

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1034

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yolanda Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

2003 HOUSE EDUCATION

HB 1034

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Valista Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

2003 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1034

House Education Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date January 15, 2003

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
2	x		5325- end
			tape didn't record all
Committee Clerk Signature <i>Linda Fuchtner</i>			

Minutes:

Chairman Kelsch opened the hearing on 1034.

Anita Thomas, Attorney for the Legislative Council, and legal counsel for the Interim Education Committee. See Attached Testimony

Mary Wahl, ND Council of Educational Leaders

We are in favor of long-term planning, but 5-10-20 years for a plan is to long. In general, the principle of planning we support, but beyond a 5 yr. mark is not worthwhile. We suggest limiting the time frame to five years.

Rep. Herbel Will there be a form to complete?

Chairman Kelsch We would like to see public dialog in the school districts and also to provide us with information every two years.

Rep. Sitte Do Bismarck and Fargo do this?

Chairman Kelsch Large schools are doing this type of planning but not that far out.

Page 2

House Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB1034
Hearing Date January 15 2003

Rep. Mueller (Mary) A 20 year is a long time, is 5 year sufficient? What are your thinking,

Would your group accept 10 years?

Wahl: 10 years down the road administrative and instructional are hard to do. Buildings are easy as far a projecting when you will need a new roof.

Chairman Kelsch They should be able to project some of the staff's needs, retirement. With 95% will go to 60 years of age. I agree 20 years is a long time out. I truly believe that 10 years isn't to long to project out.

Wahl: Trying to plan to far leads to inaccuracy in enrollment beyond five years is difficult.

Chairman Kelsch the formula that we use has been perfected, they are within a small percentage of actual. What my differ is the migration from rural to urban.

Tom Decker, Department of Public Instruction

Passed out the demographic information attached.

Ten years isn't unreasonable, able to plan for staff, housing in the community etc.

Rep. Haas This is a remnant of a broader bill for the future of ND. It is extremely important with regards to demographic shift, change in curriculum as we move into new technology. As a state and a school district this is critical to student of ND. I can See Attached Testimony the justification to eliminate the 20 years and move it to 10 years for planning and revisit it every two years, with subject to revisions, this can be a very valuable tool for us at the state and for the communities.

Rep. Mueller Is this a local control issue, if schools had planned for consolidations, etc. it may be easier to do now that the time has come. It is an organized approach to the future based on solid decisions. Smaller schools can't hide from what they see happening.

Page 3
House Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB1034
Hearing Date January 15 2003

Bev Nielson, Executive Director for the ND School Boards Association.

Concur with what has been said. Twenty years is to long, ten we can make work, with revision every two years. A larger concern: for the people in the communities, Department of Public Instruction, legislature, What authority will this report have. The plan will be revised and adjusted. And when the school board changes are they held accountable to the old administration. This could be an emotional upset to close a school. the public may not See Attached Testimony these as plans not promises.

Rep. Haas Credibility of the plan, the approach they take at the local level to have input from all levels, that will give it credit. Concern about obligating future boards through levy changes, teacher hiring, etc.

5-10 yr. plans are not cast in stone, they need to be used to guide the future.

Rep. Jon Nelson planning takes place in each school already. They have to go through some kind of process already.

Gloria Lokken

I feel we make open hearings a standard process not just during time of crisis. I can see a caution on predictions with time periods to work through problems.

OPPOSITION:

Dr. Johnson, Superintendent of Bismarck Public Schools, See Attached Testimony

Require a process of public hearing, records, discussion, and a plan would be seen as a pledge or guarantee.

Rep. Haas Could you envision a 5 year plan after you receive enough input or may be a 3/4/5 options down the road?

Page 4
House Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB1034
Hearing Date January 15 2003

Dr. Johnson: we are open to that. A plan that addresses the demographics.

Rep. Haas Creating options during the five year plan as you proceed and then weigh and revise the options as you go.

Dan Huffman, Assistant Superintendent of Fargo Public School Dist., See Attached Testimony

Chairman Kelsch closed hearing on 1034 and appointed a sub committee to work on amendments. Rep. Haas Rep. Mueller Rep. Herbel

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yolanda Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

2003 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1034

House Education Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 1-20-03

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1		x	2550 - 4100
Committee Clerk Signature <i>Linda Guchner</i>			

Minutes:

Chairman Kelsch Opened the committee work o HB 1034, passed out an amendment.

Rep. Haas moved the amendment with Rep. Hawken seconded the amendment.

Discussion of the amendment.

