

# MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1275

2007 HOUSE EDUCATION

HB 1275

# 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1275**

## House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **5 February 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **2790 and 2796**

Committee Clerk Signature

*Jan Prindle*

Minutes:

**Tom Decker, DPI, introduced the bill. (Testimony Attached.)**

**Representative Karls:** When open enrollment is approved, I just assumed that the foundation aid payment follows.

**Decker:** Foundation aid did follow, but that is only half the cost of the student's education. So the effect in the long term is that the sending district is escaping half the cost of that resident student's education and imposing that cost on the receiving district. Receiving districts have been willing to take some number of students because at least in the short run may not cost the additional money. In the long run, any amount less than full cost is subsidization of the district. That is a very significant tax shelter for the sending district.

**Representative Hunskor:** Would you walk us through the current flow of money versus what it would be like if this bill becomes law.

**Decker:** Right now when an open enrolled student goes from District A to District B all that follows is foundation aid and tuition apportionment. Right now that is about 39 to 40% of the cost of education on the average. For every student a receiving district takes they are picking up over half the cost of those students. The state law allows them to decide if they have room or not. Now, as we have established on our discussions on equity, we want the money to

follow as well. Tuition free agreements would go away as well. Automatically in all cases, the cost of education would follow that student.

**Representative Sukat:** There are a number of students in our District 1 that attend District A so the aid is following them, but the tuition part is not following them. So the way I understand now, District 1 would have to pay tuition to District A. Private schools are not involved in this at all.

**Decker:** You understand it right. This does not involve private schools, it's between public schools.

**Representative Mueller:** The implication is that those enrolling out are going to pay to school the open enrollee attends. In addition there can be no side arrangements by school districts to accommodate one another in regard to open enrollment. If they don't charge the tuition they are going to have their state aid held back. Is that really what we want to be doing here?

**Decker:** That is already a provision in law. If you buy the basic argument that resident districts should pay the full cost of their students' education wherever they attend, then it doesn't matter—they should pay the cost.

**Paul Johnson, superintendent, Bismarck School District, testified in favor of the bill.**  
**(Testimony Attached.)**

**Representative Mueller:** Since you are losing the amount of money you are, have you or your board considered not taking students.

**Johnson:** That has happened over time. At one time this was a positive thing for the Bismarck School District. It isn't anymore. My recommendation will be to not accept open enrolled students anymore. Unless this legislation passes, there is simply no reason for us to accept open enrollment students.

**Representative Hunskor:** If that were to happen and you had a couple of students that were open enrolled in your school and then there are two younger students and then it is their turn, how would you deal with that.

**Johnson:** We did this years ago to try to accommodate families. Frankly, I don't think we have the option and not others. We would simply have to close it off. We cannot pick and choose who comes into our district so we would have to simply say we're not going to do it anymore.

**Bev Nielson, ND School Board Association, testified in opposition on this bill.** While it would be an economic benefit to some of our districts, it could be financially devastating to some of our districts. Receiving districts have always had the option to refuse students if it had a negative impact on them financially. Back in 93 when this passed the very argument that is being now was made and those proposing it said this would absolutely not happen. I don't believe it would have passed if local tax money would have had to be paid. In the majority of cases, those districts are willing and able to provide the services to the students that choose to open enroll out. They don't want them to leave. They lose foundation aid when they leave. They don't have any choice in letting them go. It would have been extremely helpful if the printout DPI furnished had a final column which would show the net cost to the sending district. That is critical information you need to have before you make this decision. Districts would be double taxing their residents to pay tuition out to schools when they are offering those very services at home. Again, the receiving district has options and the sending district does not have the option to say we cannot afford to let you go.

**Representative Herbel:** What implications does this have for the kindergarten through 8 that send their kids to high schools?

**Nielson:** They already pay tuition to the high school and they are allowed a tax levy specifically for the high school because they don't offer the service. This would not affect

them. The reason the NDSBA is objecting is that we feel you need to know how devastating it is to those districts that are going to have to pay the tuition.

**Representative Haas:** If you think about this purely from a conceptual standpoint. Is your opinion the same?

**Neilson:** The problem is I don't know how our system could survive the way it is if kids were making choices all the time and districts would have to pay tuition for those kids out and how they would set their budget and how they would tax their residents. It's a whole different scenario that has not been thought out and is very confusing. If the state were paying 100% of the costs and it just went where the kids went then it wouldn't be as much of an issue, but when you are offering those services at home then how do you tax extra for those kids. That's the question and we would like you to think about it.

**Kathy Mauch, school board member of Apple Creek School District, testified in opposition to the bill. (Testimony Attached.)** When a parent comes to us and wants to open enroll a child out of our district into Bismarck we handle that very personally on our level. We talk to them and want to know why. Almost every time it's for the convenience of the parents. When they come into our district, it's because those parents want their child to go to school in a small school setting and get that more individualized education.

**Vice Chairman Meier:** How many students do you have in your school?

**Mauch:** We have 55 in kindergarten through 6 right now.

**Representative Herbel:** How do you address the situation in the receiving school district and justify their costs.

**Mauch:** They did not have to take our children. At one point it was advantageous for Bismarck to take our kids. We don't tax for those kids and use it to run our school. I understand that it costs them and I would say that the \$95.0 percentage wise is probably just

as significant, if not more so, than the dollar amount that Bismarck is talking about. I don't think that in one year 18% of our budget does not come close to \$95.0.

**Representative Herbel:** What is your general fund mil levy?

**Mauch:** Don't quote me for certain. I think it is 85 mils and our high school is 127 mils so our total is close to 190 mils.

**Representative Haas:** If you are not willing to pay the tuition and Bismarck is educating those kids if the area where they live is contiguous to the Bismarck district, would you agree to allow the annexation of that property to the Bismarck district and then you wouldn't have to worry about it.

**Mauch:** All the property is not contiguous. What you would be asking us to do is dissolve our district and become a part of Bismarck. Not all of the families' property is contiguous. I'm not saying we don't want to pay tuition, but it never has had to be a part of open enrollment in the past and to make it all happen in one year it would absolutely be our demise. I understand Bismarck's position too. It negates the whole thing of open enrollment. It negates legislative intent when that bill was passed and it is wrong.

**Representative Herbel:** You kind of indicated that if this didn't hit you all at one time, it wouldn't be as painful. Would you consider doing this over a period of 3 to 5 years?

**Mauch:** I could work with that, but it still negates open enrollment. It is not open enrollment if the tuition has to go with it.

**Representative Hanson:** If Bismarck does not take your students anymore, where would you go?

**Mauch:** This does not refer to high school students. We already pay tuition for them. This is for 6<sup>th</sup> and under students.

**Dean Bard, ND Small Organized Schools, testified in opposition to the bill.** This is not an easy situation. Years ago the situation was that the district where parents wanted to send

their students to another district, they would have to apply for a tuition agreement. Invariably, what happened was that the sending district would deny it and the receiving district would approve it. It then went to a 3 member county committee to make the decision whether the kids would be allowed to go to another district. By and large that committee would let kids go where they wanted to. That created a problem. That was when the agreement came about that there would be no tuition. That seemed to work pretty good. In the 90s we came up with the idea that we should let kids go where they wanted to go regardless and the open enrollment bill came into being. Our association did not oppose. We were afraid of the concept because we thought there would be an exodus from the small districts but we did not oppose it because there was such a groundswell from parents in favor of it. We thought we would be left with the property that would produce tax dollars. In those days larger districts were eager to take in students because the percentage of state aid was higher. In the rural districts where you get to the point where you cannot sustain a classroom anymore, that stings. You have to look at this from the standpoint of the larger districts having a better opportunity to shuffle to accommodate the inflow of kids. The losing districts don't have that opportunity. It's a tough situation and it's gotten tougher since the level of state aid has slid downward over the years. We would hope the answer is not to saddle the sending districts with these extra costs because I don't think they could stand it.

