

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 628

EA 032 833

AUTHOR Christy, W. Keith; McNeal, Larry
TITLE Implications of Legislative Policy Development for Public School Districts.
PUB DATE 1999-11-14
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration (Charlotte, NC, November 13-15, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Role; *Charter Schools; *Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditure per Student; Government School Relationship; *Home Schooling; Nontraditional Education; Politics of Education; Public Education; *School Choice; *School District Autonomy; State Aid; State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; Arkansas; Colorado

ABSTRACT

During the 1980s and 1990s, state legislatures became significantly involved in developing policy that determined how and where students should be offered their K-12 education. These legislative acts have occurred most notably in the passage of revision of policy dealing with public school finance, charter schools, home schools, choice enrollment, and local board of education control. Increasingly, state legislatures are perceived to be creating more restrictions for mainstream public schools while legislating fewer restrictions for alternative schooling options. This paper examines these issues in Arkansas, Colorado, and Arizona where significant legislative policy involvement has occurred. The examination includes the changing revenue base for public schools, the increase in the number of charter schools and home schools, the increasing number of students attending charter and home schools, the expansion of choice-enrollment options, and the waning influence of local boards of education in matters of local control. The factors used in exploration of the topic were student population, public school enrollment, and per-pupil expenditures that occurred during the period 1983-97 for Arkansas, Colorado, and Arizona. Legislative involvement in the policymaking process has fundamental implications for public school districts. (Author)

ED 481 628

Implications of Legislative Policy Development for Public School Districts

W. Keith Christy
wkchristy@ualr.edu

Larry McNeal
lxmcneal@ualr.edu

The University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Little Rock, Arkansas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Keith Christy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Charlotte, North Carolina
November 13-15, 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EAD32833

Implications of Legislative Policy Development for Public School Districts

Abstract

During the decades of the 1980s and 1990s, state legislatures became significantly involved in developing policy that determined how and where students would be offered their K-12 education. These legislative acts have occurred most notably in the passage and revision of policy dealing with public school finance, charter schools, home schools, choice enrollment, and local board of education control (Candoli, Hack, & Ray, 1998; Ray, 1998; Burrup, Brimley, & Garfield, 1999; McGuire, 1999).

Increasingly, state legislatures are perceived to be creating more restrictions for “main stream” public schools while legislating fewer restrictions for “alternative” schooling options. As an example of this trend occurring during the past two decades, legislatures in many states passed legislation that: erodes fiscal support to traditional public schools; encourages growth of the charter school movement; provides greater freedom and less accountability of parents for home schools; mandates local school districts to accept enrollment of non-resident pupils; and develops laws that take much of the responsibility for policy making from local boards of education and transfers it to the legislature (Arizona Revised Statutes, 1998; Arkansas School Laws Annotated, 1998; Colorado Revised Statutes, 1987).

The presenters will not suggest that these movements are detrimental for students, but that a dichotomy exists between requirements for main stream public schools and alternative schooling options. The presenters will examine these issues in Arkansas, Colorado, and Arizona where significant legislative policy involvement has occurred. The examination will include the changing revenue base for public schools, the increase in the number of charter schools and home schools as well as the increasing number of students attending charter and home schools, the expansion of choice enrollment options, and the waning influence of local boards of education in matters of local control. Legislative involvement in the policy making process has fundamental implications for public school districts.

Implications of Legislative Policy Development for Public School Districts

Introduction

The public and their policymakers have given considerable debate to the place of alternative schooling options being used as a means of improving the public education system (Swanson & King, 1997). They write that family choice of schooling, like no other, clearly brings into conflict the values of liberty, equity and fraternity. As more opportunities for alternative schooling are created by state and national leadership, Sarason (1999) concludes that legislatures are saying, "If you have a way of improving the quality and outcomes of schooling and you cannot implement that way within the system, here is an opportunity to get out of the clutches of the system (p. 32)."

