



February 3, 2017

IN THIS ISSUE:

- This Week in Review
- Education Funding Plans
- AEA
- Pensions/Health Benefits
- Committee Meeting Schedule
- Useful Links
- Bill Watch

Week 4 – January 30–February 3, 2017

This Week in Review

During the fourth week of session, most legislative Committees again plowed through a load of bills, continuing more public hearings and ramping up the number of bills they moved to executive action. The major news of import to school administrators was action on bills to address a *McCleary* solution. The Senate Majority Coalition Caucus package, released late last week, took several steps. It was heard in Committee, quickly adopted and just as quickly moved to the full Senate and was adopted. Also this week. the House and Senate Democrats introduced legislation to implement their education funding proposal, first released in early January to the Education Funding Task Force (EFTF). Find more information on the *McCleary* bills later in this newsletter.

This week, two new legislators were sworn in. Remember, Senator Brian Dansel (R-Republic) resigned his seat last Tuesday after accepting an appointment in President Trump's administration. This left the Senate with a 24–24 tie and opened the door for Minority Democrats to cause mischief, such as their ill-fated attempt at taking over the Senate Floor last Friday to amend Senate Rules in the hopes of moving Levy Cliff legislation (HB 1059). To limit the chances of the Senate Democrats' opportunity to take advantage of the unique Senate tie, the State Republican Party, 7th District Precinct Committee Officers and County Commissioners in Northeast Washington promptly acted to fill Dansel's vacated seat. Acting in record time, Republican PCO's met on Saturday and, as required, forwarded three candidates for County Commissioners to consider. On Monday, Commissioners from the 7th Legislative District's five Counties quickly appointed Representative Shelly Short (R-Addy), providing the Majority Coalition Caucus with their 25th vote. Working just as quickly, PCO's provided recommendations to fill Short's now vacant House seat, and Commissioners met promptly on Wednesday night and appointed Jacquelin Maycumber (R-Republic), Short's long-time Legislative Assistant, to replace Short. New Senator Short was sworn-in on Tuesday and new Representative Maycumber was sworn-in on Thursday.

Committee Action

This week, the Senate Early Learning & K-12 Education Committee heard a number of bills, took executive action on a few others, while also holding a series of work sessions. On Monday, the Committee discussed current high school graduation requirements. On Tuesday, the work session focus was on parent/family engagement opportunities

About TWIO

This Week in Olympia is emailed to active WASA and AEA members each Friday during the **Legislative Session and is posted** on WASA's website at https:// wasa-oly.org/WASA/TWIO.

Join us at the 2017 WSSDA/WASA/ WASBO Legislative Conference, February 12-13. Register at www.wasa-oly.org/wasa/leg17

and community-school connections. The Governor's Office of the Education Omsbud reviewed recommendations from a family engagement work group required by HB 1408, adopted last session. They also heard a presentation from Communities in Schools of Washington and a presentation on parent, family, and community engagement from the Washington State PTA. The Committee closed the week with work sessions on home visiting and Highly Capable programs.

On Thursday, the House Capital Budget Committee held a work session on School Construction. Similar to a work session in the Senate Ways & Means Committee on January 19, this work session was held in lieu of a required report from an interim School Construction Technical Work Group. The Work Group was established in the 2016 Supplemental Capital Budget and was charged with monitoring a series of school construction activities and identifying key issues for the Legislature to consider to improve how state assistance is provided to school districts. The Work Group is supposed to be a precursor to anticipated legislative work on school construction in 2017: proviso language stated the Legislature "intends to consider forming a Joint Legislative Task Force on School Construction in 2017." The Committee first received a broad overview of K-12 school construction from Committee staff. Then several presentations were made, covering the list of issues required to be addressed in last session's Capital Budget proviso, including an overview of the School Construction Assistance Program (OSPI); a review of the K-3 Class Size Reduction Grant Program (OSPI); a review of the Information and Condition of Schools (ICOS) program (OSPI); the Condition of K-12 Public Schools report (WSU Energy Office); and the K-12 Capital Facilities Cost Study (Construction Services Group, ESD 112).

The Senate Law & Justice Committee held a public hearing on a piece of priority legislation on Tuesday. SB 5505 is intended counteract the results of a 2016 Supreme Court case. N.L. v. Bethel. Prior to the ruling, school districts were only held liable for injuries caused by the misconduct of a student when the injury: 1) was reasonably foreseeable; AND occurred in a custodial setting. The Supreme Court—in a 5–4 decision—ruled that school districts could be held liable for criminal misconduct of their students that occurs outside of district custody and supervision. The concern is that this decision is contrary to previous legal precedent and puts school districts in an untenable position, potentially opening the floodgates to costly litigation. SB 5505 would close this door—and return to previous, well-established liability protections—by specifically stating in statute that school districts are not liable for civil damages resulting from criminal acts committed by any of their students that occur outside of the district's custody and/or supervision. WSSDA, WASA, and AWSP have prepared a short background and explanation of the SB 5505—N.L. v. Bethel fix.

Education Funding Plans

Senate Republican Proposal

The Senate Republicans unveiled their Education Funding Plan on Friday—and there has been a whirlwind of activity since. Word on the street was there continued to be divisions within the Caucus regarding the proposal and it was yet not ready for primetime, so it was somewhat of a surprise when the proposal was released. Now it is apparent that politics played a hand in the timing of the release. When Sen. Dansel resigned from his seat last week, the partisan split in the Senate became 24 seats to 24 seats. At the same time, Senator Doug Ericksen (R-Ferndale) continued to be absent in the other Washington. attending to his duties as temporary Communications Director during the federal EPA transition. With a 24–23 advantage, this provided Senate Democrats with a brief window of opportunity to attempt to take over the Senate Floor and force action on HB 1059, the Levy Cliff bill. As we reported in last week's TWIO, that effort fizzled. In an attempt to deflect from the Democrats takeover efforts, Majority Republicans did two things. First, they added HB 1059 to Monday's public hearing schedule in the Senate Ways & Means

Committee, providing some evidence they were willing to discuss the issue (although there was no signal they ever intended to act on the issue). Second, they unveiled their Education Funding Plan, showing they were prepared to solve the whole McCleary problem. Those two acts (sincere or not) publicly displayed the Senate Republican's positive effort to address the session's major priority...while also calling into question the Senate Democrat's attempt to take advantage of a temporarily unstable Senate.