**Representative Mueller:** Do you think there are sending districts that encourage this because they have less obligation to generate tax dollars.

**Bard:** I don't think so, but it could happen. I'm not aware of any specific instances where that is a fact.

**Chairman Kelsch closed the hearing of HB 1275.**



## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1275**

### House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **6 February 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **2920**

Committee Clerk Signature

*Jan Prindle*

Minutes:

**Vice Chairman Meier opened discussion of HB 1275.**

**Jerry Coleman, DPI**, provided a handout to replace the one he distributed at the hearing yesterday. That one was incorrect and this replaces it. The bill provides for tuition for open enrolled students. I pulled the wrong numbers in. I pulled in the average cost rather than what the simulation for the tuition cost for that school district. This schedule corrects. Please replace it with this schedule.

Discussion closed.

## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1275

### House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **7 February 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **3306**

Committee Clerk Signature

*Jan Prindle*

Minutes:

**Chairman Kelsch opened discussion of HB 1275.**

**Vice Chairman Meier:** I move a **Do Pass**. **There was no second.**

**Representative Hanson:** I move a substitute motion: **Do Not Pass.**

**Representative Johnson:** **I Second.** After hearing the testimony I agree when open enrollment was discussed, there is no way that could have passed with this provision. I think it would be devastating to too many schools.

**Representative Sukat:** The Williston School District, along with many others, is hit hard. Astronomically. You are looking at \$700.0 in debt for 116 outgoing students. They are pulling buses up to the door and trucking kids to School District 8 and the numbers it looks like the outgo will be about \$6.0 to \$7.0 per student based on the state average. I surely couldn't support this.

**Chairman Kelsch:** At 7:54 this morning I got chewed on by the Williston superintendent. The message has been delivered twice now. The Mandan superintendent has not chewed on me because he knows the reason why I did this.

**Representative Hunsakor:** I gave you a letter from the Kenmare superintendent and he talks about the reorganization there and there are 33 students open enrolled into the Glenburn district. They had the option to say no but they are receiving them. His feeling is that they

just reorganized and this creates a large financial problem if this bill passes. I'm going to resist the bill also.

**Representative Hanson:** Several sessions I had a bill that you couldn't run a bus into another district without the permission of that district. It's failed both times. In Jamestown we have 40 kids coming in and 75 going out. That's why I'm not going to support this bill.

**Representative Mueller:** The superintendent in Valley City said he was receiving 40 -50 students from Maple Valley and some of Valley City are going to Maple Valley. If we are going to have tuition follow the student we have to base the tuition on something. He used numbers like this. It costs him \$9800 at Maple Valley, in Valley City he is doing it for about \$6000. What happens he has to pay \$9800 to Maple Valley and only is able to charge \$6000.

**Representative Herbel:** I agree with the concept of the bill. I hate seeing schools getting a free lunch, but at the same time when I look at the numbers and see the devastating effect it will have on some districts, it's going to be a big problem. I don't think I can justify supporting the bill. I would like to see some other way to do this. And, they do have the option to not accept those kids.

**Chairman Kelsch:** Just because this wasn't included when open enrollment was passed, it's not something that wasn't looked at or thought about. It may not have been the right thing to do at that time; however, twelve years later may be the time to do it. I thought it was a good opportunity to have the discussion. My school district loses money, but that's not to say that I necessarily agree that it's the wrong thing to do. I think that if a school district is educating a kid, those monies should be with the kid. That's why I introduced the bill and philosophically that's how I feel about equity. I understand school districts stand to lose money. I often wonder why are students open enrolling. We heard a couple of examples. I have probably one of the poorest examples. It's a colleague of mine who lives in Marina Bay and decided it was more convenient for them if their kids are at the school behind where the husband works.

I asked what kind of educational opportunities are they getting? What kind of school is it?

They transferred from Fort Lincoln, one of the newest elementary schools, to one of the older elementary in Bismarck—what are the differences in education. She said she really didn't care, it was just a matter of convenience for them so the kids could walk to their father's office after work. I found that to be a horrible reason for open enrollment, but I know it happens.

**Representative Haas:** If you look at this print out we got from Jerry Coleman, the greatest impact is around the larger communities surrounded by elementary schools. The necessary precursor bill that needs to be passed before we can pass this bill is to put all land into a high school district. That would take away all of the arguments for not passing this bill.

**Representative Hunsakor:** The people I talked to in the school district in my part of the world, even the ones that are going to hurt with this bill, say we know you are moving in the right direction. It's a good way to go, but it's too much, too fast. It's going to come, but I don't think it's good right now. We're not ready for it and it needs to be looked at; but, we'll go that way in time.

**Representative Sukat:** I think this theory is good. In our district we have School District 8 and Trenton that is just 13 miles down the road and kids end up going to Trenton because of free lunches and sports—because they cannot compete in Williston—but can in Trenton. We have a lot of kids out of Williston that end up in School District just because they want to be in a smaller school. I'm not so sure all that open enrollment isn't okay. They should have the opportunity, but jumping into this thing all at one time, it's just not possible. If there were way we could put this together to be done over a period of time, that would have some potential. That's something we should be looking at.

**Chairman Kelsch:** I know, Representative Haas, you were thinking about it by phasing in at maybe 25%, 50%, 75%--that way.

**Representative Haas:** We had talked about that. It was brought up during Committee discussion.

**Representative Wall:** Does current law forbid such as Bismarck, in their situation with Apple Creek, contractually negotiating for an amount additional to foundation aid?

**Chairman Kelsch:** For their high school students they currently pay, but not for the elementary students if they come in to the school district. Tom (Decker), would you come forward and explain how those contracts work.

**Decker:** If you don't provide the grade level services, any district will pay full tuition for those students. There is no provision in law for Bismarck to negotiate some amount of payment for open enrolled students. According to the attorney general, school districts only have the authority specifically granted them by law and there is no specific authority in law for Bismarck and Apple Creek to negotiate any kind of payment for these open enrolled students.

**Chairman Kelsch:** Other than foundation aid, there would be nothing above that.

**Representative Johnson:** I think another thing is the discrepancy as to how much it costs to educate between districts: \$9.0 in some districts, \$6.0 in another district. Wouldn't there not be an effort to put on some extra buses and try to lure students to that \$9.0 district?

**Chairman Kelsch:** It's possible, but do you really think there are superintendents out there that are that devious?

**Representative Hanson:** I call the question.

**Chairman Kelsch:** The question has been called for the **Do Not Pass on HB 1275**.

**A roll call vote was taken. Yes: 8, No: 4, Absent: 1 (Solberg)**

**FISCAL NOTE**  
 Requested by Legislative Council  
 01/10/2007

Bill/Resolution No.: HB 1275

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
<b>Revenues</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Expenditures</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Appropriations</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill would require school districts of residence to pay tuition, as provided for in state law, for any resident student who attends a public school outside the district of residence. There is no fiscal impact on the school districts collectively.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

Section One of the bill eliminates tuition-free agreements. Section Two of the bill requires payment of full tuition for open-enrolled students. The bill, if passed, would result in transfer of funds between local districts.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

None.