This paper will examine implications that legislative policy may have upon the efforts to reform the traditional public school system or to give greater freedom to alternative schooling options. The factors used in exploration of this topic were; student population, public school enrollment, and per-pupil expenditures that occurred during the period 1983-1997 for the states of Arkansas, Arizona, and Colorado. These states were chosen due to the nature of their legislatures to be forerunners in providing alternative schooling options for parents and students.

The issues examined were; public school finance, charter schools, home schools, choice enrollment, and local board of education control. The data for analysis included estimated school age population projected by the United States Census Bureau; pupil enrollments recorded by the state departments of education; per-pupil expenditures recorded in the Education Vital Signs of the American School Board Journal; charter school laws, regulations and enrollments; home school laws, regulations, choice enrollment laws and regulations, local board of education control recorded in state code.

Alternative schooling options have been the focus of polling for the 1997 and 1999 *Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools* (Rose & Gallup, 1999). For a question in these two years, respondents were asked whether the focus of public education should be on reforming the existing system or finding alternatives to the existing public schools. The results from 1997 and 1999 were very similar. The national totals for both years

showed 71% of the respondents favored reforming the existing system while 27% in 1999 and 23% in 1997 favored finding alternative systems.

Swanson and King (1997) explain that people view school choice as a means increasing parental influence of educational services and of reducing the control of government, professional administrators, and educators. The objectives of school choice should include:

- Providing affordable options among desirable schools to those who do not currently enjoy such options
- Enhancing the efficiency of the education enterprise by improving student achievement at little or no increase in expense
- Accommodating cultural pluralism and diversity in values and philosophies. (p.407)

The research issue pursued by this review centered on the implications that may exist for traditional public schools as legislative policy has been developed to provide alternative schooling opportunities.

Trends of School Age Population and Public School Enrollment

The states of Arizona and Colorado have been among the fastest growing populations in the United States during the 1980s and 1990s. Table 1 shows the school age growth pattern. The data included the United States Census Bureau (1999) forecast for the student age population of the states and the public school enrollment recorded in Education Vital Signs (Bryant & Blom, 1998). These data were used to maintain consistency in making comparative relationships. Appendixes A, B, and C provide the numbers from which these percentages were obtained. The data show that the percent of students enrolled in the public schools remained fairly stable in Arkansas and Colorado during these years. A notable decrease for the percent of students attending public school is seen in the Arizona statistics beginning in 1990.

Table I

Percent of Public School Enrollment to State Student Age Population

	<u>Arizona</u>	<u>Arkansas</u>	<u>Colorado</u>
7/1/83	95.84%	92.39%	91.30%
7/1/84	97.49%	94.01%	91.69%
7/1/85	98.87%	93.93%	91.95%
7/1/86	100.10%	95.11%	92.50%
7/1/87	99.79%	94.87%	91.78%
7/1/88	100.31%	94.92%	91.84%
7/1/89	100.49%	95.27%	92.66%
7/1/90	90.45%	95.96%	92.61%
7/1/91	91.77%	96.58%	93.59%
7/1/92	93.16%	95.55%	93.22%
7/1/93	91.35%	95.60%	92.48%
7/1/94	93.81%	94.96%	92.48%
7/1/95	92.41%	93.74%	92.57%
7/1/96	91.93%	93.60%	92.90%
7/1/97	93.60%	95.02%	92.29%

Note: The percentage in excess of 100 is due to unexpectedly higher population growth than was projected by the U. S. Census Bureau statistics.

Trends of Public School Finance

As shown in Table 2, public school per-pupil expenditures have generally not kept pace with the increased student membership in Arizona and Colorado. It appears that financial support of public schools in Arkansas has increased significantly more than any increase in student enrollment in public schools. Also noted is the inconsistent change to per-pupil expenditure in all

states during this period. This inconsistency of expected revenues makes it very difficult for local boards of education to plan programs and staff schools from one year to the next.

