

1 HB 1369 – The Need for Increased Per Pupil Funding, SPED, and EL Support

- 2 Chair and Members of the Committee,
- 3 I come before you today to urge this body to reconsider the proposed 2% per-pupil increase in
- 4 HB 1369 and the lack of growth in funding for Special Education (SPED) and English
- 5 Learner (EL) services. Our public schools are among the best in the nation, yet they are
- 6 operating under significant financial strain—struggling to meet the needs of students with
- 7 increasingly limited resources.

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

24

8 A History of Underfunding

- 9 In 2013, when North Dakota's school funding formula was revamped, the legislature recognized
- that per-pupil funding should increase by at least 3% annually to keep pace with inflation.
- 11 Yet, the reality has been starkly different:
 - Over the past 12 years, per-pupil funding has increased by an average of only 1.85% per year—well below inflation and far from what was projected to sustain quality education.
 - Over the past 10 years, teacher salaries have grown by an average of just 1.68% per year—a rate that lags significantly behind other sectors and makes recruitment and retention an increasing challenge.
 - Meanwhile, SPED funding remains stagnant at only 35% of actual costs, and EL funding continues to be severely underfunded, leaving districts struggling to provide critical services.

21 The Funding Disparity in HB 1369

- While K-12 public schools are being asked to operate under a 2% per-pupil increase, the
- 23 conversation around state funding includes:
 - State employees projected to receive a 4% increase,
- Higher education receiving a 4% increase,
- A push to fund ESA (Education Savings Accounts) or voucher programs, which would direct public funds away from the 93% of North Dakota students who attend public schools.
- 29 If public schools receive **only 2%**—with no increase for SPED or EL—while other areas of
- 30 government and education receive **double that amount**, it sends a clear message about our
- 31 priorities. Adding to this concern, the same legislature that rejected funding for school meals
- 32 for children is now considering shifting money toward ESAs, while claiming that public
- 33 **schools are not being harmed in the process**. That is a difficult narrative for the voters of
- North Dakota to align with.



1 The Urgent Need to Act

- 2 North Dakota's public schools have consistently delivered **outstanding results** despite these
- 3 funding constraints. We rank #2 in the nation for math achievement in grades 4 and 8 and
- 4 have demonstrated incredible innovation in education. But excellence cannot be sustained on
- 5 **inadequate funding**.

6

7

8 9

10

11

- We cannot continue to expect great educators to remain in this profession when their pay increases lag behind other sectors year after year.
- We cannot meet the diverse needs of students if SPED and EL programs remain painfully short on funding.
- We cannot ask public schools to do more with less while simultaneously diverting public dollars elsewhere.

12 A Call to Invest in Public Schools, Not Just Talk About It

- Public education is the backbone of our communities, workforce, and economy. If we believe in
- its value, we must fund it accordingly. A 2% increase simply does not reflect the reality of
- inflation or the growing needs of our students and educators.
- 16 I respectfully urge you to:
- 17 Increase the per-pupil funding beyond 2% to reflect inflationary needs.
- 18 Commit to additional funding for SPED and EL services so students receive the support
- 19 they require.
- 20 Prioritize public school investment over ESA programs that divert funds from the 93%
- 21 of students in public schools.
- Voters in North Dakota understand the value of strong public schools. They will also recognize
- 23 when the funding narrative does not align with the realities in their communities.
- 24 Thank you for your time and your commitment to North Dakota's students and educators.

25