

Comparison of SB 6362 – EHB 2242 Fix Bills (Rev. 2-9-18)

Topic	SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)	2SSB 6362 (As Passed out of Senate Ways & Means 2/6/18)	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. 1)	Identical language. (Section 401, p. 30)	HB 2717 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	Did not address; included a place holder that said this issue should be addressed. (Section 14, p. 22)	Did not address; includes place holder saying this issue should be addressed. (Section 301, pp. 20-21)	HB 2717 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	SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)	2SSB 6362 (As Passed out of Senate Ways & Means 2/6/18)	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
Local effort assistance	Did not address; included a place holder that said this issue should be addressed. (Section 14, p. 22)	Did not address; includes place holder saying this issue should be addressed. (Section 301, pp. 20-21)	HB 2717 would change LEA formulas. (Section 203, pp. 14-15)	
Regionalization	Not addressed	For districts sharing a boundary with any school district with a regionalization factor more than one tercile higher, the regionalization factor for the district with the lower regionalization factor must be increased by 6%, if the lower district is located west of Cascades. (Section 202, p. 12)	HB 2717 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)	
Experience Factor	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)	Removed staff mix from charter schools and tribal compact schools. BUT, would allow regionalization for charter schools and tribal compact schools when they are located in the geographical region of a district receiving a regionalization factor. (Section 202, p. 12)	HB 2717 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 Tacoma News Tribune , Rolfes said the removal of staff mix was intentional and would not be corrected.

Topic	SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)	2SSB 6362 (As Passed out of Senate Ways & Means 2/6/18)	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
Changes to High-Poverty LAP	<p>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 dropped below the 50% would continue to receive funding for one additional year.</p> <p>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 funds allocated to categorical programs. (Section 2, pp. 7-9)</p>	<p>High-poverty LAP would be 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.</p> <p>Removed the one-year grace period.</p> <p>For the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years, school districts would be allowed to carry over from one year to the next up to 20% of the funds allocated to categorical programs. (Section 101, pp. 7-8)</p>	<p>HB 2763/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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
K-3 Staffing Ratio Compliance	<p>Would extend the compliance date to 2019-20 school year. (Section 2, p. 4)</p>	<p>Not included in this draft. Compliance would remain in effect for the 2018-19 school year. (Section 101, p. 4)</p>	<p>HB 2717 would tie the compliance date to a district's actual classroom capacity. (Section 302, pp. 23-24)</p> <p>SB 6483 would allow a school district to include additional staffing types in the ratio calculation to reach 17:1. (Section 5, p. 9)</p>	

Topic	SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)	2SSB 6362 (As Passed out of Senate Ways & Means 2/6/18)	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
Special Education	The multiplier would be increased from 0.9309 to 0.9609 (Section 17, p. 27)	The multiplier would be increased from 0.9309 to 0.9609. (Section 102, p. 10)	<p>HB 2964 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.</p> <p>HB 2964 also would explicitly grant use of enrichment levies for special education, and would increase the safety net threshold.</p>	HB 2964 is the most comprehensive of the approaches to special education.
Prototypical Schools	Not addressed in substitute	Not addressed in 2 nd substitute.	HB 2717 would begin phase in of I-1351 staffing ratios. (Sections 302, 303, pp. 23-26)	
Def. of “Resident Student”	<p>The section of law in the OSPI bill that defined resident student is removed from this bill.</p> <p>In other words, the substitute is silent on a definition of resident student.</p>	<p>Would define “resident student” as a student who lives within the geographical boundaries of the school district or a student who transfers into the district by choice under RCW 28A.225.225.</p> <p>Students in online programs, as defined by RCW 28A.250.010, and do not attend a school within the district, are excluded.</p> <p>The definitions would go into effect January 1, 2019. (Section 304, p. 26: LEA) (Section 307, p. 29: levies)</p>		<p>SPI Reykdal said Jan. 31 that OSPI needed “resident” defined if it remained in statute.</p> <p>Two ways to handle:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amendment to the section of law to remove “resident.” 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)

Topic	SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)	2SSB 6362 (As Passed out of Senate Ways & Means 2/6/18)	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
OSPI approval of enrichment levies	Requires preapproval by OSPI (Section 15)	Would continue to require preapproval of enrichment levies by OSPI.		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				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation 	Not addressed	<p>Would create a transportation grant program for districts that get less transportation funding than actual costs. (Section 103, p. 11)</p> <p>Would permit enrichment levies to cover operating costs for student transportation to and from school. (Section 302, p. 21)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation levies 	Removed transportation levies from the definition of "local revenues," which were restricted by 2242.	<p>Would remove transportation levies from the definition of "local revenues," which were restricted by 2242. (Section 302, p. 21)</p> <p>Would eliminate transportation vehicle levies after November 15, 2018, and would allow collection only through Calendar Year 2020. (Section 306, p. 27)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety net 	Not addressed	Would change the date the safety net report is due from 2019 to Sept. 1, 2018. (Section 402, p. 31)		

Topic	SSB 6362 (Passed out of Senate Education 1/25/18)	2SSB 6362 (As Passed out of Senate Ways & Means 2/6/18)	Other Ideas from other bills	Comments/Alignment with Priorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development 		Requires the state auditor to audit the expenditure of PD funds per 2242. (Section 403, 407)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Salary hiring freeze??? 		Would limit the total school district expenditures for CAS, CIS, and CLS by more than the previous calendar year's annual average CPI. (Sections 203, 208, and 207)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other salary 		Would remove the \$90,000 cap on CIS salaries. (Section 204, p. 14) Would cap expenditure of local revenues for CAS costs related to enrichment activities to 25% of total district expenditures. (Section 302, p. 22)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sick leave 		States an intention to address I-1433 (paid sick leave) in the operating budget.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEBB single/family coverage 		Would limit family coverage to no more than three times the premium for a school employee purchasing single coverage. (Section 206, pp. 18-19)		