Even though the Senate Republican Education Funding Plan was apparently released prematurely, there has been no effort to slow the train down and thoughtfully review the plan. Since the moment it was unveiled last week, it has been on a very fast-track. Friday morning, Senate Republicans released a broad summary of the plan, along with a more detailed, comprehensive set of the plan's major components. Before anyone had much of a chance to digest the proposal, it was announced it would receive a public hearing in the Senate Ways & Means Committee three days later, on January 27. On Saturday, the actual bill language was released (although the bill was yet to be officially introduced). On Monday, the bill received a public hearing in the Senate Ways & Means Committee. The next day, the bill was officially introduced and numbered SB 5607. Later that afternoon, the Committee moved the bill to executive action and adopted it. On Wednesday, the full Senate took action and adopted the bill, sending it to the House for its action.

SB 5607 is a huge bill, with multiple moving parts and in-depth intricacies. In addition to the Republican summaries, linked above, the non-partisan Ways & Means staff Bill Report does a decent job of walking through the main components of the bill. There is simply just not enough time or space to fully analyze this legislation in TWIO. Instead of repeating what is noted in those documents, we will highlight the major pieces, including some of the key concerns and some of the "hidden" elements to be aware of within the bill.

- The current Prototypical School Funding Model is eliminated and replaced with a per pupil funding model. The model provides a guaranteed minimum per pupil amount (\$10,000), with supplemental per pupil amounts for Special Education (\$7,500), Transitional Bilingual (\$1,000), poverty (\$2,000-5,000), CTE (\$500), Highly Capable (\$1,000), and homeless (\$1,500) students. After all funding calculations are completed, if the per pupil funding amount is less than \$12,500, the state will back-fill the funding to increase the funding to \$12,500. However, when a school district calculates its per pupil funding amount, all local, state, AND federal dollars are included—which would likely drive the required "backfill" amount from the state down. For example, if a district has a capital levy or receives federal Impact Aid, these funds would essentially be used to supplant a portion of the state funding, so many districts would not achieve the "guaranteed" \$12,500 per student. Ultimately, this bill replaces the current research-based, evidence-based, transparent funding model with a model that is unproven—a model Washington used to use, but was scrapped by the 1977 Basic Education Act.
- Beginning in Calendar Year 2018, in addition to the current allowable State Property Tax at \$3.60 per \$1,000 of assessed value (currently collected at approximately \$2.14 per \$1,000), the state will impose a new uniform Local Effort Levy of \$1.80 per \$1,000 of assessed value to be collected on behalf of school districts. (Language in the bill would allow the tax rate to be lowered to the stated goal of \$1.25 per \$1,000 – which would bring the total below the current \$3.60 per \$1,000 limit.) Beginning in Calendar Year 2019, the funding collected from the Local Effort Levy would be distributed back to school districts to provide school districts with the necessary minimum per pupil funding discussed above. Because the state will begin collecting more funds within the constitutional \$10.00 per \$1,000 limit for regular levies (current \$2.14 +

- \$1.80), the state makes a commitment to reimburse local taxing districts in the amount the taxing district's regular levy is negatively impacted (payments must be appropriated by the Legislature, however). These are additional costs that must be paid out of the state's General Fund.
- School district Maintenance & Operations levies would be eliminated in Calendar Year 2019; taxes due and payable in Calendar Year 2019 are prohibited. Local Effort Assistance (LEA or "levy equalization") is repealed January 1, 2019. In Calendar Year 2020, school districts can request/collect levies, but they are capped at ten percent. Additionally, prior to submitting levy, districts must provide a report to OSPI detailing how levy funds will be used: OSPI must approve of the report, ensuring funds are not used for basic education costs.
- The Levy Cliff is extended for Calendar Year 2018; that is, current levy policy (28 percent lid and 14 percent LEA) continues in Calendar Year 2018. Ironically, intent language in the bill echoes school district arguments in support of extending the Levy Cliff. Section 401 reads: "The Legislature recognizes that school districts rely on local property tax levies. The Legislature further recognizes that the state levy lid law, which limits the amount a school district may collect through local levies, is statutorily scheduled to revert to a lower limit beginning in Calendar Year 2018. The Legislature further finds that this lower limit may impair some school district finances. Therefore, the Legislature intends to maintain the current levy limit for an additional year as the state revises its statutory policies with regard to local school district levies." Yes. exactly. The Senate, however, continues to refuse to deal with this issue now, continuing to believe it needs to be a part of a larger McCleary solution. That is understandable—and actually makes some sense—however, does anyone believe this bill (or any other *McCleary* fix) can or will be adopted before school districts become impacted by the Levy Cliff? District budget managers are being impacted right now, by being required to draft two budgets. School administrators are being impacted right now, as they begin to review staffing needs for the coming year. Teachers and Classified Staff are being impacted right now, anxiously wondering if funding will be available to keep their job next year, or if they are on the potential chopping block. Legislators fully recognize the May 15 non-renewal deadline, but they fail to understand that: (1) some districts' Collective Bargaining Agreements require an earlier non-renewal notice: and (2) even if an earlier date is not required, some legislators believe making staffing decisions, preparing notices (if necessary) and delivering those notices is a short and simple process.
- Educator compensation is the key component to solving the McCleary conundrum. The Senate GOP bill makes major policy changes in the area of compensation. The bill eliminates the current Salary Allocation Model (beginning with the 2018-19 school year) and "provides greater flexibility for local school districts to decide the actual salaries for Certificated Instructional Staff, within specified limitations." Districts would be prohibited from providing salary increases based on an advanced degree that is not in the subject area in which the individual teaches. Minimum CIS salaries would be increased to \$45,000. Actual salaries would be bargained locally; however, total salary and benefits paid to Certificated Instructional Staff, Certificated Administrative Staff, and Classified Staff would not be allowed to exceed 80 percent of the district's total general fund expenditures. Until the 2023–24 school year, districts may exceed the 80 percent cap if current salaries and benefits exceed the cap. This limit is unrealistic: using 2014–15 data, 117 school districts were over the 80 percent threshold; 167 were at 78 percent. Presumably those numbers are higher now.

