, the public does not ask for such books.

Why not? The public does not now pay for early childhood education, as they do for public schools. "Preschool," "early childhood education," and "day care" are yawn words—they would not work well in a headline.

Historically, there are traditions that tell us that children are good, that children are bad, and that children are neither good nor bad. Freud confused the issue further with talk of children's latent sexuality. Some people, like the House of Juda group recently in the news, see physical punishment of children even to the point of death as their way to the Lord. Deep down, we all know how to raise children—because we learned from our parents.

People tend to think little about early childhood education. Children are a weak political constituency. The public needs jazzy stuff to respond to a concern such as young children.

There are no well-delineated liberal or conservative positions on early childhood education. One can infer two basic positions, however, though they are not clearly defined. The conservatives believe that taking children out of their homes is one more way to destroy families and undermine the strength of the nation. The liberals believe that children are a national resource and that the state must assist parents in raising their children.

I did a lengthy article on child care for *The Ann Arbor News* a couple years ago. The public response was quietly positive. The editor, a single mother, strongly encouraged the story. Most people are not very interested in this topic. Editors can be convinced that it is interesting. The problem is to find a reporter who wants to convince an editor that the story is worth doing.

Presented by David Welkart
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

What are our strengths today as early childhood educators? There have been several positive shifts from two decades ago. First, we now have the staff and organization we need to serve disadvantaged children across the country. When Head Start began in 1965, we had virtually no one with training or experience for this task. Second, we have developed a high degree of good will in the community at large. Third, we have the unique strength of a set of research findings that documents the long-term effectiveness of our efforts to provide high quality early childhood education.

The early childhood field faces several difficult challenges. Can we learn to cooperate and to identify those things that we agree about? We should also learn to value the diversity within early childhood care and education. Many kinds of programs can do a good job for children and families. On the other hand, we must face up to the importance of maintaining high quality in programs. The early childhood field also needs to develop greater sophistication in economics. For example, we should come to recognize that, if two programs are assessed as having similar results, the one-year program is more economical than the four-year program.

Whom should we talk to if we want to increase public support for good early childhood programs? We should talk to the public through the media. We should talk to legislators, once we know that there is public support for our cause. An essential audience is people who are now middle-level professionals. They will be the trend-setters of the future. Our message to them is simple: early childhood education is good for children and saves society money.

We are riding the front edge of major social change. Families are having fewer children and they are interested in providing their children with a high quality of experience. A large and still growing number of mothers are finding employment outside the home, thereby increasing the demand for child care. The early childhood field is growing. We are in position to help shape the coming social changes and to build a better quality of life for children and for society.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Group Discussion

Are there other issues involved in institutionalizing early childhood programs besides those discussed at this conference? Another major set of issues has to do with the maintenance of high quality in early childhood programs. High/Scope has plans for dealing with these issues separately, but it should be recognized that they are intimately bound up with

Where Do We Go From Here?



institutionalization issues. In essence, we want to institutionalize high quality early childhood programs. We want to resist the institutionalization of low quality programs.

The dominant theme that emerged from the discussion is that we must engage in more and better communication with each other, with parents, and with those outside the early childhood field. This communication must be two-way; we must listen as well as talk. We are not the only ones with useful information to share about the value and benefits of high quality early childhood education. Some of the ways that this communication should take place are as follows:

1. Those of us in the early childhood field must talk with each other more often. We must arrive at some consensus about defining the core of our work, and we must work together at communicating that commonality effectively.
2. Many of us are members of religious institutions (churches, synagogues). They are potent forces in local communities, and we should join with them in speaking out on behalf of children and the programs that they need.
3. Schools are already involved with

services for young children. Working together, we can improve those services; some early childhood advocates are employed in the schools, but rarely talk to teachers of other grades. We should involve high school teachers in spreading early childhood information among their students who are or will be parents.

4. We should join community groups such as Chambers of Commerce; we can learn from them and they from us.

5. Meetings should be held for community leaders to discuss early childhood education in depth, similar to this conference. The difference would be that local movers and shakers, not just the early childhood advocates, would be involved in the discussion and resolution of problems.

6. Parents in particular are important in the process of institutionalizing early childhood education. Their choice of programs for their children is one factor affecting program quality.

High/Scope was asked to provide advocates with clear messages and informational tools that are needed to make these communications effective. ■

How Should We Market (continued)

Perhaps the easiest route to interesting people in early childhood education is to focus on children. Everybody knows some kids. But don't say that kids need early childhood education. Say that they can benefit from this gift. Children's rights are not a popular cause in this country as they have been in some European countries. A "right" to early childhood education would not be a popular idea. "Family policy" might be an approach that would encompass early childhood care and education. Or we might seek to focus on family well-being

in the broadest sense.

How Should We Market?

Small Group Discussions

In marketing the idea of early childhood education, two questions are important: What is our message? Who are our audiences?

Our message has to do with the fact that we provide care and education for young children and support for their families. Several slogans were suggested, i.e.,

Good preschools make lives better.

*Time is short when children are small:
What is the quality of your child's life?*

Our audiences are parents, funding sources, policy makers, and community leaders. High/Scope's Voices for Children Project is seeking to reach these audiences. It is especially important to seek to organize parents on behalf of early childhood education. This kind of parent involvement has been instrumental in political advances for handicapped children and foster children. ■



RECORDS CERTIFICATION



I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

James O. Smith
Signature of Camera Operator

7/25/89
Date

H

B

6

3

7

The attached spread sheet is prepared from notes
in a meeting with Supt. Daryl Hargraves and
Legislative drafter, Mike Ford, on March 12th.
I have not seen a draft of the proposed changes
but arrived at the numbers using my notes.

Laraine L. Ginn

Revised?

FISCAL NOTE - TAYLOR
MARCH 5, 1986

District	SUB-TOTA UNITS	GEOG. FACTOR	ADJUSTED UNITS	full value	VS = 494,663 Vi / Vs WHEN Vi =	CITY BOROUGHS Pi	PL874 AMOUNTS	B1	B2 = 2576.8012 REAA Pi	BASIC NEED (NOT L.T.85%)	
ADAK	81	0.400	113.40				2,069,611	3,410	1.323	0.850	4,674,433
ALASKA GATEWAY	92	0.200	110.40				741,971	1,438	0.558	0.916	4,905,708
ALEUTIANS	26	0.500	39.00				114,029	1,311	0.509	0.924	1,747,005
ANCHORAGE	3466	0.000	3,466.00	15,755,411,000	387,358	0.783	0.883	311,662			148,342,243
ANNETTE	49	0.050	51.45				1,486,491	3,599	1.397	0.850	2,120,808
BERING STRAITS	208	0.550	322.40				4,141,068	3,359	1.303	0.850	13,289,570
BRISTOL BAY	36	0.550	55.80	101,798,800	422,402	0.854	0.872	330,510			2,359,380
CHATHAM	57	0.100	62.70				987,379	3,227	1.252	0.850	2,584,541
CHUGACH	24	0.200	28.80				205,577	1,600	0.621	0.907	1,266,588
COPPER RIVER	79	0.200	94.80				119,130	207	0.080	0.988	4,541,880
CORDOVA	51	0.150	58.65	120,673,000	309,418	0.626	0.906	22,579			2,577,158
CRAIG	27	0.100	29.70	34,707,400	186,599	0.377	0.943	32,914			1,358,852
DELTA-GREELEY	124	0.200	151.20				1,252,226	1,155	0.448	0.933	6,839,369
DILLINGHAM	59	0.550	91.45	97,669,900	210,043	0.425	0.936	440,065			4,152,145
FAIRBANKS	1193	0.100	1,312.30	4,210,997,700	313,528	0.634	0.905	0			57,587,826
GALENA	19	0.550	29.45	19,149,500	131,161	0.265	0.960	613,114			1,371,408
HAINES	62	0.100	68.20	93,945,500	268,033	0.542	0.919	44,127			3,038,471
HOONAH	30	0.100	33.00	27,845,200	130,118	0.263	0.961	220,433			1,537,202
HYDABURG	16	0.100	17.60	12,688,900	130,813	0.264	0.960	0			819,713
IDITAROD	78	0.550	120.90				1,088,825	2,729	1.059	0.850	4,983,589
JUNEAU	430	0.050	451.50	1,613,388,900	343,274	0.694	0.896	30,070			19,616,172
KAKE	34	0.100	37.40	11,608,000	57,465	0.116	0.983	502,218			1,782,154
KASHUNAMIUT	32	0.55	49.60				0	0	0.000		0
KENAI	818	0.100	899.80	3,290,219,200	384,920	0.778	0.883	212,791			38,543,503
KETCHIKAN	235	0.050	246.75	675,985,100	277,157	0.560	0.916	8,088			10,960,985
KING COVE	14	0.500	21.00	23,230,800	193,590	0.391	0.941	189,499			958,666
KLAWOCK	22	0.100	24.20	5,563,000	35,660	0.072	0.989	419,624			1,160,904
KODIAK	247	0.150	284.05	572,370,700	251,260	0.508	0.924	251,964			12,725,349
KUSPUK	81	0.550	125.55				1,100,658	2,698	1.047	0.850	5,175,265
LAKE & PENINSU	86	0.550	133.30				1,322,920	3,575	1.388	0.850	5,494,726
LOWER KUSKOKWI	373	0.550	578.15				6,543,466	2,446	0.949	0.858	24,045,004
LOWER YUKON	223	0.550	345.65				5,699,330	4,432	1.720	0.850	14,247,952
MAT-SU	802	0.050	842.10	2,367,406,200	252,766	0.511	0.923	26,277			37,707,434
NENANA	18	0.200	21.60	12,881,500	102,234	0.207	0.969	1,842			1,014,967
NOME	98	0.550	151.90	115,712,900	137,309	0.278	0.958	92,128			7,059,212
NORTH SLOPE	167	0.550	258.85	12,876,786,900	11,148,733	22.538	0.850	4,142,183			10,669,991
NORTHWEST ARCT	253	0.550	392.15				3,730,416	2,445	0.949	0.858	16,311,100
PELICAN	8	0.100	8.80	10,155,400	188,063	0.380	0.943	0			492,431
PETERSBURG	63	0.150	72.45	161,219,300	270,275	0.546	0.918	9,929			3,225,710
PRIBILOFS	33	0.500	49.50				742,781	4,431	1.719	0.850	2,640,427
RAILBELT	64	0.200	76.80				106,088	297	0.115	0.983	3,659,989
SAND POINT	13	0.500	19.50	71,086,800	618,146	1.250	0.850	0			803,805
SITKA	137	0.050	143.85	396,227,900	239,557	0.484	0.927	127,433			6,469,548
SKAGWAY	14	0.100	15.40	58,447,100	429,758	0.869	0.870	0			649,475
SOUTHEAST ISLA	93	0.150	106.95				1,131,670	2,471	0.959	0.856	4,440,534
SOUTHWEST REGI	94	0.550	153.45				2,155,860	4,436	1.721	0.850	6,325,324
ST. MARY'S	21	0.550	32.55	4,239,400	36,864	0.075	0.989	475,116			1,560,754
TANANA	14	0.550	21.70	11,195,400	143,531	0.290	0.957	150,396			1,006,565
UNALASKA	20	0.500	30.00	105,309,400	746,875	1.510	0.850	162,133			1,236,623
VALDEZ	82	0.150	94.30	1,740,431,900	2,200,293	4.448	0.850	29,417			3,887,117
WRANGELL	58	0.150	66.70	111,757,000	247,798	0.501	0.925	2,534			2,991,535
YAKUTAT	23	0.200	27.60	17,679,400	112,608	0.228	0.966	158,243			1,292,687
YUKON FLATS	93	0.550	144.15				716,465	1,900	0.738	0.889	6,217,295
YUKON KOYUKUK	101	0.550	156.55				1,920,984	3,223	1.251	0.850	6,453,108
YUPIIT	30	0.55	46.50				0	0	0.000		0
CENTRALIZED CO	61	0	60.81			0.000		0	0.000		2,948,765
	10,739		12,448	44,728,789,100		0	46,410,234				533,182,876
				494,663							