Even with what seems to be significant gains in these states, the 1998 per-pupil expenditure data (Bryant & Blom, 1998). rank Arkansas 42nd with \$5,222, Arizona 47th with \$4,937, and Colorado 36th with \$5,704. The national average per-pupil expenditure was \$6,548. Enrollment shifts in each of these states has occurred with regions experiencing significant population growth and other regions of the states having significant declining enrollment.

Table II

Percent Annual Change to Student Enrollment and Per-Pupil Expenditure

	Arizona		Arkansas		Colorado	
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
	Enrollment Change	Change to P-P Expend.	Enrollment Change	Change to P-P Expend.	Enrollment Change	Change to P-P Expend.
7/1/84	3.89%	2.30%	1.48%	3.85%	0.60%	4.20%
7/1/85	4.72%	0.71%	0.17%	10.67%	0.96%	15.27%
7/1/86	4.12%	9.18%	0.93%	-15.11%	1.41%	4.85%
7/1/87	3.79%	12.05%	-0.09%	18.89%	0.33%	6.60%
7/1/88	2.90%	5.24%	-0.15%	20.17%	-0.03%	5.82%
7/1/89	2.89%	14.29%	-0.33%	4.01%	0.48%	-1.14%
7/1/90	-6.78%	1.93%	-0.06%	3.36%	2.04%	10.44%
7/1/91	3.53%	-3.66%	1.05%	10.97%	3.28%	0.67%
7/1/92	4.20%	1.57%	0.33%	2.26%	3.31%	-2.42%
7/1/93	1.84%	3.53%	0.53%	2.89%	2.03%	-7.75%
7/1/94	5.50%	0.42%	0.68%	3.98%	2.47%	19.98%
7/1/95	3.83%	0.65%	0.62%	6.43%	2.46%	0.29%
7/1/96	3.62%	1.27%	1.08%	2.93%	2.61%	1.20%
7/1/97	4.14%	12.54%	1.13%	16.10%	2.04%	2.77%

Effect of Charter School Funding on School Districts

Shifts in population that lead to declining enrollment at individual school sites mean reduced funding for those school districts. Bernstein (1999) writes that the most direct and immediate impact of charter schools upon other public schools of the school district is financing. No matter what the mechanism for financing charter schools, he writes “public schools wind up with fewer dollars to improve the education of their students” (p. 25). These shifts often create revenue losses that may justify state assistance (Swanson & King). As an impact upon school board members, UCLA researchers found that school district directors in California seemed to understand the ramifications of charter school funding and that financing these schools was the issue with the most immediate political ramifications in the districts.

Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado each base school district revenue on the number of students in membership at certain times during the school year. This is not different from the method used in many states to provide revenue to school districts. The legislation in these states requires that a certain percentage of the per-pupil revenue must be given to the local charter school for operating expenses. The argument for making this transfer of money is based on the premise that the money should follow the student. In reality, the concept of marginal cost (Bernstein, 1999) states that it costs less to add one or two pupils to a class. However, when one or two pupils leave that class there is no loss of expense other than maybe consumable supplies. Bernstein (1999) uses the following example:

This means that if 10 students in each grade were to transfer to a charter school from a 1,000-student public elementary school, the public school would lose approximately \$500,000. No teacher, custodian, or secretary salaries can be eliminated as a result of the reduction in the number of students. However, the public school would have \$500,000 less available to educate its remaining students. (p.26)

Colorado’s experience with charter school funding is similarly expressed by Colorado Association of School Executives associate executive, Phil Fox. Fox (Rofes, 1999) claims it is unfair to take money away from school districts that lose students to alternative schooling options

because, "The basic infrastructure must be maintained to serve the balance of students. Just because 30 [students] leave doesn't necessarily mean that the cost of the building is any less or the cost of the utilities is any less." (p. 15)

A way of showing this loss of revenue to school districts within these states is shown in Table 3. The yearly totals are computed by multiplying the number of charter school and home school students that have left the traditional public school by the annual per-pupil expenditure, both of which are shown in Appendixes A, B, and C. The example shows that in 1997, an Arizona school district would have a loss of \$131 per student for the entire school district. Similarly, in Arkansas it was \$93 and in Colorado, the loss was \$166. It must be noted that the Arkansas loss is the result of home school students only as there were no charter schools in existence during this period.