- To address cost of living issues, a housing allowance is provided to eligible districts of up to \$10,000 per staff position; all staff would receive the bonus if the district is eligible. An eligible district must have average assessed valuation above the statewide assessed valuation. This is for residential property only, however—that means staff in a high cost area like Seattle would only receive \$3,300 of the total allowable \$10,000. Even though cost of living supplements currently are provided (in the form of TRII contracts) and are recognized as necessary to recruit and retain staff, the bill specifically notes the housing allowance is not considered a part of basic education. The bonus provided to teachers who have attained certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards becomes a local school district option under the bill. This bonus is not considered a part of basic education.
- Language in the bill states the *intent* to provide "a teacher recruitment and retention bonus of \$10,000 for teachers employed in urban, high-poverty schools" (Section 501). There is no specific mechanism in the bill, however, to implement this intent. Later in the bill (Section 506) there is a Recruitment and Retention Bonus of \$12,500 provided to both Certificated Instructional Staff and Certificated Administrative Staff employed in a school district with more than 25,000 students and a poverty rate exceeding 25 percent. Apparently this allowance was limited to specifically assist Tacoma School District. Unfortunately, under this section (and others) "poverty" is not defined by the number of students eligible for the Free and Reduced-Price Lunch program (as is normally the case), but is based on US Census data—which drives a district's poverty rate down. Tacoma is NOT an eligible district using this definition of poverty. See this **chart** for impacts.
- School districts are authorized to enter into state-funded extended year contracts with nonsupervisory CIS to provide remedial education instruction and services to underachieving students. The contracts may be used for up to an additional 90 days of employment outside the 180-day school district year and must be time-based with compensation provided on an hourly rate. These contracts must be separately accounted for by school districts and they must be audited as part of the regular financial audits by the State Auditor's Office.
- A Top Teacher Recognition Grant Program would be established, subject to appropriation. Each ESD would be required to identify the top five percent of teachers from a list of nominees submitted by school districts' board of directors within the ESD's region. Teachers identified in the top two percent would receive a one-time award of \$50,000. Other teachers identified in the top five percent would receive a one-time award of \$25,000.
- School districts must offer health benefit plans where the ratio of health insurance premiums of individual to family rates is no greater than 3:1. This would improve health care affordability for families, but could be costly for school districts. For more details, review the comments from The Nexus Group in the Pensions/Health Benefits section of this newsletter.
- Under the bill, school districts gain flexibility to hire "non-traditional" teachers: that is, teachers that are not certified. The bill stipulates that a non-certified teacher must be provided general supervision by a certified person. Language clarifies these individuals must undergo a record check. Although teachers no longer need to be certified, language added onto the bill in Committee replicates **SB 5070**, which—among other things—requires paraeducators to be certified.
- The bill specifically prohibits teacher strikes. Even though it is understood (at least by management) that common law provides no right to strike, multiple

trial court decisions and Attorney General opinions also note there is no right to strike, bill language "intends to provide greater clarity." WEA is arguing this language proves there is doubt about a current prohibition against teachers striking—and they will argue, if this language fails to be adopted, "the Legislature had an opportunity to specifically prohibit teacher strikes and they didn't, therefore, it is clear teacher strikes ARE permitted."

- As part of the accountability mechanisms in the bill, we return to the world of No Child Left Behind. The bill establishes a series of goals, "Measures of Success," which each school district is expected to meet by 2020: Increase third grade literacy rate to 86 percent; Improve high school readiness to 72 percent; Raise the four-year graduation rate to 89 percent; and Enhance the quality of the high school diploma by increasing the number of high school graduates who enroll in college and are not required to take remedial courses to 93 percent. Additionally, by 2024 districts are expected to close the opportunity gap to five percent.
- Each year, school districts must annually report to OSPI: the percentage of students demonstrating the characteristics of entering kindergarteners in all six areas of the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills; and the percentage of high school graduates who are enrolled in postsecondary education or training or are employed during the second guarter following graduation, as well as the percentage during the fourth quarter following graduation.
- School districts with exemplary performance, as measured by meeting the Measures of Success, will be rewarded greater autonomy, flexibility, and control over operation of their schools. School districts which meet the performance targets would be relieved from most state statutes. This is backwards. Under the Education Reform Act of 1993 (HB 1209), ALL districts were supposed to be provided with additional flexibility to assist them to be successful. That flexibility never came. Instead, the Legislature continues to discuss providing flexibility ONLY if a district proves to be successful. If a district succeeds even with the burden of restrictive state statutes, do they even need additional flexibility? Struggling schools have a greater need to innovate. As a part of this flexibility, school districts are encouraged to exempt schools within the district from local school district policies and collective bargaining agreements. Can a school or district simply waive a CBA?
- The State Board of Education must develop a process for up to five percent of districts (that are not meeting standards) to become innovation districts and be exempt from most state laws and rules. Districts that wish to be innovation districts must submit a plan to the State Board detailing how flexibility will enable the district to improve students' educational outcomes. Persistently failing schools would not be eligible for additional flexibility. Perhaps they are most in need of flexibility?
- In addition to performance, school districts will also be held accountable on the financial side of things. Under the bill, school districts would be required to establish a "subfund" of the general fund to account for financial operations of the district that are paid from local revenue. Expenditures from this fund would have to be tracked separately. By the 2018–19 school year, school districts would be required to provide separate accounting of state, federal, and local revenues to expenditures, including the identification and separate accounting of basic education and nonbasic education expenditures by revenue source.

- Like the Legislature, this bill would require school districts to develop a fouryear budget outlook, including a four-year enrollment projection. The fouryear outlook and the four-year enrollment projection would be required to be submitted to the school district's ESD and to OSPI. School district budgets would also have to set forth the state-funded salary amounts, locally funded salary amounts and total salary amounts for every individual CIS. CAS, and CLS.
- To ensure school district levy funds are not being used for basic education purposes, the State Auditor's regular financial audits must include a review of the expenditure of school district excess levy funds. The audits must also review supplemental contracts to ensure they comply with the new limitations.
- Beginning in the 2019–20 school year, each district must create an "attendance" reserve" to reduce chronic student absenteeism, defined as 18 or more absences in a school year. If a school's three-year average absentee rate exceeds 20 percent of the student population, OSPI must recover funds from the district's reserve in an amount equal to the amount of funds the school received for each chronically absent student in excess of 20 percent.
- School principals are provided with additional authority to remove teachers who are determined to be "detrimental to the academic performance of students." After three years in any five-year period, if the teacher has failed to show improvement through in-service training and mentorship, the principal may initiate dismissal.
- The bill includes a small school hold-harmless provision. Under this provision, for any school district that is estimated to receive less funding through the basic per pupil guarantee than projected under current law for the state and local funding sources the basic per pupil guarantee is replacing, the district will receive the higher amount.
- In a further accountability effort, ESDs, larger school districts, and education agencies must implement the Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. OSPI must select ten schools with 5,000 or more students to pilot the program beginning in the 2018–19 school year. OSPI would be required to develop a phase-in schedule for all districts with at least 5,000 students to implement Baldrige by 2020–21. Each district would receive a \$10,000 grant to implement the program (although fully engaging in Baldrige is much more costly). By December 1, 2019, all ESDs, OPSI, the State Board of Education, the Professional Educator Standards Board, WSSDA, and the Office of the Education Ombuds must implement the program.
- Initiative 732 (Educator Cost of Living Adjustments) and Initiative 1351 (Class Size Reduction) are both repealed.
- The entire Act, except for the Levy Cliff delay, would be subject to a public referendum. The Act would be sent to the voters for their ratification or rejection in the November election.