Rep. Haas: Rep. Mueller, Rep. Haas Rep. Herbel worked in sub committee on this amendment.

We took out the 20 year plan requirement and the reporting requirement. It must be done every two years. And the local boards are accountable to their patrons and the people living in their districts. We didn't feel that the reporting requirement was necessary.

Voice vote on amendment, passed.

Amended bill discussion:

DO PASS AS AMENDED motion by Rep. Herbel and second by Rep. Mueller.

Rep. Norland Why do we want to force the districts into doing this. They are doing this already.

Are we accomplishing anything by do this.

Page 2
House Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB 1034
Hearing Date 1-20-03

Rep. Haas I don't think long range strategic planning is going on at the elementary and secondary level. Change comes very hard for a lot of districts. This is really necessary for student of ND.

Rep. Mueller: The greatest share at the district level are planning, where they are going and how they are going to get there and those kind of things. Some probably are not. It makes sense for all to sit down to make some determinations on where they are going and how they are going to get there. The old adage if you don't now where you are going how can you get there.

Rep. Williams I think districts are doing this and that this bill isn't really necessary.

Rep. Haas No requirement to report to Department of Public Instruction , this came from the Interim Committee. Revising this plan at least every two years.

Rep. Herbel Concerns about the time factor/ reporting of it. Those have been eliminated by the amendment. I see nothing wrong with having a plan. I have schools in my district that don't have a plan, they plan to operate indefinitely.

Rep. Meier The think it is key what Rep. Herbel just said is having something upgraded every two years a lot more frequent then what was in the previous bill.

Chairman Kelsch we debated this at quit some length during interim committee. We also tried to add this on to a bill in the last session, because we thought it would be helpful to us as legislators. One of the things that disturbed me a little was the fact that during the interim we did find districts that really are not going through the process. We know they will not be in existence forever. But they will change. A tool for us to see that school dist. are giving this some thought.

DO PASS AS AMENDED 10-4-0 . Rep. Mueller to carry.

FISCAL NOTE
Requested by Legislative Council
01/22/2003

Amendment to: HB 1034

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.*

	2001-2003 Biennium		2003-2005 Biennium		2005-2007 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

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

2001-2003 Biennium			2003-2005 Biennium			2005-2007 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

2. Narrative: *Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.*

School districts will be required to prepare and submit the required reports to DPI. However, this bill, as amended, will have no impact on state revenue sources as a result of this bill.

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.*

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.*

No identifiable fiscal impact.

C. Appropriations: *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, of the effect on the biennial appropriation for each agency and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget. Indicate the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations.*

Name:	Tom Decker	Agency:	Public Instruction
Phone Number:	328-2267	Date Prepared:	01/22/2003

FISCAL NOTE
Requested by Legislative Council
12/13/2002

Bill/Resolution No.: HB 1034

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.*

	2001-2003 Biennium		2003-2005 Biennium		2005-2007 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

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

2001-2003 Biennium			2003-2005 Biennium			2005-2007 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

2. Narrative: *Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.*

School districts will be required to prepare and submit the required reports to DPI. However, there will be no impact on state revenue sources as a result of this bill.

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.*

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.*

No identifiable fiscal impact.

C. Appropriations: *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, of the effect on the biennial appropriation for each agency and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget. Indicate the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations.*

Name:	Linda L. Gibbins	Agency:	Public Instruction
Phone Number:	328-2261	Date Prepared:	12/17/2002

30151.0201
Title.0300

Prepared by the Legislative Council staff for
Representative Haas
January 20, 2003

VR
1/20/03

HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1034 EDU.1-21-03

Page 1, line 1, after "A BILL" replace the remainder of the bill with "for an Act to create and enact a new section to chapter 15.1-07 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to school district demographics and planning.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:

SECTION 1. A new section to chapter 15.1-07 of the North Dakota Century Code is created and enacted as follows:

School district demographics - Long-term planning process.

1. Between January first and June thirtieth of every even-numbered year, the board of each school district shall invite the public to participate in a planning process addressing the effects that demographics might have on the district in the ensuing five-year and ten-year periods, and specifically addressing potential effects on:
 - a. Academic, athletic, and extracurricular programs;
 - b. Instructional and administrative staffing;
 - c. Facility needs and utilization; and
 - d. District tax levies.
2. At the conclusion of the planning process, the board shall prepare a report, publish a notice in the official newspaper of the district indicating that the report is available, and make the report available upon request."

Renumber accordingly

Date: 1-20-03
Roll Call Vote #: 0

2003 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO.

