1997-98 SESSION COMMITTEE HEARING RECORDS

Committee Name:

Joint Committee on Finance (JC-Fi)

Sample:

Record of Comm. Proceedings … RCP
- 05hrAC-EdR_RCP_pt01a
- 05hrAC-EdR_RCP_pt01b
- 05hrAC-EdR_RCP_pt02

- Appointments … Appt
- **

- Clearinghouse Rules … CRule
- **

- Committee Hearings … CH
- **

- Committee Reports … CR
- **

- Executive Sessions … ES
- **

- Hearing Records … HR
- **

- Miscellaneous … Misc
- 97hrJC-Fi_Misc_pt96c_LFB

- Record of Comm. Proceedings … RCP
- **

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Transfer of Certain AODA Programs from DPI to DHFS (DPI and DHFS)

[LFB Summary: Page 316, #14 and Page 491, #46]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) administers seven state-funded and one federally-funded alcohol and other drug abuse (AODA) prevention and intervention programs that provide funding to school districts.

Assistance to Schools for AODA Programs. DPI receives an allocation from the monies collected by the state through the 23% penalty assessment surcharge imposed on certain fines and forfeitures. DPI's share of this revenue, set by current statute at 13.6% of the total amount collected, is used to (a) provide grants to local school districts to fund projects related to the prevention of and intervention in pupil AODA problems; (b) provide grants for school staff development programs in AODA prevention, intervention and instruction; and (c) fund positions to administer the grants and provide in-service training, technical assistance and information to school districts. A local match of at least 20% of total project costs is required for all grants. In 1996-97, base funding for this grant program is $1,296,200 PR, with an additional $660,400 PR for program administration and technical assistance.

Early AODA Prevention and Intervention Programs. This program consists of four separate grant programs: (1) Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE); (2) Families and Schools Together (FAST); (3) pupil AODA projects; and (4) after-school/summer school grants. Total funding for these programs is $2,720,000 GPR. DPI is statutorily required to allocate $995,000 for DARE, $1,000,000 for FAST, $300,000 for grants for pupil AODA projects and $425,000 for after-school/summer school grants. DPI is authorized to transfer funding among these programs if the amounts allocated will not be fully utilized in a given program. These transfers

must be made by November 1 or within 120 days after the effective date of the biennial budget act, whichever is later. Annually, DPI must submit a report to the Joint Committee on Finance describing all transfers.

Through DARE, a school board may contract with a city or county to provide drug abuse resistance education to pupils in grades three to nine using law enforcement officers trained in DARE instruction.

The FAST program provides early intervention and prevention services to pupils ages six through eleven who have a high risk of dropping out of school, experiencing AODA problems or being adjudged delinquent. Program activities must involve school, family and community participation, including mental health and AODA specialists. DPI may award grants up to $50,000 to school districts with small and medium memberships (less than 10,000) and up to $70,000 to school districts with large memberships (10,000 or more).

DPI awards pupil AODA grants of up to $1,000 to school districts for education, prevention or intervention projects designed by pupils enrolled in the school district. Grants must be equally distributed on a statewide basis to the extent possible and must be used to pay for the costs of the pupil projects.

Finally, DPI awards after-school/summer school grants of up to $30,000 to school districts with higher-than-average dropout rates to implement an after-school or summer school program for pupils in grades one to nine, in cooperation with community-based organizations. The program, which must be coordinated with the district's children-at-risk program and include tutoring services, is intended to develop pupils' interests and skills to prevent AODA problems. Grants may not exceed 80% of the cost of the program, and no more than 7% of the grant may be used for administration.

Youth AODA Programs. Grants are made to school districts for the development or expansion of K-12 AODA prevention and intervention curriculum or, if a district already has such a curriculum, the development or expansion of an AODA prevention and intervention program. Programs must meet standards established by DPI and are required to: (1) provide staff training in AODA prevention; (2) provide a pupil assistance program; (3) develop and implement a K-12 AODA curriculum; (4) provide instruction to pupils in ways to deal effectively with social pressures and gain positive self-esteem; and (5) give teachers release time to participate in training and pupil assistance programs. In awarding grants, DPI must give priority to school districts in which no pupil assistance program is available. In 1996-97, base level funding for youth AODA grants is $1,800,000 GPR.

Alcohol and Traffic Safety Education Program. ATS is intended to inform pupils of the hazards of drunken driving through the provision of consultant services, curriculum development, in-service training and grants to school districts. Funding is derived from a portion of revenues collected through the $300 surcharge paid by persons convicted of intoxicated driver offenses.

In 1996-97, base-level funding for ATS is $225,200, of which $100,000 is allocated for grants to school districts.

Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act. According to federal law, the state educational agency must receive 80% of the state's funding under subtitle B of the Act. Ninety-one percent of DPI's portion of these federal funds are distributed to school districts and 9% is set aside for DPI administrative costs and technical assistance related to the program. Approximately 70% of the school district funds are distributed on a per pupil basis to each school district in the state and the remainder is distributed through a competitive grant process based on school district need, as determined through district grant applications. In 1996-97, a total of $6,457,500 FED is budgeted under DPI for Safe and Drug Free Schools, including $5,876,300 for grants and $581,200 for administration and technical assistance.

GOVERNOR

Transfer the assistance to schools for AODA, FAST, after-school/summer school, pupil AODA and youth AODA programs from DPI to the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). Transfer from DPI to DHFS $7,050,000 GPR and $4,631,900 PR (a correction would be required to transfer the correct amount to DHFS), 5.0 PR positions and the incumbent employes holding positions in DPI that are primarily related to these programs. The GPR funding transferred to DHFS would be placed in one appropriation. Specify that DHFS would be required to allocate $1,000,000 for FAST, $300,000 for grants to pupil AODA projects, $425,000 for after-school/summer school programs and $1,800,000 for youth AODA programs.

Eliminate the current authorization for monies to be reallocated, as well as the reporting requirement relating to any reallocations. In addition, delete a requirement that the Department collect and analyze information about the projects funded under these programs and submit an evaluation report to the Legislature and the Governor by July 1 each year. Repeal the requirement that DPI and DHFS prepare a joint biennial report to the Legislature regarding a plan for the development, testing and implementation of cooperative and integrated school-community AODA prevention, intervention, treatment and rehabilitation services.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In September, 1996, based on a comprehensive audit of prevention programs for children, youth and families, the Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) recommended that DHFS and DPI, the two state agencies responsible for nearly two-thirds of all state-level prevention programs, report to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee by April 1, 1997, on their plans to evaluate the prevention programs they administer and proposals to consolidate overlapping prevention programs for which they have responsibility.

2. In their reports to the Audit Committee, neither agency recommended consolidating programs across agencies due to differing target institutions, such as school districts versus county agencies, and prevention strategies. Instead, the reports focused on consolidation efforts within the separate agencies, coordination efforts across agencies and improved program evaluation efforts.

3. The LAB noted that most state and local staff interviewed for its September, 1996, audit report, indicated that there is some benefit to several agencies providing prevention services and administration. These staff suggest that supporting diverse approaches to prevention is more likely to result in multiple perspectives that lead to a useful debate on prevention policy.

4. The LAB reported that consolidating administrative responsibilities within a single state agency may have only limited benefits because (a) most prevention programs are already consolidated within DHFS or DPI; (b) programs of some agencies serve unique populations; and (c) federal laws and regulations place limits on how federal funding may be utilized and require that federal funds be awarded to designated state agencies. For example, even if the state-funded AODA programs were transferred from DPI to DHFS, the federally-funded Safe and Drug Free Schools program would have to remain in DPI due to federal requirements that 80% of these funds be allocated to the state educational agency.

5. The LAB audit identified 39 AODA programs in DHFS. The Governor's budget proposal recommends reorganizing the administration of several of these programs, but makes no effort to evaluate or consolidate them. It could be argued that it would be better to first assess DHFS's success in consolidating and evaluating its many AODA programs before transferring additional AODA programs to DHFS.

6. Although DHFS did not request the proposed transfer, DHFS supports the Governor's recommendation because DHFS staff believe it would increase the integration of school-based prevention services with other community programs that encourage positive behaviors in adolescents, including graduation from high school, self-sufficiency, avoidance of substance abuse, pregnancy and delinquency. DHFS argues that a more integrated approach to providing substance abuse services to adolescents would facilitate more coordinated, comprehensive and effective services to adolescents and their families. Further, because DHFS serves as the lead agency for providing services to children and families, staff at DHFS believe that it can best administer this integrated approach.

7. SB 77 would transfer other prevention programs to DHFS, including the community intervention program from the Department of Corrections and the funding and administrative duties for adolescent pregnancy programs from the Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services (APPS) Board, reducing the roles of other agencies in providing prevention services to specific populations. However, on April 24, 1997, the Committee chose to delete from SB 77 the Governor's recommendation relating to the transfer of responsibilities and funding between DHFS and the APPS Board.

8. Currently, DHFS does not administer AODA programs that directly fund prevention and intervention programs for school districts. However, DHFS administers 11 AODA grant programs specifically targeted at serving youth, ten of which are federally-funded programs. This includes six programs funded through the Governor's 20% share of Wisconsin's federal Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Community Act funds, which must be used for substance abuse and violence prevention services targeted at youth under the age of 18 with a focus on serving youth not served by the state's educational system and avoiding duplication of services.

9. Opponents of the Governor's proposal oppose the transfer of certain AODA programs from DPI to DHFS because each of the DPI state-funded, grant programs, except ATS, is counted toward state funding of 66.7% of partial school revenues. Arguably, school aid programs should remain consolidated in a single state agency. Additionally, the transfer would require school districts to deal with two different state agencies for both AODA funding and school aids and appears to contradict the goal of "one-stop shopping" for government services.

10. DPI argues that familiarity with the K-12 education system is an important element in administering prevention programs specifically for school districts. DPI attempts to combine AODA prevention programs into other areas such as curriculum and instruction development, teacher education and pupil health programs. Additionally, DPI has developed a single application and evaluation form for all AODA programs. By transferring those AODA programs to DHFS, they might not be integrated into larger K-12 educational programs and may not retain their school-centered focus.

11. On the other hand, DHFS is the state agency with primary responsibilities in children and family programs as well as health and prevention programs, and may be able to better integrate these AODA prevention programs into a community-based prevention strategy.

12. The bill would transfer five of DPI's seven state-funded AODA programs to DHFS. Both DARE and Alcohol and Traffic Safety Education (ATS) would remain in DPI. The ATS program is administered in coordination with the driver's education program and one staff member administers both programs with a focus on teaching safe driving practices; because ATS is not specifically an AODA prevention program, it may be more consistent with program objectives if ATS would be retained in DPI. However, it could be argued that DARE should be included in the AODA transfer to DHFS, especially since DHFS administers the federal portion of the DARE program.

13.. The LAB reported that state agencies have generally provided insufficient evaluations of the effectiveness of prevention programs. It may be desirable to retain the requirement that the administering agency collect and analyze information about FAST, pupil AODA, after-school/summer school and DARE grants, evaluate their effectiveness and submit a report to the Legislature biennially.

14. If the Committee approves the Governor's recommendation, a correction would be required to transfer the proper amount of funding to DHFS.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Transfer of AODA Programs

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to transfer five school district AODA grant programs from DPI to DHFS, including a correction to the bill regarding program revenue reestimates, which would adjust funding by $300 PR in 1997-98 and -$651,500 PR in 1998-99.

