

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2200

2007 SENATE EDUCATION

SB 2200

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2200

Senate Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 17, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1280

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Chairman Freborg opened the hearing on SB 2200, a bill relating to the determination of state aid to school districts, relating to school district census, the school district equalization factor, weighting factors, supplemental payments, additional per student payments, property valuations and teacher compensation payments; to provide for a commission on education improvement; to provide for teacher compensation increases; to provide for contingent payments; to provide for a contingent transfer. All members were present.

Chairman Freborg explained the procedure for the hearing and asked for a show of hands of people who intended to testify in favor of and against the bill.

Senator Flakoll introduced the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 4:33

Representative Rae Ann Kelsch testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 9:42

Representative David Monson testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 11:22

Representative Pam Guleson testified in favor of the bill. Meter 13:38 She wants to lend her support to the bill and commends the Commission on Education Improvement. She was part of the blue ribbon commission to evaluate the education formula in the early 90's and knows

how difficult it is and appreciates the open process and public input . Creating a formula is a challenge. We live in a state of extreme demographics – high population vs. very low, increasingly urban vs. very rural. It will never be beneficial to pit one against the other. Increasing dollars in the formula will be the key. Creating a great educational system is the greatest legacy we can pass onto our children.

Senator Ray Holmberg testified in favor of the bill. Meter 15:46. He is happy to be a co-sponsor of the bill. This bill embodies change. We are talking about perfection vs. good, You will not find perfection in this bill, and perfection is the purview of God. The legislature looks for good answers to problems and he believes SB 2200 is a good answer. He hopes the committee will give favorable passage to SB 2200 and send it down to appropriations where they await it with open arms.

Senator David O'Connell testified. Meter 17:17 This is the most challenging commission he has ever served on and the most time consuming. Normally we look at what is best for the majority when we try to pass a bill. In this case we have to look at what is best for all students, not just the majority of the students. He does have a couple of amendments and will present them when the committee has time.

Senator Bakke said she noticed Senator O'Connell was the only dissenting vote on the bill yet he is a sponsor. Can he explain that?

Senator O'Connell said he had concerns in the committee. He wanted to let the Senate Education Committee know he has concerns. He has concerns with the mills; they are looking at property tax. He has had some good discussions with Senator Flakoll regarding philosophy. By sponsoring the bill, he has some ownership. He hopes we can make it better.

Chairman Freborg said we are off to a good start, we have had six commission members testify in 15 minutes.

Lt. Governor Jack Dalrymple explained the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 20:42 The commission has outstanding members who were chosen for their knowledge of education funding. The commission will be available to assist the committee in any way it can, they do have a program that mirrors that of Department of Public Instruction so scenarios can be run. They can also help with information gathering. He reviewed the bill summary and list of terms. Chairman Freborg thanked the Lt. Governor for his testimony.

Wayne Sanstead, Superintendent of Public Instruction, testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 1:10:14.

Martin Schock, Elgin – New Leipzig – Carson school district testified in favor of the bill. Meter 1:19:46 We now have plusses in funding. The handout shows an example of a sampling of school districts and how this bill will affect their funding and it shows increases. Both of his districts will share because of their cooperative agreement. It can't be business as usual in education in academics or funding. We need to predict, project, prepare and forward think to be able to provide the services necessary for our students. We need to look at what we can do for each other, not just what we can do for ourselves. We need to look at what is best for our students, not just what is best for economic development or our pride. We need to expand our definition of community. Its no longer about "me", it's about "us", all of us across the state. It's about providing and equitable and adequate education for all students.

Doug Johnson, Executive Director of the North Dakota Council of Educational Leaders testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 1:23:00

Jack Maus, Superintendent of Grafton Public Schools, testified in favor of the bill. Meter 85:17. He was superintendent at Hatton Public Schools when the stay in the lawsuit was reached.

Both Hatton and Grafton have a history of financial struggles and both levy above the 185 mill level. The two key provisions of the lawsuit stay were a minimum of \$60 million of new money.