Table III

Loss of School District Funding from Charter School and Home School Students

	Arizona		Arkansas		Colorado	
	Total	Local District	Total	Local District	Total	Local District
	State	Per-Pupil	State	Per-Pupil	State	Per-Pupil
7/1/93	NA	NA	\$26,566,000	\$60	\$26,339,664	\$42
7/1/94	\$593,952	\$.81	\$21,322,458	\$48	\$49,566,000	\$77
7/1/95	\$27,291,600	\$36	NA	NA	\$64,974,432	\$99
7/1/96	\$78,250,919	\$99	NA	NA	\$113,880,360	\$166
7/1/97	\$107,967,253	\$131	\$42,820,400	\$93	\$113,897,472	\$166

The revenue that a charter school receives is the result of agreement between the school district and the charter school. In Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado, this amount is based upon the state per-pupil expenditure, regardless of grade level or special programs being served at the charter school. In actual practice, the cost to educate an elementary school student is less than a high school student. This difference is not considered in the legislation of these states. The system

of making considerations for different grades and programs commonly known as *weighted-pupil* or *weighted classroom* formula (Swanson & King, 1997, p. 228).

Swanson and King (1997) explain that these systems assign weights to grade levels or special programs that are then tied to a base and this defines the lowest-cost instruction. The weighted-pupil system would more accurately reflect the true cost of providing educational programs to charter school students. Several states use a weighted formula for elementary, middle school and high school students (Odden & Picus). Illinois and New York have a factor differential of .25 for grades K-6 and 7-12 which accounts for a secondary school student being funded at 25% more than an elementary school student. Using such a formula, a charter school under the present system in these states would receive a per-pupil revenue of \$5,000 for all students in a 300-student K-8 charter school. This school would be entitled to \$1,500,000. With the weighted-pupil formula that would assign factors of .87 for K-6, 1.12 for grades 7-8, and assuming an equal distribution among the grade levels, this 300-student K-8 charter school would be entitled to \$1,374,450. By not using a weighted formula for distribution, the school district in this example loses an additional \$125,500 for the loss of students to this one charter school.

The Charter School Movement

The first charter school was established in 1971 in Minnesota (Fox, 1999). Since that time, the number of charter schools has grown nationally (McGuire, 1998). During the 1997-98 school year, the number of charter schools in operation continued to grow rapidly, with 279 additional charters opening in the 1997-98 school year. As of August 28, 1999, there were 1,700 charter schools in operation and the President's goal was to have 3,000 by the end of 2000 (Fox, 1999).

Rees & Youssef (1999) describe a charter school as "A public school that agrees to meet certain performance standards in exchange for exemptions from public school regulations other than those governing health, safety, and civil rights" (p.vii). McGuire (1998) writes in a study conducted by the United States Department of Education that "charter schools are public schools set apart from others by virtue of a charter, or contract with a state or local agency, that provides

the charter school with public funds for a specified time period” (p.1). The “charter” states the terms under which the school can be held accountable for improving student performance and achieving goals set out in the charter. This charter frees the school developers from a number of state regulations that apply to other public schools.

In the second-year study of charter schools, McGuire (1998) points out that charter school proponents maintain that these schools are created by local educators, parents, community members, school boards, and other sponsors in the hope that new models of schooling and competitive pressures on public schools will improve the current system. Opponents of charter schools express concern that this school arrangement may provide an escape for other public school students and threaten to pull public education apart.

Growth of the charter school movement seems to have been fostered as parents with students in charter schools reported dissatisfaction with their experience in other public schools. In focus group discussions (McGuire, 1998), parents and students consistently voiced dissatisfaction with their previous public schools, expressing concerns about low academic standards, a dehumanizing culture, student safety, and unresponsiveness to serious parent involvement.