FISCAL NOTE -
MARCH 5, 1986

District	BASIC NEED (NOT L.T.85%)	Pi/(1-Pi) REQUIRED LOCAL EFFORT	ESTIMATED LOCAL INTENSIVE SP. ED.	EFFORT	TOTAL MONEY AVAILABLE
ADAK	4,674,433	5.667		824,900	5,499,333
ALASKA GATEWAY	4,905,708	10.947		448,140	5,353,848
ALEUTIANS	1,747,005	12.107		144,300	1,891,305
ANCHORAGE	148,342,243	7.514	2280000	19,741,427	170,363,670
ANNETTE	2,120,808	5.667		374,260	2,495,068
BERING STRAITS	13,289,570	5.667		2,345,218	15,634,788
BRISTOL BAY	2,359,380	6.806		346,641	2,706,021
CHATHAM	2,584,541	5.667		456,095	3,040,637
CHUGACH	1,266,588	9.738		130,068	1,396,656
COPPER RIVER	4,541,880	81.916		55,446	4,597,326
CORDOVA	2,577,158	9.650		267,073	2,844,232
CRAIG	1,358,852	16.683		81,449	1,440,302
DELTA-GREELEY	6,839,369	13.871		493,075	7,332,444
DILLINGHAM	4,152,145	14.686		282,723	4,434,868
FAIRBANKS	57,587,826	9.515		6,052,163	63,639,989
GALENA	1,371,408	24.157	1199500	56,770	2,627,678
HAINES	3,038,471	11.300		258,888	3,307,359
HOODHAD	1,537,202	24.349		63,133	1,600,335
HYDABURG	819,713	24.253		33,799	853,512
IDITAROD	4,983,589	5.667		879,457	5,863,046
JUNEAU	19,616,172	8.606		2,279,321	21,895,493
KAKE	1,782,154	56.471	500000	31,559	2,313,713
KASHUNAMIUT	0	0.000	50000		
KENAI	38,543,503	7.569		5,092,298	43,635,801
KETCHIKAN	10,960,985	10.905	233500	1,005,156	12,199,641
KING COVE	958,666	16.050	283500	59,729	1,304,895
KLAWOCK	1,160,904	91.593		12,675	1,173,579
KODIAK	12,725,349	12.123	50000	1,049,655	13,825,005
KUSPUK	5,175,265	5.667	216500	913,282	6,395,047
LAKE & PENINSU	5,494,726	5.667	50000	969,658	6,514,384
LOWER KUSKOKWI	24,045,004	6.023		3,992,380	28,037,384
LOWER YUKON	14,247,952	5.667		2,514,345	16,762,297
MAT-SU	37,707,434	12.046		3,130,205	40,837,640
NENANA	1,014,967	31.206		32,525	1,047,492
NONE	7,059,212	22.981		307,178	7,366,391
NORTH SLOPE	10,669,991	5.667	50000	1,882,940	12,602,931
NORTHWEST ARCT	16,311,100	6.027		2,706,214	19,017,314
PELICAN	402,431	16.544		24,325	426,756
PETERSBURG	3,225,710	11.210		287,753	3,513,463
PRIBILOFS	2,040,427	5.667		360,075	2,400,503
RAILBELT	3,659,989	56.808		64,427	3,724,416
SAND POINT	803,805	5.667		141,848	945,653
SITKA	6,469,548	12.774		506,458	6,976,006
SKAGWAY	649,475	6.672	100000	97,348	846,823
SOUTHEAST ISLA	4,440,534	5.952		746,006	5,186,540
SOUTHWEST REGI	4,325,324	5.667		1,116,234	7,441,558
ST. MARY'S	1,560,754	87.889		17,758	1,578,512
TANANA	1,006,565	21.989		45,777	1,052,342
UNALASKA	1,236,623	5.667		218,227	1,454,850
VALDEZ	3,887,117	5.667		685,962	4,573,079
WRANGELL	2,991,535	12.307	1300000	243,081	4,534,617
YAKUTAT	1,292,687	28.240	66500	45,775	1,404,962
YUKON FLATS	6,217,205	8.039		773,349	6,990,554
YUKON KOYUKUK	6,453,108	5.667		1,138,784	7,591,892
YUPIIT	0	0.000			
CENTRALIZED CO	2,948,765	#DIV/0!			
	533,182,876		6,379,500	65,837,333	602,400,943

The attached spread sheet is prepared according to
Sponsor Substitute for HB637. It is impossible to
arrive at a meaningful amount with the bill
written as it is.

Laurence L. Glenn

FISCAL NOTE - TAYLOR
MARCH 5, 1986

DRAFT

DRAFT

VS =

B2 =

District	SUB-TOTA UNITS	GEOG. FACTOR	ADJUSTED UNITS	full value	422,551 Vi / Vs WHEN Vi =	CITY BOROUGH Pi	PL874 AMOUNTS	B1	81/82	438 WAA Pi	BASIC NEED (NOT L.T.85%)	Pi/(1-Pi) LOCAL EFFORT REQUIRED
ADAK	81	0.400	113.40				2,069,611	3,410	7.764	-0.168	-922,029	-0.144
ALASKA GATEWAY	92	0.200	110.40				741,971	1,438	3.283	0.508	2,717,393	1.031
ALEUTIANS	26	0.500	39.00				114,029	1,311	2.992	0.551	1,042,372	1.228
ANCHORAGE	3466	0.000	3,466.00	15,755,411,000	387,358	0.917	311,662				144,963,761	6.270
ANNETTE	49	0.050	51.45				1,486,491	3,599	8.217	-0.233	-580,405	-0.189
BERING STRAITS	208	0.550	322.40				4,141,068	3,359	7.668	-0.150	-2,348,060	-0.131
BRISTOL BAY	36	0.550	55.80	101,798,800	422,402	1.000	330,510				2,300,118	5.667
CHATHAM	57	0.100	62.70				987,379	3,227	7.367	-0.105	-319,401	-0.095
CHUGACH	24	0.200	28.80				205,577	1,600	3.653	0.452	631,452	0.825
COPPER RIVER	79	0.200	94.80				119,130	207	0.473	0.929	4,271,132	13.094
CORDOVA	51	0.150	58.65	120,673,000	309,418	0.732	22,579				2,531,935	8.107
CRAIG	27	0.100	29.70	34,707,400	166,599	0.442	32,914				1,344,810	14.083
DELTA-GREELEY	126	0.200	151.20				1,252,226	1,155	2.637	0.604	4,431,633	1.528
DILLINGHAM	59	0.550	91.45	97,669,900	210,043	0.497	440,065				4,104,248	12.414
FAIRBANKS	1193	0.100	1,312.30	4,210,997,700	313,528	0.742	0				56,556,858	7.985
GALENA	19	0.550	29.45	19,149,500	131,161	0.310	613,114				1,361,767	20.505
HAINES	62	0.100	68.20	93,945,500	268,033	0.634	44,127				2,992,829	9.515
HOONAH	30	0.100	33.00	27,845,200	130,118	0.306	220,433				1,526,400	20.645
HYOABURG	16	0.100	17.60	12,688,900	130,813	0.310	0				813,824	20.505
IDITAROD	78	0.550	120.90				1,088,825	2,729	6.230	0.065	383,737	0.070
JUNEAU	430	0.050	451.50	1,613,388,900	343,274	0.812	30,070				19,228,622	7.210
KAKE	34	0.100	37.40	11,608,000	57,465	0.134	502,218				1,776,713	48.020
KASHUNAMIUT	32	0.55	49.60				0	0	0.000		0	0.000
KENAI	818	0.100	899.80	3,290,219,200	384,920	0.911	212,791				37,672,969	6.318
KETCHIKAN	235	0.050	246.75	675,985,100	277,157	0.656	8,088				10,788,673	9.163
KING COVE	14	0.500	21.00	23,230,800	193,590	0.458	169,499				948,431	13.556
KLAWOCK	22	0.100	24.20	5,563,000	35,660	0.084	419,624				1,158,792	78.365
KODIAK	247	0.150	284.05	572,370,700	251,260	0.595	251,964				12,545,586	10.204
KUSPUK	81	0.550	125.55				1,100,658	2,698	6.159	0.076	463,541	0.082
LAKE & PENINSU	86	0.550	133.30				1,322,920	3,575	8.163	-0.224	-1,451,078	-0.183
LOWER KUSKOKWI	373	0.550	578.15				6,543,466	2,446	5.585	0.162	4,549,781	0.194
LOWER YUKON	223	0.550	345.65				5,699,330	4,432	10.118	-0.518	-8,678,665	-0.341
MAT-SU	802	0.050	842.10	2,367,406,200	252,766	0.598	26,277				37,174,503	10.148
NENANA	18	0.200	21.60	12,881,500	102,234	0.242	1,842				1,009,468	26.545
NOME	98	0.550	151.90	116,712,900	137,309	0.325	92,128				7,007,279	19.513
NORTH SLOPE	167	0.550	258.85	12,876,786,900	11,148,733	26.384	4,142,183				10,669,991	5.667
NORTHWEST ARCT	253	0.550	392.15				3,730,416	2,445	5.581	0.163	3,096,363	0.194
PELICAN	8	0.100	8.80	10,155,400	188,063	0.445	0				392,270	13.981
PETERSBURG	63	0.150	72.45	161,219,300	270,275	0.640	9,929				3,176,170	9.417
PRIBILOFS	33	0.500	49.50				748,731	4,431	10.116	-0.517	-1,241,894	-0.341
RAILBELT	64	0.200	76.80				106,088	297	0.678	0.898	3,345,386	8.826
SAND POINT	13	0.500	19.50	71,086,800	618,146	1.463	0				803,805	5.667
SITKA	137	0.050	143.85	396,227,900	239,557	0.567	127,433				6,382,696	10.758
SKAGWAY	14	0.100	15.40	58,447,100	429,758	1.017	0				632,895	5.555
SOUTHEAST ISLA	93	0.150	106.95				1,131,670	2,471	5.641	0.154	797,707	0.182
SOUTHWEST REGI	99	0.550	153.45				2,155,860	4,436	10.128	-0.519	-3,863,303	-0.342
ST. KARY'S	21	0.550	32.55	4,239,400	36,864	0.087	475,116				1,557,913	75.628
TANANA	14	0.550	21.70	11,195,400	143,531	0.340	150,396				998,672	18.605
UNALASKA	20	0.500	30.00	105,309,400	746,875	1.768	182,133				1,236,623	5.667
VALDEZ	82	0.150	94.30	1,740,431,900	2,200,293	5.207	29,417				3,887,117	5.667
WRANGELL	58	0.150	66.70	111,757,000	247,798	0.586	2,534				2,950,294	10.377
YAKUTAT	23	0.200	27.60	17,679,400	112,608	0.266	158,243				1,285,057	24.063
YUKON FLATS	93	0.550	144.15				716,465	1,900	4.339	0.349	2,440,858	0.538
YUKON KOYUKUK	101	0.550	156.55				1,920,984	3,223	7.359	-0.104	-788,119	-0.094
YUPIIT	30	0.55	46.50				0	0	0.000		0	0.000
CENTRALIZED CO	61	0	60.81				0	0	0.000		2,948,765	#DIV/0!
	10,739		12,448	44,728,789,100	20,907,611	49	29,464,10,234	54,388	124	2	392,714,254	#DIV/0!