SB 5607 is dense and complex. You can read the various summaries and the actual bill over and over and it is still difficult to determine some of the real-world impacts. Certainly, some of the major questions surround the issue of funding. Would SB 5607 provide more or less funding to school districts? Would it increase or decrease property taxes for citizens (and businesses)? Well, it depends where you live...and it depends on who you ask. When presenting this bill, Senator John Braun (R-Centralia), Chair of the Senate Ways & Means Committee and main author of SB 5607, noted that every school district in the state would receive more money under the plan. Apparently, that was a bit of hyperbole because later he—and his GOP colleagues—backed off that statement and

began to say it would provide "99.8 percent" of our state's students with an increase. They have produced spreadsheets which indicate only the tiniest of districts would lose funding under this plan (hmmm, what happened to the hold harmless provisions for them?). (The Republicans also have a second spreadsheet which displays similar information in a slightly different way.) The chart also indicates a large majority of taxpavers would see a reduction in property taxes.

So, maybe the funding mechanism works? Well, before you can decide that, you must look at the "other" numbers. In the Ways & Means Committee, Democratic members asked the non-partisan staff how many students were in districts that would see a decrease in funding. Staff stated about half (approximately 591,000 students) would have less funding. Later, in debate on the Senate Floor, Democrats continually recited "605,000 students." Senate Democrats have used spreadsheets prepared by nonpartisan Committee staff to bolster their point (another spreadsheet indicates per student funding impacts). What's going on? The Republican charts are bright and sunny, while the Democratic charts are gloomy and rainy. Well, as the saying goes, "Politicians use statistics like a drunk man uses a lamppost; more for support than illumination." Said in a less crass way, data always depends on the assumptions and variables. The Republican charts assume the impending Levy Cliff has already occurred, while the Democratic charts incorporate that loss of funding.

The Senate Republicans have said it was important to move the bill as fast as possible so negotiations in the House could begin in earnest at the earliest possible date. Makes sense, but if haste was so important, why was the plan introduced three weeks after session started? If speed was of the essence, releasing the plan on January 9, the first day of session—and the deadline for recommendations from the EFTF—seems like a better starting line. Or perhaps, January 4, when their Democratic counterparts released their plan. Regardless, the final bill will alter (potentially drastically) how schools are funded and will have major impacts on school administrators, teachers, and other staff—not to mention students. It would have been nice to have been involved in the development of such a revolutionary plan, rather than having to sprint after it as it sprang from the barn. Nevertheless, what's done is done and it is up to us to understand as best as possible what the plan does, how it does it and whether it can be done better.

We had our first opportunity, albeit a shallow one, to provide input at Monday's Ways & Means Committee hearing. We will have a second opportunity when the House Appropriations Committee hears SB 5607 this upcoming Monday, February 6.

Democratic Proposal

House and Senate Democrats recommendations were jointly submitted to the Education Funding Task Force on January 4. Since then, they have derided Republicans for failing to work with Democrats on a bi-partisan plan or even submit their own recommendations. The Republicans did submit "Guiding Principles" to the EFTF, but then argued against them being included in a Task Force report. Ultimately, the Task Force failed to adopt ANY report. After the Senate Republicans released their Education Funding Plan, then introduced legislation to implement the plan, Republicans turned to mocking the Democrats. They argued that the Democrats simply produced a "spending plan," with no detail and way to pay for it and, further, no legislation to implement it. Earlier this week, Democrats in both the House and Senate introduced their implementing legislation (HB 1843/SB 5623) to accompany their EFTF recommendations. And now the game is afoot.

With a Senate Republican package on the table, already passed by the full Senate, and an actual bill introduced by the Democrats (companion bills in the House and Senate) negotiations between the two houses are on the horizon. Senate Republicans will like balk at any "official" negotiations until the House has adopted its plan, but that should occur shortly. HB 1843 will receive a public hearing in the House Appropriations Committee

on Monday, February 6, 3:30 p.m., alongside of SB 5607. HB 1843 has already been tentatively scheduled for executive action on Wednesday, February 8. Barring any Caucus meltdown (don't bet against that happening), the House Education Funding Plan should move to the full House as early as the end of next week, but more likely the following week.

We will have a more detailed review of HB 1843/SB 5623 later; however, the recommendations submitted to the EFTF (link above) provide a quick-and-dirty summary of what is contained in the bills. As with the Senate Republican plan, we strongly encourage you to read and understand the Democratic proposal. Seek to understand the impacts on your school district and the education system as whole. And keep us apprised of your thoughts.

If you're able, please consider being on-hand for the House Appropriations Committee on Monday, February 6, 3:30 p.m., House Hearing Room A of the John L. O'Brien Building. Both the Democratic Education Funding Plan, HB 1843, and the Senate Republican Education Funding Plan, SB 5607, will receive a public hearing.

AEA

By Mitch Denning

On Monday, in preparation for testimony on Thursday on HB 1508, WA Kids Ready to Learn Act of 2017, we met with the bill's prime sponsor, Reps. Monica Stonier (D-Vancouver), and supporters, Mia Gregerson (D-SeaTac) and Zack Hudgins (D-Tukwila), to discuss our two recommended changes. The bill is an omnibus school nutrition bill, addressing (1) breakfast after the bell; (2) changing the definition of instructional hours to allow districts who serve breakfast in the classroom and whose teachers are instructing their students while their students are eating breakfast, and the consumption of breakfast, doesn't interfere with the instructional activity, to count that time as "instructional hours;" (3) elimination of the reduced price copay for grades PreK and 4–12; and (4) the farm to school program.

WSNA has proposed two potential amendments to HB 1508, (1) that the requirement for nutrition staff to give preference to WA grown food when service breakfast after the bell be modified to read, "as feasible," due to bid laws, and participation in the Dept of Defense's Fruit and Vegetable Program. We're also arguing that (2) the implementation of the elimination of the reduced price copay should not begin with the highest need school, as the bill states, as this is not doable due to the wide range of income levels in all schools and districts that serve reduced-price students. We're proposing instead that the implementation take place by elementary schools, including PreK in the 2017-19 biennium, and then by secondary schools in the 2019–21 biennium, in keeping with the bill's timeline for implementation.

Rep. Stonier has accepted our proposed amendment on WA grown food, and we're working with her on our proposed implementation plan.

We testified "other" on HB 1508 in House Education yesterday, due to our two proposed changes. It's scheduled to come out of House Education on Thursday, Feb. 9.

Both WSNA and WAMOA support HB 1551, Apple a Day Program, which would fund, in the K-12 portion of the 2017-19 Capital Budget, needed kitchen equipment improve the ability of schools' nutrition programs to serve healthy foods. A similar grant was included in the 2015–17 Capital Budget, and 30 districts received grants in the amount of \$1.8M. Another 53 districts applied, but did not receive grant funds.