Alternative A1	PR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- $651,200

2. Maintain current law, which would leave assistance to schools for AODA programs, youth AODA programs, DARE, FAST, after-school/summer school and pupil AODA grants, as well as program revenue funding for administration and technical assistance, and 5.0 PR positions in DPI. Adjust funding by $300 PR in 1997-98 and -$651,500 PR in 1998-99.

Alternative A2	PR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- $651,200

3. In addition to the transfer proposed under the bill, transfer the DARE program and $995,000 GPR annually to DHFS.

B. Report on Effectiveness of Programs

1. Specify that the administering agency must submit a biennial report to the Legislature that evaluates the effectiveness of each of these AODA programs.

2. Take no action.

MO# Alt. insert

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE_____ NO _____ ABS_____

Prepared by: Ruth Hardy

Insert

#668 - School to Work page 10 Alt #B3

#669 - AOLA Alt #A2 #B1 page 6

MO# all above

1	JENSEN	✓Y	N	A
	OURADA	✓Y	N	A
	HARSDORF	✓Y	N	A
	ALBERS	✓Y	N	A
	GARD	✓Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	✓Y	N	A
	LINTON	Y	✓N	A
	COGGS	Y	✓N	A
	BURKE	✓Y	N	A
2	DECKER	✓Y	N	A
	GEORGE	Y	✓N	A
	JAUCH	✓Y	N	A
	WINEKE	✓Y	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	✓Y	N	A
	COWLES	✓Y	N	A
	PANZER	✓Y	N	A

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS ____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Charter Schools -- Creation by Other Entities in the MPS District (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 484-85, #32]

CURRENT LAW

Charter School Establishment

An unlimited number of charter schools may be formed in the state; however, only local school boards may authorize the establishment of a charter school. There are two methods for creating a charter school.

First, a school board may, on its own initiative, contract with an individual or group to operate a school as a charter school. There is no requirement for a public hearing on the school board's proposal.

Second, a school board may authorize the establishment of a charter school upon receipt and approval of a written petition requesting the board to do so. The petition must be signed by at least 10% of the teachers employed by the district or by at least 50% of the teachers employed at one school in the district. The board must hold a public hearing within 30 days of receiving the petition. At the hearing, the board must consider the level of employe and parental support for the school. After the hearing, the board may grant the petition.

Legal Status of a Charter School

A charter school is an instrumentality of the school district in which it is located. Although a school board may contract with an individual or group to operate a charter school, all personnel of a charter school must be employed by the school board. Two or more school

boards may enter into a contractual agreement to establish a charter school, locating the school in just one of the establishing school districts.

Charter School Restrictions

A charter school cannot: (a) be a converted private school; (b) be sectarian in its programs, admissions policies; employment practices and all other operations; or (c) charge tuition.

Charter schools are also prohibited from discriminating in admission or denying participation in any program or activity on the basis of a person's sex, race, religion, national origin, ancestry, pregnancy, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, or physical, mental, emotional or learning disability.

Pupil Rights

No pupil may be required to attend a charter school without the approval of his or her parents or legal guardian, or the pupil's approval if the pupil is an adult. In addition, if a charter school replaces a public school, in whole or in part, the school must give preference in admission to any pupil residing within the attendance area of the current or former public school.

Charter School Requirements

A charter school is not subject to the provisions of Chapter 115 through 121 of the Wisconsin Statutes, which generally govern elementary and secondary education, except for the following requirements to:

a. Participate in the state's pupil assessment program which currently includes the Wisconsin reading comprehension test at third grade and the knowledge and concepts examinations administered to fourth-, eighth- and tenth-grade pupils.

b. Be included in a school district's annual school performance report.

c. Ensure that all of the school's instructional staff hold a license or permit to teach issued by DPI.

The Department has promulgated an administrative rule defining "instructional staff" to mean all professional employes who have direct contact with pupils or with the instructional program of the school, including teachers, librarians, pupil services staff and administrative staff.

In addition, DPI has established, by rule, a special charter school instructional staff license and permit. The license may be issued to an individual who is already licensed by DPI and authorizes the individual to perform any instructional duty in a charter school.

Individuals who do not hold a DPI license or permit may be issued a renewable, one-year charter school instructional permit if the school district has conducted a search for a qualified, licensed individual and the individual receiving the permit: (a) has a bachelor's degree in the subject he or she would be teaching or in a related field, or has formal proof of mastery in the trade he or she would be teaching; and (b) receives six credits of training or education in each school year that he or she is employed by the charter school. An individual is exempt from the continuing education requirement if he or she: (a) holds a bachelor's or higher degree and is a full-time employe of an approved teacher preparation institution in Wisconsin; or (b) has a formal proof of mastery in a trade and is a full-time employe of a Wisconsin Technical College System district.

The Department's rule also requires that the responsibilities of an individual holding a charter school permit be coordinated, directed and inspected by a person who is licensed by DPI to teach the subject or trade which the permit-holder is teaching. Finally, the rule specifies that charter school instructional staff would receive the same immunity from liability as staff in non-charter schools.

Charter School Contract

If a charter school is established through the petition process, the school board is required to contract with the person named in the petition to operate the school. If a charter school is established on the initiative of the school board, the board may contract with an individual or group to operate the school. The contract may be for any term not exceeding five school years and can be renewed for one or more terms not exceeding five school years.

The contract and the petition must include the following 15 provisions and may include other provisions agreed upon by the parties:

1. The name of the person who is seeking to establish the charter school.

2. The name of the person who will be in charge of the charter school and the manner in which administrative services will be provided.

3. A description of the educational program of the school.

4. The methods the school will use to enable pupils to attain the state's educational goals and expectations under s. 118.01 of the statutes.

5. The method by which pupil progress in attaining the state's educational goals and expectations will be measured.

6. The governance structure of the school, including the method to be followed by the school to ensure parental involvement.

7. The qualifications that must be met by the individuals to be employed in the school although state licensure is required of instructional staff.

8. The procedures that the school will follow to ensure the health and safety of the pupils.

9. The means by which the school will achieve a racial and ethnic balance among its pupils that is reflective of the school district population.

10. The requirements for admission to the school.

11. The manner in which annual audits of the financial and programmatic operations of the school will be performed.

12. The procedures for disciplining pupils.

13. The public school alternatives for pupils who reside in the school district and do not wish to attend or are not admitted to the charter school.

14. A description of the school facilities and the types and limits of the liability insurance that the school will carry.

15. The effect of the establishment of the charter school on the liability of the school district.

Funding and Expenditures

The contract between the school board and the person operating the charter school must specify the amount to be paid by the school board to the charter school during each school year of the contract. The pupils enrolled in the charter school are included in the school district's membership and the contract costs are eligible for state sharing under the general school aid formula.

A charter school may participate in categorical school aid and grant programs, but such participation needs to be included in the charter. Further, a charter school has to comply with all requirements associated with the program in which it participates.

GOVERNOR

Authorize the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) and the Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC) District Board to establish by charter and operate, or contract with a group or individual to operate, a

charter school. Specify that a charter school established or contracted for would have to be located within the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) District and only pupils within MPS could attend the charter school. Provide that these charter schools would not be instrumentalities of the MPS district and MPS could not employ any personnel for these charter schools.

Specify that whenever one of these entities intends to establish a charter school, it would be required to notify DPI of its intention by February 1 of the previous school year. Provide that the Chancellor of UWM could not contract for the establishment of a charter school without the approval of the UW Board of Regents, although the Chancellor would be able to directly establish and operate a charter school without Regent approval.

Require the chartering or contracting entities: (1) ensure that all instructional staff of the charter school hold a license or permit to teach issued by DPI, and (2) administer the 4th, 8th and 10th grade knowledge and concepts examinations currently required by state law. The bill does not specify that the chartering or contracting entities would be required to administer the Wisconsin reading comprehension test given to third-grade pupils as required by all schools, including charter schools, under current law.

Provide that a charter for a charter school established by the City of Milwaukee, UWM or MATC would have to include all of the items for a petition to establish a charter school under current law, except: (a) the name of the person who would operate the charter school; (b) the name of the person who would be in charge of the charter school and the manner in which administrative services would be provided; and (c) the effect of the establishment of the charter school on the liability of the school district. Provide that a contract to operate a charter school would have to include all of the items required for a petition to establish a charter school under current law, except a description of the effect of the establishment of the charter school on the liability of the school district.

Create a sum sufficient appropriation within DPI to pay the operator of a charter school under this provision an amount equal to the shared cost per member of MPS in the previous school year multiplied by the number of pupils attending the charter school. (A corrective amendment would be needed to accomplish the intent of the draft.) DPI would have to make payments equivalent to 25% of the total in September, December, February and June of each school year and would send the check to the operator of the charter school. The Department would annually reduce the general school aids paid to MPS by the total amount paid to these charter schools. Specify that general school aids paid to other school districts would not be increased or reduced as a result of these payments or the reduction in aid to MPS and that the amount of the aid reduction for MPS would lapse to the general fund.

Exclude pupils attending charter schools established by the City of Milwaukee, UWM or MATC from the calculation of MPS's revenue limits, in the same manner that pupils under the existing Milwaukee parental choice program are excluded.

These provisions relating to the establishment of charter schools by the City of Milwaukee, UWM or MATC would take effect on July 1, 1998.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. There are currently 13 charter schools operating in 11 school districts. The Madison Metropolitan School District and the Verona School District each operate two charter schools. MPS operates one charter school, which is the Highland Community School, a former private Montessori school that serves approximately 68 pupils.

2. In their budget requests, neither the UW System nor the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) requested the authority to sponsor or establish charter schools. UWM reports, while the University was not included in the planning of the charter school proposal, it would consider establishing a charter school if it determines that such an initiative would be financially feasible and consistent with its goals as an institution of higher education. MATC indicates that it is supportive of the proposal and would partner with other entities to establish charter schools, but would most likely not run a charter school on its own. Arguably, as educational institutions with schools of education and/or K-12 partnerships, both UWM and MATC would have faculty and staff qualified to establish or sponsor a charter school. On the other hand, it could be argued that the focus of UWM and MATC should remain in the area of higher education and that their K-12 programming should be limited to partnerships with K-12 schools and specific educational programs for K-12 pupils and staff.

3. Both UWM and MATC indicate that they have positive relationships with MPS and currently are significantly involved with MPS pupils through numerous joint programs with the school district. UWM believes that the ability to sponsor the establishment of charter schools with entities other than MPS should be approached carefully in order not to hamper the University's relationship with MPS, and emphasizes that positive relations with MPS are vital to educational reform in Milwaukee.

4. The City of Milwaukee has stated that it would contract with other entities to establish charter schools, but has no plans to run its own charter schools.

5. According to data provided by the Education Commission of the States, there are 26 states with charter school laws; only three states (Michigan, Minnesota and North Carolina) allow entities other than a local school board, state education agency, state education board, state superintendent or state charter school board to sponsor a charter school. In these three states, state universities or technical and community colleges may sponsor charter schools; however, in both Minnesota and North Carolina, the state board of education must have the final approval of all charter schools. None of the 26 states authorize local governments to sponsor charter schools.

