SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 6447

AS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 4, 1994

Brief Description: Adopting a formula for transmitting funds for transfer students.

SPONSORS: Senator Prince

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 6447 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.
Signed by Senators Pelz, Chairman; McAuliffe, Vice Chairman; Gaspard, Hochstatter, McDonald, Moyer, Nelson, M. Rasmussen and Winsley.

Staff: Leslie Goldstein (786-7424)

Hearing Dates: January 31, 1994; February 4, 1994

BACKGROUND:

In 1990, legislation was enacted to increase students' and parents' options in choosing what school district students attended. Under this "choice program", procedures were established when resident school districts were required to release students, and nonresident school districts were required to adopt policies about accepting out-of-district students. According to a December, 1993, report from the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1.5 percent of the student population, or 14,000 students, chose to attend schools in districts in which they did not live.

School districts could require nonresident students to pay transfer fees or tuition. In 1993, legislation was enacted prohibiting the charge of transfer fees or tuition.

SUMMARY:

When a student is released from the student's home district and attends school in a nonresident district, the home district must transmit maintenance and operation levy dollars to the nonresident district. The amount of the transfer is based upon an amount equal to the maintenance and operation levy in the home district divided by the number of students in that district. However, the amount shall not exceed the amount calculated in the same manner in the receiving district. Payments must be made on the same schedule the levy dollars are collected.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE:

Language is clarified to state that sending districts shall not pay more than the amount of levy dollars per enrolled student in the sending district or more than the amount of levy dollars per enrolled student in the receiving district.

The requirement expires in two years.

Appropriation: none

Revenue: none

Fiscal Note: none requested

TESTIMONY FOR:

In a small school district serving a number of students from a larger district, the inability to charge transfer fees hurts the program of students in the district.

This legislation helps remedy some parts of the unfairness of the levy system.

TESTIMONY AGAINST:

What happens in sending districts that do not have levies? Will this legislation make it more difficult to pass levies?

TESTIFIED: Senator Prince, prime sponsor; Harry Amend, Freeman School District (pro); Marcia Costello, WA Assn. of School Administrators (con); Dwayne Slate, WA State School Directors Assn. (con)