We testified today in House Capital Budget in support of HB 1551, stating that there is a clear district need for this funding assistance.

Pensions/Health Benefits

By Fred Yancey – The Nexus Group This Week in Olympia: Week 4, Jan 30-Feb 3, 2017

continued

Be Careful What You Wish For; There's always a Catch. Anonymous

SB 5607, the recent Republican 'fix' for McCleary has a section that addresses health benefits. Simply stated it directs districts to offer plans where the ratio of health insurance premiums of individual to family rates is no greater than 3:1. This is great for those currently paying substantial premium costs, but read on to see the rub.

Doing this in practice would be a substantial added cost to districts which would represent a further drain on district dollars that could be used elsewhere.

A little summary would be in order.

Background

The 2012 Legislature passed and the Governor signed ESSB 5940 which had the following goals: 1) Improve transparency of the health benefit and financial data, 2) Create greater affordability for full family coverage compared to employee only coverage with the goal being a cost ratio no greater than 3:1, 3) Significantly reduce administrative costs, and 4) Assess the advantages and disadvantages of consolidated purchasing of health insurance for certificated and classified staff either through the establishment of a separate employee group, School Employee Benefit Board (SEBB) or through the existing Public Employee Benefit Board (PEBB). The Health Care Authority (HCA) delivered a report to the Legislature on June 1, 2015. Said report was also presented to the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) in December 2015 with the final report being presented January 2016 for legislative consideration and possible action. There was no legislative consideration/action on this report. In fact, Senator Karen Keiser, a key advocate and expert on health care had not even realized the report was neither done nor obviously read said report.

Caveats

An important point to keep in mind is that the analysis did not consider/study the costs and availability of dental, vision, or other types of insurance benefits that are also often part of an employee/employer negotiated package. So HCA's analysis of cost impacts only speaks to medical insurance offerings/costs and, maybe of import, SB 5607 does not exclude these coverages for meeting the premium ratio. Unclear, at best. That issue aside, the dollar projections following only pertain to health insurance cost changes. And note that these dollar figures are now out of date, and certainly expected to be greater as insurance costs have risen. Furthermore, these costs were based on the assumption that health care offerings would be consolidated at a state-wide level.

To continue

As stated earlier, one of the main goals of the original legislation was to consider the appropriateness of the a 3:1 ratio in which employee premiums for full family coverage would be no greater than three times the cost of employee only premiums. The report focused very heavily on developing models that would meet this equity goal. The 2013 real cost ratio was 10:1 for all K-12 employees, (11:1 for certificated and 9:1 for classified), a far cry from 3:1. The average monthly contribution/cost for a full-time employee covering only themselves for medical was \$41 while full family costs averaged \$477/month. Part-time costs ranged from \$71 for self to \$545 for full family. Under all consolidation scenarios tested the ratio dropped significantly, ranging from 2.37:1

to 2.89:1. But note that SB 5607 does not move to a consolidated health plan system. Instead the 9 carriers and 764 existing plans as of the report date will remain.

Financial modeling of the scenarios determined that consolidation creates a more affordable option for K-12 employees spending around \$20+ million less as well as achieving greater equity if consolidated with PEBB and/or SEBB. However, this requires the employer contribution to increase as much as \$117 million for medical benefits, due in large part to the additional enrollment and dependent coverage depending on the chosen scenario and the premium split between the employer and employee. (Range of employer/district increase is \$31 million to \$116.5 million).

The bottom line

Districts should be aware and wary of the added benefit costs which would possibly be substantial given the mandated ratio, the current cost differential of individual vs. family rates, and the unknown if the ratio applies to any tiered vision, dental, insurance plans.

Just thought you'd want to know.



Legislative Resources

Committee Meeting Schedule

Legislative Committees Meetings are scheduled to be held at the following times but are subject to change.

Up-to-date meeting schedules and agendas are available on the **State Legislature** website.

Mondays

1:30-3:25 p.m.

Senate Early Learning & K-12 Education Senate Hearing Room 1

House Education House Hearing Room A

3:30-5:30 p.m.

Senate Ways & Means Senate Hearing Room 4

House Appropriations House Hearing Room A

Tuesdays

1:30-3:25 p.m.

Senate Early Learning & K-12 Education Senate Hearing Room 1

House Education House Hearing Room A

3:30-5:30 p.m.

Senate Ways & Means Senate Hearing Room 4

Wednesdays

3:30-5:30 p.m.

Senate Ways & Means Senate Hearing Room 4

House Appropriations House Hearing Room A

Thursdays

8-9:55 a.m.

House Education House Hearing Room A

1:30-3:25 p.m.

Senate Early Learning & K-12 Education Senate Hearing Room 1

3:30-5:30 p.m.

Senate Ways & Means Senate Hearing Room 4

House Appropriations House Hearing Room A

Useful Links

Washington State Government http://www.access.wa.gov

State Legislature

http://www.leg.wa.gov

Senate

http://www.leg.wa.gov/Senate

House of Representatives http://www.leg.wa.gov/House

Legislative Committees

http://www.leg.wa.gov/ legislature/pages/ committeelisting.aspx

Legislative Schedules

http://www.leg.wa.gov/legislature/pages/ calendar.aspx

Office of the Governor

http://www.governor.wa.gov

OSPI

http://www.k12.wa.us

http://www.tvw.org

Session Cutoff Calendar

January 9, 2017

First Day of Session.

February 17, 2017

Last day to read in committee reports in house of origin, except House fiscal, Senate Ways & Means, and Transportation committees.

February 24, 2017

Last day to read in committee reports from House fiscal, Senate Ways & Means, and Transportation committees in house of origin.

March 8, 2017

Last day to consider bills in house of origin (5 p.m.).

March 29, 2017

Last day to read in committee reports from opposite house, except House fiscal, Senate Ways & Means, and Transportation committees.

April 4, 2017

Last day to read in opposite house committee reports from House fiscal. Senate Ways & Means, and Transportation committees.

April 12, 2017*

Last day to consider opposite house bills (5 p.m.) (except initiatives and alternatives to initiatives, budgets and matters necessary to implement budgets, differences between the houses, and matters incident to the interim and closing of the session).

April 23, 2017

Last day allowed for regular session under state constitution.

*After the 94th day, only initiatives, alternatives to initiatives, budgets and matters necessary to implement budgets. messages pertaining to amendments, differences between the houses, and matters incident to the interim and closing of the session may be considered.

Bill Watch

TWIO tracks critical education bills each week as they are introduced. Detailed bill information can be accessed by clicking on the bill number. The following is a list of the bills of highest interest to school administrators. A more comprehensive bill watch list is located on the **WASA** website.