6. Most states, including Wisconsin, allow a broad spectrum of entities to operate charter schools, pending approval of eligible sponsors. Under current law, any UW campus, WTCS district or city government could operate a charter school, with the approval of a local school board. If these entities would wish to operate a public K-12 charter school, they could coordinate with a local school board for approval to operate a charter school. On the other hand, current law would not allow these entities the administrative and funding autonomy proposed under SB 77.

7. Charter school proponents argue that allowing entities, other than the MPS Board, to sponsor charter schools in Milwaukee would spur the establishment of more charter schools, heightening educational reform in the state's largest school district. Charter school proponents in Milwaukee argue that even if UWM, MATC and the City would chose not to establish charter schools, it is important to have multiple avenues through which charter schools could be established. Additionally, proponents argue that starting such an initiative in Milwaukee could provide information on the performance of charter schools and may lead to statewide expansion of the proposed initiative if it is successful.

8. Alternatively, opponents argue that school boards should be responsible for the establishment and general operation of any public K-12 school within a given school district. Additionally, they argue that the pace of charter school establishment is appropriate given the amount of planning required to establish and run an educational institution.

9. Currently, all public employes in the state of Wisconsin, except City of Milwaukee and County of Milwaukee employes, are participants in the Wisconsin retirement system (WRS). Under WRS, teachers, who generally provide nine months of service per year, are credited for 12 months of service for retirement purposes. Teachers at charter schools established by UWM or MATC would become employes of UWM or MATC and therefore, would be members of WRS. However, teachers at charter schools established by the City of Milwaukee would be employes of the City and would be members of the City's retirement system, which does not currently cover teachers and may only credit them for nine months of service for each school year versus the 12 months of service they would earn under WRS for each school year. Because newly-established charter schools would likely hope to hire experienced MPS teachers, the differing retirement system structure would provide a negative incentive for MPS teachers to teach in City of Milwaukee charter schools. However, the City could provide that teachers be defined as 12-month employes, as under WRS, which would mitigate this disincentive.

10. If the Committee wishes to extend to entities, other than the MPS School Board, the authority to create or contract for the establishment of charter schools, but would prefer to grant such authority only to educational institutions, the Committee could exclude the City of Milwaukee from the charter school proposal. Additionally, the Committee could exclude MATC or UWM because their current duties do not include oversight of K-12 education.

11. Under the Governor's proposal, operating funding would be provided to these charters schools through equivalent reductions in state aid to MPS. One could argue that funding should not be reduced from a school district in order to pay for the costs of establishing a new school which is not under the purview of the district. For example, if MPS's shared cost per member for 1997-98 school aids would be $5,800, then a charter school serving 100 pupils established by one of these entities in 1998-99 would receive $580,000 in state aid and MPS would lose the equivalent amount of revenue. In addition, these pupils would be excluded from the calculation of MPS's revenue limits. While MPS would lose pupils for which they must fund programs and classes, the funding reduction imposed on MPS may not equal the marginal cost of educating each pupil.

12. Charter school proponents argue that because the pupils served by the new charter schools would be MPS pupils, the loss in MPS revenue would simply be the amount of funding that MPS would have spent on those pupils. Additionally, because state statutes require that preference for charter school establishment should be for schools that serve children-at-risk, MPS may lose pupils who disrupt school operations or are more expensive to educate.

13. Under the Milwaukee parental choice program, the state pays the parent or guardian an amount that is equal to the lesser of: (a) MPS equalization aid payment per member for that school year (an estimated $4,373 in 1996-97); or (b) the private school's operating and debt service cost per pupil that is related to educational programming, as determined by DPI. Unaudited shared costs in the prior year, 1995-96, totalled $5,645. As a result, pupils in the proposed charter schools would have a greater impact on the aid received by MPS than pupils in the choice program. To reduce the effect on equalization aid to MPS, the Committee could use a calculation for the payment to these proposed charter schools based on equalization aid per member, rather than shared cost per member.

14. If UWM, MATC or the City of Milwaukee would choose to establish charter schools, they could incur significant startup costs and ongoing operating costs. A per pupil payment to these entities based on a lower per-member equalization aid amount, rather than per member shared costs as under the bill, may not provide sufficient resources for these charter schools to succeed.

15. Under the Milwaukee parental choice program, one of the limits on pupil eligibility is that in the school year prior to their initial enrollment, participants must have been either enrolled in MPS, the choice program or grades kindergarten through three in private schools located within the City of Milwaukee, or not enrolled in school. SB 77 does not establish a similar limitation, so that equalization aid and revenue limits for MPS could be reduced, if pupils who transfer from a private school would attend the proposed charter schools. In this case, the resources available to MPS would be reduced, even though MPS would not have realized any cost savings due to a reduction in the number of pupils. To address this concern, it may be desirable to establish the same limitation on pupil eligibility for this charter school proposal, as applies to the current Milwaukee parental choice program.

16. Staff at DOA indicate that several technical corrections would be required to accomplish the intent of the bill: (a) require the chartering or contracting entity to administer the Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test during third grade; (b) modify the formula for aid paid to the operator of a charter school and reduced from MPS's annual general aids to ensure that payments and reductions are equivalent; and (c) require that the Chancellor of UWM receive approval of the UW Board of Regents to both establish and operate or contract for the establishment of a charter school.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation with modifications to: (a) ensure that charter school operators administer the Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test; (b) clarify that the aid payment and reduction would be equivalent; and (c) require UW Regent approval for all UWM charter school activities.

2. Approve the Governor's recommendation with modifications to: (a) ensure that charter school operators administer the Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test; (b) clarify that the aid payment and reduction would be equivalent; and (c) require UW Regent approval for all UWM charter school activities. In addition, approve one or more of the following changes:

a. Delete the provision to allow the City of Milwaukee to participate under the proposal;

b. Delete the provision to allow the Milwaukee Area Technical College to participate under the proposal;

c. Delete the provision to allow the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to participate under the proposal;

d. - FAIL Specify that the state would pay the charter school the lesser of: (1) the MPS equalization aid payment per member for that school year; or (2) the charter school's operating and debt service cost per pupil that is related to educational programming, as determined by DPI.

e. PASS Provide that as an additional eligibility requirement, in the school year prior to their initial enrollment, participants would have to have been enrolled in MPS, the choice program, the proposed charter schools, or grades kindergarten through three in private schools located within the City of Milwaukee, or not enrolled in school.

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Ruth Hardy

MO# Alt #2e

2 JENSEN	Y	N	A
/ OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 9 NO 7 ABS ____

VOTES OVER

MO# Alt #2D

JENSEN	Y	~~N~~	A
OURADA	Y	~~N~~	A
HARSDORF	Y	~~N~~	A
ALBERS	Y	~~N~~	A
GARD	Y	~~N~~	A
KAUFERT	Y	~~N~~	A
LINTON	~~Y~~	N	A
COGGS	~~Y~~	N	A

1 BURKE	~~Y~~	N	A
2 DECKER	~~Y~~	N	A
GEORGE	~~Y~~	N	A
JAUCH	~~Y~~	N	A
WINEKE	~~Y~~	N	A
SHIBILSKI	~~Y~~	N	A
COWLES	Y	~~N~~	A
PANZER	Y	~~N~~	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS ____

PAPER #670

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Charter Schools -- Statewide Changes (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 486-487, #33, #34, #35]

CURRENT LAW

Charter School Establishment and Petition Appeals

An unlimited number of charter schools may be formed in the state; however, only local school boards may authorize the establishment of a charter school. There are two methods for creating a charter school.

First, a school board may, on its own initiative, contract with an individual or group to operate a school as a charter school. There is no requirement for a public hearing on the school board's proposal.

Second, a school board may authorize the establishment of a charter school upon receipt and approval of a written petition requesting the board to do so. The petition must be signed by at least 10% of the teachers employed by the district or by at least 50% of the teachers employed at one school in the district. The board must hold a public hearing within 30 days of receiving the petition. At the hearing, the board must consider the level of employe and parental support for the school. After the hearing, the board may grant the petition.

The Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) School Board must grant or deny a charter school petition within 30 days after a public hearing. If the Board denies the petition, the person seeking to establish the charter school may, within 30 days after the denial, appeal the decision to DPI. The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) must issue a decision within 30 days after receiving the appeal. This decision is final and not subject to judicial review.

Charter School Contract

If a charter school is established through the petition process, the school board is required to contract with the person named in the petition to operate the school. If a charter school is established on the initiative of the school board, the board may contract with an individual or group to operate the school. The contract may be for any term not exceeding five school years and can be renewed for one or more terms not exceeding five school years.

Legal Status of a Charter School

A charter school is an instrumentality of the school district in which it is located. Although a school board may contract with an individual or group to operate a charter school, all personnel of a charter school must be employed by the school board. Two or more school boards may enter into a contractual agreement to establish a charter school, locating the school in just one of the establishing school districts.

Charter schools created within the MPS are not considered instrumentalities of the District. Personnel employed by these charter schools are not considered employes of the District.

GOVERNOR

Provide that a petition requesting a school board to establish a charter school would only have to be signed by at least 10% of the teachers employed by the school district or by at least 50% of the teachers employed at one school in the district if the proposed charter school would replace a public school in whole or in part. This modification would first apply to petitions submitted on the effective date of the bill.

Require that all school boards would have to grant or deny a charter school petition within 30 days following the currently required public hearing on the petition. Provide that if a school board would deny a petition, the person seeking to establish a charter school could, within 30 days after the denial, appeal the denial to DPI. DPI would have to issue a decision within 30 days; its decision would be final and not subject to judicial review. This provision would first apply to petition hearings that take place on the effective date of the bill.

Provide that charter school contracts could be for any term, which would apply both to the initial contract as well as to contract renewals. This provision would first apply to contracts entered into, extended, modified or renewed on the effective date of the bill.

Provide that the MPS school board would determine whether or not a charter school established by the district is an instrumentality of the district. Specify that if the MPS board would determine that the charter school is an instrumentality of the district, the board would have

to employ all personnel for the charter school. If the board would determine that the charter school is not an instrumentality of the district, the board could not employ any of the personnel for the charter school.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Petition Process for Charter School Establishment

1. In 1993 Act 16, the Legislature enacted the original charter school legislation and required teacher signatures for the establishment of charter schools through the petition process with the intention of requiring a certain level of support from teachers. The petition process enables teachers to request the establishment of a charter school even if a school board has not acted to do so independently.

2. The provision under SB 77 would retain the requirement for teacher signatures in the petition process only if a charter school would replace a public school in whole or in part. However, it could be argued that demonstrated teacher support should remain a consideration in the establishment of all charter schools, particularly when the establishment of a charter school may affect their terms of employment.

3. On the other hand, by requiring teacher signatures for the establishment of a charter school through the petition process, other groups, such as parents, business leaders and other community members, are hindered from starting a charter school that may not have the support of large numbers of teachers. Additionally, gathering such large percentages of teacher signatures in large school districts may place a disproportionate burden on groups, other than teachers, that wish to establish charter schools in these districts.

4. One could argue that support for the establishment of a charter school should be a consideration of a school board when considering such an action. However, general community support could continue to be gauged during public hearings on charter school petitions that would remain in the law under the bill.

Appeals Process

5. Proponents of the Governor's proposal contend that allowing charter school petitioners, in any school district, to appeal a school board's denial will increase the number of charter schools in the state, and allow for the consideration of charter petitions even in school districts in which the board is generally opposed to charter schools. Because the appeals process currently applies only to petitions to establish charter schools within MPS, this provision would provide a comparable process for all school districts. However, according to DPI, a charter school petition has never been appealed to the Department for charter schools proposed within the MPS district.