House HOUSE EDUCATION Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number HB 1034 30151.1201

Action Taken amendments

Motion Made By Haas Seconded By Hawken

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Kelsch					
Rep. Johnson					
Rep. Nelson					
Rep. Haas					
Rep. Hawken					
Rep. Herbel					
Rep. Meier					
Rep. Norland					
Rep. Sitte					
Rep. Hanson					
Rep. Hunsakor					
Rep. Mueller					
Rep. Solberg					
Rep. Williams					

Total (Yes) 14 No 0

Absent 0 voice vote

Floor Assignment _____

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

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yalosta Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

42
Date: 1/20/03
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2003 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO.

House HOUSE EDUCATION Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number HB 1034

Action Taken amend. 1034 — Do Pass

Motion Made By Herbel Seconded By Mueller

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Kelsch	✓				
Rep. Johnson	✓				
Rep. Nelson		✓			
Rep. Haas	✓				
Rep. Hawken	✓				
Rep. Herbel	✓				
Rep. Meier	✓				
Rep. Norland		✓			
Rep. Sitte		✓			
Rep. Hanson	✓				
Rep. Hunsakor	✓				
Rep. Mueller	✓				
Rep. Solberg		✓			
Rep. Williams	✓				

Total (Yes) 10 No 4

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Mueller

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

Yalosta Rickford 10/2/03
Operator's Signature Date

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
January 21, 2003 11:14 a.m.

Module No: HR-11-0821
Carrier: Mueller
Insert LC: 30151.0201 Title: .0300

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1034: Education Committee (Rep. R. Kelsch, Chairman) recommends AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS and when so amended, recommends DO PASS (10 YEAS, 4 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1034 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 1, after "A BILL" replace the remainder of the bill with "for an Act to create and enact a new section to chapter 15.1-07 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to school district demographics and planning.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:

SECTION 1. A new section to chapter 15.1-07 of the North Dakota Century Code is created and enacted as follows:

School district demographics - Long-term planning process.

1. Between January first and June thirtieth of every even-numbered year, the board of each school district shall invite the public to participate in a planning process addressing the effects that demographics might have on the district in the ensuing five-year and ten-year periods, and specifically addressing potential effects on:
 - a. Academic, athletic, and extracurricular programs;
 - b. Instructional and administrative staffing;
 - c. Facility needs and utilization; and
 - d. District tax levies.
2. At the conclusion of the planning process, the board shall prepare a report, publish a notice in the official newspaper of the district indicating that the report is available, and make the report available upon request."

Renumber accordingly

2003 SENATE EDUCATION

HB 1034

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Valosta Rickford

Date

10/2/03

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1034

Senate Education Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 2-17-03

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1			0 - 19.1
Committee Clerk Signature <i>Dan Johnson</i>			

Minutes: VICE-CHAIRMAN LEE called the committee to order. Roll Call was taken with all (6) members present.

VICE-CHAIRMAN LEE opened the hearing on HB 1034 which relates to school district demographics and planning.

Testimony in support of HB 1034:

ANITA THOMAS, Legislative Council staff, explained the bill and the differences from the interim bill to the amended House bill. (see attached)

REPRESENTATIVE HAAS, Dist.36, explained some of the actions of the House. He said the interim bill had asked for a 20 year plan, and the committee thought that was too long a time frame. They dropped the reporting requirement because of the ever-changing demographics of our state. The committee wants to make sure there is a required planning process to take place at the local level

Page 2
Senate Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB 1034
Hearing Date 2-17-03

SENATOR COOK asked why the reporting process was dropped. He still feels there would be value in that if the reports were filed at a central place where legislators could possible access them and see what some of the long-term planning looks like. REPRESENTATIVE HAAS stated this was the most controversial element of the bill when they dropped the reporting element. The committee felt that if the local school districts took this seriously, and involved the patrons of the district in meaningful planning, then the report was possibly not necessary. He stated the House committee had received testimony stating the districts felt the reporting would be just one more thing they would have to file with DPI, and they didn't really want to do it.

SENATOR CHIRSTENSON asked if this is an ongoing process. REP. HAAS stated it is ongoing and continual.

SENATOR FLAKOLL asked if there would be any benefit in looking at a 2, 5 and 10 year plan. REP. HAAS stated that would be excellent

TOM DECKER DPI, stated the department supports the bill. He feels a 2 year time frame would be good. He further stated it takes about 5 years for any significant change to take place.

SENATOR COOK asked if there is value in submitting a report. MR. DECKER stated he feels there is value in submitting a report which ensures the job will get done in a timely fashion and a product will be delivered.