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

494,663

HB 637

Section 1 - Establishes a formula for calculating the amount of state aid that each school district receives. The formula in subsection (c) is similar to one used by the state from 1970 to 1980. Each district receives a sum determined by multiplying the basic need of the district, as determined in subsection (b), by an equalized percentage, determined in subsection (c). Federal P.L.-81-874 funds are included in the formula under subsection (d).

Section 2 - Provides for reimbursement of 100 percent of the costs of special education intensive programs to each district.

Section 3 - Amends the present instructional unit allotment for each district.

Section 4 - Increases the base instructional unit value by 8 percent over the existing value. This amount establishes a dollar value for the instructional units allotted to each district.

Section 5 - Requires district to match the amount of state contributed funds in order to receive state aid. Again, the formula in this section was used by the state from 1970 until 1980 and derives from Sec. 4, ch. 238, SLA 1970.

Section 6 - Establishes a grant fund for assisting school district in assessing potential handicapping conditions of pupils.

Section 7 - Amends the definition of "secondary school" to provide that a school if a middle or junior high school, will not qualify as a separate school unless it has at least 200 students, in addition to the other requirements of the definition.

Section 8 - Requests the governor to direct the Department of Education to study the area differentials established in AS 14.17.051.

Section 9 - Effective date section.

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

POUCH Y - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
907-465-3800

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

M E M O R A N D U M

March 11, 1986

SUBJECT: State support for education
SSHB 637

TO: Representative Niilo Koponen

FROM: Michael F. Ford *M.F.*
Legislative Counsel

The following is a sectional analysis of SSHB 637:

Section 1 - Establishes the amount of state aid that each school district is eligible to receive, as calculated by multiplying the basic need as defined in (b) of this section by the equalized percentage in subsections (c) or (d). Provides separate equalized percentages for those districts with assessed valuations, as opposed to those without assessed valuations.

Section 2 - Establishes that the total number of instructional units within each district is equal to (1) the number of units for elementary and secondary schools, (2) the number of units for vocational education, (3) the number of units for special education, and (4) the number of units for bilingual studies.

Section 3 - Provides for 100% reimbursement of special education intensive and assessment programs.

Section 4 - Establishes a formula for funding centralized correspondence study.

Section 5 - Repeals and reenacts the table of allowable instructional units.

Section 6 - Provides an instructional unit allotment for each school district.

Section 7 - Amends the base instructional unit value.

Representative Niilo Koponen
Page 2
March 11, 1986

Section 8 - Establishes a formula for required local effort and requires the local school district to provide matching funds.

Section 9 - Amends the definition of "secondary school."

Section 10 - Effective date.

MFF:mkr
m3/153

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

POUCH Y - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
907-465-3200

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

M E M O R A N D U M

March 13, 1986

SUBJECT: State support for education
SSHB 637

TO: Representative Robin Taylor

FROM: Michael F. Ford *m. f.*
Legislative Counsel

The following is a sectional analysis of SSHB 637:

Section 1 - Establishes the amount of state aid that each city or borough school district is eligible to receive, as the amount calculated by multiplying the basic need as defined in (b) of this section by the equalized percentage in subsection (c). Establishes the amount of state aid that each rural educational attendance area is eligible to receive, as the amount calculated by multiplying the basic need as defined in (b) of this section by the equalized percentage in subsection (d).

Section 2 - Establishes that the total number of instructional units within each district is equal to (1) the number of units for elementary and secondary schools, (2) the number of units for vocational education, (3) the number of units for special education, and (4) the number of units for bilingual studies.

Section 3 - Provides for 100% reimbursement of special education intensive and assessment programs.

Section 4 - Establishes a formula for funding centralized correspondence study.

Section 5 - Repeals and reenacts the table of allowable instructional units.

Section 6 - Provides an instructional unit allotment for each school district.

Representative Robin Taylor
Page 2
March 13, 1986

Section 7 - Amends the base instructional unit value.

Section 8 - Establishes a formula for required local effort and requires the local school district to provide matching funds.

Section 9 - Amends the definition of "secondary school."

Section 10 - Effective date.

MFF:mkr
m3/162

1 IN THE HOUSE

BY TAYLOR

2 2d SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 637

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to state support for education; and
7 providing for an effective date."

8 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

9 * Section 1. AS 14.17.021 is repealed and reenacted to read:

10 Sec. 14.17.021. STATE AID. (a) The amount of state aid that
11 each city and borough school district may qualify for is calculated by
12 multiplying the basic need as defined in (b) of this section by the
13 equalized percentage as defined in (c) of this section. The amount of
14 state aid that each rural educational attendance area may qualify for
15 is calculated by multiplying the basic need as defined in (b) of this
16 section by the equalized percentage as defined in (d) of this section.

17 (b) The basic need of each school district is determined by
18 multiplying the instructional unit allotment of the district as de-
19 termined under AS 14.17.051 by the number of instructional units in
20 the district.

21 (c) The equalized percentage for each city and borough school
22 district is the greater of 85 percent or a percentage computed accord-
23 ing to the formula $P_i = 1 - (1-k) V_i/V_s$ in which

24 (1) P_i (equalized percentage) = percent of need to be
25 provided by the state;

26 (2) k (level of average state percent of basic need) = 85
27 percent;

28 (3) V_i (valuation per pupil in average daily membership in
29 the district) = full and true value of taxable real and personal

1 property within the district divided by the average daily membership
2 of the district;

3 (4) V_s = average of the valuation per pupil in average
4 daily membership for city and borough school districts of the state.

5 (d) The equalized percentage for each rural educational atten-
6 dance area is the greater of 85 percent or a percentage computed
7 according to the formula $P_i = 1 - (1-k) B_1/B_2$ in which

8 (1) P_i (equalized percentage) = percent or need to be
9 provided by the state;

10 (2) k (level or average state support of basic need) = 85
11 percent;

12 (3) B_1 = amount per pupil in average daily membership in
13 the rural educational attendance area of the payment received under 20
14 U.S.C. 236-244, as amended, in the prior fiscal year;

15 (4) B_2 = amount per pupil in average daily membership for
16 all of the rural educational attendance areas in the state or the
17 payment received under 20 U.S.C. 236-244, as amended, in the prior
18 fiscal year.

19 * Sec. 2. AS 14.17.031(a) is amended to read:

20 (a) The total number of instructional units within each school
21 district is the sum of

22 (1) the number of units for elementary schools and the
23 number of units for secondary schools as determined from AS 14.17.-
24 041(a) or [,] (b) [, (c), OR (d)];

25 (2) the number of units for vocational education determined
26 from AS 14.17.041(c) [AS 14.17.041(e)] as approved by the department;

27 (3) the number of units from special education determined
28 from AS 14.17.041(d) [AS 14.17.041(f)] as approved by the department;

29 and

1 (4) [IF THE DISTRICT HAS FIVE OR MORE CORRESPONDENCE PUPILS
2 ENROLLED IN AN APPROVED DISTRICT CORRESPONDENCE STUDY PROGRAM, THE
3 NUMBER OF UNITS FOR CORRESPONDENCE PUPILS DETERMINED BY APPLYING THE
4 NUMBER OF CORRESPONDENCE PUPILS TO AS 14.17.041(a); AND

5 (5)] the number of units for bilingual education determined
6 from AS 14.17.041(e) [AS 14.17.041(g)] as approved by the department.