6. On the other hand, it could be argued that the decision to grant a charter school petition should rest with the school board, which would have a better understanding of the educational needs of the students in the district than would a state agency. Further, because charter schools are instrumentalities of local school boards (except in MPS) and therefore the legal, financial and administrative responsibility of a school board, it may be desirable to ensure that a school board would retain the final authority to grant or deny a petition to establish a charter school.

7. According to data provided by the Education Commission of the States, of the 26 states that currently allow the establishment of charter schools, ten states provide for some type of appeals process. Most of these states allow appeals to the state boards of education or the state education agency. In Florida, despite an appeals process to the state board of education, the final decision to establish a charter school remains with the local school board. In Minnesota, appeals to the state board of education are authorized only if at least two local school board members voted for the charter school petition. Georgia does not allow for an appeals process, but the state board may allow for the resubmission of a charter school petition to a local school board and assist in the improvement of the charter school application. If the Committee would wish to authorize an appeals process, but would wish to retain some local control of charter school petitions, it could authorize DPI to consider a charter school petition appeal only if at least one school board member in districts with three or five school board members or two school board members in districts with seven or nine school board members voted to support the petition.

8. If additional state assistance to local efforts to form charter schools is desired, the Committee could require DPI to provide technical assistance to charter school petitioners. To accomplish this, DPI could be provided with $38,300 GPR in 1997-98 and $51,100 GPR in 1998-99 and 1.0 GPR position beginning in 1997-98 to assist charter school petitioners in improving their applications for charter school establishment; this position could also assist the State Superintendent in determining appeals from charter school petitioners. Currently, DPI does not have a full-time staff member assigned to providing assistance to school districts in the area of charter schools. One staff member, with full-time duties in other areas, assists school districts, teachers and private citizens that request information and assistance on establishing a charter school.

9. Current law and SB 77 do not specify the criteria to be used by DPI in determining whether to grant or deny a charter school petition. In order to ensure consistency in appeals decisions, the Committee could require DPI to promulgate rules as to the procedures and criteria the agency will follow in deciding appeals.

Contract Term

10. Under current law, charter school contracts are limited to five-year terms. It may be desirable to retain the limited term of contracts, to ensure that school boards would have opportunities, within a relatively short period of time, to determine if a charter school is beneficial to the educational programs of the school district. The five-year contracts would enable school boards to avoid a long-term commitment to a charter school that is not performing well.

11. Under current law, if a school board would determine that a charter school has violated the terms of its contract, a school board could terminate a contract prior to the end of the five-year term. It could be argued that local school boards should decide the length of a charter school contract. If the board would determine that a longer-term contract is appropriate, it should have the opportunity to provide for such a charter school contract and could terminate the contract if the charter school violates the contract.

Instrumentality of School District -- Milwaukee Public Schools

12. Under current law, several exemptions and special provisions apply to MPS regarding the establishment of charter schools: (a) if the MPS School Board denies a charter school petition, the person seeking to establish a charter school may appeal the decision to DPI; (b) private schools may be converted to public charter schools; (c) several MPS employe status issues are prohibited subjects of collective bargaining (this provision has not been applied pending the outcome of current litigation); and (d) charter schools created within MPS are not considered instrumentalities of the District. Personnel employed by these charter schools are not considered employes of MPS.

13. Currently, all charter schools in the state, except those established by MPS, are instrumentalities of the school district in which they are established, which means school districts are legally and financially responsible for their charter schools and must employ all charter school employes. In the MPS district, charter schools are not instrumentalities of the school district and MPS does not employ any of the employes. MPS has established one charter school, the Highland Community School which is a former private Montessori school that serves approximately 68 pupils.

14. Currently, all public employes in the state of Wisconsin, except City of Milwaukee and County of Milwaukee employes, are participants in the Wisconsin retirement system (WRS). MPS employes are members of WRS, as are all public school employes, and teachers, who generally provide nine months of service per year, receive 12 months of retirement credit per year under WRS. Under current law, because charter schools established by MPS are not instrumentalities of the school district, employes of MPS charter schools cannot be members of

WRS, which provides a disincentive for MPS teachers to transfer to charter schools established by the district.

15. Proponents of the Governor's proposal believe that the flexibility provided to MPS in deciding the instrumentality of charter schools established by the district will spur the creation of charter schools within MPS. First, allowing MPS to establish charter schools that are instrumentalities of the district, would enable current MPS teachers to work in the newly established charter schools without losing their membership in WRS. Second, as under current law, MPS could create charter schools, such as converted private schools whose teachers are not current MPS employes, which would not be instrumentalities of the district.

16. Opponents of the proposal argue that both the provision under SB 77 and the current law provision regarding charter school instrumentality within MPS should be changed to ensure that all charter schools in MPS are instrumentalities of the district, as is provided for the other 425 school districts in Wisconsin. They believe that local school boards should control public K-12 education, and therefore should be responsible for the employes of all K-12 public schools established in Wisconsin.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Petition Process for Charter School Establishment

1. → Default Approve the Governor's recommendation to modify the charter school petition process.

FAIL

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

B. Appeals Process

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to establish an appeal process relating to charter school petitions.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation through one or more of the following:

a. Authorize DPI to consider a charter school petition appeal only if at least one school board member in districts that have three or five school board members or at least two school board members in districts that have seven or nine school board members voted to support the petition.

b. Provide DPI with $38,300 GPR in 1997-98 and $51,100 GPR in 1998-99 and 1.0 GPR position beginning in 1997-98 to provide technical

assistance to charter school petitioners in improving their applications for charter school establishment, assist the State Superintendent in determining appeals from charter school petitioners and provide information to persons interested in charter school issues.

Alternative B2b	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	$89,400
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.00

c. Require DPI to promulgate rules as to the procedures and criteria the agency will follow in deciding charter school appeals.

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

C. Contract Term

→ Default

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to specify that contracts could be for any term, rather than for at most five years as under current law.

FAIL

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

D. Instrumentality of School District - Milwaukee Public Schools

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation that the MPS school board would determine whether or not charter schools established by the district would be instrumentalities of the MPS district.

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

PASS - oops see motion #45026

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation and instead, specify that charter schools established by MPS would be instrumentalities of the district.

Prepared by: Ruth Hardy

MO# Alt #A2

JENSEN	Y	~~N~~	A
OURADA	Y	~~N~~	A
HARSDORF	Y	~~N~~	A
ALBERS	Y	~~N~~	A
GARD	Y	~~N~~	A
KAUFERT	Y	~~N~~	A
LINTON	~~Y~~	N	A
COGGS	~~Y~~	N	A

BURKE	~~Y~~	N	A
DECKER	~~Y~~	N	A
GEORGE	~~Y~~	N	A
JAUCH	~~Y~~	N	A
WINEKE	~~Y~~	N	A
SHIBILSKI	~~Y~~	N	A
COWLES	Y	~~N~~	A
PANZER	Y	~~N~~	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS ____

VOTES OVER →

MO# Alt # B2c

JENSEN	✓	N	A
1 OURADA	✓	N	A
HARSDORF	✓	N	A
ALBERS	✓	N	A
2 GARD	✓	N	A
KAUFERT	✓	N	A
LINTON	✓	N	A
COGGS	✓	N	A
BURKE	✓	N	A
DECKER	✓	N	A
GEORGE	Y	✓	A
JAUCH	✓	N	A
WINEKE	Y	✓	A
SHIBILSKI	✓	N	A
COWLES	✓	N	A
PANZER	✓	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS ____

MO# Alt # C2

JENSEN	Y	✓	A
OURADA	Y	✓	A
HARSDORF	Y	✓	A
ALBERS	Y	✓	A
GARD	Y	✓	A
KAUFERT	Y	✓	A
LINTON	✓	N	A
COGGS	✓	N	A
BURKE	✓	N	A
DECKER	✓	N	A
GEORGE	✓	N	A
JAUCH	✓	N	A
1 WINEKE	✓	N	A
2 SHIBILSKI	✓	N	A
COWLES	Y	✓	A
PANZER	Y	✓	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS ____

MO# Alt # D3

1 JENSEN	✓	N	A
OURADA	✓	N	A
HARSDORF	✓	N	A
ALBERS	✓	N	A
GARD	✓	N	A
KAUFERT	✓	N	A
LINTON	✓	N	A
COGGS	✓	N	A
BURKE	✓	N	A
DECKER	✓	N	A
GEORGE	✓	N	A
JAUCH	✓	N	A
WINEKE	✓	N	A
SHIBILSKI	✓	N	A
COWLES	✓	N	A
2 PANZER	✓	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ____

PAPER 671

Representative Jensen

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Charter School Instrumentality - MPS

Motion:

Move to require that the instrumentality of charter schools created by the Milwaukee Public (MPS) School Board would be determined as follows: (a) private schools that would be converted to charter schools would not be instrumentalities of the MPS District and MPS would not employ any of the charter school employes; (b) charter schools that would be created through the teacher petition process would be instrumentalities of the MPS District and MPS would employ all employes of the charter school; (c) the MPS School Board would determine whether or not all other charter schools established through MPS School Board action would be instrumentalities of the MPS district and that all employes of charter schools that would be instrumentalities of the MPS Board would maintain all collective bargaining rights.

Note:

Under current law, charter schools established by the MPS School Board are not considered instrumentalities of the MPS School Board and MPS does not employ any of the charter school employes.

MO# #4506

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 12 NO 4 ABS ____

Representative Albers

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Charter School Authorization for Establishment by CESA 6

Motion:

Move to allow the board of control of cooperative educational service agency 6 (CESA 6) to authorize the establishment of charter schools. Provide that CESA 6 could approve a petition from any group that is not affiliated with a religious organization that wishes to establish a charter school. Require CESA 6 to notify the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) that it has received such a petition and to include a description of the proposed charter school.

Require that a petition filed with CESA 6 include all of the information required under current law for a petition filed with a school board, except that the petition would have to include the effect of the establishment of the charter school on the liability of CESA 6, rather than a school district. In addition, require that the petition include the name of the school district in which the charter school would be located.

Require that each school district, from which pupils attend a charter school that has been established by a CESA 6, provide funding to the charter school equivalent to at least 75% of the shared cost per member of the school district multiplied by the number of pupils enrolled in the charter school that reside in the school district.

Require the annual convention for CESA 6 to adopt bylaws establishing the procedure for reviewing and either granting or denying charter school petitions. Prohibit CESA 6 from granting a petition unless such bylaws are in effect. Require CESA 6 to either grant or deny a petition within 60 days after receiving it and to notify DPI of its decision. Prohibit the CESA 6 from granting a petition that would convert a public school to a charter school. Prohibit CESA 6 board of control from granting a petition for the establishment of a charter school located outside of the territory of CESA 6. Provide that only pupils that reside within the territory of CESA 6 may attend the charter school.

Provide that the following current law requirements would not apply to charter school established by CESA 6: (a) the school is an instrumentality of the school district in which it is located; and (b) the school board employs all personnel of the charter school.

Provide that charter schools established by CESA 6 would be required to meet the current law requirements for all charter schools.