Bill #	Title	Status	Sponsor
<u>HB 1005</u>	Agency rule-making authority	H State Government	Taylor
<u>HB 1006</u>	The right to work	H Labor & Workplace	Shea
<u>HB 1007</u>	Religious objectors	H Labor & Workplace	Shea
<u>HB 1011</u>	Gender-segregated facilities	H Judiciary	Taylor
<u>HB 1012</u>	High school graduation/science test	H Education	Taylor
<u>HB 1015</u>	Carrying concealed pistols	H Judiciary	Shea
<u>HB 1017</u>	School siting	H Environment	McCaslin
<u>HB 1021</u>	Funding education first	H Appropriations	MacEwen
<u>HB 1023</u>	Military students/activities	H Education	MacEwen
<u>HB 1025</u>	Appropriations legislation priorities	H Appropriations	Taylor
<u>HB 1033</u>	Private colleges/need grant	H Higher Education	Manweller
<u>HB 1034</u>	State officials/legal action	H Judiciary	Manweller
<u>HB 1035</u>	Prevailing wage survey data	H Labor & Workplace	Manweller
<u>HB 1042</u>	School district/ESD reports	H Appropriations	Springer
SHB 1046	Certificates of achievement	H Appropriations	MacEwen
<u>HB 1051</u>	Infrastructure financing	H Capital Budget	DeBolt
SHB 1059	School levy lid revisions/delay	S Ways & Means	Lytton
<u>HB 1060</u>	Medical marijuana/students	H Heath Care/Wellness	Blake
<u>HB 1067</u>	Operating Budget 2017–2019	H Appropriations	Ormsby
<u>HB 1068</u>	Operating Supplemental Budget 2017	H Appropriations	Ormsby
<u>HB 1072</u>	Constitutionality of acts	H Judiciary	Koster
<u>HB 1075</u>	Capital Budget 2017–2019	H Capital Budget	Tharinger
<u>HB 1080</u>	State general obligation bonds	H Capital Budget	Tharinger
<u>HB 1115</u>	Paraeducators	H Education	Bergquist
<u>HB 1146</u>	Transportation Supplemental Budget 2015–2017	H Transportation	Clibborn
<u>HB 1147</u>	Transportation Budget 2017–2019	H Transportation	Clibborn
<u>HB 1158</u>	I-200 repeal	H Capital Budget	Santos
<u>HB 1159</u>	Employment after government service	H State Government	Pellicciotti

<u>HB 1160</u>	Sunshine committee	H State Government	Springer
<u>HB 1169</u>	Student loan assistance	H Higher Education	Orwall
<u>HB 1170</u>	Truancy reduction efforts	H Judiciary	Orwall
<u>HB 1174</u>	Firearms/hunting education	H Education	Muri
HB 1203	School construction taxes	H Finance	Young
<u>HB 1206</u>	State estate tax, repealing	H Finance	Young
<u>HB 1208</u>	Charter schools/athletics	H Education	Johnson
<u>HB 1215</u>	Innovation schools	H Education	Hargrove
<u>HB 1224</u>	Growth management/sup court review	H Environment	Pike
<u>HB 1235</u>	Physical education assessments	H Education	Riccelli
<u>HB 1236</u>	Truancy/school assignments	H Judiciary	Klippert
<u>HB 1246</u>	School bus safety	H Education	McCabe
<u>HB 1254</u>	Educational grant program	H Education	Young
<u>HB 1256</u>	School assessment system	H Education	Young
<u>HB 1279</u>	School safety drills	H Education	Pettigrew
<u>HB 1282</u>	Career & technical education	H Appropriations	Tarleton
<u>HB 1284</u>	School emergency panic button	H Education	Lovick
<u>HB 1287</u>	Collective bargaining	H Labor & Workplace	Chandler
<u>HB 1294</u>	Model ethnic studies curriculum	H Education	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1295</u>	Language access/public schools	H Education	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1303</u>	Educational interpreters	H Education	Stambaugh
<u>HB 1310</u>	School violence reports	H Education	Manweller
<u>HB 1313</u>	Applied learning	H Education	Pettigrew
<u>HB 1319</u>	Educators evaluation frequency	H Education	McCaslin
<u>HB 1341</u>	Professional certification/teachers	H Education	Bergquist
<u>HB 1346</u>	Nurse in school setting	H Education	Springer
<u>HB 1374</u>	Educational staff associate/service years	H Appropriations	Dolan
<u>HB 1377</u>	Student mental health	H Education	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1393</u>	Federal forestlands/education funding	H Appropriations	Walsh
<u>HB 1412</u>	Academic support	H Education	Sells
<u>HB 1415</u>	High school student assessments	H Education	Taylor
<u>HB 1417</u>	OPMA/IT security matters	H State Government	Hudgins
<u>HB 1434</u>	Shared leave/pregnancy	H State Government	Robinson

<u>HB 1451</u>	Language access/students	H Education	Orwall
<u>HB 1453</u>	Agriculture science education	H Education	Blake
<u>HB 1457</u>	Back-to-school supplies/tax	H Finance	Irwin
<u>HB 1481</u>	Driver education uniformity	H Transportation	Hayes
<u>HB 1500</u>	Tax exemptions	H Finance	Pollet
<u>HB 1508</u>	Student meals & nutrition	H Education	Stonier
<u>HB 1509</u>	Credits for high school graduation	H Education	Stonier
<u>HB 1511</u>	Learning assistance program	H Education	Lytton
<u>HB 1516</u>	Public records storage system	H State Government	MacEwen
<u>HB 1517</u>	School construction/lottery	H Capital Budget	MacEwen
<u>HB 1518</u>	Social emotional learning	H Education	Senn
<u>HB 1539</u>	Sexual abuse of students	H Education	McCabe
<u>HB 1542</u>	Dropout prevention/farming	H Education	Doglio
<u>HB 1549</u>	Tax preferences	H Finance	Lytton
<u>HB 1550</u>	B&O tax/education	H Finance	Lytton
<u>HB 1551</u>	Student nutrition/grants	H Capital Budget	Riccelli
<u>HB 1555</u>	Carbon pollution tax	H Finance	Lytton
<u>HB 1563</u>	Child abuse hotline/posting	H Education	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1564</u>	Pesticide exposure	H Health Care/Wellness	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1572</u>	High school assessments	H Education	Dolan
<u>HB 1573</u>	Sunscreen/schools	H Education	Harris
<u>HB 1579</u>	Real estate disclosure/schools	H Business & Finance Services	Kilduff
<u>HB 1594</u>	Public records administration	H State Government	McBride
<u>HB 1595</u>	Public records request costs	H State Government	Nealey
HB 1600	Career and college readiness	H Education	Santos
HB 1601	Beginning educator support	H Education	Santos
HB 1602	School sports/rights	H Judiciary	Young
<u>HB 1608</u>	Capital budget resources	H Appropriations	Pike
<u>HB 1618</u>	Engagement coordinators	H Education	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1621</u>	Social-emotional learning	H Appropriations	Senn
		Washington Association of School Ad	ministrators