Table 4 demonstrates the growth of charter schools that has occurred soon after legislation had been passed to allow their establishment. Colorado charter school legislation occurred first in 1993, Arizona in 1994 and with Arkansas legislation first in 1995 (McGuire, 1999). The Arkansas law of 1995 was revised in 1999 to encourage growth of charter schools within the state (Arkansas Charter Schools Act of 1999). No charter schools were formed under the 1995 legislative requirements.

Table IV

Charter School Enrollments

	Arizona	Arkansas	Colorado
7/1/93	0	0	0
7/1/94	138	0	2,356

Table IV (continued)

7/1/95	6,300	0	4,281
7/1/96	17,837	0	6,941
7/1/97	21,869	0	11,378
7/1/98	36,736	0	14,495

Charter School Legislation

The definition of a charter school in Arkansas, Colorado, and Arizona is quite similar in that each defines it to be a public school that is operating under the terms of a charter granted by the state board (The Arkansas Charter Schools Act of 1999, Colorado Revised Statutes, 1999, Arizona Revised Statutes, 1999). One difference is that Colorado only allows charter schools to be governed by the local board of education, while Arizona and Arkansas allow charter schools to be governed by commercial or private entities. In all states, the charter school would operate under a charter that would be a performance-based contract for a three-year period. This charter exempts the school from state and local rules, regulations, policies, and procedures specified in the contract.

Funding for Charter Schools

An Arkansas charter school receives funds equal to the minimum state and local revenue per average daily membership. The funds for the charter school are provided through the Public School Fund (The Arkansas Charter Schools Act of 1999, § 6-10-116[7][a][1]). Colorado charter schools are funded at 95% of the school district's per-pupil operating revenues (Bills that passed, 1999).

Supplemental Federal and State Charter School Funds

In 1994, Congress created the Public School Charter Program (Medler) that provided discretionary grants to help charter schools with startup costs. The fund has grown from \$6 million in 1995 to the FY 2000 request of \$100 million (Fox). These funds are supplemental to district funding for charter schools and are available upon acceptance of a grant proposal. The allocation received by Arkansas (Pierce) for the 1999-2000 school year was \$368,000. These funds in

Arkansas may be used to support planning and application preparation for potential charter schools.

The Home School Movement

Kelly (1999) reports that educating children at home has become a popular trend throughout the United States with *Education Week* giving estimates that between 1 and 2 million children are educated in home schools annually. Obtaining accurate home school counts are difficult in that some states do not keep records of the number of home school students. Arizona schools report home school enrollment only to the county superintendent. Arkansas and Colorado do have some yearly figures for home school enrollments. Arkansas, Arizona, and Colorado require home school parent/guardian to register with the local school district of residence. Lines (1999) has estimated that in 1995 Arizona had 61.5% of parents that reported to local officials of homeschooling. Colorado was estimated at 68.2% and Arkansas estimated at 92.3%.

Arkansas Education Code § 6-15-501 (1998) defines a home school to be “a school primarily conducted by parents or legal guardians for their own children.” Colorado and Arizona home school laws have similar definitions. This is an alternative form of education in which children learn under the general supervision of their parent or guardian. The teaching content for homeschooled students is substantially controlled by the choice of the parent/guardian, within the bounds of state laws.

As with the trend in most other states, home school legislation in Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado has few restrictions for parents desiring to home school their children. In each of these states, the requirement is for the parent to notify the school district of residence with basic information about the student. Home school laws became unrestricted in Colorado in 1984. Prior to that, parents were required to have an approved course of study that had been approved by the department of education (School Attendance Law of 1963). In each of these states, there is no significant mechanism for monitoring home schools other than through mandated testing. The testing requirement in Colorado allows a school district to monitor student progress if the student scores at or below the thirteenth percentile on the nationally standardized test (School Attendance

Law of 1963). Home school growth for Arizona was not available except for an estimate by Lines (1999). Table 5 shows that Arkansas (Bundy) and Colorado (Home School Trends) figures show growth of home school students with significant increases experienced during these years.