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

None.

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

None.

<b>Name:</b>	Thomas Decker	<b>Agency:</b>	Public Instruction
<b>Phone Number:</b>	328-2267	<b>Date Prepared:</b>	01/10/2007

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Roll Call Vote #: \_\_\_\_\_

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken as Pass

Motion Made By Meier Seconded By \_\_\_\_\_

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Kelsch			Rep Hanson		
V Chairman Meier			Rep Hunskor		
Rep Haas			Rep Mueller		
Rep Herbel			Rep Myxter		
Rep Johnson			Rep Solberg		
Rep Karls					
Rep Sukut					
Rep Wall					

Total Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Absent \_\_\_\_\_

Floor Assignment \_\_\_\_\_

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

*Second*  
*No*

Date: 7 Feb  
Roll Call Vote #: 2

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1275

House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken do Not Pass

Motion Made By Hanson Seconded By Johnson

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Kelsch		✓	Rep Hanson	✓	
V Chairman Meier		✓	Rep Hunskor	✓	
Rep Haas		✓	Rep Mueller	✓	
Rep Herbel	✓		Rep Myxter	✓	
Rep Johnson	✓		Rep Solberg		
Rep Karls		✓			
Rep Sukut	✓				
Rep Wall	✓				

Total Yes 8 No 4

Absent 1 (Palberg)

Floor Assignment Johnson

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:



**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HB 1275: Education Committee (Rep. R. Kelsch, Chairman) recommends DO NOT PASS**  
(8 YEAS, 4 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1275 was placed on the  
Eleventh order on the calendar.

2007 TESTIMONY

HB 1275

HB 1275  
5 Feb 07

**TESTIMONY ON HB 1275**  
**EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**February 5, 2007**  
**by Thomas Decker, Director, School Finance**  
**(701) 328-2267**  
**Department of Public Instruction**

---

---

Chairperson Kelsch, members of the committee, for the record, I am Tom Decker, Director, School Finance & Organization, Department of Public Instruction.

House Bill 1275 changes the law in regards to obligation to pay tuition.

I addressed your committee earlier in the session on another bill about the need for clarification of state policy in regard to district of residence obligation to support the education of their resident students.

We passed the Open Enrollment Law in 1993 without requiring tuition because we believed the greater good at the time, was served by having parents and students in the position to choose their school of attendance.

Arguably, we should have required those districts to pay tuition for their resident students who open enrolled out at the time of the Open Enrollment Law was initially passed. We didn't do that. In the years sense, open enrollment has become quite popular.

Either through open enrollment or tuition waivers, another vehicle which allows students to attend outside their district of residence without their resident districts paying the full cost of their education, many students attend schools in places other than their district of residence. The effect is to offset or fail to cover the full cost of education on the part of the resident district. The handout attached to my testimony shows the number of students who are open enrolled in and out of every district in the state.

Anytime we allow a student to attend school in a district other than their district of residence, where only state foundation aid follows the student, the receiving district gets only half of the cost of that students' education. As a short term issue, that might be tolerable, but since we have established open enrollment as an important policy for students and parents in North Dakota, it is time we address the issue of equitable funding to follow those students. When we are spending as much time and effort as we are currently spending trying to provide an equitable method of distribution of aid to schools generally, we would be remiss not to take the opportunity to deal with this important equity issue as well.

Every time a district sends a resident student to a neighboring district to get an education, the resident districts, as things are now in North Dakota, are escaping or shifting thousands of dollars of cost obligation from the district of residence to the district of attendance. Covering the full cost of education should be the obligation of the resident district for every resident student. If need be, we could phase in tuition payment according to the formula currently in law, over a period of two to four years but we need to do something to address the inequities involved in the current situation.

Some will argue that to require tuition payment will simply result in a money shuffle between districts. If paying your bills is viewed as money shuffling, lets get started.

HB 1275

Revised 2/5/2007

To correct Tuition Amounts

JL

Open Enrollment/Tuition Calculation Report  
2006-2007 School Year

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out	Tuition KG	Tuition 1-6	Tuition 7-8	Tuition 9-12
1013	Hettinger 13	1	312	8	2	5,279.06	6,516.70	4,728.04	4,638.65
2002	Valley City 2	1	1,094	56	29	3,221.16	4,455.90	5,684.89	3,283.45
2046	Litchville-Marion 46	1	165	12	26	5,949.48	7,442.01	6,340.95	8,176.73
2065	N Central 65	1	148	7	14	7,730.71	7,958.75	8,092.90	9,285.96
2082	Wimbledon-Courtenay 82	1	150	-	7	7,618.24	7,018.91	6,425.21	9,797.29
3005	Minnewaukan 5	1	217	3	18	5,208.55	7,753.90	7,009.54	7,070.18
3006	Leeds 6	1	167	6	4	7,523.59	6,308.98	6,786.90	5,709.17
3009	Maddock 9	1	183	34	3	7,828.63	5,203.49	6,137.98	4,951.96
3016	Oberon 16	2	40	-	8	10,117.51	11,910.37	8,275.18	-
3029	Warwick 29	1	189	-	20	8,465.99	7,787.72	4,168.06	10,222.85
3030	Ft Totten 30	1	176	-	-	-	-	-	21,333.03
4001	Billings Co 1	2	48	9	20	19,606.34	24,141.46	20,893.51	794.87
5001	Bottineau 1	1	667	36	-	4,382.59	5,345.29	4,816.98	4,861.91
5017	Westhope 17	1	117	11	6	8,498.04	6,991.64	9,495.63	7,951.93
5054	Newburg-United 54	1	73	10	17	10,293.54	11,776.86	11,951.38	17,024.08
6001	Bowman County 1	1	442	8	8	16,500.79	5,195.40	8,479.86	6,753.68
6033	Scranton 33	1	163	10	4	11,894.45	5,889.23	7,764.06	8,803.81
7014	Bowbells 14	1	68	-	9	10,004.66	8,755.80	7,263.60	9,518.26
7027	Powers Lake 27	1	118	-	11	5,806.90	6,441.57	4,900.35	8,609.78
7036	Burke Central 36	1	87	1	-	6,249.21	13,034.10	10,278.34	10,565.94
8001	Bismarck 1	1	10,650	307	43	3,549.51	5,307.04	5,024.37	5,506.58
8025	Naughton 25	3	3	-	3	7,907.77	7,485.66	794.87	685.50
8028	Wing 28	1	90	22	-	4,341.49	4,781.58	8,254.53	7,727.26
8029	Baldwin 29	2	19	4	19	9,982.01	8,530.03	5,418.46	-
8033	Menoken 33	2	12	-	41	794.87	13,482.17	14,019.76	794.87
8035	Sterling 35	2	38	-	16	14,926.74	7,933.99	12,561.70	-
8039	Apple Creek 39	2	55	14	48	4,832.96	6,849.29	-	-
8045	Manning 45	3	5	-	15	774.45	7,516.84	-	-
9001	Fargo 1	1	10,646	81	17	5,051.27	6,547.71	6,492.58	6,964.27
9002	Kindred 2	1	691	33	19	2,984.98	3,598.01	3,793.22	3,337.15
9004	Maple Valley 4	1	261	28	47	7,417.22	9,462.08	5,296.38	5,241.91
9006	West Fargo 6	1	5,901	4	126	4,449.03	4,939.51	5,511.20	5,558.52
9007	Mapleton 7	2	67	-	7	7,215.16	9,590.61	-	-
9017	Central Cass 17	1	822	15	6	4,130.74	3,156.17	3,588.13	3,863.73
9080	Page 80	2	98	9	22	7,132.64	7,261.10	-	-
9097	Northern Cass	1	505	70	10	2,897.96	4,961.42	4,096.02	5,093.33
10014	Border Central	Dissolved	-	-	-	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
10019	Munich 19	1	106	9	3	6,333.21	6,602.93	8,775.22	5,988.66
10023	Langdon Area 23	1	449	4	15	7,624.62	6,834.47	4,298.84	5,493.51
11040	Ellendale 40	1	358	5	15	3,086.13	5,188.09	2,972.00	4,855.19
11041	Oakes 41	1	527	16	4	4,323.94	3,694.12	3,692.78	3,636.28
12001	Divide County 1	1	237	-	1	4,457.62	7,245.41	6,795.42	6,017.98
13008	Dodge 8	2	15	-	3	22,178.95	19,450.72	-	-
13016	Killdeer 16	1	360	68	1	4,307.61	5,467.48	4,852.82	6,499.10
13019	Halliday 19	1	28	2	41	15,540.87	21,479.61	23,480.45	22,606.44
13037	Twin Buttes 37	2	44	-	10	29,749.26	33,469.59	29,753.34	-
14002	New Rockford 2	2	421	17	8	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
15006	Hazleton-Moffit-Braddock 6	1	137	8	7	6,152.81	6,655.84	3,874.56	7,359.45
15010	Bakker 10	2	4	-	8	14,968.71	14,202.79	794.87	794.87
15015	Strasburg 15	1	161	10	18	5,393.80	4,932.26	5,297.73	4,714.51
15036	Linton 36	1	326	19	6	3,687.23	4,614.23	5,019.74	4,187.17
16049	Carrington 49	1	616	35	15	4,528.55	4,248.28	3,923.47	4,621.74
17003	Beach 3	1	289	1	2	5,404.69	8,145.58	6,840.64	8,264.38