			TWIO February 3, 2017
HB 1628	Foster care/education success	H Education	Kagi
HB 1643	Teacher loan forgiveness program	H Education	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1644</u>	Teacher shortage	H Education	Ortiz-Self
<u>HB 1645</u>	Educator shortage TO	H Education	Ortiz-Self
HB 1654	Teacher certification	H Education	McCaslin
HB 1664	Teaching effectiveness	H Education	Caldier
HB 1666	Tax preferences approval	H Finance	Santos
HB 1684	Innovative supplemental contracts	H Education	Santos
<u>HB 1685</u>	Retired teachers as mentors	H Education	Santos
<u>HB 1686</u>	Bilingual instruction definitions	H Education	Santos
<u>HB 1687</u>	Gangs in schools' task force	H Education	Santos
<u>HB 1688</u>	Open education resources project	H Education	Santos
<u>HB 1689</u>	Student transportation allocation	H Appropriations	Santos
<u>HB 1690</u>	Bilingual instruction report	H Education	Santos
<u>HB 1691</u>	Teacher & principal evaluation program	H Education	Harris
<u>HB 1694</u>	Public school construction	H Capital Budget	MacEwen
<u>HB 1703</u>	School safety planning	H Education	Pollet
<u>HB 1705</u>	Flexibility schools & zones	H Education	Kirby
<u>HB 1706</u>	Civics test/high school graduation	H Education	Chandler
<u>HB 1730</u>	Capital gains excise tax	H Finance	Jinkins
<u>HB 1732</u>	Educator professional growth	H Education	Springer
<u>HB 1734</u>	Substitute teachers/PESB	H Education	Lovick
<u>HB 1741</u>	Educator preparation data/PESB	H Higher Education	Slatter
<u>HB 1756</u>	Career & technical education	H Education	Manweller
<u>HB 1764</u>	Property tax revenue limit	H Finance	Lytton
<u>HB 1767</u>	Substitute teacher complaints	H Education	Kraft
<u>HB 1778</u>	School district bonds	H Education	Stonier
<u>HB 1779</u>	School district bonds/voting	H Education	Muri
<u>HB 1781</u>	Compost & recycling/schools	H Education	Kloba
HB 1788	Psychotropic medication/students	H Education	Hargrove
HB 1793	High school student assessments	H Education	Senn
HB 1800	Voting rights	H State Govt, Elections & Tech	Gregerson
		11.4	a

<u>HB 1817</u>

Zero-based budget reviews

H Appropriations

Stokesbary

<u>HB 1818</u>	State spending programs review	H Appropriations	Stokesbary
<u>HB 1827</u>	Educator workforce supply	H Education	Santos
<u>HB 1842</u>	Lead in drinking water	H Environment	Pollet
<u>HB 1843</u>	Basic education program	H Appropriations	Sullivan
<u>HB 1878</u>	Allergen info in public schools	H Education	Stanford
<u>HB 1886</u>	OSPI & state board of education	H Education	Harris
<u>HB 1896</u>	Civics education	H Education	Dolan
<u>HB 1898</u>	Middle school CTE	H Education	McCaslin
<u>HB 1901</u>	Month of the kindergartener	H State Govt, Elections & Tech	Griffey
<u>HB 1913</u>	Schools/leasehold excise tax	H Finance	Dolan
<u>HB 1923</u>	School construction grants	H Capital Budget	Blake
<u>HB 1925</u>	Schools/lead in water	H Environment	Pollet
<u>HB 1926</u>	Capital gains excise tax	H Finance	Pollet
HJM 4001	Occupational portability	H Rules R	Sawyer
HJR 4200	Debt guarantee/infrastructure	H Capital Budget	DeBolt
HJR 4203	School district bonds	H Education	Stonier
HJR 4204	School district bonds/voting	H Education	Muri
HJR 4205	Operating budget timeliness	H Appropriations	MacEwen
<u>SB 5013</u>	Tenant property, disposition	S Rules 2	Warnick
SB 5017	Student loan information	S Higher Education	Bailey
SB 5019	Ballots, prepaid postage	S State Government	Hasegawa
SB 5022	Education loan information	S Ways & Means	Bailey
<u>SB 5023</u>	School levy lid revisions/delay	S Early Learning/K–12	Wellman
SB 5028	Native American curriculum	S Ways & Means	McCoy
SSB 5031	Uniform money services act	S 2nd Reading	Angel
SB 5047	Operating Supplemental Budget 2017	S Ways & Means	Braun
<u>SB 5048</u>	Operating Budget 2017–2019	S Ways & Means	Braun
<u>SB 5054</u>	Safety belts in school buses	S Transportation	Dansel
<u>SB 5064</u>	Student freedom of expression	S Early Learning/K-12	Fain
SB 5066	Zero-based budget reviews	S Ways & Means	Miloscia
<u>SB 5067</u>	Voting rights	S State Government	Miloscia
SB 5068	District-based elections	S Rules 2	Miloscia
SB 5070	Paraeducators	S Early Learning/K-12	Rivers