At the time he heard it, it seemed like a lot of money but when you begin to look at all the funding issues of the state, a lot of needs still can't be met. Secondly was the Governor's Commission on Education Improvement; it was and is a great success. There was great leadership and talented committee members. His expectations have been exceeded. \$80 million is a big first step. The key change in the formula is the money follows the students. It is a transition and a framework for the future. Equity and adequacy can be reached. There are parts of the bill that are not necessarily favorable to his districts but we have to look at the funding issue as a whole and as a whole state.

Nancy Sand, North Dakota Education Association testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 1:28:32.

Paul Stremick, Superintendent of Dickinson Public Schools, testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 1:31:35

Jon Martinson, Executive Director of the North Dakota School Boards Association, testified in favor of the bill. Their delegates passed a resolution to support a formula for equity and adequacy. He appreciates that the commission has accepted his subcommittee recommendations that include additional funding for JPA's and for providing pilot programs for new two new technical centers in western North Dakota.

Warren Larson, Superintendent of Williston Public Schools. (Written testimony attached) Meter 1:39:54

Larry Klundt, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership, UND testified in favor of the bill.

Meter 1:46:04 He distributed "Understanding School Finance for North Dakota K – 12

Schools". The problem in North Dakota is our schools are good. It's difficult to move to great or excellent because we get complacent. We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to create an equitable and adequate system that funds our schools. Many concepts in the bill are

addressed in the document he distributed. Some solutions are also in the document. He suggests we spend \$10,000 per student. To go from good to excellent, we have to spend money.

Don Moore, former state senator for 12 years, testified in favor of the bill. In each session he spent a lot of time on education finance with no success. He thanks the commission members and is pleased they are proposing things he couldn't get done. They have done a remarkable job, no other group could have accomplished this, They are thinking outside the box. Three repealers are the great parts of the bill: the mill deduct, equalizing the state tuition fund and automatically adjustment of the weighting factor. This bill is so closely integrated, if you tinker with it, it won't work. The section about 70% of new money to teacher salaries is strange. It wasn't in the first report but was in the final report. The state should not mandate what to do with the money, it will take care of itself and he recommends an amendment.

Bill Gorder, Walsch County Commissioner, testified in favor of the bill. He is in awe of what the commission has done. Grafton has been in the lawsuit and he thought they should stay with the lawsuit, he didn't think the commission would get the job done. This is a monumental thing. He has been in the legislature on the Education Committee for 16 years. He is a farmer and appreciates what the commission has done.

Mike Kraft, School Board President for the Apple Creek School Board, testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 2:04:56.

Sandy Clark, North Dakota Farm Bureau, testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 2:10:13

Dan Donstad, President of the Grafton School Board, testified in favor of the bill. He is a plaintiff in the lawsuit. He was skeptical of the commission proposal. The commission has done a wonderful job. The bill will get us to a point where equity can be achieved. The only

agenda of the commission was what is best for the kids of North Dakota. Now is the time to act. This will launch us into an adequacy debate. Our hands are tied with the current formula.

Sarita McComish testified in favor of the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 2:17:33

Royal Lyson, Superintendent of the Center Stanton Schools, testified in opposition to the bill. He has one concern. The coal severance and coal diversion taxes are in place of real estate taxes. 65% goes to the general fund. The remainder is divided between the city, county and schools. It is unfair to use 75% of the imputed taxable value when the state general fund is already getting 65% of the coal severance tax. They are losing at both ends. They are at 175 mills.

Senator Gary Lee said Paul Stremick gave the example of \$688 for this kind of input into one school district, why isn't nearly \$700 per student enough?

Mr., Lyson said he wasn't here for Mr. Stremick's testimony. Since they are already giving 65% and they can't levy property tax on the plant, what alternative do they have?

Senator Gary Lee asked if the dollar amount is levied in lieu of property tax.

Mr. Lyson said yes but 65% goes to the general fund.

Senator Flakoll asked if he would be in support of legislation to have property tax instead of the coal tax.

Mr. Lyson said no.

Richard Ray, Administrator at Manville Elementary School, testified in opposition to the bill.