Table V

Home School Enrollments

	<u>Arizona</u>	<u>Arkansas</u>	<u>Colorado</u>
7/1/85		572	
7/1/86		818	
7/1/87		1,138	
7/1/88		1,400	
7/1/89		2,064	
7/1/90		2,736	
7/1/91		3,140	3,339
7/1/92		4,025	4,390
7/1/93		4,742	5,746
7/1/94		5,193	6,669
7/1/95	8,000*	NA	7,581
7/1/96		NA	8,503
7/1/97		8,200	8,587
7/1/98		NA	8,827

* Estimate by Lines (Appendix A, 1999)

Choice Enrollment as an Attendance Option

Arkansas and Colorado have "choice enrollment" legislation and Arizona has "open-enrollment" legislation. The language is very similar for each state in that nonresident students of a school district may enroll in another school district of the student's/parent's choosing without

paying tuition. Prior to choice or open enrollment legislation, school districts could charge tuition to the student for the privilege of attending school as a nonresident (ALIS Online, 1999; Arkansas School Laws Annotated, 1998; Colorado Revised Statutes, 1998). Limitations to accepting students at particular schools would be for lack of space or when a desegregation plan is in effect that would be negatively impacted by student movement. Choice enrollment data are limited with inconsistent reporting being given. The report of Arkansas shows that nearly 4,100 students participated in the choice enrollment option during the 1997-98 school year.

Legislation disallowing school districts to charge tuition for nonresident pupils was created for Colorado in 1990. The impact to losing students by the choice enrollment option is the same as losing students to charter schools and home schools. The loss of one of two students does not add expense, but the loss of per-pupil revenue takes money from the school district with no means of receiving revenue from sources such as tuition or contracting services between school districts.

Local Board of Education Control

Each state legislature determines the level of governance that will be provided through state laws with rules and regulations that will impact the type of decisions that may be made by the local board of education. This level of local control is quite different among the states of Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado. Table VI gives an overview of the types of state-level governance in these states. This table does not include common requirements such as state history instruction; drug, alcohol and tobacco instruction; compulsory attendance; entrance age requirements, etc. Colorado does not have a lengthy list of state mandates as it is explained in Education Laws and Regulations (1999) that "Both by citizen preference and law, Colorado is a 'local control' state. This means that many pre-kindergarten through 12th grade decisions--on issues such as curriculum, personnel, school calendars, graduation requirements, and classroom policy --are made by the 176 school district local administrations and their school boards.

Table VI

Examples of State-Level Governance in Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado

<u>Arizona¹</u>	<u>Arkansas²</u>	<u>Colorado³</u>
Academic Standards	Academic Standards	Academic Standards
Student Assessment	Student Assessment	Student Assessment
Minimum Course of Study	Minimum Course of Study	Building Accountability
Graduation Requirements	Graduation Requirements	Committee
Graduation Competency Test	Purchase and Distribute	Third Grade Reading
School Council	Textbooks	Competency
Oral and Silent Reading Time	Academic Distress Takeover	
Extracurricular Activity Rules	Fiscal Distress Takeover	
Curriculum Review for Underachieving Schools	Special Education Funding Smart Start, K-3 Instruction	
Phonics Instruction	Uniform Grading Scale for	
School Report Cards	Secondary Schools	
Voluntary Career Ladders	Academic Standards for	
Promotion competency criteria	Competitive Interscholastic Activities	

1 ALIS Online Title 15

2 ADE Rules and Regulations (1999)

3 Colorado Laws and Regulations (1999)

To further illustrate the level of state involvement in local affairs, Table VII shows newly enacted legislation from 1999 that affects how local boards of education must function. Some of this legislation is indicative of further erosion of local control of education and of the emphasis from these state legislatures to encourage more alternative schooling options for students.