MARY WAHL, ND Council of Educational Leaders, presented a "planning session schedule".

(see attached) She stated they support planning by school districts. There only concern is the time frame. They feel a five year time frame is good and a ten year time is too long especially if the report is done every other year. NCLB could not have been incorporated into any plan

Yalosta Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

Page 3
Senate Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB 1034
Hearing Date 2-17-03

because it was an unknown until just recently. Also, taxable values are an uncertainty. She feels 10 years has too many variables and feels a 5 year schedule is better. You would at least have a four year reporting span.

SENATOR COOK asked if MS. WAHL thinks a five and 10 year plan would help the legislators in their deliberations. She doesn't think a 10 year plan is time-effective.

There was no opposition.

The hearing was closed.

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Yolanda Rickford

Date

10/2/03

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1034

Senate Education Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 03-03-03

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1	X		10.6 - 20.8
1		x	3.8 - 22.4
Committee Clerk Signature <i>Andrea Johnson</i>			

Minutes: CHAIRMAN FREBORG called the committee to order. Roll Call was taken with all (6) members present.

Discussion on HB 1034:

SENATOR FLAKOLL asked if there is interest within the committee with something other than a 5 and 10 year plan.

SENATOR FREBORG asked if we should have the districts predict their demise in 10 years, and if the committee really thinks the districts will be fair in their predictions.

SENATOR COOK feels this would give the districts a chance to look at what may happen in 10 years and give them the chance to make changes.

SENATOR FLAKOLL asked if we should look at a 2 - 4 - 6 year plan.

SENATOR LEE feels it is important to look ahead 5 - 10 years. He feels a 2 year plan is an operational plan. A longer range plan would force the district to look ahead and base their operation on it. SENATOR FREBORG asked if he is talking about a written plan or on long

Page 2
Senate Education Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB 1034
Hearing Date 03-03-03

range goals. SENATOR LEE said the plan includes goals and would probably change as the years go by. SENATOR FREBORG stated that things move so fast now, that maybe we should look at shorter terms of planning.

SENATOR FALKOLL has a concern that the first report would be so far out and the board would probably change before the five years were done.

SENATOR COOK feels an important part of the legislation is it requires a planning process with public input.

Tape 1, Side B:

SENATOR COOK is comfortable with the bill as is. He feels the schools could go through this and then come back after 2 or 5 years with their thoughts on how it is working and how true it is. SENATOR FREBORG feels a long range plan (10 years) would be a "dream" of what they hope for, but in reality, not what will be.

SENATOR CHRISTENSON feels a 10 year plan needs to be done, even if it is only a projection. SENATOR FREBORG feels schools will refuse to look at their long range plan accurately. They now tend to not believe what DPI is saying about declining enrollment, even though DPI is using the latest census figures for their projections. His worry is that the smaller schools would plan for something that isn't there. SENATOR COOK feels with the public participating, it may be more accurate.

Senator Falkoll proposed an amendment to change the 5 and 10 years to 4 and 8 years.

Senator Cook seconded.

Page 3

Senate Education Committee

Bill/Resolution Number HB 1034

Hearing Date 03-03-03

SENATOR FLAKOLL explained why the 4 and 8 years for reporting. He feels he students from the 1st five year report would already be out of school. He feels every four years may make it more viable.

SENATOR CHRISTENSON feels putting things in black and white may make it more realistic.

SENATOR FREBORG worries about the schools not facing reality in a 10 year plan.

Roll Call Vote on the Amendment. 2 YES. 4 NO. Amendment fails.

SENATOR COOK moved a DO PASS. Seconded by SENATOR FLAKOLL.

ROLL CALL VOTE: 5 YES. 1 NO. 0 ABSENT. MOTION CARRIED.

CARRIER: SENATOR COOK

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yolanda Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

Date: 3/3/03

Roll Call Vote #:

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. *HB 1034*

Senate EDUCATION

Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee**Legislative Council Amendment Number**

Action Taken amend to 4 & 8 yrs. instead of 5 & 10 yrs.

Motion Made By Sen. Flakoll Seconded By Sen. Cook

[illegible]

Total (Yes) 2 No 4

Absent 0

Floor Assignment _____

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

Amendment fails

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature Yalosa Rickford

10/2/03
Date

Date: 3/3/03

Roll Call Vote #: 2

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

Senate EDUCATION

Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee**Legislative Council Amendment Number**

Action Taken

Motion Made By

Seconded By

[illegible]

Total (Yes) 5 No 1

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Sen. Cook

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

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

1st Copy Pickled *10/2/03*

Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
March 3, 2003 1:20 p.m.