Note:

This motion would allow the board of control of CESA 6 to approve petitions to establish charter schools.

MO# 3196

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS ___

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Postsecondary Enrollment Options Program (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 480, #30 and Page 482, #31]

GOVERNOR

The following changes to the postsecondary enrollment options program are included in the bill:

1. Require a pupil to notify the school board of his or her intention to enroll in an institution of higher education, defined as a UW institution or a private college, under the program at least 90 days before the start of the technical college semester.

2. Provide that a school board would be responsible for the payment of tuition and fees on behalf of a pupil who takes a course at a UW institution or private college, regardless of whether or not the course is taken for high school credit.

3. Specify that a pupil taking a course at a technical college or an institution of higher education would not be responsible for any portion of the tuition and fees for the course, regardless of whether or not the course is taken for high school credit.

4. For each pupil attending a technical college under the program, require the school board to pay to the technical college an amount equal to one of the following: (a) the cost of tuition, course fees and books, if the pupil is enrolled for less than seven credits at the technical college; or (b) the school district's average per-pupil cost for regular instruction and instructional support services in the previous school year, as determined by DPI, multiplied by the result of dividing the number of credits taken by the pupil by 15.

5. Allow the parent or guardian of a pupil taking a course for high school credit at a UW institution or private college to apply to DPI for reimbursement of transportation costs if the pupil's parent is unable to pay these costs.

MODIFICATIONS TO BILL

1. Specify that a pupil would be required to notify the school board of his or her intention to enroll in a UW institution or private college under the program at least 90 days before the start of the UW institution or private college semester, rather than the technical college semester.

2. Provide that a school board would be responsible for the payment of tuition and fees on behalf of a pupil who takes a course at a UW institution or private college, only if the course is taken for high school credit.

3. Specify that a pupil taking a course at a technical college or an institution of higher education would not be responsible for any portion of the tuition and fees for the course, if the course is taken for high school credit.

4. For each semester in which a pupil is enrolled at a technical college under the program, require the school board to pay to the technical college an amount as follows: (a) if the pupil is enrolled for less than seven credits eligible for high school credit, the cost of tuition, course fees and books, at the technical college; or (b) if the pupil is enrolled for seven credits eligible for high school credit, or more, an amount equal to one-half of the school district's average per-pupil cost for regular instruction and instructional support services in the previous school year, as determined by DPI, multiplied by the result of dividing the number of credits taken by the pupil by 15.

5. Allow the parent or guardian of a pupil taking a course for high school credit at a technical college, as well as a UW institution or private college, to apply to DPI for reimbursement of transportation costs.

Explanation: These modifications are needed in order to accomplish the intent of the Governor's recommendations regarding the changes to the postsecondary enrollment options program.

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# Modification to Bill

JENSEN	✓	N	A
ZOURADA	✓	N	A
HARSDORF	✓	N	A
ALBERS	✓	N	A
GARD	✓	N	A
KAUFERT	✓	N	A
LINTON	✓	N	A
COGGS	✓	N	A

BURKE	✓	N	A
DECKER	✓	N	A
GEORGE	✓	N	A
JAUCH	✓	N	A
WINEKE	Y	✓	A
SHIBILSKI	✓	N	A
COWLES	✓	N	A
PANZER	✓	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS ____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Postsecondary Enrollment Options Program -- UW and Private Colleges (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 480, #30]

CURRENT LAW

Under the postsecondary enrollment options (PSEO) program, any public school pupil enrolled in the 11th or 12th grades may enroll in a UW institution, technical college or private, nonprofit college located in the state for the purpose of taking one or more courses. A postsecondary institution may admit a pupil under the program only if space is available and the pupil meets the institution's admission standards. A pupil who intends to participate in the PSEO program must notify the school district by March 1 if he or she intends to enroll in the fall semester, and by October 1 if he or she intends to enroll in the spring semester.

A course may be taken for high school and postsecondary credit or for postsecondary credit only. If a pupil intends to receive high school credit, the school board is responsible for determining whether the district offers a comparable course and if not, whether the course satisfies any of the state's high school graduation requirements and the number of high school credits to be awarded. The school board is required to notify the pupil, in writing, of its decisions before the end of the semester in which the application is submitted. A pupil may appeal the school board's decision to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Pupils attending postsecondary institutions under this program are included in a school district's membership for state aid purposes. If the course is taken for high school credit and a comparable course is not offered in the school district, the district is responsible for payment of an amount to the postsecondary institution as follows:

1. If the pupil attends a UW institution or a technical college, the actual cost of tuition, fees, books and other necessary materials directly related to the course.

2. If the pupil attends a private college, the lesser of: (a) the actual cost of tuition, fees, books and other materials; or (b) an amount determined by multiplying the statewide cost per high school credit, as computed by DPI, by the number of high school credits taken at the college.

The pupil is responsible for payment of tuition and fees for a course taken solely for postsecondary credit or if the school board, or DPI on appeal, determines that the district offers a comparable course.

If a school board determines that the number of resident pupils enrolled in a course at a postsecondary institution is equal to or greater than the number normally required for the district to offer the course and the board expects the situation to continue in the next school year, the school district is required to offer the course in the district in the next school year.

The parent or guardian of a pupil who is taking a course for high school credit that is not comparable to a course offered in the school district may apply to DPI for reimbursement of the costs of transportation between their high school and the postsecondary institution if they are unable to pay these costs.

DPI is required to promulgate rules to implement and administer the PSEO program.

GOVERNOR

Rename the PSEO program "youth options program" and delete the requirement that DPI promulgate rules to administer the program. In addition, establish separate criteria and requirements for pupils attending technical colleges under the program. (Changes to the program for pupils attending technical colleges are discussed in a separate issue paper).

Modify the current program for pupils attending UW institutions and private, nonprofit colleges as follows:

Determination of High School Credit. Require that the State Superintendent involve institutions of higher education in the development of guidelines to assist school districts in determining whether a course taken at a postsecondary institution satisfies any of the state's high school graduation requirements and the number of high school credits to award the pupil for the course, if any.

Timing of Application and Notification. Require a pupil to notify the school board of his or her intention to enroll in a postsecondary institution at least 90 days before the start of the

institution of higher education's semester. Require a school district to notify a pupil of its determinations regarding high school graduation requirements and credits prior to the beginning of the semester in which the pupil will be enrolled at an institution of higher education.

Course Comparability. Delete the requirement that a school board: (a) determine whether a course a student intends to take is comparable to one offered in the school district; and (b) offer a course in the next school year if the number of pupils enrolled in a postsecondary course is equal to or greater than the number normally required for the district to offer the course and the board expects the situation to continue in the next school year. In addition, allow the parent or guardian of a pupil taking a course for high school credit at a postsecondary institution to apply to DPI for reimbursement transportation costs, regardless of whether the course taken is comparable to a course offered by the school district.

Payment of Tuition and Fees. Specify that a pupil taking a course for high school credit at an institution of higher education under this program would not be responsible for any portion of the tuition and fees for the course.

School District Requirements. Require a school board to grant a high school diploma to a pupil who has satisfied all of the state's graduation requirements regardless of whether the pupil met all or a portion of the requirements while attending a postsecondary institution.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. For the fall, 1996 semester, 383 pupils took a total of 1,599 credits at UW campuses under the PSEO program. In comparison, 163 pupils enrolled in courses at UW campuses in the fall, 1993 semester. Although no estimate on the number of pupils who took courses at private colleges is available, 13 of the 21 colleges participated in the program in 1993-94, while all 21 participated in 1996-97.

A. Timing of Application and Notification

2. According to DOA staff, the proposed change in the dates by which a pupil must notify the school district that he or she intends to participate in the program is intended to increase access to the program. The current deadlines may result in reduced participation because pupils do not have sufficient time to determine which course or courses to take. For example, UW course schedules are not usually available until February or early March for fall semester courses, and October or early November for spring semester courses. The bill would extend the deadline for most pupils, depending on the institution they plan to attend, to late May or early June, for the fall semester courses and to late October or early November for spring semester courses.

3. Some school districts have expressed concerns that the later application deadlines included in SB 77, particularly for fall enrollments, would not allow sufficient time for districts to adjust their budgets and staffing levels in response to changes in enrollments. An option which may accommodate both pupils and school districts would be to change the application dates to November 1 and April 1.

4. To correspond with the proposed change in the application dates, SB 77 would change the deadline for the school board to notify the pupil of its decision regarding graduation requirements and number of high school credits to prior to the beginning of the semester in which the pupil will be enrolled. Thus, a pupil may be unaware of the board's decisions until just before classes begin. Since a school board's determinations could influence the pupil's decision to take the course, it may be reasonable to require the school board to notify the pupil of its determinations at least 30 days prior to the start of the higher education institution's semester.

B. Course Comparability and Payment of Tuition and Fees

5. When the PSEO program was created in the 1991-93 state budget (1991 Act 39), the Joint Committee on Finance modified the Governor's proposal by including the current provision that requires a school board to pay tuition and fees only for a course taken for high school credit which is not comparable to a course offered by the district. Although this provision, as well as the requirement that if a sufficient number of pupils enroll in a postsecondary course, a school board must establish a comparable course in the next school year, was vetoed, both provisions were subsequently included in the administration's recommendations for the 1991-93 budget adjustment act (1991 Act 269).

6. Similar to other proposed changes to the program, DOA staff indicate that the repeal of the comparability requirement is intended to increase pupil participation by expanding the number and type of postsecondary courses in which pupils could enroll. In addition, travel time and longer meeting times for college courses currently cause scheduling difficulties for many pupils. It is argued that repealing the comparability requirement would allow a pupil to schedule larger blocks of time at a postsecondary institution while still meeting his or her graduation requirements.

7. Under the bill, payment for any postsecondary course taken for high school credit would be the responsibility of the school district. DPI administrative rules for the program specify that a school district must grant high school credit provided that the course meets any of the state's high school graduation requirements and the course: (a) is complementary to, consistent with, or expands on, a course of study or sequence of courses offered by the school district; (b) expands an opportunity for the pupil to move to another level of academic or vocational course of study; (c) meets or exceeds the same standards for rigor and content as other courses approved, but not offered, by the school district for credit toward graduation; or (d)

supports, rather than prevents a pupil from completing the state's high school graduation requirements.

8. In 1996-97, the per credit charge for tuition and fees at a UW institution ranges from $79.33 to $129.17. The per credit amount charged to school districts for pupils enrolled in private colleges under the PSEO program in 1996-97 is $194 for colleges which operate on a semester basis and $129 for colleges which operate on a quarter basis.

9. UW System staff indicate that, on average, pupils enrolled at UW campuses under the PSEO program take one or two courses valued at three to four credits each. Therefore, the current cost to a school district for each course taken by a pupil ranges from approximately $317 to $776 per semester for tuition and fees plus an additional amount for books and other materials. A pupil taking 15 credits, which is the maximum number of credits per semester allowed under the program, would result in charges to the school district ranging from $952 to $2,910 per semester for tuition and fees.

10. School district comments contained in a 1993 DPI survey of school districts indicate that while a majority of school districts believed that the PSEO program benefitted pupils, many districts viewed the program as an unfunded mandate and expressed concern regarding its impact on district budgets.