Table VII

Selected 1999 Legislative Requirements Impacting Control of Local Boards of Education

<u>Arizona¹</u>	<u>Arkansas²</u>	<u>Colorado³</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Assessment instrument for state standards. ◦ State-wide nationally-normed testing ◦ District assessment plan ◦ Promotion competencies at third and eighth grade ◦ Grade level promotion competencies ◦ State report card of assessment results ◦ Remedial summer school for grade K-3 promotion ◦ Instruction in phonics ◦ Local objectives that address student achievement, dropout rate, and employment/college entrance data ◦ Home school students participation in public school activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Revised assessment requirements for local school districts ◦ Set September 15 as cut-off date for kindergarten enrollment ◦ Individual school report cards to parents ◦ Transferring employees keep up to 90 days of sick leave in new district ◦ Open-enrollment charter schools ◦ Distribution of grade level standards to all parents ◦ Teacher may impose long-term exclusion for disruptive student ◦ Local boards must consider school uniform requirement ◦ Required certification for class or subject area taught 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Charter schools may offer programs that duplicate public schools ◦ Charter schools are tax-exempt ◦ Charter schools to receive 95% of district per-pupil revenues ◦ School district must advertise local charter school in notice of school options ◦ Graduation competencies

Table VII (continued)

-
- Increases minimum salary
from \$20,000 to \$21,860
-

- 1 Arizona Legislative Computer Services
- 2 Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators Legislative Update
- 3 Bills that Passed in '99 Legislative Session

Conclusion

In his weekly radio address to the nation on August 28, 1999, President Clinton spoke about the \$100 million in grants for charter schools and remarked, "This is the kind of education we want for all our children." (Fox, p. 1). By statements such as this and by the documented recent actions of legislatures in Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado, policymakers will continue to provide incentives for alternative schooling options. The enrollment data show that these alternatives have continued to draw larger numbers of students to their offerings.

There are some basic issues to be addressed by the traditional public school establishment and by the state and federal policymakers. These issues seem to be; (1) adjustments that traditional public schools must do to maintain and draw enrollment to their schools; and (2) policymakers must recognize that policy development and equitable funding are necessary for all schools to demonstrate improvement of student achievement. Legislative policies that seem to be diminish state requirements for alternative schooling while creating additional requirements for traditional public schools will not be in the best interest of the nation's educational system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

- ADE Rules and Regulations (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.arkedu.state.ar.us/reg.htm>
- ALIS Online (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars/15/816-01.htm>
- ALIS Online Title 15 (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars/15/title15.htm>
- Arizona Legislative Computer Services (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/legtext/laws.htm>
- Arizona Revised Statutes (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars/15/title15.htm>
- Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators Legislative Update (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.aaea.k12.ar.us/legislative%20session%2099/>
- Arkansas Charter Schools Act of 1999 (1999). Arkansas School Laws Annotated. Senate Bill 562. §6-15-501 and § 6-10-116[3][1] (1987 & Supp. 1998).
- Choice Enrollment Report (1999). Arkansas Department of Education. [Online]. Available: http://www.as-is.org/search/search_choice.cgi?year=1997&data_level=state&
- Arkansas Laws Annotated (1999). (Online). Available: [http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/lpbin/lpext.dll?f=file\[fbrowse-h.htm\]](http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/lpbin/lpext.dll?f=file[fbrowse-h.htm)
- Bernstein, M. F. (1999). Why I'm wary of charter schools. The School Administrator. August, 1999. Number 7, Vol. 56.
- Bills that passed in '99 legislative session (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.casb.org/legislativehighlights/newlaws.html>
- Bryant, A. L. & Blom, D. E. Education Vital Signs, (1998). American School Board Journal. December 1983-1998. Volumes 170-185, No. 12.
- Bunday, K. M. (1995). Homeschooling has been growing rapidly in recent years. [Online]. Available: <http://learninfreedom.org/homeschool-growth.html>

Burrup, P. E., Brimley, V. Jr., & Garfield, R. R. (1999). Financing Education in a Climate of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Candoli, I. C., Hack, W. G., and Ray, J. R. (1998). School business administration: A planning approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Charter Schools. Arkansas School Laws Annotated (1998). § 6-10-116 and § 6-15-501(1987 & Supp. 1998).