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out	Tuition KG	Tuition 1-6	Tuition 7-8	Tuition 9-12
17006	Lone Tree 6	2	33	-	1	11,499.53	11,726.01	8,698.00	-
18001	Grand Forks 1	1	7,316	140	17	4,457.42	6,059.98	6,325.89	5,830.96
18044	Larimore 44	1	489	30	10	3,262.76	4,761.83	3,868.10	4,907.70
18061	Thompson 61	1	425	45	55	8,435.69	4,313.05	3,500.36	3,979.67
18125	Manvel 125	2	147	6	25	6,532.53	4,114.27	4,230.85	-
18127	Emerado 127	2	67	4	21	21,784.28	9,649.18	7,091.95	-
18128	Midway 128	1	257	4	36	4,220.31	5,982.96	6,444.48	7,226.95
18129	Northwood 129	1	295	38	28	5,035.00	6,254.30	6,741.12	6,803.67
18140	Grand Forks AFB 1	4	-	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
19018	Roosevelt 18	2	135	1	21	4,261.17	3,585.83	5,034.09	-
19049	Elgin-New Leipzig 49	1	169	6	7	4,891.78	8,350.29	-	6,748.62
20007	Midkota 7	1	118	5	26	7,463.25	9,123.85	11,863.18	10,091.27
20018	Griggs County Central 18	1	297	6	7	7,529.32	4,334.66	5,634.21	4,928.76
21001	Mott-Regent 1	1	242	7	10	4,114.31	5,162.70	5,913.79	4,895.77
21009	New England 9	1	169	12	15	5,846.18	6,756.81	6,446.86	6,787.01
22011	Pettibone-Tuttle 11	2	6	-	7	19,775.51	20,483.35	794.87	794.87
22014	Robinson 14	2	7	-	3	13,015.66	20,520.53	794.87	794.87
22020	Tuttle-Pettibone 20	1	23	-	8	794.87	-	23,542.35	16,495.50
22026	Steele-Dawson 26	1	282	39	4	3,846.51	5,132.13	3,376.04	6,391.52
22028	Tappen 28	1	90	8	22	-	6,963.50	6,267.02	7,163.48
23003	Edgeley 3	1	216	12	18	5,174.33	4,862.35	7,187.23	5,437.32
23007	Kulm 7	1	121	5	8	10,086.61	9,472.39	8,032.07	10,405.25
23008	LaMoure 8	1	321	23	4	3,876.57	5,714.07	3,295.27	4,660.96
23011	Verona 11	Dissolved	-	-	-	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
24002	Napoleon 2	1	245	6	7	3,367.82	4,214.95	5,208.14	6,022.29
24056	Gackle 56	1	101	2	18	7,838.16	8,176.86	9,558.76	10,626.73
25001	Velva 1	1	410	40	5	3,305.34	4,660.17	2,642.19	5,352.43
25014	Anamoose 14	1	79	8	4	7,178.73	7,150.66	6,615.27	6,224.84
25057	Drake 57	1	129	1	13	7,239.75	7,245.11	7,289.87	6,950.10
25060	TGU 60	1	344	13	31	6,164.89	7,882.44	5,343.55	7,488.13
26004	Zeeland 4	1	52	4	-	15,796.04	8,566.34	15,855.43	15,974.77
26009	Ashley 9	1	148	2	-	5,234.39	7,062.51	6,335.02	5,751.42
26019	Wishek 19	1	230	7	6	4,232.88	4,603.39	4,330.48	5,341.35
27001	McKenzie Co 1	1	539	21	18	5,271.17	6,946.14	5,931.74	6,891.49
27002	Alexander 2	1	41	-	9	26,058.38	14,705.37	20,972.10	23,089.26
27014	Yellowstone 14	2	47	-	-	6,797.17	8,388.63	8,295.17	-
27018	Earl 18	3	3	-	-	9,452.85	10,446.66	794.87	794.87
27019	Bowline Butte	Dissolved	-	-	-	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
27032	Horse Creek 32	3	6	-	-	794.87	12,847.21	794.87	794.87
27036	Mandaree 36	1	174	-	11	20,006.77	20,962.12	21,803.44	21,432.00
28001	Montefiore 1	1	216	2	30	4,271.49	4,514.44	3,971.54	5,499.43
28004	Washburn 4	1	305	15	5	3,285.26	4,396.17	4,003.57	5,389.38
28008	Underwood 8	1	210	3	18	6,346.06	6,931.62	6,462.27	7,462.89
28050	Max 50	1	145	9	10	5,912.51	5,554.25	2,568.51	5,777.37
28051	Garrison 51	1	331	18	6	4,043.15	6,074.84	6,162.30	5,391.06
28072	Turtle Lake-Mercer 72	1	166	1	4	4,152.07	7,670.54	4,969.41	6,902.48
28085	White Shield 85	1	124	1	10	6,517.46	6,061.44	7,396.47	5,504.28
29003	Hazen 3	1	640	36	14	3,080.61	3,854.00	3,921.75	4,334.47
29020	Golden Valley 20	1	37	-	23	221.10	-	9,076.34	10,648.60
29027	Beulah 27	1	726	33	6	3,009.08	4,710.42	4,394.80	4,833.42
30001	Mandan 1	1	3,144	49	171	2,958.29	4,768.14	4,538.54	4,563.26
30004	Little Heart 4	2	16	2	6	4,344.13	6,138.19	5,918.89	-
30007	New Salem 7	1	329	20	6	3,900.46	4,428.90	3,290.10	4,286.73
30008	Sims 8	2	20	2	6	15,379.39	14,104.33	14,886.80	200.61
30013	Hebron 13	1	162	5	8	5,487.35	4,826.79	3,766.82	8,997.67