7 * Sec. 3. AS 14.17 is amended by adding a new section to read:

8 Sec. 14.17.036. SPECIAL EDUCATION INTENSIVE AND ASSESSMENT
9 PROGRAMS. The department shall reimburse 100 percent of the costs of
10 special education intensive programs and programs for assessing poten-
11 tially handicapping conditions of pupils, to each district. The
12 department shall review the costs incurred by each district and may
13 deny reimbursement if the cost incurred was not as a result of a
14 special education intensive program or a program for assessing poten-
15 tial handicapping conditions of pupils.

16 * Sec. 4. AS 14.17 is amended by adding a new section to read:

17 Sec. 14.17.038. FUNDS FOR CENTRALIZED CORRESPONDENCE STUDY.
18 Funds for centralized correspondence study shall be provided by appro-
19 priation from the public school foundation account in an amount equal
20 to the number of instructional units for correspondence pupils de-
21 termined under AS 14.17.041(a), multiplied by the base instructional
22 unit value specified in AS 14.17.056.

23 * Sec. 5. AS 14.17.041 is repealed and reenacted to read:

24 Sec. 14.17.041. TABLE OF ALLOWABLE INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS. (a)
25 Elementary schools:

ADM	No. instructional Units
under 20	2
20 - 32	3
33 - 46	4

1	47 - 62	5
2	63 - 80	6
3	81 - 999	6 plus 1 for each 18 pupils
4		or fraction of 18
5	(b) Secondary schools:	
6	ADM	No. Instructional Units
7	under 33	3
8	33 - 46	4
9	47 - 62	5
10	63 - 80	6
11	81 - 999	6 plus 1 for each 18 pupils
12		or fraction of 18
13	(c) Vocational education schedule:	
14	ADM	No. Instructional Units
15	Full-Time Equivalent	
16	5 - 10	1
17	11 - 25	2
18	26 - 40	3
19	41 and over	3 plus 1 for each 20 pupils
20		or fraction of 20 pupils in
21		Full-Time Equivalent ADM
22	(d) Special education schedule:	
23	ADM	No. Instructional Units
24	Full-Time Equivalent	
25	1 - 15	1
26	16 - 30	2
27	31 - 45	3
28	46 and over	4 plus 1 for each 11 pupils
29		or fraction of 11 pupils in

Full-Time Equivalent ADM

(e) Bilingual education schedule:

Weighted ADM	No. Instructional Units
1 - 12	1
13 - 18	2
19 - 42	3
43 and over	3 plus 1 for each 24 weighted ADM or fraction of 24 weighted ADM

* Sec. 6. AS 14.17.051 is amended to read:

Sec. 14.17.051. INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT ALLOTMENT. The instructional unit allotment for each school district or regional educational attendance area is as follows:

(1) for [GATEWAY BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND] Anchorage School District, the district is entitled to receive the base instructional unit allotment;

(2) for Annette Island School District, Borough of Juneau School District, [PETERSBURG CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, WRANGELL CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,] Sitka Borough School District, and Matanuska-Susitna Borough School District, the district or area is entitled to receive 105 [104] percent of the base instructional unit allotment;

(3) for Craig City School District, Gateway Borough School District, Hydaburg City School District, Klawock City School District, Kake City School District, Chatham School District, Skagway City School District, [SOUTHEAST ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND] Kenai Peninsula Borough School District, [THE DISTRICT OR AREA IS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE 108 PERCENT OF THE BASE INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT ALLOTMENT;

(4) FOR] Pelican City School District, Hoonah City School District, Haines Borough School District and North Star Borough School

1 District, the district or area is entitled to receive 110 [112] per-
2 cent of the base instructional unit allotment;

3 (4) [(5)] for Cordova City School District, Valdez City
4 School District, Southeast Island School District, Kodiak Island
5 School District, Wrangell City School District, and Petersburg City
6 School District [HAINES BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,] the district or area
7 is entitled to receive 115 percent of the base instructional unit
8 allotment;

9 (5) [(6)] for Nenana City School District, Delta School
10 District, Alaska Gateway School District, Upper Railbelt Regional
11 School District, Yakutat City School District, Chugach School Dis-
12 trict, and Copper River School District, the district or area is
13 entitled to receive 120 percent of the base instructional unit allot-
14 ment;

15 (6) [(7)] for Adak Regional School District the area is
16 entitled to receive 140 percent of the base instructional unit allot-
17 ment;

18 (7) [(8)] for Pribilof Islands School District, Aleutian
19 Chain School District, King Cove City School District, Sand Point City
20 School District, and Unalaska City School District, the district or
21 area is entitled to receive 150 percent of the base instructional unit
22 allotment;

23 (8) [(9)] for Yukon Flats School District, Dillingham City
24 School District, Bristol Bay Borough School District, Southwest Re-
25 gional School District, Lake Peninsula School District, Lower Kusko-
26 kwim School District, Galena City School District, Kuspuk School
27 District, Yukon-Koyukuk School District, Northwest Arctic School
28 District, Tanana [SELAWIK] City School District, Nome City School
29 District, Bering Straits School District, Iditarod Area School

1 District, North Slope Borough School District, Lower Yukon School
2 District, Yupit School District, Kashunamiut School District, and St.
3 Mary's City School District, the district or area is entitled to
4 receive 155 percent of the base instructional unit allotment [;

5 (10) FOR KODIAK ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE DISTRICT IS
6 ENTITLED TO RECEIVE 116 PERCENT OF THE BASE INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT ALLOT-
7 MENT).

8 * Sec. 7. AS 14.17.056 is amended to read:

9 Sec. 14.17.056. BASE INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT VALUE. The base in-
10 structional unit value for fiscal years beginning on or after July 1,
11 1986 [1982], is \$48,495 [\$42,450]. [THE BASE INSTRUCTION UNIT VALUE
12 FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 1981, IS \$38,590.]

13 * Sec. 8. AS 14.17 is amended by adding a new section to read:

14 Sec. 14.17.072. REQUIRED LOCAL EFFORT. (a) Payment of state
15 aid to a local school district under this chapter is contingent upon
16 matching by the district in the amount of the required local effort
17 for that district in the ratio of:

18 required local effort to state contribution = $1:Pi/(1-Pi)$.

19 (b) For purposes of this section, Pi = equalized percentage as
20 defined in AS 14.17.021(c) or (d).

21 * Sec. 9. AS 14.17.250(9) is amended to read:

22 (9) "secondary school" means a school of grades 7 - 12
23 [SEVEN THROUGH TWELVE], or an appropriate combination of grades within
24 that range; when grades 7, 8, 9, or 10 [SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE, OR TEN]
25 are organized separately as a middle or junior high school, or grades
26 10 - 12 [TEN THROUGH TWELVE] are organized separately as a senior high
27 school, each school is considered a separate secondary school for the
28 purposes of AS 14.17.010 - 14.17.250 if

29 (A) the school is conducted in a separate school plant

1 facility;

2 (B) the school is accredited by the Northwest Accred-
3 iting Association;

4 (C) the school, if a middle or junior high school,
5 includes a minimum ADM of 200 [10] students in any combination of
6 grades seven, eight or nine [, IF THE SCHOOL WAS IN OPERATION
7 BEFORE JULY 1, 1980; OR

8 (D) THE SCHOOL, IF A MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
9 INCLUDES A MINIMUM ADM OF 20 STUDENTS IN ANY COMBINATION OF
10 GRADES SEVEN, EIGHT OR NINE, IF THE SCHOOL FIRST BEGAN OPERATION
11 ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 1980];

12 * Sec. 10. This Act takes effect July 1, 1986.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

BILL ANALYSIS *for H.B. 637 sub.*

Purpose: It is the intent of this bill to streamline the Public School Foundation enacted in 1970 and suspended by Temporary and Special Acts of the Legislature in 1983, 1984, and 1985.

The streamlining consists of addressing:

1. equalized percentage provisions to include regional educational attendance areas in the equalizing scheme;
2. district costs of assessing students for potentially handicapping conditions;
3. district costs of providing services to severely handicapped children;
4. an adjusted base unit value that reflects the cost of inflation;
5. needed changes to insure that certain programs are conducted for educational, rather than revenue generating reasons; and
6. different interregional costs of doing business.

7. *insure that local wealth is factored in.*
System Analysis:

Section 1 - State aid shall be computed by identifying the number of students participating in a district educational program and applying the number of students to the schedules listed in Section 5, AS 14.17.041 to determine the number of instructional units to which a district is entitled as identified in Section 4, AS 14.17.031

The number of instructional units is multiplied by The base value as provided in Section 8, AS 14.17.056 and adjusted by Section 7, AS 14.17.051. The product identifies a financial entitlement for basic education.

The financial entitlement of each school district is modified by an equalized percentage method that compares the wealth of each district to the wealth of all districts in the state.

Subsection (c) uses assessed valuation of property in each city and borough school district as the method for comparing each district's wealth per student to the average wealth of all city and borough school districts in the state. The ratio established is an inverse one so that the poorer districts receive more from the state than a wealthy one. However, a floor is established so that no district receives less than 90 percent of entitlement.

Subsection (d) uses prior year PL 81-874 payments in each

regional education attendance (REAA's have no assessed valuation) as the method for comparing each district's wealth per student to the average prior year PL 81-874 payments for all regional education attendance areas. The ratio is an inverse one and operates identically to that in subsection (c). REAA's would keep all of their PL 81-874 payment.

It should be noted that "k" the level of support to be provided, is one of the mechanisms which can be used by the legislature to adjust the ration of state/local financial support.

Section 2 - Deletes the separate application of the schedule for correspondence study students. These students and all other alternative program students for which a physical classroom is not required would be counted under the existing schedules.

X Section 3 ^{sec.} Provides that the Department of Education would reimburse the districts for 100 percent of the costs of assessing children for potentially handicapping conditions and the costs of providing services to low incidence handicapped children.

Section 4 - Provides for funding of the Central Correspondence Study Program from the Public School Foundation account by appropriating in the same fashion as if it were a school district.