Module No: SR-37-3744
Carrier: Cook
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
HB 1034, as engrossed: Education Committee (Sen. Freborg, Chairman) recommends
DO PASS (5 YEAS, 1 NAY, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). Engrossed HB 1034 was
placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.

(2) DESK, (3) COMM

Page No. 1

SR-37-3744

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Yolanda Rickford

Date

10/2/03

2003 TESTIMONY

HB 1034

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yolanda Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

HOUSE BILL NO. 1034

School District Demographics and Long Term Plans

While considering what education would look like and should look like in this state in the next 5, 10, and 20 years, the interim committee determined that school boards and districts should be engaging in the same line of questioning and ultimately planning.

The committee therefore proposed a bill that would require school boards to hold a public hearing during the first six months of each even numbered year, to consider the effects of demographics on their district, and most importantly, to consider appropriate responses to the population changes, regardless of whether those changes are positive or negative.

The board would then be required to prepare a report that sets forth the district's 5, 10, and 20 year plan. The plan must include potential changes in academic, athletic, and extracurricular programs; potential staff changes; potential building changes,

including repairs, remodeling, new construction, and even closure; and potential taxation changes.

When the report is ready, the school district must publish notice of that fact in the newspaper and it must make the report available to anyone upon request.

During the committee hearings, some suggested that 20 years is a long time in terms of doing any practical planning.

Proponents however suggested that the bill draft will force school boards and school district patrons to have very public conversations about factors that will seriously impact their ability to deliver education to their students.

Madame Chairman, members of the committee, the interim committee recommended this bill by a vote of 16-0.

Persons Age 0 to 4 Years in North Dakota by County, 1990 and 2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 and 2000 Decennial Censuses

Change: 1990-2000

Fips	Areaname	1990	2000	Numeric	Percent
38001	Adams County, North Dakota	214	117	-97	-45.33
38003	Barnes County, North Dakota	809	623	-186	-22.99
38006	Benson County, North Dakota	716	619	-96	-13.43
38007	Billings County, North Dakota	84	31	-53	-63.10
38009	Bottineau County, North Dakota	486	280	-206	-42.39
38011	Bowman County, North Dakota	233	149	-84	-36.05
38013	Burke County, North Dakota	138	82	-56	-40.58
38016	Burleigh County, North Dakota	4532	4330	-202	-4.46
38017	Cass County, North Dakota	7593	8130	537	7.07
38019	Cavaller County, North Dakota	427	208	-219	-51.29
38021	Dickey County, North Dakota	355	327	-28	-7.89
38023	Divide County, North Dakota	159	70	-89	-55.97
38025	Dunn County, North Dakota	330	206	-124	-37.58
38027	Eddy County, North Dakota	172	139	-33	-19.19
38029	Emmons County, North Dakota	315	229	-86	-27.30
38031	Foster County, North Dakota	276	200	-76	-27.54
38033	Golden Valley County, North Dakota	135	105	-30	-22.22
38036	Grand Forks County, North Dakota	5905	4245	-1,660	-28.11
38037	Grant County, North Dakota	227	123	-104	-45.81
38039	Griggs County, North Dakota	202	130	-72	-35.64
38041	Hettinger County, North Dakota	244	120	-124	-50.82
38043	Kidder County, North Dakota	204	137	-67	-32.84
38045	LaMoure County, North Dakota	334	208	-126	-37.72
38047	Logan County, North Dakota	173	128	-45	-26.01
38049	McHenry County, North Dakota	393	294	-99	-25.19
38051	McIntosh County, North Dakota	225	142	-83	-36.89
38053	McKenzie County, North Dakota	577	359	-218	-37.78
38055	McLean County, North Dakota	679	438	-241	-35.49
38057	Mercer County, North Dakota	862	394	-468	-54.29
38059	Morton County, North Dakota	1709	1638	-71	-4.15
38061	Mountrail County, North Dakota	505	431	-74	-14.65
38063	Nelson County, North Dakota	237	138	-99	-41.77
38065	Oliver County, North Dakota	187	93	-94	-50.27
38067	Pembina County, North Dakota	619	432	-187	-30.21
38069	Pierce County, North Dakota	272	246	-26	-9.56
38071	Ramsey County, North Dakota	583	682	201	22.76
38073	Ransom County, North Dakota	369	347	-22	-5.96
38075	Renville County, North Dakota	178	113	-65	-36.52
38077	Richland County, North Dakota	1301	1074	-227	-17.45
38079	Rolette County, North Dakota	1414	1208	-206	-14.57
38081	Sargent County, North Dakota	295	247	-48	-16.27
38083	Sheridan County, North Dakota	135	55	-80	-59.26
38085	Sioux County, North Dakota	460	425	-35	-7.61
38087	Slope County, North Dakota	63	36	-27	-42.86
38089	Stark County, North Dakota	1790	1307	-483	-26.98
38091	Steele County, North Dakota	159	127	-32	-20.13
38093	Stutsman County, North Dakota	1487	1174	-313	-21.05
38095	Towner County, North Dakota	287	137	-150	-52.26
38097	Traill County, North Dakota	553	507	-46	-8.32
38099	Walsh County, North Dakota	973	711	-262	-26.93
38101	Ward County, North Dakota	5011	4348	-663	-13.23
38103	Wells County, North Dakota	367	226	-141	-38.42
38105	Williams County, North Dakota	1593	1135	-458	-28.75
38000	North Dakota	47,945	39,400	-8,545	-17.82