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out	Tuition KG	Tuition 1-6	Tuition 7-8	Tuition 9-12
30017	Sweet Briar 17	3	9	4	11	467.65	4,756.20	6,005.65	-
30039	Flasher 39	1	220	42	2	4,463.21	5,129.98	3,590.45	3,600.96
30048	Glen Ullin 48	1	173	1	11	7,575.77	5,868.26	5,556.41	6,715.77
31001	New Town 1	1	707	6	10	7,730.76	6,841.03	4,265.65	5,495.79
31002	Stanley 2	1	350	32	3	4,495.19	5,076.62	5,986.53	6,314.81
31003	Parshall 3	1	270	5	7	7,361.74	5,426.34	6,096.73	6,238.17
32001	Dakota Prairie 1	1	273	17	80	7,467.36	7,482.63	5,964.05	7,183.87
32066	Lakota 66	1	217	44	8	4,518.40	3,906.51	3,996.64	4,814.42
33001	Center-Stanton 1	1	255	4	31	5,492.31	6,341.82	3,700.59	5,635.55
34006	Cavalier 6	1	431	16	1	4,143.93	5,518.65	4,924.91	5,379.34
34012	Valley 12	1	162	3	-	4,622.55	6,736.21	6,880.20	7,282.19
34019	Drayton 19	1	144	3	2	10,940.33	7,565.61	7,326.00	8,860.53
34043	St Thomas 43	1	119	3	1	20,437.22	7,952.83	5,873.16	8,782.77
34100	North Border 100	1	477	3	22	7,034.54	5,929.78	6,211.11	7,422.18
35001	Wolford 1	1	46	7	1	5,174.84	8,800.27	8,940.11	9,154.15
35005	Rugby 5	1	528	1	17	4,469.69	5,932.63	4,599.41	5,969.46
36001	Devils Lake 1	1	1,756	-	25	4,196.82	4,705.00	5,139.84	4,946.41
36002	Edmore 2	1	79	4	2	794.87	-	6,335.78	12,212.87
36044	Starkweather 44	1	87	12	2	16,507.49	7,150.48	5,580.24	6,735.25
37002	Sheldon 2	2	21	2	7	9,413.77	11,682.94	638.91	-
37006	Ft Ransom 6	2	23	7	1	516.60	9,526.30	-	-
37019	Lisbon 19	1	641	26	15	2,189.28	3,578.71	3,797.02	4,032.77
37022	Enderlin 22	1	305	18	20	4,304.22	5,041.54	4,911.22	4,979.43
38001	Mohall-Lansford-Sherwood 1	1	317	9	42	7,466.32	7,272.14	6,346.73	8,137.35
38026	Glenburn 26	1	260	89	13	4,135.25	6,358.89	5,391.58	4,774.16
39005	Mantador	Dissolved	-	-	-	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
39008	Hankinson 8	1	312	17	5	3,558.28	4,363.72	2,289.00	4,886.10
39018	Fairmount 18	1	125	8	3	7,355.23	8,326.77	8,127.06	7,843.69
39028	Lidgerwood 28	1	196	3	5	3,423.49	5,047.95	5,183.66	6,482.63
39037	Wahpeton 37	1	1,295	10	25	3,814.80	4,829.91	5,150.19	3,760.95
39042	Wyndmere 42	1	242	3	10	5,044.02	5,461.24	5,153.63	4,589.52
39044	Richland 44	1	317	21	5	3,122.63	4,200.51	3,417.20	3,072.83
40001	Dunseith 1	1	423	-	33	10,897.58	11,434.96	9,256.15	11,787.26
40003	St John 3	1	315	6	2	6,067.22	6,680.76	4,449.39	6,466.52
40004	Mt Pleasant 4	1	259	23	6	6,160.03	4,598.72	3,558.76	5,802.82
40007	Belcourt 7	1	1,625	-	9	5,100.88	7,077.40	6,323.58	8,363.70
40029	Rolette 29	1	168	7	3	4,669.68	5,587.18	6,822.46	5,700.90
41002	Milnor 2	1	292	8	8	3,277.69	3,956.07	2,902.28	3,950.67
41003	N Sargent 3	1	234	5	3	2,457.04	3,831.34	2,247.44	4,875.63
41006	Sargent Central 6	1	273	4	7	6,059.30	5,107.75	3,494.61	7,375.40
42016	Goodrich 16	1	41	2	2	6,417.08	12,741.92	11,511.15	10,472.69
42019	McClusky 19	1	102	4	2	6,801.64	6,712.54	10,235.91	8,474.78
43003	Solen 3	1	157	-	20	10,008.45	11,206.54	7,699.40	9,879.31
43004	Ft Yates 4	1	198	-	3	10,209.79	10,206.21	35,292.72	12,535.85
43008	Selfridge 8	1	44	1	4	12,310.80	19,818.29	10,436.17	25,273.00
44012	Marmarth 12	2	10	-	3	794.87	14,330.68	14,329.26	794.87
44032	Central Elementary 32	2	6	-	11	794.87	21,935.54	794.87	794.87
45001	Dickinson 1	1	2,599	58	36	3,416.05	5,050.02	4,324.95	4,468.03
45009	South Heart 9	1	236	26	45	3,309.55	4,096.43	3,245.49	4,317.27
45013	Belfield 13	1	204	21	23	4,973.89	4,575.24	3,819.37	4,475.91
45034	Richardton-Taylor 34	1	256	32	4	4,160.60	5,325.84	6,138.35	5,031.75
46010	Hope 10	1	120	20	7	88.72	-	3,967.24	3,584.05
46019	Finley-Sharon 19	1	171	6	10	6,281.03	5,975.38	3,823.53	7,957.40
47001	Jamestown 1	1	2,237	29	75	4,213.37	5,192.06	5,713.81	4,121.18
47003	Medina 3	1	160	20	7	5,174.59	5,586.68	5,555.53	6,537.41