Section 5 - Identifies the various school and educational program schedules by which a district determines the number of instructional units to which it is entitled.

Section 6 - Places the districts in various groups in recognition of the different geographical costs of doing business. These percentages are used to adjust the base instructional unit value.

It is suggested that an interim committee of the legislature be established by legislative intent to examine the appropriations of these differentials and make recommendations to the next legislature.

Section 7 - Establishes the basic instructional unit value which is used to determine a district's financial entitlement as provided in Section 1.

Section 8 - Requires a local district match to receive the state dollars identified as part of the entitlement in Section 1.

Section 9 - Defines that a district may count a junior high school separately when it meets the condition of having 200 students in the affected grades.

BILL ANALYSIS *for H.B. 637 sub.*

Purpose: It is the intent of this bill to streamline the Public School Foundation enacted in 1970 and suspended by Temporary and Special Acts of the Legislature in 1983, 1984, and 1985.

The streamlining consists of addressing:

1. equalized percentage provisions to include regional educational attendance areas in the equalizing scheme;
2. district costs of assessing students for potentially handicapping conditions;
3. district costs of providing services to severely handicapped children;
4. an adjusted base unit value that reflects the cost of inflation;
5. needed changes to insure that certain programs are conducted for educational, rather than revenue generating reasons; and
6. different interregional costs of doing business.

System Analysis:

Section 1 - State aid shall be computed by identifying the number of students participating in a district educational program and applying the number of students to the schedules listed in Section 5, AS 14.17.041 to determine the number of instructional units to which a district is entitled as identified in Section 4, AS 14.17.031.

The number of instructional units is multiplied by The base value as provided in Section 8, AS 14.17.056 and adjusted by Section 7, AS 14.17.051. The product identifies a financial entitlement for basic education.

The financial entitlement of each school district is modified by an equalized percentage method that compares the wealth of each district to the wealth of all districts in the state.

Subsection (c) uses assessed valuation of property in each city and borough school district as the method for comparing each district's wealth per student to the average wealth of all city and borough school districts in the state. The ratio established is an inverse one so that the poorer districts receive more from the state than a wealthy one. However, a floor is established so that no district receives less than 90 percent of entitlement.

Subsection (d) uses prior year PL 81-874 payments in each

regional education attendance (REAA's have no assessed valuation) as the method for comparing each district's wealth per student to the average prior year PL 81-874 payments for all regional education attendance areas. The ratio is an inverse one and operates identically to that in subsection (c). REAA's would keep all of their PL 81-874 payment.

It should be noted that "k" the level of support to be provided, is one of the mechanisms which can be used by the legislature to adjust the ration of state/local financial support.

Section 2 - Deletes the separate application of the schedule for correspondence study students. These students and all other alternative program students for which a physical classroom is not required would be counted under the existing schedules.

X Section 3 ^{21.01} Provides that the Department of Education would reimburse the districts for 100 percent of the costs of assessing children for potentially handicapping conditions and the costs of providing services to low incidence handicapped children.

Section 4 - Provides for funding of the Central Correspondence Study Program from the Public School Foundation account by appropriating in the same fashion as if it were a school district.

Section 5 - Identifies the various school and educational program schedules by which a district determines the number of instructional units to which it is entitled.

Section 6 - Places the districts in various groups in recognition of the different geographical costs of doing business. These percentages are used to adjust the base instructional unit value.

It is suggested that an interim committee of the legislature be established by legislative intent to examine the appropriations of these differentials and make recommendations to the next legislature.

Section 7 - Establishes the basic instructional unit value which is used to determine a district's financial entitlement as provided in Section 1.

Section 8 - Requires a local district match to receive the state dollars identified as part of the entitlement in Section 1.

Section 9 - Defines that a district may count a junior high school separately when it meets the condition of having 200 students in the affected grades.

HB 637

	AV	AW	AX	AY	AZ	BA
4	SECOND SPONSOR SUSTITUTE FOR HB637					
5	SCHOOL	TOTAL	TOTAL	INST UNIT	BASIC	LEVEL OF
6	DISTRICT	K-12	UNITS	ALLOT. \$	NEED \$	ST SUPP %
7		ADM				
8	ADAK	607	51	68600	3494299	.92
9	ALASKA GTWY	516	66	58800	3902838	.96
10	ALEUTIAN	88	20	73500	1470000	.97
11	ANCHORAGE	40674	2810	49000	137686135	.93
12	ANNETTE	413	36	51450	1842543	.91
13	BERING ST.	1233	177	75950	13472241	.91
14	BRISTOL BAY	241	28	75950	2145573	.98
15	CHATAM	306	44	53900	2371600	.92
16	CHUGACH	129	20	58800	1176000	.96
17	COPPER RIVER	575	66	58800	3862413	.99
18	CORDOVA	390	36	56350	2049720	.98
19	CRAIG	186	21	53900	1111677	.99
20	DELTA GR	1084	83	58800	4865688	.97
21	DILLINGHAM	465	44	75950	3346532	.99
22	FAIRBANKS	13430	929	53900	50052653	.98
23	GALENA	146	17	75950	1291150	.99
24	HAINES	351	36	53900	1920177	.99
25	HOONAH	214	23	53900	1259902	.99
26	HYDABURG	97	17	53900	916300	.99
27	IDITAROD	399	63	75950	4784850	.93
28	JUNEAU	4700	338	51450	17378394	.98
29	KAKE	202	23	53900	1219477	1.00
30	KASHU	166	22	71950	1670000	1.00
31	KENAI	8548	652	53900	35151279	.98
32	KETCHIKAN	2439	180	51450	9282564	.99
33	KING COVE	120	15	73500	1102500	.99
34	KLAWOCK	156	17	53900	916300	1.00
35	KODIAK	2281	200	56350	11244600	.99
36	KUSPUK	408	64	75950	4860800	.93
37	LAKE & PENI	370	67	75950	5088650	.91
38	LOWER KUSK	2676	325	75950	24699867	.94
39	LOWER YK	1286	170	75950	12946589	.89
40	MJT-SU	9366	670	51450	34491385	.99
41	NENANA	126	17	58800	999600	.99
42	NOME	850	73	75950	5553829	.99
43	NORTH SLOPE	1155	137	75950	10391866	.80
44	NW ARCTIC	1526	188	75950	14303577	.94
45	PELICAN	54	9	53900	485100	.99
46	PETERSBURG	597	51	56350	2891448	.99
47	PRIBILOF	169	24	73500	1764000	.89
48	RAILBELT	357	45	58800	2631288	.99
49	SAND POINT	115	15	73500	1102500	.97
50	SITKA	1654	124	51450	6399551	.99
51	SKAGWAY	136	16	53900	862400	.98
52	SOUTHEAST IS	458	73	53900	3934700	.94
53	SOUTHWEST	486	78	75950	5888649	.89
54	ST MARYS	115	21	75950	1594950	1.00
55	TANANA	78	13	75950	987350	.99
56	UNALASKA	141	17	73500	1249500	.96
57	VALDEZ	791	62	56350	3518342	.89
58	WRANGELL	451	40	56350	2264554	.99
59	YAKUTAT	157	18	58800	1058400	.99
60	YUKON FLATS	377	63	75950	4784850	.95
61	YUKON-KOYUKU	582	90	75950	6835500	.92
62	YUPIIT	285	42	75950	3189900	1.00
63	ST CORR STUD	995	67	49000	3283000	1.00
64		105917	8614	3574550	489050453	

AZ:AY

	BB	BC	BD	BE	BF
	SCHOOL	STATE	INTENSIVE	ST SUPP	FY 86 ST.
	DISTRICT	SUPP \$	SERVIC \$	\$/ADM	\$/ADM (ADJ)
5					
6					
7					
8	ADAK	3199116		5270	4163
9	ALASKA GTWY	3763306		7294	7834
10	ALEUTIAN	1422258		16162	19410
11	ANCHORAGE	135043667	2329000	3377	3471
12	ANNETTE	1678266		4064	3824
13	BERING ST.	12284437	25000	9983	3960
14	BRISTOL BAY	2100669	25000	8820	10121
15	CHATAM	2182009	17000	7186	6447
16	CHUGACH	1129387		8755	10810
17	COPPER RIVER	3842607		6683	7296
18	CORDEVA	2018297		5175	5279
19	CRAIG	1101399		5922	7581
20	DELTA GR	4726468		4360	5148
21	DILLINGHAM	3311705		7122	9020
22	FAIRBANKS	49275135	1244000	3762	4102
23	GALENA	1282759		8786	10395
24	HAINES	1894677		5398	7195
25	HOONAH	1251779		5849	6473
26	HYDABURG	910361		9385	9530
27	IDITAROD	4461369	25000	11244	13331
28	JUNEAU	17082826	510000	3743	3827
29	KAKE	1216005	51000	6272	7393
30	KASHU	1670900		10066	10259
31	KENAI	34480902	289000	4068	4361
32	KETCHIKAN	9155096	289000	3872	3916
33	KING COVE	1091925		9099	9751
34	KLAWOCK	914681	51000	6190	7714
35	KODIAK	11104622	221000	4965	5708
36	KUSPUK	4535917	102000	11367	14508
37	LAKE & PENI	4637983		12535	13281
38	LOWER KUSK	23203189		8671	9831
39	LOWER YK	11525137		8962	6751
40	MAT-SU	34059432		3636	3679
41	NENANA	994537		7893	10927
42	NOME	5516045	77000	6580	7452
43	NORTH SLOPE	8313492	50000	7241	9570
44	NW ARCTIC	13437213	25000	8822	8788
45	PELICAN	480580		8900	13879
46	PETERSBURG	2652729		4778	4446
47	PRIBILOF	1570368		9292	8347
48	RAILBELT	2611928		7316	9695
49	SAND POINT	1068734		9293	8846
50	SITKA	6323594	102000	3885	4130
51	SKAGWAY	844037		6200	6265
52	SOUTHEAST IS	3693842		8000	8226
53	SOUTHWEST	5241530	25000	10836	10198
54	ST MARYS	1592037		13844	15544
55	TANANA	980329		12568	14922
56	UNALASKA	1203263	25000	8711	9223
57	VALDEZ	3134789	1248000	5541	4977
58	WRANGELL	2236752		4960	4915
59	YAKUTAT	1052495		6704	8059
60	YUKON FLATS	4559634	75000	12293	14564
61	YUKON-KOYUKU	6289732		10807	11032
62	YUPIIT	3189900	50000	11368	11474
63	ST CORR STUD	3283000		3299	2608
64		472029347	6855000		