Meter 2:27:46. The bill is crafted on taxable value per student. They have 150 elementary students and 85 students who attend the high school. Because they have to pay the cost for the high school students. The ADM formula needs to include the high school students as well as the elementary students. Make a simple revision. It doesn't matter where they are getting educated; their kids go to Grand Forks. If high school students are not counted in the ADM,

they look like a rich district and they are bumped out of the equity program. In truth, they are well below the state average. He likes most of this bill. Dr. Stremick pointed out the tuition benefit because the state aid would go up under the new formula and that is significant, it would save them 25 mills. He guesses it was an unintended consequence.

Representative Conrad testified in opposition to the bill. She is from the Minot area. This is the most important issue in the 3rd district this session. She has asked legislative council to prepare 2 amendments that will make this a bill she can support. She has 4 school districts in her district: the Minot district (the east side of Minot, some of the poorest areas in Minot), Surrey, who loves the bill, Nedrose and Bell, large schools who are hurt by this bill. Impact aid paid to the Minot Air Force Base School District, it is their only income and their only expense is to the Minot School District. We have to maintain a school district that appeals to the Air Force. The tuition paid by Nedrose and Bell for their high school students is equal to what Minot residents pay in property tax. They aren't given credit for those students. She understands they can't be counted twice. She would like to support the bill. Maybe we should wait 2 more years, put the \$80 million into the current formula for two more years and get it right.

Senator Flakoll asked if she has seen the letter to Wayne Sanstead from the Attorney General regarding impact aid that says impact aid can be classified as tuition, do you disagree with that opinion.

Representative Conrad said legally that is probably right. She can't see a difference in Belcourt School District getting their money directly from the federal government and Minot School District getting their money from the Minot Air Force Base School Board.

Senator Flakoll asked if the taxable value in the Nedrose and Bell districts is fairly high behind each student.

Representative Conrad said some major industrial development is being done in the Nedrose School District. The same would go for South Prairie, The formula should be sound.

Senator Flakoll asked if she prefers the current formula, are they getting whacked by the current formula.

Representative said the flaw is so great, lets put off the bill and study equity again, Lets study adequacy first and equity second.

Senator Bakke asked if she is proposing foundation aid go to the sending district rather than the receiving district?

Representative Conrad said she also has Minot. They have tried to figure out what works for all. Minot needs the state dollars, but we need to give credit for the local contribution to those students.

Senator Horn, district 3, testified in opposition to the bill. Meter 2:42:00 He has many of the same concerns as Representative Conrad. He commends the commission and there is much to commend in the bill. There is work yet to be done to make this a better bill. Two of the elementary schools in his district are being hurt by the bill. Apple Creek and Manville has the same concerns. Surrey is being treated well by the bill and he is happy for them. Minot is a in a special category and would urge removing the impact aid from the formula. He doesn't think federal regulations allow it to be done. He urges the committee to be more fair and equitable and build a better plan.

Dr. Dave Looyen, superintendent of the Minot Schools and the Minot Air Force Base Schools testified in opposition to the bill. Meter 2:44:19 (Written testimony attached) He distributed a copy of public law 103-382 relating to Impact Aid. Senator Gary Lee asked with revenue of \$6600 per student, what is their cost per student?

Dr. Looyesen said that is the impact aid funds, they also get funds from the state of North Dakota. That money is all blended into the Minot Public Schools and he hasn't taken it out directly. For the middle school on the base, it costs more than any other school in the district. The enrollment is declining but you have to keep teachers. It costs about 25% more.

Senator Gary Lee asked what is the cost per student in Minot.

Dr. Looyesen said the cost is just under the state average, around \$6600, combined for both districts.

Senator Flakoll asked when impact aid is no longer impact aid?" When a teacher receives money as part of their salary from impact aid and pays their property tax, is that impact aid?

Dr. Looyesen said no.

Senator Flakoll said he wants to clarify the point that the question is only in terms of equity payments, not in per pupil payments.

Dr. Looyesen said it affects imputed value which in turn affects the equity payments.

Senator Flakoll said if you are not eligible either way for equity payments the point is moot.

Dr. Looyesen they would get equity payments if they didn't have the air force base money and students included.