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out	Tuition KG	Tuition 1-6	Tuition 7-8	Tuition 9-12
47010	Pingree-Buchanan	1	156	49	9	3,685.67	4,676.29	3,033.65	4,932.55
47014	Montpelier 14	1	111	26	13	7,138.10	6,008.18	5,933.65	5,462.96
47019	Kensal 19	1	50	-	3	4,980.26	11,355.59	7,901.58	11,648.27
47026	Spiritwood 26	2	10	5	2	12,593.27	19,167.63	794.87	794.87
48002	Bisbee-Egeland 2	1	56	1	5	17,654.47	10,201.37	11,151.03	12,586.55
48008	Southern 8	1	204	1	3	7,226.11	4,882.79	4,138.44	5,583.19
48028	North Central 28	1	62	-	13	10,892.70	9,998.52	11,870.26	12,663.86
49003	Central Valley 3	1	263	-	30	4,659.48	5,321.89	3,295.55	4,955.95
49007	Hatton 7	1	221	2	17	5,254.04	5,150.83	4,677.62	5,676.97
49009	Hillsboro 9	1	405	16	14	3,449.14	5,963.92	3,985.04	5,661.31
49014	May-Port CG 14	1	565	10	39	3,800.12	4,151.86	5,481.60	5,487.14
50003	Grafton 3	1	895	12	16	3,233.52	3,744.53	2,808.63	3,262.61
50005	Fordville-Lankin 5	1	94	10	12	133.19	5,810.06	6,993.78	6,442.53
50020	Minto 20	1	236	20	6	4,140.92	6,184.79	4,247.75	4,437.97
50051	Nash 51	2	18	2	6	28,573.18	7,568.68	21,087.96	-
50078	Park River 78	1	415	15	13	3,430.56	5,244.08	4,145.73	5,480.31
50106	Edinburg 106	1	122	19	3	3,235.02	4,325.44	5,374.56	5,354.02
50128	Adams 128	2	67	6	4	5,576.39	8,182.66	-	-
51001	Minot 1	1	6,411	160	141	2,767.87	5,959.37	6,608.58	4,893.74
51004	Nedrose 4	2	224	54	44	4,529.40	3,646.62	6,723.66	-
51007	United 7	1	545	18	56	2,370.32	4,162.25	2,619.26	4,037.28
51010	Bell 10	2	157	49	24	2,916.76	3,477.61	4,916.14	-
51016	Sawyer 16	1	134	6	40	1,753.66	9,808.55	2,906.64	3,718.36
51019	Eureka 19	2	10	3	12	794.87	11,995.54	794.87	794.87
51028	Kenmare 28	1	283	17	3	4,915.49	6,660.19	7,802.72	6,435.51
51041	Surrey 41	1	332	32	30	1,451.15	5,591.07	4,685.79	1,752.13
51070	S Prairie 70	2	141	34	37	4,169.54	4,562.80	5,208.59	-
51160	Minot AFB 160	4	-	-	31	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
51161	Lewis and Clark 161	1	370	16	13	6,368.49	5,846.63	6,946.06	6,367.04
52025	Fessenden-Bowdon 25	1	186	14	16	10,405.02	8,828.15	6,323.99	6,681.44
52035	Pleasant Valley 3	2	16	-	4	12,840.18	14,652.06	12,697.59	-
52038	Harvey 38	1	436	14	6	3,986.99	6,670.06	4,703.49	5,804.91
53001	Williston 1	1	2,136	20	116	3,134.25	4,664.80	4,318.22	4,280.47
53002	Nesson 2	1	159	6	9	5,494.77	5,173.47	5,505.78	6,693.24
53006	Eight Mile 6	1	225	81	-	10,632.98	9,726.01	8,450.11	11,577.50
53008	New 8	2	202	62	44	5,053.26	7,554.88	7,622.97	-
53015	Tioga 15	1	234	5	13	3,700.68	5,741.60	6,367.31	6,085.66
53091	Wildrose-Alamo 91	4	-	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
53099	Grenora 99	1	53	-	3	9,869.05	13,280.04	22,703.75	24,380.00
99000	North Dakota		95,600	3,160	3,160	4,642.64	5,980.94	5,615.43	6,027.06

NOTES:

1st year reorganized districts will show errors. The tuition amount was not calculated for them.

Dtype = 1 provides K-12 services, 2 provides K-8 services only, 4 = non-operating

DENK12 = Fall K-12 Enrollment

Open Enr In = Students open enrolled into the district.

Open Enr Out = Students open enrolled out of the district

Tuition = the public school district tuition amount charged by the educating district. The amount is net of foundation aid received by the educating district for them.



**Testimony in Support of HB 1275  
Paul K. Johnson, Superintendent  
Bismarck School District  
Monday, February 5, 2007**

Representative RaeAnn Kelsch, Chair  
House Education Committee  
RE: Full payment for Open Enrollment Students

Madame Chair and Members of the Committee:

History

I was an administrator for many years in North Dakota before the open enrollment law was passed in the mid-nineties. I was an administrator in school districts where we worked very hard to make sure no student in our district attended school in another district and I was an administrator in a school district where we routinely entered into non-tuition agreements with residents of other school districts who wanted to attend our school district.

The revenue available to accepting school districts under non-tuition agreements was similar to the revenue available to accepting school districts through open enrollment. The accepting school district was able to count the student on its ADM, thereby receiving foundation aid.

In some cases, families would have excellent reasons to attend another school district, yet would be denied a non-tuition agreement. In some cases it led to rancorous annexation proceedings, whereby the only choice, outside of paying tuition, would be annexation of property to another school district. The desire of one family to attend school out of their district of residence would sometimes pit one school district against another in county and state hearings on annexations.

## Why open enrollment?

In the mid-nineties, open enrollment was determined to be a solution to the problems created when a family wanted to attend school in another district, but would be subject to the decision of a local school board. I believe open enrollment has proven to be a positive solution for families.

Open enrollment, although viewed suspiciously, was accepted by school districts because it allowed an alternative to tuition agreements and annexations. Open enrollment allowed school districts to keep property even when a family chose to attend a neighboring school district. It allowed a vehicle for a family to attend a neighboring school district, which could be more convenient or have an educational benefit to the family.

## Bismarck's Situation

A DPI report from 2005-06, shows that Bismarck has a net of 225 open enrollment students. Next is Grand Forks with a net of 104 open enrollment students. Bismarck has a net this year of 264 students and rising.

Why do we allow open enrollment? When open enrollment started, the number of students open enrolling into Bismarck was small. As enrollment declined in Bismarck during the decade from 1995 - 2005, it was a way of balancing out enrollment and using available classrooms. The Board saw no reason not to open the district to non-resident students who may have had a good reason for attending in Bismarck. The situation now is that our district enrollment is growing and, because of the growth of the area, open enrollments are also increasing.

Attached to this testimony is a non-resident student report presented to our School Board in November. You will notice that students come from two fast-growing areas in proximity to the Bismarck School District. As patrons of the Bismarck School District buy houses in neighboring school districts, they want to keep their kids in school here. In some cases, our schools are closer to their residential area than those in the neighboring school district. In at least one rural district, there is no room to educate more students in their school building. Parents who work in Bismarck, but live in neighboring districts, find it convenient to bring the kids to school here. We are suspicious that it might be more cost effective for neighboring districts not to educate the students and let them open enroll into Bismarck. That's not fair.

#### All the Dollars Should Follow the Open Enrollment Students

School Districts are receiving fewer dollars for open enrollment students. State revenue, as a share of total school district revenue has declined from almost 50% in the mid-nineties to about 40% currently. Therefore, we are receiving less for open-enrollment students than we once did.

During the school year 2005-06, the Bismarck School District had a total of 266 open enrollment students. We received a foundation aid payment of \$2,765.00 and tuition apportionment per student of \$351.00 for a total of \$3116.50 per student. Our cost per student, as computed by DPI, was \$6538.25 per student. Total revenue for the 266 students was

\$828,989.00, but the total cost was \$1,739,174.00. The difference between our cost and the revenue we receive for open enrollment students was \$910,186.00.

There is no incentive for us to continue to accept open enrollment students. Our district enrollment is growing, foundation aid as a percent of revenue is declining, and we could keep some of the families in Bismarck who are now purchasing homes in neighboring districts.