	BD	BE	BF	BG	BH	BI
5	SCHOOL	ST SUPP	FY 86 ST.	HB637 AS	FY 86 ST.	HB637 AS %
6	DISTRICT	\$/ADM	\$/ADM (ADJ)	%FY86 (ADJ)	\$/ADM (UNADJ)	FY86 (UNADJ)
7						
8	ADAK	5270	4163	1.27	4163	1.27
9	ALASKA GTWY	7294	7834	.93	7834	.93
10	ALEUTIAN	16162	19410	.83	19410	.83
11	ANCHORAGE	3377	3471	.97	3442	.98
12	ANNETTE	4064	3824	1.06	3824	1.06
13	BERING ST.	9983	9960	1.00	9960	1.00
14	BRISTOL BAY	8820	10121	.87	10121	.87
15	CHATAM	7186	6447	1.11	6447	1.11
16	CHUGACH	8755	10810	.81	10810	.81
17	COPPER RIVER	6683	7296	.92	7296	.92
18	CORDOVA	5175	5279	.98	5230	.99
19	CRAIG	5922	7581	.78	7581	.78
20	DELTA GR	4360	5148	.85	5148	.85
21	DILLINGHAM	7122	9020	.79	9020	.79
22	FAIRBANKS	3762	4102	.92	3836	.98
23	GALENA	8786	10395	.85	10395	.85
24	HAINES	5398	7195	.75	6599	.82
25	HOONAH	5849	6473	.90	6473	.90
26	HYDABURG	9385	9530	.98	9530	.98
27	IDITAROD	11244	13331	.84	13331	.84
28	JUNEAU	3743	3827	.98	3767	.99
29	KAKE	6272	7393	.85	7393	.85
30	KASHU	10066	10259	.98	10259	.98
31	KENAI	4068	4361	.93	4056	1.00
32	KETCHIKAN	3872	3916	.99	3535	1.10
33	KING COVE	9099	9751	.93	9751	.93
34	KLAWOCK	6190	7714	.80	7714	.80
35	KODIAK	4965	5708	.87	5708	.87
36	KUSPUK	11367	14500	.78	14508	.78
37	LAKE & PENI	12535	13281	.94	13281	.94
38	LOWER KUSK	8671	9831	.88	9831	.88
39	LOWER YK	8962	6751	1.30	6751	1.33
40	MAT-SU	3636	3679	.99	3644	1.00
41	NENANA	7893	10927	.72	10927	.72
42	NOME	6580	7452	.88	7452	.88
43	NORTH SLOPE	7241	9570	.76	9570	.76
44	NW ARCTIC	8822	8788	1.00	8788	1.00
45	PELICAN	8900	13879	.64	12936	.69
46	PETERSBURG	4778	4446	1.07	4446	1.07
47	PRIBILOF	9292	8347	1.11	8347	1.11
48	RAILBELT	7316	9695	.75	9695	.75
49	SAND POINT	9293	8846	1.05	8614	1.08
50	SITKA	3885	4130	.94	3859	1.01
51	SKAGWAY	6206	6265	.99	5594	1.11
52	SOUTHEAST IS	8065	8226	.98	8226	.98
53	SOUTHWEST	10836	10198	1.06	10198	1.06
54	ST MARYS	13844	15544	.89	15544	.89
55	TANANA	12568	14922	.84	13895	.90
56	UNALASKA	8711	9223	.94	8538	1.02
57	VALDEZ	5541	4977	1.11	4977	1.11
58	WRANGELL	4960	4915	1.01	4915	1.01
59	YAKUTAT	6704	8059	.83	8059	.83
60	YUKON FLATS	12293	14564	.84	14564	.84
61	YUKON-KOYUKU	10807	11032	.98	11032	.98
62	YUPIIT	11368	11474	.99	11474	.99
63	ST CORR STUD	3299	2608	1.26	2608	1.26
64						

1 IN THE HOUSE

BY TAYLOR

2 2d SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 637

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to state support for education; and
7 providing for an effective date."

8 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

9 * Section 1. AS 14.17.021 is repealed and reenacted to read:

10 Sec. 14.17.021. STATE AID. (a) The amount of state aid that
11 each city and borough school district may qualify for is calculated by
12 multiplying the basic need as defined in (b) of this section by the
13 equalized percentage as defined in (c) of this section. The amount of
14 state aid that each rural educational attendance area may qualify for
15 is calculated by multiplying the basic need as defined in (b) of this
16 section by the equalized percentage as defined in (c) of this section.

17 (b) The basic need of each school district is determined by
18 multiplying the instructional unit allotment of the district as de-
19 termined under AS 14.17.051 by the number of instructional units in
20 the district.

21 (c) The equalized percentage for each district is the greater of
22 80 percent or a percentage computed according to the formula $P_i = 1 -$
23 $(1-k) V_i/V_s$ in which

24 (1) P_i (equalized percentage) = percent of need to be
25 provided by the state;

26 (2) k (level of average state support of basic need) = 97
27 percent;

28 (3) V_i = full and true value of taxable real and personal
29 property within the district multiplied by two mills and divided by

1 the average daily membership of the district and, if a rural educa-
2 tional attendance area, plus the amount per pupil in average daily
3 membership in the rural educational attendance area of the payment
4 received under 20 U.S.C. 236-244, as amended, in the prior fiscal
5 year;

6 (4) $V_s = V_i$ for all districts multiplied by the average
7 daily membership for all districts divided by the total average daily
8 membership of all districts.

9 * Sec. 2. AS 14.17.031(a) is amended to read:

10 (a) The total number of instructional units within each school
11 district is the sum of

12 (1) the number of units for elementary [SCHOOLS] and [THE
13 NUMBER OF UNITS FOR] secondary schools as determined from AS 14.17.-
14 041(a) or [,] (b) [, (c), OR (d)];

15 (2) the number of units for vocational education determined
16 from AS 14.17.041(c) [AS 14.17.041(e)] as approved by the department;

17 (3) the number of units from special education determined
18 from AS 14.17.041(d) [AS 14.17.041(f)] as approved by the department;
19 and

20 (4) [IF THE DISTRICT HAS FIVE OR MORE CORRESPONDENCE PUPILS
21 ENROLLED IN AN APPROVED DISTRICT CORRESPONDENCE STUDY PROGRAM, THE
22 NUMBER OF UNITS FOR CORRESPONDENCE PUPILS DETERMINED BY APPLYING THE
23 NUMBER OF CORRESPONDENCE PUPILS TO AS 14.17.041(a); AND

24 (5)] the number of units for bilingual education determined
25 from AS 14.17.041(e) [AS 14.17.041(g)] as approved by the department.

26 * Sec. 3. AS 14.17 is amended by adding a new section to read:

27 Sec. 14.17.036. SPECIAL EDUCATION INTENSIVE PROGRAMS. The
28 department shall reimburse 100 percent of the costs of special educa-
29 tion intensive programs to each district. The department shall review

1 the costs incurred by each district and may deny reimbursement if the
2 cost incurred was not as a result of a special education intensive
3 program.

4 * Sec. 4. AS 14.17 is amended by adding a new section to read:

5 Sec. 14.17.038. FUND FOR CENTRALIZED CORRESPONDENCE STUDY.
6 Funds for centralized correspondence study shall be provided by appro-
7 priation from the public school foundation account in an amount equal
8 to the number of instructional units for correspondence pupils de-
9 termined under AS 14.17.041(b), multiplied by the base instructional
10 unit value specified in AS 14.17.056.

11 * Sec. 5. AS 14.17.041 is repealed and reenacted to read:

12 Sec. 14.17.041. TABLE OF ALLOWABLE INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS. (a)
13 Elementary and secondary schools:

ADM (K - 12)	No. Instructional Units
under 12	2
12 - 18	3
19 - 26	4
27 - 35	6
36 - 45	7
46 - 56	8
57 - 68	9
69 - 81	10
82 - 95	11
96 - 110	12
111 - 126	13
127 - 143	14
144 - 161	15
162 - 178	16
179 - 200	17

1 (b) A district with average daily membership equal to or greater
2 than 81 pupils in elementary and ^{81 pupils in} secondary school shall receive
3

4 an additional eight units plus one unit for each additional
5 16 pupils or fraction of 16.

6 (c) Vocational education schedule:

7 ADM	No. Instructional Units
8 Full-Time Equivalent	
9 5 - 10	1
10 11 - 25	2
11 26 - 40	3
12 41 and over	3 plus 1 for each 20 pupils ; 13 or fraction of 20 pupils in 14 Full-Time Equivalent ADM

15 (d) Special education schedule:

16 ADM	No. Instructional Units
17 Full-Time Equivalent	
18 1 - 15	1
19 16 - 30	2
20 31 - 45	3
21 46 and over	4 plus 1 for each 11 pupils 22 or fraction of 11 pupils in 23 Full-Time Equivalent ADM

24 (e) Bilingual education schedule:

25 Weighted ADM	No. Instructional Units
26 1 - 12	1
27 13 - 18	2
28 19 - 42	3
29 43 and over	3 plus 1 for each 24

weighted ADM or fraction of
24 weighted ADM

* Sec. 6. AS 14.17.051 is amended to read:

Sec. 14.17.051. INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT ALLOTMENT. The instructional unit allotment for each school district or regional educational attendance area is as follows:

(1) for [GATEWAY BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND] Anchorage School District, the district is entitled to receive the base instructional unit allotment;

(2) for Annette Island School District, Borough of Juneau School District, Gateway Borough School District. [PETERSBURG CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, WRANGELL CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,] Sitka Borough School District, and Matanuska-Susitna Borough School District, the district or area is entitled to receive 105 [104] percent of the base instructional unit allotment;

(3) for Craig City School District, Hydaburg City School District, Klawock City School District, Kake City School District, Chatham School District, Skagway City School District, [SOUTHEAST ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND] Kenai Peninsula Borough School District, [THE DISTRICT OR AREA IS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE 108 PERCENT OF THE BASE INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT ALLOTMENT;