<u>SB 5076</u>	School district bonds	S Ways & Means	Mullet
<u>SB 5086</u>	Capital Budget 2017–2019	S Ways & Means	Honeyford
<u>SB 5090</u>	State general obligation bonds	S Ways & Means	Honeyford
<u>SB 5095</u>	Transportation Supplemental Budget 2015–2017	S Transportation	King
<u>SB 5096</u>	Transportation Budget 2017–2019	S Transportation	King
<u>SB 5107</u>	Early learning opportunities	S Early Learning/K-12	Billig
<u>SB 5111</u>	Capital gains excise tax	S Ways & Means	Braun
<u>SB 5112</u>	Tax preferences	S Ways & Means	Braun
<u>SB 5113</u>	B&O tax/education	S Ways & Means	Braun
<u>SB 5114</u>	Quarterly revenue forecasts	S 2nd Reading	Braun
<u>SB 5115</u>	School director compensation	S Early Learning/K-12	Carlyle
<u>SB 5117</u>	Military students/extracurricular	S Early Learning/K-12	Rolfes
<u>SB 5120</u>	Employment after government service	S State Government	Carlyle
<u>SB 5127</u>	Carbon pollution tax	S Ways & Means	Braun
<u>SB 5129</u>	Charter schools/athletics	S Early Learning/K-12	Hunt
<u>SB 5142</u>	Educational interpreters	S Early Learning/K-12	Kuderer
<u>SB 5149</u>	Paid family leave	S Com/Labor/Sports	Fain
<u>SB 5151</u>	Ballot measure committees	S State Government	Fain
<u>SB 5155</u>	K–2 suspension and expulsion	S Early Learning/K-12	Billig
<u>SB 5166</u>	Sales tax/indebtedness	S Ways & Means	Ericksen
<u>SB 5183</u>	Career & technical education	S Early Learning/K-12	Rolfes
<u>SB 5202</u>	High school assessments	S Early Learning/K-12	Baumgartner
<u>SB 5203</u>	Transit infrastructure/youth court	S Human Services/Mental Health	Wilson
<u>SB 5206</u>	Career & tech education/elementary school	S Early Learning/K-12	Chase
<u>SB 5216</u>	Firearms/hunting education	S Early Learning/K-12	O'Ban
<u>SB 5217</u>	Teacher certification	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5226</u>	School district liability	S Law & Justice	Zeiger
<u>SB 5236</u>	Civic learning partnership	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5238</u>	Teaching cursive in schools	S Early Learning/K-12	Warnick
<u>SB 5241</u>	Foster care/education success	S Early Learning/K-12	Carlyle
<u>SB 5258</u>	Washington AIM program	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5267</u>	Voting rights	S State Government	Hunt
<u>SB 5283</u>	Educational staff associate/service years	S Early Learning/K-12	Warnick

<u>SB 5290</u>	Medical marijuana/students	S Early Learning/K-12	Hobbs
<u>SB 5291</u>	Academic support	S Early Learning/K-12	Pearson
<u>SB 5293</u>	Truancy reduction	S Human Services/Mental Health	Darneille
<u>SB 5297</u>	Educational employees' compensation	S Ways & Means	Ranker
<u>SB 5298</u>	Levy authority/local effort assistance	S Ways & Means	Ranker
<u>SB 5310</u>	Retired teachers/coaches	S Ways & Means	Hunt
<u>SB 5313</u>	Civics education & campaign compliance	S Early Learning/K-12	Fain
<u>SB 5318</u>	Agriculture science education	S Early Learning/K-12	Hunt
<u>SB 5325</u>	Nurse in school setting	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5348</u>	Special ed./cert of individual achievement	S Early Learning/K-12	Fain
<u>SB 5367</u>	Pupil transportation funding	S Early Learning/K-12	Becker
<u>SB 5379</u>	Cross-laminated timber	S State Government	McCoy
<u>SB 5404</u>	Sunscreen/schools	S Early Learning/K-12	Rivers
<u>SB 5417</u>	ASB food & beverage sales	S Early Learning/K-12	Chase
<u>SB 5420</u>	Declaration of Human Rights	S Early Learning/K-12	Chase
<u>SB 5432</u>	Special education funding allocation	S Early Learning/K-12	Rolfes
<u>SB 5443</u>	Fiscal notes	S Ways & Means	Brown
<u>SB 5448</u>	Psychotropic medicine/students	S Early Learning/K-12	Rivers
<u>SB 5449</u>	Digital citizenship	S Early Learning/K-12	Liias
<u>SB 5450</u>	Cross-laminated timber	S Local Government	Liias
<u>SB 5453</u>	School construction grants	S Ways & Means	Honeyford
<u>SB 5459</u>	Beginning educator support	S Early Learning/K-12	Rolfes
<u>SB 5484</u>	Early learning facilities fund program	S Ways & Means	Honeyford
<u>SB 5486</u>	Innovative supplemental contracts	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5487</u>	Retired teachers as mentors	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5488</u>	Bilingual instruction report	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5489</u>	Bilingual instruction definitions	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5503</u>	Safety belts on school buses	S Transportation	Baumgartner
<u>SB 5505</u>	School district liability	S Law & Justice	Zeiger
<u>SB 5526</u>	Educator preparation data/PESB	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5529</u>	Dual language/early & K-12	S Early Learning/K-12	Rolfes
<u>SB 5534</u>	Housing allowance/schools	S Ways & Means	Fortunato
<u>SB 5545</u>	Public employee bargaining/OPMA	S Com/Labor/Sports	Wilson

<u>SB 5547</u>	Educator professional growth	S Early Learning/K–12	Rolfes
<u>SB 5548</u>	Substitute teachers/PESB	S Early Learning/K–12	Rivers
<u>SB 5556</u>	PERS 1 & TRS 1/added benefit	S Ways & Means	Hunt
<u>SB 5562</u>	School district waivers	S Early Learning/K–12	Fortunato
<u>SB 5563</u>	Truancy law costs	S Human Services/Mental Health	Fortunato
<u>SB 5567</u>	Education sector excellence	S Early Learning/K-12	Miloscia
<u>SB 5571</u>	Compost & recycling/schools	S Early Learning/K-12	Palumbo
<u>SB 5583</u>	WIAA rules and policies	S Com/Labor/Sports	Baumgartner
<u>SB 5585</u>	Future teachers conditional scholarship	S Ways & Means	Ranker
<u>SB 5588</u>	Racial disproportionality	S Ways & Means	Hasegawa
<u>SB 5601</u>	Teacher postretirement employment	S Early Learning/K-12	Darneille
<u>SB 5605</u>	OSPI background checks	S Early Learning/K-12	Walsh
SSB 5607	Education	S Passed 3rd	Braun
SB 5622	Career readiness education	S Early Learning/K-12	Rolfes
<u>SB 5623</u>	Basic education program	S Ways & Means	Rolfes
SB 5639	Alternative student assessments	S Early Learning/K-12	Conway
<u>SB 5641</u>	School district class naming	S Early Learning/K-12	Keiser
<u>SB 5644</u>	Skill center facility maintenance	S Ways & Means	Honeyford
<u>SB 5651</u>	Siting of schools	S Early Learning/K-12	Conway
SB 5662	Professional educator standards board	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5664</u>	Federal forestlands/education funding	S Ways & Means	Braun
<u>SB 5668</u>	Civics education	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5673</u>	OSPI & state board of education	S Early Learning/K-12	Zeiger
<u>SB 5677</u>	Schools/leasehold excise tax	S Higher Education	Zeiger
SJM 8000	Free and fair elections	S State Government	Takko
SJM 8001	Elections, money spent on	S State Government	Hasegawa
SJR 8200	Publicly funded schools	S Early Learning/K–12	Baumgartner
SJR 8202	School district bonds	S Ways & Means	Mullet
SJR 8204	Individual income tax prohibit	S Ways & Means	Fortunato