If we chose not to accept open enrollment students, there would be consequences for neighboring school districts. Bismarck families have assumed that they can keep their children in the Bismarck School District as they buy new homes in neighboring school districts. Knowing that their children are going to immediately switch schools will be a disincentive for them to relocate to areas outside the Bismarck School District. In the case of our rural school districts, there is probably no room in their schools. As stated earlier, I know that to be true in one case.

Open enrollment has proven to be good thing for many families in North Dakota. It's time for receiving districts to receive the full cost of open enrollment students. We strongly urge a **DO PASS** on HB 1275.

BISMARCK PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SUMMARY OF NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS

November 1, 2006

<u>SCHOOL DISTRICT</u>	<u>NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS ATTENDING BISMARCK VIA A TUITION AGREEMENT</u>	<u>NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS ATTENDING BISMARCK VIA OPEN ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>BISMARCK RESIDENT STUDENTS ATTENDING OTHER SCHOOLS VIA OPEN ENROLLMENT</u>
APPLE CREEK	54	43	11
BALDWIN	7	15	
CENTER		1	
DICKINSON	1		
ELGIN		1	
FORT TOTTEN	1		
GRAND FORKS	1		
H - M - B		3	
HEBRON		3	
MANDAN	1	173	24
MANNING	13	12	
MENOKEN	21	29	
MINOT	2		
MONTEFIORE		14	
NAUGHTON	1	3	
NEW SALEM		3	
STEELE-DAWSON			1
STERLING	10		
TOTAL	112	300	36
SOUTH CENTRAL FROM MANDAN		7	
CAREER & TECH ED STUDENTS		52	
SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS		17	
TUITION WAIVER AGREEMENTS		5	
FOREIGN EXCHANGE STUDENTS		5	
MANCHESTER HOUSE RESIDENTS		8	
PARENT TUITION		2	
STATE RESPONSIBILITY		<u>6</u>	
TOTAL NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS		514	

Preliminary Profile Data ... not finalized.

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	CENSUS	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out
1013	Hettinger 13	1	336	275	18	2
2002	Valley City 2	1	1,136	1,153	52	19
2046	Litchville-Marion 46	1	179	181	16	29
2065	N Central 65	1	144	152	6	17
2082	Wimbledon-Courtenay 82	1	149	143	7	5
3005	Minnewaukan 5	1	181	79	3	21
3006	Leeds 6	1	172	169	8	5
3009	Maddock 9	1	196	170	37	6
3016	Oberon 16	2	44	42	-	7
3029	Warwick 29	1	195	295	-	13
3030	Ft Totten 30	1	171	499	-	-
4001	Billings Co 1	2	50	118	8	19
5001	Bottineau 1	1	712	709	32	9
5017	Westhope 17	1	117	128	5	10
5054	Newburg-United 54	1	73	80	11	13
6001	Bowman 1	1	375	360	9	5
6017	Rhame 17	1	65	61	6	4
6033	Scranton 33	1	150	137	5	14
7014	Bowbells 14	1	76	82	-	6
7027	Powers Lake 27	1	103	114	-	11
7036	Burke Central 36	1	84	75	1	-
<u>8001</u>	<u>Bismarck 1</u>	1	10,549	10,956	<u>266</u>	<u>41</u>
8025	Naughton 25	3	11	9	7	3
8028	Wing 28	1	84	62	14	-
8029	Baldwin 29	2	17	59	5	20
8033	Menoken 33	2	12	71	-	37
8035	Sterling 35	2	33	76	-	15
8039	Apple Creek 39	2	51	152	15	38
8045	Manning 45	3	4	35	-	11
9001	Fargo 1	1	10,747	11,345	50	18
9002	Kindred 2	1	675	658	29	19
9004	Maple Valley 4	1	262	287	22	49
9006	West Fargo 6	1	5,677	5,306	-	69
9007	Mapleton 7	2	76	193	-	9
9017	Central Cass 17	1	821	749	18	4
9080	Page 80	2	107	103	11	20
9097	Northern Cass	1	486	423	48	9
10014	Border Central 14	1	-	30	-	27
10019	Munich 19	1	108	92	13	2
10023	Langdon Area 23	1	472	537	8	13
11040	Ellendale 40	1	358	383	7	15
11041	Oakes 41	1	522	489	14	7
12001	Divide County 1	1	265	246	-	1
13008	Dodge 8	2	19	23	1	3
13016	Killdeer 16	1	383	295	69	1
13019	Halliday 19	1	30	107	4	45
13037	Twin Buttes 37	2	41	75	-	11
14001	New Rockford 1	1	375	324	30	3
14012	Sheyenne 12	1	93	71	-	24
15006	Hazleton-Moffit-Braddock 6	1	143	134	7	7
15010	Bakker 10	2	5	31	-	9
15015	Strasburg 15	1	172	169	11	16
15036	Linton 36	1	339	305	17	6

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	CENSUS	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out
16049	Carrington 49	1	647	610	33	15
17003	Beach 3	1	300	218	2	2
17006	Lone Tree 6	2	41	52	-	1
18001	Grand Forks 1	1	7,453	6,771	127	23
18044	Larimore 44	1	528	499	21	8
18061	Thompson 61	1	413	425	48	48
18125	Manvel 125	2	142	278	6	20
18127	Emerado 127	2	68	170	2	28
18128	Midway 128	1	264	271	4	34
18129	Northwood 129	1	315	348	40	28
18140	Grand Forks AFB 1	4	-	703	-	-
19018	Roosevelt 18	2	153	143	1	15
19049	Elgin-New Leipzig 49	1	164	184	9	5
20007	Midkota 7	1	140	157	5	27
20018	Griggs County Central 18	1	322	291	6	4
21001	Mott-Regent 1	1	248	234	7	9
21009	New England 9	1	170	165	8	15
22011	Pettibone-Tuttle 11	2	9	26	-	4
22014	Robinson 14	2	11	27	-	5
22020	Tuttle-Pettibone 20	1	28	17	-	6
22026	Steele-Dawson 26	1	292	200	35	3
22028	Tappen 28	1	95	98	10	18
23003	Edgeley 3	1	221	245	13	17
23007	Kulm 7	1	120	123	4	9
23008	LaMoure 8	1	330	281	24	3
23011	Verona 11	4	-	44	-	-
24002	Napoleon 2	1	232	226	4	7
24056	Gackle-Streeter 56	1	103	112	1	14
25001	Velva 1	1	422	359	29	2
25014	Anamoose 14	1	95	76	4	3
25057	Drake 57	1	123	131	-	10
25060	TGU 60	1	366	382	17	38
26004	Zeeland 4	1	55	60	2	-
26009	Ashley 9	1	153	147	1	-
26019	Wishek 19	1	249	204	8	4
27001	McKenzie Co 1	1	549	589	21	17
27002	Alexander 2	1	46	44	2	6
27014	Yellowstone 14	2	48	80	-	-
27018	Earl	3	8	15	-	2
27019	Bowline Butte	4	-	5	-	4
27032	Horse Creek 32	3	6	13	2	-
27036	Mandaree 36	1	208	194	-	12
28001	Montefiore 1	1	217	210	4	26
28004	Washburn 4	1	305	283	11	6
28008	Underwood 8	1	206	211	3	14
28050	Max 50	1	156	150	11	10
28051	Garrison 51	1	340	307	17	4
28072	Turtle Lake-Mercer 72	1	173	168	1	4
28085	White Shield 85	1	121	116	1	7
29003	Hazen 3	1	652	606	36	7
29020	Golden Valley 20	1	46	54	-	16
29027	Beulah 27	1	761	700	18	8
30001	Mandan 1	1	3,165	3,570	39	157
30004	Little Heart 4	2	25	41	4	6
30007	New Salem 7	1	340	315	14	8