(4) FOR] Pelican City School District, Hoonah City School District, Southeast Island School District, Haines Borough School District and North Star Borough School District, the district or area is entitled to receive 110 [112] percent of the base instructional unit allotment;

(4) [(5)] for Cordova City School District, Valdez City School District, Kodiak Island School District, Wrangell City School District. and Petersburg City School District [HAINES BOROUGH SCHOOL

1 DISTRICT,) the district or area is entitled to receive 115 percent of
2 the base instructional unit allotment;

3 (5) [(6)] for Nenana City School District, Delta School
4 District, Alaska Gateway School District, Upper Railbelt Regional
5 School District, Yakutat City School District, Chugach School Dis-
6 trict, and Copper River School District, the district or area is
7 entitled to receive 120 percent of the base instructional unit allot-
8 ment;

9 (6) [(7)] for Adak Regional School District the area is
10 entitled to receive 140 percent of the base instructional unit allot-
11 ment;

12 (7) [(8)] for Pribilof Islands School District, Aleutian
13 Chain School District, King Cove City School District, Sand Point City
14 School District, and Unalaska City School District, the district or
15 area is entitled to receive 150 percent of the base instructional unit
16 allotment;

17 (8) [(9)] for Yukon Flats School District, Dillingham City
18 School District, Bristol Bay Borough School District, Southwest Re-
19 gional School District, Lake Peninsula School District, Lower Kusko-
20 kwim School District, Galena City School District, Kuspuk School
21 District, Yukon-Koyukuk School District, Northwest Arctic School
22 District, Tanana [SELAWIK] City School District, Nome City School
23 District, Bering Straits School District, Iditarod Area School Dis-
24 trict, North Slope Borough School District, Lower Yukon School Dis-
25 trict, Yupit School District, Kashunamiut School District, and St.
26 Mary's City School District, the district or area is entitled to
27 receive 155 percent of the base instructional unit allotment [;

28 (10) FOR KODIAK ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE DISTRICT IS
29 ENTITLED TO RECEIVE 116 PERCENT OF THE BASE INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT

1 ALLOTMENT].

2 * Sec. 7. AS 14.17.056 is amended to read:

3 Sec. 14.17.056. BASE INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT VALUE. The base in-
4 structional unit value for fiscal years beginning on or after July 1
5 1986 [1982], is \$49,000 [\$42,450]. [THE BASE INSTRUCTION UNIT VALUE
6 FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 1981, IS \$38,590.]

7 * Sec. 8. AS 14.17 is amended by adding a new section to read:

8 Sec. 14.17.072. REQUIRED LOCAL EFFORT. (a) Payment of state
9 aid to a local school district under this chapter is contingent upon
10 matching by the district in the amount of the required local effort
11 for that district in the ratio of:

12 required local effort to state contribution = $1:Pi/(1-Pi)$.

13 (b) For purposes of this section, Pi = equalized percentage as
14 defined in AS 14.17.021(c).

15 * Sec. 9. AS 14.17.250(4) is repealed and reenacted to read:

16 (4) "elementary school" means a school consisting of grades
17 K - 7;

18 * Sec. 10. AS 14.17.250(9) is repealed and reenacted to read:

19 (9) "secondary school" means a school consisting of grades
20 7 - 12;

21 * Sec. 11. AS 14.17.022, 14.17.023, 14.17.031(b) and (c) are repealed.

22 * Sec. 12. This Act takes effect July 1, 1986.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29



RECORDS CERTIFICATION



I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

James O. Smith
Signature of Camera Operator

7/25/89
Date

H B

G 7 O

**STATE OF ALASKA 1986 LEGISLATIVE SESSION
FISCAL NOTE**

Revision Date: _____

REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No.: CSHB 640 (HESS)
 Title: An Act relating to the State
 Physical Therapy Board;

Sponsor: House HESS
 Requester: House HESS
 Date of Request: _____

FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected: Commerce & Economic Dev.
 BRU: Occupational Licensing

Components: _____

EXPENDITURES / REVENUES : (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
PERSONAL SERVICES		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TRAVEL		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
CONTRACTUAL		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
SUPPLIES		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
EQUIPMENT		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
---------	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

FUNDING: (Thousands of dollars)

GENERAL FUND		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

POSITIONS:

FULLTIME		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
PARTTIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS: Attach a separate page if necessary.

The bill extends the State Physical Therapy Board for four years and enacts a re-write of AS 08.84.120 relating to REFUSAL, REVOCATION, AND SUSPENSION OF LICENSE. The bill also classifies a violation as a Class B Misdemeanor. In addition, the bill repeals sections relating to practice by referral, therefore allowing physical therapists to practice independently. The bill is not expected to generate new costs or revenues.

Prepared by: Jennifer Strickler, Management Analyst
 Division: Occupational Licensing

Phone: 465-2144
 Date: 3-17-86

Approved by Commissioner: [Signature]
 Agency: Commerce & Economic Development

Date: 3/17/86

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note):

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

HOUSE
COMMITTEE REPORT

LABOR & COMMERCE

(7)

Date referred: 2/17/86

FURTHER REFERRALS: FINANCE

DATE: Feb 24, 1986

HEALTH, EDUCATION AND
The SOCIAL SERVICES

Committee has considered HB 640

"An Act relating to the State Physical Therapy Board; and providing for an effective date."

and recommends:

- do pass
- do not pass
- do pass with attached amendment(s)
- no recommendation
- replace with CSHB 640 (HESS) same title
- new title

and recommends do pass

further referral to the _____ Committee

- and attaches:
- letter of intent
 - first fiscal note
 - new fiscal note
 - zero fiscal note

*Sunset Review
Report attached*

SIGNING DO PASS:

SIGNING O'

Max Rosenberg
Katie Hurley
 vice chair
Robin L. Taylor
David W. Thompson
W. K. Korman
Clare Shalvey

W. K. Korman no vote

Max Rosenberg
 Chairman
W. K. Korman co-chair

STATE OF ALASKA 1986 LEGISLATIVE SESSION
FISCAL NOTE

Revision Date : _____

REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. : HB 640
 Title : Continuation of the
State Physical Therapy Board
 Sponsor : House HESS
 Requestor : _____
 Date of Request : _____

FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected : Commerce & Econ. Dev.
 BRU : Occupational Licensing
 Components : _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES : (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CAPITAL						
----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
----------------	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

FUNDING : (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

POSITIONS :

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : Attach a separate page if necessary

This bill provides for continuation of the State Physical Therapy Board and allows physical therapists to practice independently.

No new costs or revenues are expected to be generated by the bill.

Prepared by: Jennifer Strickler, Mgnt. Analyst Phone: 465-2144
 Division: Occupational Licensing Date: 2/20/86

Approved by Commissioner: _____ Date: 2/20/86
 Agency: Commerce & Economic Development

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note):

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

Original sponsor: Health, Education and
Social Services Committee

IN THE HOUSE

BY THE HEALTH, EDUCATION AND
SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 640 (HESS)
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

A BILL

For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to the State Physical Therapy Board;
and providing for an effective date."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

* Section 1. AS 08.03.010(c)(8) is amended to read:

(8) State Physical Therapy Board (AS 08.84.010) -- June 30,
1990 [1986].

* Sec. 2. AS 08.84.120 is repealed and reenacted to read:

Sec. 08.84.120. REFUSAL, REVOCATION, AND SUSPENSION OF LICENSE.

(a) The board may refuse to license an applicant, may refuse to renew
the license of a person, and may suspend or revoke the license of a
person who

(1) has obtained or attempted to obtain a license by fraud
or material misrepresentation;

(2) uses drugs or alcohol in a manner that affects the
person's ability to practice physical therapy competently and safely;

(3) has been convicted of a state or federal felony or
other crime that effects the person's ability to practice competently
and safely;

(4) is guilty, in the judgment of the board, of gross
negligence or malpractice or has engaged in conduct contrary to the
recognized standards of ethics of the physical therapy profession;

(5) has continued to practice physical therapy after becom-
ing unfit due to physical or mental disability;

(6) has failed to refer a patient to another qualified

professional when the patient's condition is beyond the training or ability of the physical therapist; or

(7) as a physical therapy assistant, has attempted to practice physical therapy that has not been initiated, supervised, and terminated by a licensed physical therapist.

(b) The refusal or suspension of a license may be modified or rescinded if the person has been rehabilitated to the satisfaction of the board.

* Sec. 3. AS 08.84.130 is amended to read:

Sec. 08.84.130. FALSE CLAIM OF LICENSE FORBIDDEN. (a) A person not licensed as a physical therapist, or whose license is suspended or revoked, or whose license is lapsed, who uses in connection with the person's name the words or letters "L.P.T.", "Licensed Physical Therapist," or other letters, words, or insignia indicating or implying that the person is a licensed physical therapist, or who in any way, orally, or in writing, directly or by implication, holds out as a licensed physical therapist is guilty of a class B misdemeanor.

(b) A person not licensed as a physical therapy assistant, or whose license is suspended or revoked, or whose license is lapsed, who in any way, orally, or in writing, directly or by implication, holds out as a licensed physical therapy assistant is guilty of a class B misdemeanor.

* Sec. 4. AS 08.84.140 is amended to read:

Sec. 08.84.140. PENALTY FOR FRAUD IN OBTAINING LICENSE. A person who wilfully makes a false oath or affirmation or who obtains or attempts to obtain a license by a fraudulent representation is guilty of a class B misdemeanor.

* Sec. 5. AS 08.84.160 is amended to read:

Sec. 08.84.160. PRACTICE OF LICENSED PHYSICAL THERAPIST. [A

PERSON LICENSED UNDER THIS CHAPTER MAY NOT TREAT HUMAN AILMENTS BY PHYSICAL THERAPY OR OTHERWISE EXCEPT UNDER THE PRESCRIPTION AND DIRECTION OF A PERSON LICENSED TO PRACTICE MEDICINE, OSTEOPATHY, DENTISTRY OR PODIATRY.] This chapter does not authorize any person to practice medicine, osteopathy, chiropractic, or other method of healing.

