

# FINAL BILL REPORT

## E2SHB 2085

---

---

C 166 L 99

Synopsis as Enacted

**Brief Description:** Creating programs addressing disruptive students in regular classrooms.

**Sponsors:** By House Committee on Education (Originally sponsored by Representatives Quall, Talcott, Haigh, Carlson, Santos, Linville, Cox, Kessler, Morris, Murray, McDonald, O'Brien, Anderson, Thomas, Ogden, Poulsen, Rockefeller, Lovick, Kenney, Wolfe, Stensen, Schual-Berke, Tokuda, Ruderman, Keiser, Wood, Constantine and Lantz).

**House Committee on Education**  
**House Committee on Appropriations**  
**Senate Committee on Education**

### **Background:**

Since 1996, the Legislature has provided funding to defray the initial costs school districts incur when they implement alternative schools and programs for at-risk and disruptive students. School districts receive one-year start-up grants through a competitive request for proposal process. The grants cover the initial costs of planning, staff recruitment and training, the purchase of equipment and supplies, and other significant one-time costs. State basic education monies provide support for program operations after the first year. To date, the Legislature has appropriated \$3,000,000 for these start-up grants.

Since 1996, five basic alternative school or program models have evolved. Those models are: (a) alternative schools as a separate organization and site; (b) schools within a school; (c) programs as a part of an existing school; (d) court detention schools; and (e) after-school or truancy board support programs. Of the 25 programs supported during the 1996-97 and 1997-98 school years, only two programs included elementary school students among the other students served. Eight served middle school students exclusively. Six served middle and high school students.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) presented a report on the grants to the Legislature in February 1999. The report included a component evaluating the effectiveness of the alternative programs. More than half of the programs reported improvements in student achievement, attendance, attitudes, and social skills. The applicants also reported a decrease in disciplinary actions and incidents. The SPI recommended that the Legislature continue funding the grants and increase the

appropriations to allow more districts to participate. The SPI also recommended implementation of an electronic data base to facilitate reporting, evaluation and information sharing. Finally, the SPI recommended that the Legislature fund additional training to help teachers implement innovative strategies for working with at-risk and disruptive students.

**Summary:**

The Legislature finds that teachers, principals, and other school staff need training in effective strategies for handling disruptive students.

If funding is provided in the budget, the SPI will conduct a series of professional development institutes during the summer of 2000 on research-based strategies for handling disruptive students. The institutes will focus on two major issues: dealing with disruption in regular classrooms, and the design and implementation of effective alternative learning programs and settings for students who exhibit frequent and prolonged disruptive behavior in regular classrooms. School districts will have an opportunity to send teams of teachers, principals, and other staff to the institutes. Participants will develop district plans to handle disruptive students. Elementary and middle school participants are encouraged to formulate school building plans as well.

Beginning with the 1999-2000 school year, elementary and junior high schools are encouraged to provide time for staff from regular education and special education programs to share successful practices for managing disruptive students.

**Votes on Final Passage:**

House 96 0  
Senate 45 3 (Senate amended)  
House 96 0 (House concurred)

**Effective:** July 25, 1999