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	CENSUS	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out
30008	Sims 8	2	20	42	4	6
30013	Hebron 13	1	164	155	6	10
30017	Sweet Briar 17	3	9	18	5	8
30039	Flasher 39	1	211	176	29	2
30048	Glen Ullin 48	1	197	210	3	7
31001	New Town 1	1	731	746	6	16
31002	Stanley 2	1	340	309	35	3
31003	Parshall 3	1	276	233	8	7
32001	Dakota Prairie 1	1	292	404	16	76
32066	Lakota 66	1	232	174	48	7
33001	Center-Stanton 1	1	265	308	4	29
34006	Cavalier 6	1	510	407	27	1
34012	Valley 12	1	160	153	3	2
34019	Drayton 19	1	153	137	5	1
34043	St Thomas 43	1	105	114	3	2
34100	North Border 100	1	485	497	-	27
35001	Wolford 1	1	48	50	8	2
35005	Rugby 5	1	546	623	7	13
36001	Devils Lake 1	1	1,810	1,936	-	26
36002	Edmore 2	1	80	79	5	2
36044	Starkweather 44	1	95	79	9	2
37002	Sheldon 2	2	25	77	2	2
37006	Ft Ransom 6	2	16	39	2	2
37019	Lisbon 19	1	640	552	25	13
37022	Enderlin 22	1	308	270	18	16
38001	Mohall-Lansford-Sherwood 1	1	332	350	9	41
38026	Glenburn 26	1	291	186	92	11
39005	Mantador 5	4	-	30	-	-
39008	Hankinson 8	1	318	280	9	6
39018	Fairmount 18	1	108	94	6	4
39028	Lidgerwood 28	1	197	196	2	7
39037	Wahpeton 37	1	1,378	1,433	13	13
39042	Wyndmere 42	1	242	243	2	18
39044	Richland 44	1	327	319	23	4
40001	Dunseith 1	1	405	831	-	29
40003	St John 3	1	313	447	11	1
40004	Mt Pleasant 4	1	281	288	15	6
40007	Belcourt 7	1	1,683	2,164	-	4
40029	Rolette 29	1	173	188	5	2
41002	Milnor 2	1	293	281	6	7
41003	N Sargent 3	1	226	192	11	2
41006	Sargent Central 6	1	285	266	5	7
42016	Goodrich 16	1	44	42	2	1
42019	McClusky 19	1	94	90	3	2
43003	Solen 3	1	171	339	-	18
43004	Ft Yates 4	2	223	801	-	3
43008	Selfridge 8	1	42	80	-	1
44012	Marmarth 12	2	9	25	-	4
44032	Central Elementary 32	2	4	20	-	6
45001	Dickinson 1	1	2,592	3,015	51	45
45009	South Heart 9	1	244	252	28	43
45013	Belfield 13	1	211	176	17	15
45034	Richardton-Taylor 34	1	271	228	36	2
46010	Hope 10	1	133	124	22	7
46019	Finley-Sharon 19	1	173	189	5	9



Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	CENSUS	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out
47001	Jamestown 1	1	2,346	2,476	29	82
47003	Medina 3	1	154	149	20	10
47010	Pingree-Buchanan	1	163	110	50	6
47014	Montpelier 14	1	95	98	26	23
47019	Kensal 19	1	55	50	-	1
47026	Spiritwood 26	2	18	17	9	1
48002	Bisbee-Egeland 2	1	69	73	1	6
48008	Southern 8	1	208	215	3	4
48028	North Central 28	1	76	77	14	12
49003	Central Valley 3	1	274	306	-	23
49007	Hatton 7	1	240	254	2	19
49009	Hillsboro 9	1	410	396	15	11
49014	May-Port CG 14	1	583	548	10	44
50003	Grafton 3	1	947	901	17	18
50005	Fordville-Lankin 5	1	103	100	9	16
50020	Minto 20	1	231	198	18	9
50051	Nash 51	2	15	35	2	7
50078	Park River 78	1	404	359	20	12
50106	Edinburg 106	1	128	101	22	4
50128	Adams 128	2	75	68	6	5
51001	Minot 1	1	6,476	5,585	151	145
51004	Nedrose 4	2	239	382	63	47
51007	United 7	1	563	655	28	62
51010	Bell 10	2	147	225	34	30
51016	Sawyer 16	1	123	141	2	32
51019	Eureka 19	2	11	43	-	9
51028	Kenmare 28	1	273	252	16	3
51041	Surrey 41	1	352	303	40	25
51070	S Prairie 70	2	146	179	31	29
51160	Minot AFB 160	4	-	1,027	-	31
51161	Lewis and Clark 161	1	383	352	20	16
52025	Fessenden-Bowdon 25	1	184	200	11	17
52035	Pleasant Valley 3	2	16	32	-	3
52038	Harvey 38	1	464	433	15	5
53001	Williston 1	1	2,157	2,337	40	94
53002	Nesson 2	1	158	166	2	6
53006	Eight Mile 6	1	230	149	59	-
53008	New 8	2	204	301	59	56
53015	Tioga 15	1	244	231	2	11
53091	Wildrose-Alamo 91	1	37	42	2	-
53099	Grenora 99	1	49	58	-	4
	North Dakota		97,120	101,346	3,044	3,044

HB 1275  
5 Feb 07

5 February 2007

Chairperson Kelsch and Representatives of House Education Committee,

My name is Kathy Mauch and I am a member of Apple Creek School Board, Bismarck, North Dakota.

I am here today to address you in reference to House Bill 1275, related to tuition payments for nonresident students and students participating in open enrollment.

I am in opposition to House Bill 1275. I am also in opposition to House Bill 1199.

House Bill 1199, if adopted, takes away the residents districts review and approval ability of an open enrollment application.

House Bill 1275 then makes it mandatory for the admitting district to charge tuition for every student who has been open enrolled into their district or forfeit any state aid otherwise payable for the nonresident student.

By making the charging of tuition mandatory, this negates the previous legislator's intent to provide an open enrollment option to parents.

Open enrollment was meant to provide an avenue for parents to determine to educate their children in another district for their own convenience without strings attached such as tuition payments.

Apple Creek currently has 44 resident students open enrolled into Bismarck and 20 student open enrolled into Apple Creek in Grades K through 6. If we had to pay tuition into Bismarck for 44 children at \$5241 per child that would be \$230,604. Then to collect Tuition for 20 children at \$6,743 per child that comes to \$134,860. That is a deficit of \$95,744 per year. Because we are only allow to raise taxes by 18% per year in our General Fund, we would not be able to meet this requirement in any given year and this would force us into financial demise.

These open enrollment agreements were entered into in good faith between the admitting and resident districts with no strings attached.

If this bill is adopted then you need to remove the term "Open Enrollment" because there is no such program any longer.

Respectfully Submitted;

Kathy Mauch  
8300 Pleasantview Road  
Bismarck, ND 58504