* Sec. 6. AS 08.84.185(a) is amended to read:

(a) In addition to action under AS 08.84.180, upon a finding that by reason of demonstrated problems of competence, experience, education, or health the authority to practice physical therapy should be limited or conditioned or the practitioner disciplined, the board may reprimand, censure, place on probation, restrict practice by specialty, procedure, or facility, require additional education or training, or revoke or suspend a license [REGISTRATION].

* Sec. 7. AS 08.84.170 is repealed.

* Sec. 8. This Act takes effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.-10.070(c).



Alaska State Legislature
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION
AND SOCIAL SERVICES

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POUCHV
JUNEAU, AK 99811
465-3759

February 24, 1986

Representative Ben Grussendorf
Speaker of the House
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. Speaker:

The House Committee on Health, Education and Social Services has considered the Sunset Review of the State Physical Therapy Board, and recommends that the board be continued. The Committee has introduced HB 640 to fulfill the findings of the Division of Legislative Audit.

As required by AS 44.60.050 (c), the Committee submits the following findings:

(1) the extent to which the board, commission or program has operated in the public interest.

The board has established regulations governing the duties and licensure requirements, has enforced their licensing statute in a uniform and consistent manner and has held meetings and administered examinations in accordance with the law.

(2) the extent to which the operation of the board, commission or agency program has been impeded or enhanced by existing statutes, procedures, and practices which it has adopted, and any other matter, including budgetary, resource, and personnel matters.

Funding for the board was reduced from \$5,200 in FY 84 to \$1,700 in FY 85. As a result, the number of meetings dropped from three each in FY 83 and 84 to two in FY 85. The House HESS Committee is concerned because physical therapist's and physical therapy assistant's fees create annual revenues of \$8,129 while annual expenditures average only \$3,417 (see Appendix A to the 9/23/85 Legislative Audit of the State Physical Therapy Board). It therefore appears that income from licensing fees exceeded expenditures by 238%.

The Committee therefore requests that the Division of Occupational Licensing seriously consider ~~reducing fees significantly and~~ restoring necessary board expenses, such as the number of meetings, if requested by the board.

The Committee further requests that the Division report in writing to the Committee by May 1, 1986 the action it is taking in response to this request.

- (3) the extent to which the board, commission or agency has recommended statutory changes which are generally of benefit to the public interest.

The board supported a statutory change recommended by the Physical Therapy Association to allow physical therapists to practice autonomously. This recommendation was suggested by the Division of Legislative Audit and supported by the committee, and is included in HB 640.

Another statutory amendment recommended by the board was to allow foreign-trained physical therapists to practice in Alaska. The statute was amended accordingly in 1980.

- (4) the extent to which the board, commission or agency has encouraged interested persons to report to it concerning the effect of its regulations and decisions on the effectiveness of service, economy of service, and availability of service which it has provided.

Notification of meetings have been published in newspapers in Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau. Meetings have been held in each of these locations, and public notice posters announcing meetings have been distributed to physical therapy departments statewide.

- (5) the extent to which the board, commission or agency has encouraged public participation in the making of its regulations and decisions.

Newspaper notice of proposed regulation changes are published statewide as required by the Administrative procedures Act.

- (6) the efficiency with which public inquiries or complaints regarding the activities of the board, commission or agency filed with it, with the department to which the board or commission is administratively assigned, or with the office of the ombudsman have been processed or resolved.

The Office of the Ombudsman and the Attorney General's Office have no outstanding consumer complaints about the Physical Therapy Board.

- (7) the extent to which the board or commission which regulates entry into an occupation or profession has presented qualified applicants to serve the public.

169 physical therapists and 11 physical therapy assistants are licensed in the state, with no evidence that unqualified applicants have been licensed.

- (8) the extent to which state personnel practices, including affirmative action practices, have been complied with by the board, commission or agency to its own activities and the area of activity or interest.

No complaints have been filed with the office of Equal Employment Opportunity relating to the Physical Therapy Board.

(9) the extent to which statutory, regulatory, budgeting or other changes are necessary to enable the agency, board or commission to better serve the interests of the public and to comply with the factors enumerated in this subsection.

The Division of Legislative Audit recommended that the licensing statute be amended to allow independent practice of physical therapists in the state as a way of saving money for the consumer. This recommendation was included by the Committee in HB 640.

As required by AS 44.60.050 (d), the Committee submits the following findings:

(1) an identification of the problems or the needs that the programs and activities of the board, commission or agency are intended to address.

The purpose of the board is to protect the public against unqualified practitioners of physical therapy.

(2) a statement, to the extent practicable, of the objectives of the program of the board, commission, or agency program, and its anticipated accomplishments.

The board is to license qualified physical therapists and physical therapy assistants in the state to protect the public welfare.

(3) an identification of any other programs having similar, conflicting or duplicate objectives.

There are no duplicate programs.

(4) an assessment of alternative methods of achieving the purposes of the program.

The Committee did not discuss any alternative methods for licensure for this profession.

(5) an assessment of the consequences of eliminating the board, commission or program and consolidating its activities with another program, or of funding it at a lower level.

The Committee did not consider eliminating the board. The Division of Legislative Audit and the Division of Occupational Licensing recommended that the board be continued to serve the public welfare. There was no discussion of further budget reductions, in fact, as set forth above, the Committee questions the current level of fees and the need for restoring the board to its former level of operations.

(6) a justification for the recommended continuation or extension of the board, commission or program, and an explanation of the manner in which it avoids duplication of or conflict with other efforts.

The board will be especially important in monitoring the profession with the addition of independent practice for the therapists to

safeguard against any unanticipated results. Other states which have allowed independent practice have experienced no difficulties regarding practice or insurance.

(7) any other information which, in the opinion of the committee, would improve the performance of the board, commission or agency with respect to its representation of and responsiveness to the public interest.

There are no additional recommendations.

Representative Max F. Gruenberg, Jr., Co-Chair
House Health, Education and Social Services Committee

Representative Niilo Koponen, Co-Chair
House Health, Education and Social Services Committee

Utermohle
2/24/86 ✓

Original sponsor: Health, Education and
Social Services Committee

1 IN THE HOUSE BY THE HEALTH, EDUCATION AND
SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

2 CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 640 (HESS)

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to the State Physical Therapy Board;
7 and providing for an effective date."

8 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

9 * Section 1. AS 08.03.010(c)(8) is amended to read:

10 (8) State Physical Therapy Board (AS 08.84.010) -- June 30,
11 1990 [1986].

12 * Sec. 2. AS 08.84.120 is repealed and reenacted to read:

13 Sec. 08.84.120. REFUSAL, REVOCATION, AND SUSPENSION OF LICENSE.

14 (a) The board may refuse to license an applicant, may refuse to renew
15 the license of a person, and may suspend or revoke the license of a
16 person who

17 (1) has obtained or attempted to obtain a license by fraud
18 or material misrepresentation;

19 (2) uses drugs or alcohol in a manner that affects the
20 person's ability to practice physical therapy competently and safely;

21 (3) has been convicted of a state or federal felony or
22 other crime that effects the person's ability to practice competently
23 and safely;

24 (4) is guilty, in the judgment of the board, of gross
25 negligence or malpractice or has engaged in conduct contrary to the
26 recognized standards of ethics of the physical therapy profession;

27 (5) has continued to practice physical therapy after becom-
28 ing unfit due to physical or mental disability;

29 (6) has failed to refer a patient to another qualified

1 professional when the patient's condition is beyond the training or
2 ability of the physical therapist; or

3 (7) as a physical therapy assistant, has attempted to
4 practice physical therapy that has not been initiated, supervised, and
5 terminated by a licensed physical therapist.

6 (b) The refusal or suspension of a license may be modified or
7 rescinded if the person has been rehabilitated to the satisfaction of
8 the board.

9 * Sec. 3. AS 08.84.130 is amended to read:

10 Sec. 08.84.130. FALSE CLAIM OF LICENSE FORBIDDEN. (a) A person
11 not licensed as a physical therapist, or whose license is suspended or
12 revoked, or whose license is lapsed, who uses in connection with the
13 person's name the words or letters "L.P.T.", "Licensed Physical Thera-
14 pist," or other letters, words, or insignia indicating or implying
15 that the person is a licensed physical therapist, or who in any way,
16 orally, or in writing, directly or by implication, holds out as a
17 licensed physical therapist is guilty of a class B misdemeanor.

18 (b) A person not licensed as a physical therapy assistant, or
19 whose license is suspended or revoked, or whose license is lapsed, who
20 in any way, orally, or in writing, directly or by implication, holds
21 out as a licensed physical therapy assistant is guilty of a class B
22 misdemeanor.

23 * Sec. 4. AS 08.84.140 is amended to read:

24 Sec. 08.84.140. PENALTY FOR FRAUD IN OBTAINING LICENSE. A
25 person who wilfully makes a false oath or affirmation or who obtains
26 or attempts to obtain a license by a fraudulent representation is
27 guilty of a class B misdemeanor.

28 * Sec. 5. AS 08.84.160 is amended to read:

29 Sec. 08.84.160. PRACTICE OF LICENSED PHYSICAL THERAPIST. [A

1 PERSON LICENSED UNDER THIS CHAPTER MAY NOT TREAT HUMAN AILMENTS BY
2 PHYSICAL THERAPY OR OTHERWISE EXCEPT UNDER THE PRESCRIPTION AND DIREC-
3 TION OF A PERSON LICENSED TO PRACTICE MEDICINE, OSTEOPATHY, DENTISTRY
4 OR PODIATRY.] This chapter does not authorize any person to practice
5 medicine, osteopathy, chiropractic, or other method of healing.

6 * Sec. 6. AS 08.84.185(a) is amended to read:

7 (a) In addition to action under AS 08.84.180, upon a finding
8 that by reason of demonstrated problems of competence, experience,
9 education, or health the authority to practice physical therapy should
10 be limited or conditioned or the practitioner disciplined, the board
11 may reprimand, censure, place on probation, restrict practice by
12 specialty, procedure, or facility, require additional education or
13 training, or revoke or suspend a license [REGISTRATION].

14 * Sec. 7. AS 08.84.170 is repealed.

15 * Sec. 8. This Act takes effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.-
16 10.070(c).