Senator Flakoll said the commission looks at this from a long telescope, looking 10 or 20 years or 50 years out. If their situation changes, some growth areas, some manufacturing, and Minot is not eligible for equity payments, are we in agreement that it only applies to equity payments.

Dr. Looyesen said he believes so.

Scott Moum, Business Manager, Minot Schools testified in opposition to the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 2:57:17

Senator Flakoll asked if his amendments went from 50% of the high valuations to 75% of the high valuations.

Mr. Moun said he did not see that in the last commission report, maybe he missed it. He is pretty certain the 2% transition minimum is there.

Senator Flakoll asked if county income should be counted?

Mr. Moun said it's not for him to say.

Senator Flakoll clarified he meant minerals.

Mr. Moun said that is for greater discussion. They are not able to tax the oil wells in their districts just as Minot is not able to tax their B52 bombers.

Vicky Steiner, Executive Director of the North Dakota Association of Oil and Gas Producing Counties testified in opposition to the bill. (Written testimony attached) Meter 3:03:50

Chuck Miller, Administrator of Nedrose Elementary School testified in opposition to the bill.

Meter 3:10:05 His is a graded elementary district and he has concern with imputed value issue because they can't count their high school students. Overall the work of the commission is good; it just needs one small change. The graded elementary districts had no direct voice on the commission. They will see some benefit from lower tuition payments but the assurance of reduced tuition is very limited and unknown. They did not receive foundation aid payments for their high school students but they did receive tuition apportionment payments which generated considerable revenue for their district and that has been removed. Another concern is the protections are limited by hold harmless provisions, in a few years we will start to see some of these protections disappear. We are looking at 2 – 7%. A lot of the data is old.

Rick Solberg, Administrator at Bell Public School, testified in opposition to the bill. Meter

3:16:06 They are one of the three or four graded elementaries. If they are allowed to count high school students, they have \$13,000 valuation per student, without them, they have an

\$18,000 valuation. He compared their taxable valuation to the K-8 district next door that would get more money under the new plan.

Roger Slotsve, Minot School Board, testified in opposition to the bill. Letter to Chairman Freborg attached. The district in the state that is supported only with federal funds spends over \$9000 per student, where is equity in that? In 41 years he has never seen anything as positive as this bill.

Dave Wisthoff, Glenburn School, testified in opposition to the bill. They have a unique situation; mills aren't as high as they like them to be. A few years ago, they lost \$95,000 per year in tuition. They did not make changes at that time. Have about 50% military students, they get some impact aid, it has decreased recently. They have oil money as well. Last year they deficit spent \$90,000 and are set to deficit spend \$105,000 this year. The plan gives them \$20,000 in new money next year, it won't go very far. It is hard to explain to the community.

Brian Nelson, Lewis and Clark School District, Berthold, Plaza, Ryder, Makoti testified in favor of the bill. They tried to raise mill levy but Ward County auditor wouldn't let them, Attorney General let them raise them. It would have big impact if raised to 170 mills in section 21. Be cautious.

Maria Wancheck, parent from Apple Creek testified in opposition to the bill. She does not want the Apple Creek school to close. Her son is in kindergarten. She discussed equity and adequacy. She is in favor of a small school environment.

Steve Heim, Superintendent at Anamoose School District, testified in favor of the bill. He has one area of concern. Meter 3:32:57 They have one student being educated out of district. At the 4.5 times the state rate, they would be liable for \$33,000 which is more than 10% of all state revenue they would generate. For a small district, one or two such students is a devastating bill to foot.

Senator Flakoll asked if he has a solution.

Mr. Heim said maybe a limit to a certain portion of the total budget, maybe 2 or 3%. Right now they have appropriations of about \$900,000. Right now, the one student with transportation costs, tuition, room and board, they are spending about \$50,000.

Senator Flakoll asked if he means 2 – 3% of entire budget for all special education needs.

Mr. Heim said for one student, It's just something to think about.

Chairman Freborg closed the hearing on senate bill 2200.

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2200

Senate Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 22, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1598

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Chairman Freborg opened the discussion on SB 2200.