11. Since it is not known how many additional postsecondary courses would be taken under the program in the absence of the course comparability requirement, it is not possible to determine the fiscal effect of the Governor's recommendation on school districts. As under current law, a postsecondary institution could accept a pupil only if space is available and the pupil meets the institution's admission standards. However, an increase in the number of pupils participating in the program, or the number of courses taken, is likely to increase school district costs. Savings to a district would result from increased participation only if such an increase was sufficient to cause a reduction in the number of courses offered and teachers employed by the district.

12. Proponents of the current PSEO program argue that it provides pupils with the opportunity to take more challenging courses and encourages school districts, through competition with postsecondary institutions, to provide a broader selection of courses and to be more responsive to the needs of advanced students. However, one could question whether the program, as modified by SB 77, would meet these goals. Districts may have little incentive to expand their course selection since offering a comparable course would no longer prevent a pupil from taking the course at a postsecondary institution. Further, increased costs associated with the program due to a higher participation rate may require a school district to reduce the total number of courses or services offered to students or reduce the number of advanced courses offered.

13. One could argue that the elimination of the course comparability requirement would allow parents of particularly motivated students to shift the cost of up to two years of their

children's postsecondary education to the school district, regardless of the family's financial need.

14. One option which could provide pupils with additional scheduling flexibility, while limiting the financial impact on school districts, would be to specify that a district would be responsible for payment of no more than the equivalent of eight credit hours for courses taken for high school credit which are comparable to courses offered by the district. A pupil would still be permitted to take up to a total of 15 credits per semester and the school district would be required to pay for any courses taken for high school credit which are not comparable to courses offered by the district.

C. Effective Date of Changes to Program

15. Since the bill does not specify an initial applicability date for the proposed changes to the program, these changes, as well as those for pupils enrolled in courses at technical colleges, would take effect on the effective date of the budget bill. Executive budget documents, however, indicate that programmatic changes for pupils attending technical colleges would first take effect in 1998-99. Since establishing a different initial applicability date for provisions relating to technical colleges would create confusion for school districts, pupils and parents, it may be desirable to specify that all of the modifications to the PSEO program would begin in 1998-99.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by approving one or more of the following:

a. Timing of Application and Notification

1. Require a pupil to notify the school board of his or her intent to enroll in a postsecondary institution under the program by April 1, if the pupil intends to enroll in the fall semester and by November 1, if the pupil intends to enroll in the spring semester;

2. Require a school board to notify a pupil of its determinations regarding satisfaction of high school graduation requirements and the number of credits to be awarded at least 30 days prior to the start of the institution of higher education's semester.

Representative Jensen

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Youth Options Program for Pupils Attending UW and Private Colleges

Motion:

Move to delete the Governor's recommendation to require a pupil to notify the school board of his or her intent to participate in the program at least 90 days before the start of the semester in which the pupil intends to enroll in an institution of higher education.

Note:

This motion would maintain the current dates by which a pupil is required to notify the school board of his or her intent to enroll in a UW or private college under the program. Under current law, a pupil is required to notify the school board by March 1, if the pupil intends to enroll at a postsecondary institution in the fall semester, and by October 1, if the pupil intends to enroll in the spring semester.

MO# 3229

1 JENSEN	~~Y~~	N	A
OURADA	~~Y~~	N	A
HARSDORF	~~Y~~	N	A
ALBERS	~~Y~~	N	A
2 GARD	~~Y~~	N	A
KAUFERT	~~Y~~	N	A
LINTON	~~Y~~	N	A
COGGS	~~Y~~	N	A
BURKE	~~Y~~	N	A
DECKER	~~Y~~	N	A
GEORGE	Y	~~N~~	A
JAUCH	~~Y~~	N	A
WINEKE	Y	~~N~~	A
SHIBILSKI	~~Y~~	N	A
COWLES	~~Y~~	N	A
PANZER	~~Y~~	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS ___

b. Course Comparability and Payment of Tuition and Fees

1. Modify the Governor's recommendation by specifying that for each pupil participating in the program, a school district would be responsible for payment for no more than the equivalent of eight credit hours per semester for courses taken for high school credit which are comparable to courses offered by the district.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by restoring the requirement that a school board determine whether a course a student intends to take is comparable to one offered in the school district. In addition, restore the provision which specifies that a pupil is responsible for tuition and fees for a course if the school board, or the State Superintendent on appeal, has determined that the course is comparable to one offered in the school district.

c. Effective Date of Statutory Changes

1. Modify the Governor's recommendation by specifying that the modifications to the PSEO program would first apply to pupils intending to participate in the program in the fall semester of 1998.

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# Alt #2b2

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS____

MO# Alt #2c1

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS____

Senator Jauch

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Youth Options Program

Motion:

Move to modify the Governor's recommendation regarding the definition of "institution of higher education" for the purposes of the youth options program to include tribally-controlled colleges. Provide that pupils would be permitted to attend tribally-controlled colleges under the program provided that the college has notified DPI of its intent to participate in the program by September 1 of the previous school year.

Note:

This motion would modify the Governor's recommendation regarding the definition of "institution of higher education" for the purposes of the youth options program to include postsecondary institutions which operated by tribal governments. Pupils would be permitted to attend such colleges under the program provided that the college has notified DPI of its intent to participate in the program by September 1 of the previous school year.

Under the current postsecondary enrollment options program, an "institution of higher education" is an institution in the University of Wisconsin System, a Wisconsin Technical College System institution or a private nonprofit institution of higher education located in the state. Private institution wishing to participate in the program are required to notify DPI of their intent by September 1 of the previous school year.

MO# 3191

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
2 DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
1 JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ____

Motion #3191

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Postsecondary Enrollment Options Program for Pupils Attending Technical Colleges (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 482, #31]

CURRENT LAW

A pupil attending a technical college under the postsecondary enrollment options (PSEO) program must be a state resident enrolled in a public school in the 11th or 12th grade and not enrolled in a technical college as a child-at-risk under the compulsory school attendance law. Pupils must notify their school district by March 1, if they plan to enroll in courses in the fall semester, or by October 1, for spring semester courses. In notifying the school district, the pupil is required to specify the course title, number of credits and whether the course will be taken for high school or postsecondary credit. A technical college may admit a pupil only if space is available and the pupil meets the college's admission standards and application deadlines developed for the PSEO program.

If a course is taken for high school credit, or for both high school and postsecondary credit, and a comparable course is not offered in the school district, the school district is required to pay to the WTCS district the actual cost of tuition, fees, books and other necessary materials directly related to the course. If the school board determines that a comparable course is offered in the school district, or if the course is taken solely for postsecondary credit, the pupil is responsible for payment of tuition and fees.

The parent or guardian of a pupil who is taking a course for high school credit that is not comparable to a course offered in the school district may apply to DPI for reimbursement of the costs of transportation between their high school and the postsecondary institution if they are unable to pay these costs.

DPI, in consultation with the WTCS Board, is required to promulgate rules establishing a uniform format for school boards to use in reporting the number of pupils attending technical colleges under the PSEO program, technical preparation programs, and the compulsory school attendance law, and the number of courses taken for technical college credit and for advanced standing in a WTCS associate degree program. The WTCS Board, in consultation with DPI, is required to establish a uniform format, identical to the format established by DPI, for WTCS district boards to use in reporting this information.

GOVERNOR

Youth Options Program

Establish separate criteria and requirements for high school pupils attending technical colleges, rather than UW institutions and private colleges, under the postsecondary enrollment options (PSEO) program, which would be renamed "youth options program." The program would be structured as follows:

A. *Eligibility and Application Process.* Allow a public school pupil, upon the pupil's request and with the written approval of his or her parent or guardian, to apply to attend a technical college for the purpose of taking one or more courses provided that the pupil: (a) has completed the 10th grade; (b) is in good academic standing; (c) notifies the school board of his or her intent to attend a technical college at least 90 days before the start of the technical college semester; and (d) does not meet the statutory definition of a child-at-risk. Delete the current law provision that specifies that a pupil can attend a technical college under the PSEO program only if he or she is a state resident.

Require a technical college district board to admit a pupil who meets the admission requirements of the program for which he or she applied. Provide that a district board could reject an application from a pupil if the district board determines that the pupil has a record of disciplinary problems. Require the technical college to ensure that the pupil's educational program meets the state's high school graduation requirements.

Require the school board of the school district in which the pupil resides to notify the pupil, in writing and prior to the beginning of the semester in which the pupil will be enrolled, if a course in which the pupil will be enrolled does not meet the graduation requirements.

Specify that the pupil would be eligible to receive both high school and technical college credit for courses successfully completed. Require a school board to grant a high school diploma to a pupil who has satisfied all of the state's graduation requirements regardless of whether the pupil met all or a portion of the requirements while attending a technical college.

B. *Appeals Process.* Provide that if a pupil disagrees with the school board's decision regarding whether the course meets the high school graduation requirements, the pupil could, within 30 days after the decision, appeal to the State Superintendent whose decision would be final and not subject to review.

C. *Payment to Technical College District Board.* For each pupil attending a technical college under the program, require the school board to pay to the technical college district board an amount equal to one of the following: (a) if the pupil is enrolled for less than seven credits eligible for high school credit at the technical college, the cost of tuition, course fees and books; or (b) if the pupil is enrolled for seven or more credits eligible for high school credit at the technical college, the school district's average per-pupil cost for regular instruction and instructional support services in the previous school year, as determined by DPI, multiplied by the result of dividing the number of credits taken by the pupil by 30.

Require that DPI, annually by the third Monday in February, make available to school boards and technical college district boards estimates of these amounts. Require a school board to make the payment to the technical college district board in two installments payable upon initial enrollment of the pupil and at the end of the semester. Specify that the pupil would not be responsible for any portion of the tuition and fees for a course taken at a technical college under the youth options program.

D. *State Aid.* Provide that a pupil attending a technical college under this program would be included in the school district's membership for state aid purposes. Provide that the payments made by school districts to technical college districts under this program would not be included in the technical college district's aidable cost for the purposes of calculating state aid payments to the technical college district.

E. *Transportation.* Specify that a school board would not responsible for transporting a pupil to or from the technical college the pupil is attending.

Reporting Requirements

Require the State WTCS Board, annually by the third Monday in February, to submit a report to DOA, DPI, the Department of Workforce Development and the Legislature including all of the following information, by school district:

1. The number of pupils who attended WTCS districts under the compulsory school attendance law and the youth options program in the previous school year.

2. The type and number of credits earned by the pupils.

3. The number of persons who applied for admission to a technical college in the previous school year who had previously earned technical college credit under the youth options program and who applied for admission within one year of graduating from high school.

4. A list of the courses given in high schools for which pupils may receive postsecondary credit and the number of pupils enrolled in the courses for postsecondary credit in the previous school year.

5. Any other information considered relevant by the Board.

Repeal the requirement that DPI, in consultation with the WTCS Board, promulgate rules establishing a uniform format for school boards to use in reporting the number of pupils attending technical colleges under the PSEO program, technical preparation programs, and the compulsory school attendance law, and the number of courses taken for technical college credit and for advanced standing in a WTCS associate degree program. Under the bill, the WTCS Board, in consultation with DPI, would still be required to establish a uniform format for WTCS district boards to use in reporting this information.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Background

1. In addition to the PSEO program, there are a number of other current law provisions which allow high school-age pupils to attend technical colleges. A child who is at least 16 years old and is not a child-at-risk may participate in a program or curriculum modification (which can include enrollment at a technical college) leading to the child's high school graduation. A similar provision applies to a child who is at least 17 years old. The payment made by the school district to the WTCS district is determined according to a contractual agreement between the two districts.

