

## Comparison of Top EHB 2242 Fix Bills (Rev. 2-4-18)

Topic	<a href="#">HB 2721 (OSPI)</a>	<a href="#">SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)</a>	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
Hold Harmless	For two school years (2018-19, 2019-20), school districts would qualify for “hold harmless” if the sum of its state, local and LEA funding under EHB 2242 is less than the sum of state, local and LEA funds it received on Jan. 1, 2017. Local revenues would include ghost funding as written. The hold harmless would apply only to what the district was legally collecting from voters on January 1, 2017, not what might have been authorized beyond actual collections. (Section 1, p. 2)	For two school years (2018-19, 2019-20), school districts would qualify for “hold harmless” if the sum of its state, local and LEA funding under EHB 2242 is less than the sum of state, local and LEA funds it received on Jan. 1, 2017. Local revenues would include ghost funding as written. The hold harmless would apply only to what the district was legally collecting from voters on January 1, 2017, not what might have been authorized beyond actual collections. (Section 1, p. 1)	<a href="#">HB 2717</a> has a slightly different approach to hold harmless. (Section 305, p. 34)	1. This does not include annual inflation factors 2. The hold harmless should be ongoing, not just 2 years for districts that can demonstrate a net loss, particularly for districts going out to voters in 2019.
Local enrichment levies	Would change the threshold from \$1.50/\$1000 AV or \$2500 per student to: For CY 2019, the dollar amount approved by voters for the 2018 tax levy or \$2,500 per student.  If the local levy rate in CY 2019 exceeds the sum of \$1.50/\$1000 plus the rate of the state property tax levy, the local levy rate must be reduced by the amount of the state property tax levy as assessed locally under EHB 2242. (Section 16, p. 26)	Did not address; included a placeholder that said this issue should be addressed. (Section 14, p. 22)	<a href="#">HB 2717</a> would increase the per pupil amount to \$3000.  For districts with less than 1000 students, would eliminate the max per pupil, and cap enrichment levies at \$1.50/\$1000 AV. (Section 202, pp. 12-14)	Senate education chair Lisa Wellman said it was important to address levies; SPI Rekdal and others are asking for a pause in implementation or phase in, with a “do no harm” mantra.  Legislators have said they made a promise to taxpayers that this would lower their local levies. There also is a concern that if limits are lifted they will just get into a McCleary 2 situation.

Topic	<a href="#">HB 2721 (OSPI)</a>	<a href="#">SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)</a>	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
Local effort assistance	Would increase LEA from \$1,500 per resident student to \$2,100. (Section 9, p. 19)	Did not address; included a placeholder that said this issue should be addressed. (Section 14, p. 22)	<a href="#">HB 2717</a> would change LEA formulas. (Section 203, pp. 14-15)	
Regionalization	Not addressed	Not addressed	<a href="#">HB 2717</a> would allow a district bordering a district with a regional factor to receive half of what the other districts is getting for the factor. (Section 103, pp. 7-8)	At the Feb. 1 hearing, Senate budget chair Rolfes said they had heard about the problems with regionalization and were trying to come up with a solution.
Experience Factor	Not addressed	Removed staff mix from charter schools and tribal compact schools. Also said charter schools and tribal compact schools were not eligible for a regionalization factor. (Sections 8 and 9, pp. 16-18)	<a href="#">HB 2717</a> would allow an 8 percent experience bonus for teachers above the state average in experience and education. (Section 101 (10), p. 4)	In an article by the <a href="#">Tacoma News Tribune</a> , Rolfes said the removal of staff mix was intentional and would not be corrected.
Changes to High-Poverty LAP	Would allow a school to continue to receive funding for one year after it no longer meets definition of qualifying school. Would redefine “qualifying school” as one with 3-year rolling average of the prior year total annual average enrollment that qualifies equal to or exceeds 50% FRPL. (Section 6, p. 15)	A school would receive high-poverty LAP based on a three-year rolling average of the prior year total annual average enrollment that qualifies for free or reduced price meals at 50% or more of total annual average enrollment. A school that drops below the 50% may continue to receive funding for one additional year.  For the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years, school districts are allowed to carry over from one year to the next up to 20% of the	<a href="#">HB 2763</a> /SB 6394 would have eliminated the threshold, driving out extra LAP to all high-poverty students, and included a four-year rolling average to coincide with the requirement for four-year school budget planning.	Rolling average creates some predictability, along with the grace period of a year. Not sure about benefit of increasing 20 percent rollover, since most funds are spent in the school year in which they are received.

Topic	<a href="#">HB 2721 (OSPI)</a>	<a href="#">SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)</a>	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
		funds allocated to categorical programs. (Section 2, pp. 7-9)		
K-3 Staffing Ratio Compliance	Would extend compliance date to 2019-20 school year (Section 3, p. 7)	Would extend the compliance date to 2019-20 school year. (Section 2, p. 4)	<a href="#">HB 2717</a> would tie the compliance date to a district's actual classroom capacity. (Section 302, pp. 23-24)  <a href="#">SB 6483</a> would allow a school district to include additional staffing types in the ratio calculation to reach 17:1. (Section 5, p. 9)	
Special Education	Not addressed	The multiplier is increased from 0.9309 to 0.9609 (Section 17, p. 27)	<a href="#">HB 2964</a> would increase the multiplier to 1.05 in the 2018-19 school year through the 2020-21 school year; then 1.09 starting in the 2021-22 school year when districts met certain conditions.  HB 2964 also would explicitly grant use of enrichment levies for special education, and would increase the safety net threshold.	HB 2964 is the most comprehensive of the approaches to special education.
Prototypical Schools	Not addressed	Not addressed in substitute	<a href="#">HB 2717</a> would begin phase in of I-1351 staffing ratios. (Sections 302, 303, pp. 23-26)	
Def. of "Resident Student"	Would define "resident student" for purposes of levies and LEA as a student who lives within the	The section of law in the OSPI bill that defined resident student is removed from this bill.		SPI Reykdal said Jan. 31 that OSPI needed "resident" defined if it remained in statute.

Topic	<a href="#">HB 2721 (OSPI)</a>	<a href="#">SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)</a>	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
	district's geographic boundaries, excluding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice students</li> <li>• PreK students</li> </ul> (Section 2, p. 3)	In other words, the substitute is silent on a definition of resident student.		Two ways to handle: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amendment to the section of law to remove "resident."</li> <li>2. Amendment to the section of law that would include definition of "resident" as a student enrolled in the district with the exception of students under RCW 28A.250.010 (online/remote students)</li> </ol>
OSPI approval of enrichment levies	Would repeal the requirement for OSPI approval of local enrichment levies. (Section 16, p. 26).  However, Section 15 leaves language in statute related to pre-approval. (Section 15, p. 25, (b))	Requires preapproval by OSPI (Section 15)		OSPI seems resigned to the fact that Legislature won't budge from this requirement.
Compliance with 9/1/18	Not addressed	Not addressed		
Other items of note				