Chairman Freborg suggested the committee go through the bill one section at a time.

Senator Flakoll advised caution in tinkering with one thing in the bill that will affect other parts of the bill. Some changes are desired based on individual circumstances. If we get into "an eye for an eye" discussion, we could go back to court.

Senator Flakoll explained each section of the bill.

During the discussion of section 3, Chairman Freborg asked if there had been any discussion on the Governor's Commission about making half day kindergarten mandatory.

Senator Flakoll said not to his recollection. Current law states half day kindergarten must be offered if the parents want it but the compulsory attendance age is 7. Law also states that once a student is enrolled in kindergarten and then they drop out they cannot reenroll that same year.

Chairman Freborg asked if we are doing any favors allowing some children to attend kindergarten while some do not. It is not the child's choice, it is their parents' choice. If we are having trouble preparing students for first grade with half day kindergarten, what about the

students that are receiving no kindergarten? He has always believed there should be mandatory half day kindergarten.

Senator Flakoll said last session the schools put together a bill for full day kindergarten and there was no public support.

Senator Bakke said she agrees it should be mandatory.

Senator Flakoll said those who are against kindergarten say any gains kids who do not attend kindergarten catch up to their peers by 4th grade.

Senator Gary Lee asked if kids drop out of kindergarten and drop out, can they go back?

Senator Flakoll said 2200 reverts back to the provision that prohibits yoyo in and out.

Chairman Freborg told the committee we can go back to any section.

There was more discussion about the cost of half day kindergarten , mandatory half day kindergarten and cost of full day kindergarten.

Senator Flakoll continued with an explanation of the bill, beginning with section 4. Meter 18:14 Section 7 has the weighting factors for students. Meter 25:30 This was originally based on the current appropriation. In special education, ELL, where additional dollars are provided, the base reflects those extra dollars. As we move towards adequacy, these will be modified.

There was significant discussion of line 24, special education. The special education units and sometimes the schools like to have an amount specified for special education purposes. The numbers were retweaked many many times so the dollars would reflect the weighting factor.

This does not cover the students under contract.

Senator Bakke asked why the weighing factor was so low for L & M, preschool special needs and special education, she was told they were at that level to keep them current for current

funding. That's telling her there is no new funding.

Senator Flakoll said that may have been true at one point. It was built from an additional \$6 million for special education. The dollars aren't following based on need, they are based on student numbers.

There was more discussion of weighting factors for special education and contracts for high need special education children, ELL, migrant students.

Senator Flakoll resumed explanation of the sections of the bill, with section 8. Meter 37:02

Senator Taylor asked how many schools are considered small but isolated,

Doug Johnson, who was listening to the discussion, said 2.

Senator Flakoll said they were told repeatedly that sections 11 and 12 have never been used in North Dakota history.

Senator Bakke observed they were very punitive.

Senator Flakoll said Department of Public Instruction does everything possible to see a school does not lose accreditation.

Section 13 contains the imputation formulas. The Governor's Commission felt strongly a dollar should be treated as a dollar and everyone should be brought to 90% of the statewide average as far as the dollars behind each student. Some people want no consideration given to mineral and tuition income, some want it considered at 100%.

Chairman Freborg said there will be amendments on this section.

Senator Flakoll continued to explain the section of the bills with section 14.

Chairman Freborg closed the discussion on SB 2200.

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2200

Senate Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 23, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1695

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Chairman Freborg opened the discussion on SB 2200.

Senator Flakoll said in follow up, there had been questions in the committee about ELL and he distributed a District Report by Language Level for ELL. (Copy attached)

Senator Flakoll continued with his review of the bill, beginning with section 17.

There was some discussion of summer school section 19. Meter 8:49

There was discussion of section 21, minimum local effort. Senator Flakoll said the presentation by Paul Stremick on this issue is very good. He has provided it to the committee and he also submitted a copy to the clerk for the record. (Copy attached) The level was at 170 originally and the Governor's Commission decided to move more slowly to that. Some schools are at 30 mills and they could care less. The bill calls for 155 mills the first year, 160 the second year and thereafter. He is aware of some amendments to this section.