Colorado Revised Statutes (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.intellinetusa.com/statemgr.htm>

Colorado Laws and Regulations (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://web.intellinetusa.com/cgi-dos/statsrcf.exe?W>

Colorado trends in home school enrollment (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/rvhome98.htm>

Colorado trends in charter school enrollment (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/charter98.htm>

Education Laws and Regualtions (1999). [On-line]. Available: http://www.cde.state.co.us/index_law.htm

Fox, M. (1999). Clinton announces \$100 million for Charter Schools. Reuters New Service. [On-line]. Available: <http://news.excite.com/.news/r/990828/12/news-clinton-education>.

Kelly, C. L. (1999). School Law Brief. The Home School Dilemma: Providing Services or Opportunities for Participation in Public School Programs. [online]. Available: <http://www.aasa.org/briefs>

Lines, P. M. Appendix A (1999). Homeschoolers: Estimating numbers and growth, Spring 1999. <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/SAI/homeschool/AppendixA.html>

Lines, P. M. Appendix B (1999). Homeschoolers: Estimating numbers and growth, Spring 1999. [online]. Available: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/SAI/homeschool/AppendixB.html>

McGuire, C. K. (1998). The second national study of charter schools. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. [On-line] <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/charter>

McGuire, C. K. (1999). The state of charter schools third year report. Office of Educational Research and Improvement [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/charter3rdyear/A.html>

Medler, A. (1999). The Federal Role in the Charter Movement. The School Administrator. August, 1999. Number 7, Vol. 56.

Odden, A. R. & Picus, O. (1992). School finance: A policy perspective. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Rose, L. C. & Gallup, A. M. (1999). The 31st annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kpol9909.htm#1a>

Pierce, R. Federal Grant will help develop charter schools. The Arkansas Democrat Gazette, August 25, 1999. p 1B.

Ray, B. D. (1998). National Home Education Research Institute. [online]. Available: <http://www.nheri.org/booklet.html>

Rees, S. R. & Youssef, S. E. School choice: What's happening in the states. The Heritage Foundation: Washington, D.C. 1999. p. vii.

Rofes, E. (1999). The Catalyst Role of Charter Schools. The School Administrator. August, 1999. Number 7, Vol. 56.

Sarason, S. B. (1999). Charters: The next flawed reform? The School Administrator. August, 1999. Number 7, Vol. 56.

School Attendance Law of 1963. Colorado Revised Statutes (1998). § 22-33-104.5 (5)(a)(I), (1998).

School Attendance Law of 1963, Colorado Revised Statutes (1998). § 22-33-104.5 (Source: L. 63), (1998).

Schools of Choice. Colorado Revised Statutes (1998). § 22-36-10 (1998).

Skillen, L. (1999). Board and district charter schools: Arizona state totals. Arizona Department of Education.

Swanson, A. D. & King, R. A. (1997). School finance: Its economic and politics. Longman Publishers.

United States Census Bureau (1999). [Online]. Available: <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/state/stiag781.txt>

Wells, A. S. (1998). UCLA Charter School Study: Beyond the rhetoric of charter school reform: A study of ten California school districts. [Online]. Available: <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/docs/charter.pdf>



U.S. Department of Education
 Institute of Education Sciences (IES)
 National Library of Education (NLE)
 Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



Reproduction Release
 (Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Implications of Legislative Policy Development for Public School Districts	
Author(s): W. Keith Christy, EdD; Larry McNeal, PhD	
Corporate Source: Southern Regional Council on Educational Adm	Publication Date: November 14, 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	↑ <input type="checkbox"/>	↑ <input type="checkbox"/>
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: <i>W. Keith Christy</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: W. Keith Christy, Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: University of Arkansas at Little Rock 2801 s. University Ave. Little Rock, AR 72204	Telephone: 501-569-3554	Fax: 501-569-3547
	E-mail Address: wkchristy@ualr.edu	Date: October 2, 2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price:	

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: Document Acquisitions Department ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management 5207 University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon 97403-5207