A child who is at least 16 years old and a child-at-risk may attend a technical college part-time, or in lieu of high school. As a condition of receiving state aid, each WTCS district board is required to offer day class programs which meet the requirements of these at-risk pupils. The law provides that courses taken at a technical college under this provision do not fulfill the state's high school graduation requirements unless approved by DPI. For these pupils, a school board is required to pay to the WTCS district an amount based on the statewide average instructional cost for general education programs in the WTCS, and additional costs associated with direct student support services, as determined jointly by DPI and WTCS. The pupil's school district is required to fund the cost of transportation, as well as board and lodging, if applicable.

High school pupils may also enroll in technical college courses under technical preparation, youth apprenticeship and other alternative programs which are provided under contracts between individual school districts and WTCS districts. The payment amount for such courses, which may be offered on site at the high school or technical college or provided through distance education, is determined by the contract.

2. In 1995-96, almost 4,000 pupils attended technical colleges in lieu of high school or as a curriculum modification, and another 6,200 pupils took WTCS courses under contracts with school districts. During the same year, a total of 664 pupils enrolled in technical colleges under the PSEO program.

3. According to DOA staff, the proposed changes to the PSEO program for pupils attending technical colleges are intended to increase participation and expand the program to allow more 11th and 12th grade pupils to attend technical colleges on a full-time basis. Although the current program permits a pupil to take up to 15 credits per semester, equivalent to a full-time student, most pupils take only one or two courses. This is primarily due to the course comparability provision.

4. SB 77 includes similar changes to the PSEO program for pupils attending UW and private institutions. Under the bill, the most significant differences between the program for pupils attending WTCS districts and for pupils attending UW and private institutions are that: (a) the school board's payment would increase for pupils attending a WTCS district at least half-time; (b) a WTCS district would be required to ensure that a pupil's education program meets high school graduation requirements; and (c) a WTCS district would be required to admit a qualified pupil regardless of whether space is available. According to DOA staff, these differences are intended to encourage more pupils to attend technical colleges, rather than UW or private institutions, on a full-time basis because school districts tend to emphasize preparation for baccalaureate degree programs over preparation for associate degree programs or the workforce.

5. Given that it is the responsibility of the state's school districts to educate pupils in grades K-12, one could question the proposal's aim of encouraging a greater number of high school pupils to attend technical colleges full-time. Concerns have been raised that a significant increase in the number of high school pupils attending technical colleges could result in an erosion of the academic standards of the technical colleges. In addition, it has been argued that the increase in school district costs which could result from the proposal would result in school districts having to limit the type and number of courses offered. One could argue that, due to the concerns which have been expressed regarding the proposal and since there are already a number of programs under which high school pupils are allowed to attend WTCS districts, pupils attending technical colleges under PSEO should not be treated differently from pupils attending UW or private institutions.

Application Process and Eligibility

6. Under SB 77, a pupil would be required to notify the school board of his or her intent to participate in the program at least 90 days prior to the start of the technical college semester. For most WTCS districts, the fall semester begins in late August or early September, and the spring semester begins in January. Therefore, pupils would have to notify the school district by late May or early June, and by October for enrollment in the fall and spring semesters, respectively. The change is intended to allow pupils sufficient time to choose courses since WTCS course schedules are not usually available until mid-April, after the current March 1 deadline for fall semester enrollment.

7. Some school districts have expressed concern that the later application dates, particularly for fall semester enrollment, would not allow sufficient time for districts to adjust their budgets and staffing levels in response to changes in enrollment due to the program. Therefore, the Committee may wish to retain the current law deadlines.

8. The bill would specify that a pupil would be eligible to receive both high school and technical college credit for courses successfully completed. Under the current PSEO program, a pupil may receive postsecondary and high school credit, or postsecondary credit only; this language is retained for pupils attending UW institutions and private colleges. It may be desirable to specify that a pupil attending a technical college could receive both postsecondary and high school credit, or postsecondary credit only, for courses successfully completed.

9. SB 77 would eliminate the requirement that a pupil's notification to the school district include the title and number of credits offered for each course and whether the course would be taken for high school and postsecondary credit, or postsecondary credit only. Presumably, a school district would need this information to determine whether a course meets the high school graduation requirements and the amount of the payment to the WTCS district. Therefore, the Committee may wish to restore the requirement that the pupil include this information.

10. Under the bill, a technical college would be required to admit a pupil who meets the admission requirements of the program for which he or she applied. However, for WTCS districts, the term "program" refers to a specific course of study leading to a postsecondary degree, vocational diploma or certificate. Since entrance to these programs generally requires that a student hold a high school diploma or the equivalent, it would be appropriate to modify the proposed language to specify that a pupil would be required to meet the requirements or prerequisites of the course or courses for which he or she applied.

11. Under current law, a technical college may admit a pupil under the PSEO program only if space is available. While SB 77 would retain this provision for UW institutions and private colleges, a technical college would be required to accept a pupil even if a course for which the pupil applied is full. WTCS districts have expressed concern that high school pupils could displace adult students in courses for which there are waiting lists. Such concerns could be alleviated by restoring the requirement that a technical college admit pupils only if space is available. However, one could argue that since the technical college would receive tuition for these pupils, they should be given the same access to courses as other WTCS students. Further, the proposed increase in the payment to a WTCS district for pupils enrolled at least half-time is intended to reflect the fact that a WTCS district's costs may increase if additional course sections are needed.

12. Some school districts contend that the bill provision which would allow a WTCS district to reject a pupil who has a record of disciplinary problems is vague and could unfairly exclude these pupils from the program. However, one could argue that since it is intended that pupils participating in the program would take existing WTCS courses, those pupils would have to be academically qualified and not represent a distraction or danger to other students. Further, many pupils who have a record of disciplinary problems may be identified as children-at-risk, for whom separate WTCS programs are currently available.

13. An option which could address the argument that the disciplinary problems provision is too vague and still permit WTCS districts to exclude certain pupils would be to adopt a provision similar to one recommended by the Legislative Council Special Committee on Public School Open Enrollment. Under that provision, a school board could reject an application from a pupil from another school district if the pupil has been expelled from school by any school district during the current or two preceding school years, or disciplinary proceedings are pending, for specified actions by the pupil.

14. SB 77 would require the technical college to ensure that a pupil's educational program meets the state's high school graduation requirements. The bill would also require the school board to notify the pupil prior to the beginning of the technical college semester, if a course in which the pupil will be enrolled does not meet the graduation requirements. It is not clear what is meant by "educational program," or whether a pupil would not be permitted to take a course which does not meet the high school graduation requirements. Further, since the school board is currently required to determine whether a course satisfies the graduation requirements, as well as the number of high school credits to be awarded, it would seem redundant to require the technical college to make such a determination. Another option would be to specify that the school board, in consultation with the WTCS district board, would make the determinations regarding satisfaction of high school graduation requirements and the number of high school credits, if any, to be awarded for a course.

15. SB 77 would require the school board to notify the pupil regarding a course's satisfaction of high school graduation requirements prior to the beginning of the semester in which the pupil will be enrolled. Thus, a pupil may be unaware of the board's decisions until just before classes begin. Since a school board's determinations could influence the pupil's decision whether to take the course, it may be reasonable to require the school board to notify the pupil at least 30 days prior to the start of the technical college semester.

Elimination of Course Comparability Requirement

16. Under current law, a school district is required to pay to the technical college an amount equal to tuition, course fees and books for pupils taking courses for high school credit which are not comparable to those offered in the school district. The pupil is responsible for the payment of tuition and fees for any course which is comparable to one offered by the district or which is taken only for postsecondary credit. The bill would require a school district to pay for courses taken for high school credit, regardless of whether a comparable course is offered by the district.

17. The removal of the course comparability requirement is intended to increase the number of pupils attending technical colleges under the program and to facilitate a pupil's full-time attendance at a technical college. It is difficult for most pupils to attend a postsecondary institution full-time while meeting their graduation requirements, without taking a course which is comparable to one offered in the district. While pupils are not currently prohibited from taking a comparable course, it is likely that more pupils would enroll in such courses if they did not have to pay tuition. In addition, travel time and longer meeting times for postsecondary courses currently cause scheduling difficulties for many pupils who are enrolled in only one or two courses.

18. The following concerns have been raised regarding the elimination of the comparability requirement:

• The resulting increase in pupil participation could force school districts to reduce the number and type of courses offered due to lower enrollments and financial constraints. Pupils who choose not to participate in the youth options program may be disadvantaged.

• Parents of particularly motivated students would be allowed to shift the cost of up to two years of their children's postsecondary education to the school district, and taxpayers. This is a particular concern in the three WTCS districts which provide college parallel programs (Madison, Milwaukee and Nicolet); these are two-year programs which provide for the automatic transfer of credits to four-year UW institutions.

• Current relationships between individual WTCS districts and school districts may deteriorate, resulting in less cooperation on other programs and activities which involve K-12 schools and technical colleges such as technical preparation, youth apprenticeship and distance learning networks.

19. If one of the purposes of the proposed changes to the program is to encourage more pupils to attend technical colleges on a full-time basis, the Committee could consider restoring the comparability requirement except for pupils who, in any academic semester, are enrolled at a technical college full-time.

20. Another option which would allow pupils to take additional courses, while limiting the financial impact on school districts, would be to specify that a school district would be responsible for payment of no more than the equivalent of eight credit hours for courses taken for high school credit in a semester, which are comparable to courses offered by the district. A pupil would still be permitted to take up to a total of 15 credits per semester and the school district would be required to pay for any courses taken for high school credit which are not comparable to courses offered by the district.

Payment to Technical College District Board

21. Aside from the comparability issue, the amount paid by a school district to a WTCS district would be the same under SB 77 as under current law for pupils taking up to six credits for high school credit at the technical college. However, the bill would increase the per credit payment amount for pupils taking seven or more credits for high school credit. For these pupils, payment would be based on the school district's average cost per pupil for regular instruction and instructional support services in the prior year, prorated for pupils who attend the technical college less than full-time. Instructional support services include curriculum development, staff training, library services and the supervision and coordination of instructional staff.

22. In 1995-96, the most recent year for which data is available, the statewide average annual cost per pupil for regular instruction and instructional support services was $3,793, while these costs for individual districts ranged from $2,576 to $7,144. If the proposed provision had been in

place in 1996-97, a school district with average instructional costs would have paid approximately $885 for a pupil taking seven credits for high school credit at a technical college, whereas if the pupil had taken six credits for high school credit, the district would have been required to pay only $325 plus the cost of books and other necessary materials. For each credit taken over six credits, the school district would be required to pay significantly more under SB 77, than under current law.

23. WTCS tuition covers an average of approximately 14% of operational costs for postsecondary and vocational-adult courses and approximately 31% of operational costs for college parallel courses. The additional payment, above tuition and fees, is intended to reflect increased costs to the WTCS district for additional services as a pupil spends a greater percentage of time at the technical college and a correspondingly lower percentage of time in the school district. It is argued that since a school district would continue to receive state aid and property tax revenue for a pupil attending a technical college, this funding should "follow" the pupil. In addition, as previously noted, a WTCS district may have to offer additional course sections to accommodate a greater number of high school students which would also increase the district's costs.