Senator Flakoll said section 22 will get some attention. It deals with the imputation value. He referred the committee to page 28 of the Stremick presentation.

Section 25 contains the ending fund balance language. It had to be added back since it was in the mill deduct section.

Senator Flakoll said the Attorney General has issued an opinion on regarding section 26 and it is legal.

Senator Flakoll referred the committee to pages 38 and 39 of the Stremick presentation for section 29. The dollars follow the student, there is no mill deduct.

Senator Taylor asked, in section 31, is the addition of tutoring for at risk kids?

Senator Flakoll said it is not so much for at risk kids as the thought that the receiving district should not have to pay tutoring expenses. This permits the sending district to levy for tutoring.

Section 33, contracts for special education, will receive some attention. This is for the extremely high cost students. This is a compromise. The big concern is extremely high cost. 4 ½ times the state wide average is about \$33,000, anything over this is paid by the state. The

Governor's Commission said lets start with equity and we will move to adequacy. Schools prefer knowing the very high costs will be paid. They would rather pay all costs over 2.5 times the state average but we cannot afford it.

Senator Bakke asked if by setting the level at 4.5 times isn't the state actually paying less?

Senator Flakoll said there are about \$2 million in new money in special education.

Senator Flakoll explained the current payment procedure for contract students and the added funding from the bill.

Senator Taylor said the 2.5 times level wasn't really 2.5 times; it was not backstopped and fully guaranteed. He will want to return to this section.

Senator Flakoll said section 54 is the backstop.

Chairman Freborg asked if this guarantee is just like the last one. He hopes the dollars remain there and keep up with costs.

Senator Flakoll said there are 2 backstops; one is a contingency line of \$1 million the second is a transfer from the Bank of North Dakota to be sure we can cover our obligations.

There was discussion about the difficulty of determining the cost of half day kindergarten.

Chairman Freborg said the estimate changed \$12 million in 2 hours when he was discussing it with Department of Public Instruction.

Senator Flakoll continued with review of section 34.

Senator Taylor said he has a little amendment for section 39.

Chairman Freborg said the committee can return to any section. Meter 1:02:51.

There was some discussion of section 41, loans for construction projects.

There was some discussion of section 43, ELL and the payments for students in the 4 language levels.

Chairman Freborg closed the discussion of SB 2200.

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2200

Senate Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 24, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1760

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chairman Freborg opened the discussion on SB 2200.

Senator Flakoll resumed his review of the bill with section 45.

Regarding section 47, Senator Bakke asked if all districts have given 70% of new money to

teacher salaries or have they just not reported that they haven't.

Senator Flakoll said he knows of no district that hasn't. With the scrutiny of the school districts, one would think a flag would have been raised if they had not. In the 2003 session, in the Fargo district, the language required 70% and his district was at 283% so in some districts it is not an issue.

Senator Flakoll continued his review through section 50 when Chairman Freborg closed the discussion, to resume after lunch.

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2200

Senate Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 24, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1854

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Chairman Freborg opened the discussion on SB 2200. All members were present.

Senator Taylor introduced amendment 70120.0806 and explained the amendment. The amendment looks at excess costs on special education. In testimony we heard of the concerns of Anamoose and have an impact on small school districts. He has discussed this with the Lt Governor. He did not think this would change the spirit of the bill and the provision of equity. The amendment would cap the cost of the special education contract students at 2% of the that school district's total annual budget. Anamoose has a total annual budget of \$800,000. You can imagine, if they had a couple of students, that could be \$100,000, 20% of their budget on 2 students. He has not run a fiscal to see how many this would catch, that will be hard to determine. It would alleviate the paid of the cost to some of our very smallest districts.

Senator Taylor moved amendment 70120.0806, seconded by Senator Bakke.

Senator Gary Lee said we have no idea of the cost of the amendment.

Senator Taylor said we would have to get Department of Public Instruction to analyze this.

Within his district, this is the only instance; it depends on the size of the budget.

Senator Flakoll asked their total percentage cost of special education in that district?