24. It is not possible to determine the impact on school districts of the proposed payment changes since it is not known how many pupils would take seven or more credits per semester, and it is not possible to calculate the marginal cost of losing a pupil. However, concerns have been expressed that school districts would discourage pupils from taking more than six credits due to the higher cost for the school district.

25. The bill would require DPI to provide to school districts and WTCS districts, annually by the third Monday in February, estimates of school district instructional costs for the current year, which would be used to calculate payments for pupils attending technical colleges in the following fall and spring semesters. These estimates could vary significantly from actual costs which are not usually known until October following the end of the fiscal year. This uncertainty could be lessened somewhat by the use of the statewide average per pupil cost for regular instruction and instructional support services.

26. The bill would not permit a WTCS district to reject a pupil based on the pupil's need for special services. In his testimony to the Joint Committee on Finance, the Director of the WTCS Board recommended that the bill be modified to provide that for pupils with exceptional educational needs (EEN), the payment by the school district would be adjusted to reflect additional costs associated with serving these pupils. The Committee could consider adopting for this program, a provision similar to one proposed in the bill under the public school open enrollment program. That provision would require that, for EEN pupils, the payment made by the sending school district to the receiving school district be equal to the receiving district's cost to provide any special services required for the pupil; if the cost is such that this payment amount would represent an undue financial burden on the sending district, that district would have the option of refusing to permit the pupil to enroll in the receiving district.

Effective Date of Changes to the Program

27. Since the bill does not specify an initial applicability date for the proposed changes to the PSEO program, these changes, as well as those for pupils enrolled in courses at UW institutions and private colleges, would take effect on the effective date of the budget bill. Executive budget documents, however, indicate that programmatic changes for pupils attending technical colleges under the youth options program would first take effect in 1998-99. WTCS staff have indicated that delaying the effective date until 1998-99, would allow sufficient time for school districts and WTCS districts to prepare for, and inform students of, the changes.

Reporting Requirements

28. Under the bill, the WTCS Board would be required to report annually on data relating to pupil participation in the youth options program as well as other programs under which pupils attend technical colleges. In addition, the Board would be required to submit a list of the courses given in high schools for which a pupil may receive postsecondary credit and the number of pupils enrolled in courses for postsecondary credit in the previous school year. This requirement should be clarified to refer to courses for which a pupil may receive WTCS credit, rather than postsecondary credit.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Separate Criteria and Requirements for Pupils Attending Technical Colleges

Default

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to establish separate criteria and requirements for pupils attending technical colleges, rather than UW or private institutions, under the PSEO program.

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation and instead, provide that all criteria and requirements for the program for pupils attending UW and private institutions would also apply to pupils attending technical colleges.

B. Eligibility and Application Process

1. Approve the Governor's recommendations regarding eligibility and the application process for the program.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendations as follows:

a. Require that a pupil notify the school board of his or her intent to attend a technical college under the program by March 1 if the pupil intends to enroll in the fall semester and by October 1 if the pupil intends to enroll in the spring semester.

b. Restore the current requirement that the pupil's notification to the school board include the title and number of credits offered for each course in which the pupil intends to enroll and whether the course would be taken for high school and postsecondary credit, or postsecondary credit only.

c. Specify that a pupil attending a technical college could receive both postsecondary and high school credit, or postsecondary credit only, for courses successfully completed.

d. Specify that a technical college would be required to admit a pupil who meets the requirements or prerequisites of the course for which he or she has applied, rather than the "admission requirements of the program."

e. Specify that a WTCS district would not be required to admit a high school pupil unless space is available.

f. Delete the provision which would allow a technical college to reject a pupil if the pupil has a record of disciplinary problems and instead, provide that a technical college could reject a pupil if the pupil has been expelled from school during the current or two preceding school years, or disciplinary proceeding is pending, for any of the following reasons:

• Conveying or causing to be conveyed any threat or false information concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made to destroy any school property by means of explosives.

• Engaging in conduct while at school or while under supervision of a school authority that endangered the health, safety or property of others.

• Engaging in conduct while not at school or while not under the supervision of a school authority that endangered the health, safety, or property of others at school or under the supervision of a school authority or of any employe or school board member.

• Possessing a dangerous weapon while at school or while under the supervision of a school authority.

g. Delete the requirement that a technical college ensure that a pupil's education program meets the state's high school graduation requirements. In addition, restore the current law provision which requires a school board to determine whether a course a pupil intends to take satisfies any of the state's high school graduation requirements and the number of high school credits to award the pupil for the course, if any.

h. Delete the requirement that a technical college ensure a pupil's education program meets the state's high school graduation standards. Instead, specify that the school board, in consultation with the WTCS district board, would determine whether a course a pupil intends to take satisfies any of the state's high school graduation requirements and the number of high school credits to award the pupil for the course, if any.

i. Require a school board to notify a pupil at least 30 days prior to the start of the technical college semester if a course in which the pupil will be enrolled does not meet the high school graduation requirements.

3. Delete the Governor's recommendations.

C. Course Comparability Requirement See motion #3230

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to require a school board to pay for a course taken for high school credit, regardless of whether the course is comparable to one offered by the school district.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation as follows:

a. Specify that a school district would be responsible for payment for a course that is comparable to one offered in the district only if the pupil is enrolled full-time at the technical college during the semester. Provide that pupils who are enrolled less than full-time at a technical college during the semester would be responsible for payment of tuition and fees for any course taken which is comparable to one offered by the district.

b. Specify that for each pupil participating in the program, a school district would be responsible for payment for no more than the equivalent of eight credit hours per semester for courses taken for high school credit which are comparable to courses offered by the district.

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation. A pupil would be responsible for payment of tuition and fees for any course taken which is comparable to one offered by the district.

D. Payment to Technical College District Board

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation regarding the amount of the payment from a school district to the technical college.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation as follows:

a. Specify that for pupils taking seven or more credits per semester, the payment amount would be based on the statewide average per pupil cost for regular instruction and instructional support services in the previous school year.

b. Provide that if a pupil with exceptional educational needs (EEN) attends a technical college under the program, the payment from the pupil's school district would be adjusted to reflect the cost of any special services required for the pupil. In addition, provide that if the additional payment would represent an undue financial burden on the school district, the school district could refuse to permit the pupil to enroll at the technical college.

E. Initial Applicability

1. Modify the Governor's recommendation by specifying that the modifications to the PSEO program would first apply to pupils intending to participate in the program in the fall semester of 1998.

2. Take no action.

F. Reporting Requirements

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by specifying that the WTCS Board report include a list of the courses given in high schools for which pupils may receive technical college credit, rather than postsecondary credit, and the number of pupils enrolled in the courses for technical college credit in the previous school year.

3. Delete the Governor's recommendations.

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# Alt #A1

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS ____

MO# Alt #A2

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS ____

VOTES over

MO# Alt #B2adopt

JENSEN	Y	N	A
2 OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS ____

MO# Alt #D2b

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
2 KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
1 DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 11 NO 5 ABS ____

MO# Alt #E1

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
2 GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS ____

MO# Alt #F2

JENSEN	Y	N	A
2 OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ____

PAPER #674

Representative Jensen

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Youth Options Program for Pupils Attending Technical Changes

Motion:

Move to modify the Governor's recommendation by specifying that for each pupil attending a technical college on a full-time basis under the program, a school board would be responsible for payment for not more than six credits per semester for courses taken by the pupil that are comparable to courses offered in the district. Provide that a pupil taking 12 or more credits during the semester would be considered to be enrolled on a full-time basis.

Note:

Under the current postsecondary enrollment options program, a school board is responsible for payment of tuition and fees for a course taken for high school credit which is not comparable to one offered in the district. SB 77 would require a school board to pay for any course taken at a technical college for high school credit, regardless of whether the course is comparable to one offered by the school district. This motion would specify that, for a pupil who is enrolled full-time at a technical college, a school board would be required to pay for not more than six credits per semester for courses that are comparable to courses offered by the district. The motion would define "full-time" as 12 or more credits per semester.

MO# 3230

1 JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
2 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS ____

Motion #3230

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Reestimate of GPR Revenue from MA Reimbursement for School Based Services (DHFS/DPI)

CURRENT LAW

1995 Wisconsin Act 27 established "school medical services" as a medical assistance (MA) benefit. School medical services are defined as health care services provided in a school to children who are eligible for MA. These services must be appropriate to a school setting and may include: (a) speech, language, audiology and hearing services; (b) occupational and physical therapy services; (c) psychological or counseling services; (d) nursing services; (e) durable medical equipment; and (f) special transport services.

If a school district or cooperative educational service agency (CESA) elects to provide school based services and if it meets all certification and reporting requirements, it is reimbursed for 60% of the federal share of allowable charges for school based services. The remaining 40% of the federal share is credited to the general fund as GPR-earned.

GOVERNOR

Estimate that MA reimbursements for school based services deposit to the general fund will total $341,700 in 1996-97 and $222,400 in 1997-98 and 1998-99.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. As of April 31, 1997, $895,900 of federal MA reimbursement for school based services was deposited to the general fund for the 1996-97 fiscal year. By the close of the fiscal

year, it is estimated that a total of $1,154,300 will be deposited to the general fund. This would increase the opening balance of the general fund by $812,600, compared to previous estimates.

2. In addition, it is estimated that the state's share of the federal reimbursement for these services will increase GPR revenues by $1,550,300 annually in 1997-99. This amount represents an increase of $1,327,900 annually from the amounts assumed in SB 77.

MODIFICATION TO BILL

1. Increase estimated revenues to the general fund by $1,327,900 annually to reflect reestimates of MA reimbursement for school based services. In addition, increase projected revenues to the general fund by $812,600 in 1996-97.

Modification	GPR
1997-99 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	$2,655,800

Prepared by: Amie T. Goldman

MO# Modification

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
2 SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ____

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

Item #	Title
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
6	Milwaukee Parental Choice Program
8	Driver Education
~~9~~	~~Children-at-Risk Aid Reduction~~
12	School District Revenue Limits -- Milwaukee Public Schools
15	Funding for Current Required Examinations
17	Federal Revenue Reestimates
18	Program Revenue Reestimates
19	Personnel Licensure Funding
21	Residential Schools -- Utilities Reestimate
22	Residential Schools -- Teacher Salary Costs
23	Residential Schools -- Pupil Transportation
24	Residential Schools -- Nonresident Fees
25	Residential Schools -- Educational Services Center
44	School District Contracts for Outpatient Services

MO# Items (1 OT 9)

JENSEN	Y	N	A
ZOURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ____

LFB Summary Items to be Addressed in Subsequent Papers

Item #	Title
16	Debt Service Reestimates
29	Interdistrict School Choice Programs

(over)

LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation

Item #	Title
13	Scheduling Referenda Relating to School Borrowing and Revenue Limits
27	Academic Standards
36	Technical Preparation Programs
38	Release of Confidential Information and Teacher License Restrictions for Failure to Pay Child Support or Delinquent Taxes
39	Administrative Leadership Academy
40	Delete Separate Annual Report on Bilingual-Bicultural Education
41	Procedures for Setting Standards for Early Admission
42	Preapproval of Summer School Classes
43	DPI Role in High School Admission and Course of Study
45	CESA Annual Convention and Planning and Reporting Requirements