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Date

10/2/03

Persons Age 20 to 34 Years in North Dakota by County, 1990 and 2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 and 2000 Decennial Censuses

Change 1990-2000

Fips	County Name	1990	2000	Numeric	Percent
38001	Adams County, North Dakota	506	260	-246	-48.62
38003	Barnes County, North Dakota	2,444	1,942	-502	-20.54
38005	Benson County, North Dakota	1,285	1,071	-214	-16.65
38007	Billings County, North Dakota	207	91	-116	-56.04
38009	Bottineau County, North Dakota	1,326	852	-474	-35.75
38011	Bowman County, North Dakota	597	379	-218	-36.52
38013	Burke County, North Dakota	420	205	-215	-51.19
38015	Burleigh County, North Dakota	14,784	14,160	-624	-4.22
38017	Cass County, North Dakota	31,608	34,519	2,911	9.21
38019	Cavalier County, North Dakota	954	440	-514	-53.88
38021	Dickey County, North Dakota	1,128	956	-172	-15.25
38023	Divide County, North Dakota	401	177	-224	-55.86
38025	Dunn County, North Dakota	680	431	-249	-36.62
38027	Eddy County, North Dakota	473	312	-161	-34.04
38029	Emmons County, North Dakota	740	431	-309	-41.76
38031	Foster County, North Dakota	679	499	-180	-26.51
38033	Golden Valley County, North Dakota	333	216	-117	-35.14
38035	Grand Forks County, North Dakota	24,133	18,791	-5,342	-22.14
38037	Grant County, North Dakota	510	292	-218	-42.75
38039	Griggs County, North Dakota	446	275	-171	-38.34
38041	Hettinger County, North Dakota	516	255	-261	-50.58
38043	Kidder County, North Dakota	515	289	-226	-43.88
38045	LaMoure County, North Dakota	835	510	-325	-38.92
38047	Logan County, North Dakota	448	241	-207	-46.21
38049	McHenry County, North Dakota	957	753	-204	-21.32
38051	McIntosh County, North Dakota	558	294	-264	-47.31
38053	McKenzie County, North Dakota	1,163	623	-540	-46.43
38055	McLean County, North Dakota	1,616	1,027	-589	-36.45
38057	Mercer County, North Dakota	2,089	829	-1,260	-60.32
38059	Morton County, North Dakota	4,862	4,236	-626	-12.88
38061	Mountrail County, North Dakota	1,138	911	-227	-19.95
38063	Nelson County, North Dakota	596	356	-240	-40.27
38065	Oliver County, North Dakota	412	212	-200	-48.54
38067	Pembina County, North Dakota	1,587	1,109	-478	-30.12
38069	Pierce County, North Dakota	811	577	-234	-28.85
38071	Ramsey County, North Dakota	2,601	1,803	-798	-30.68
38073	Ransom County, North Dakota	1,008	863	-145	-14.38
38075	Renville County, North Dakota	542	306	-236	-43.54
38077	Richland County, North Dakota	4,015	3,409	-606	-15.09
38079	Rolette County, North Dakota	2,709	2,374	-335	-12.37
38081	Sargent County, North Dakota	766	622	-144	-18.80
38083	Sheridan County, North Dakota	310	145	-165	-53.23
38085	Sioux County, North Dakota	784	833	49	6.25
38087	Slope County, North Dakota	165	84	-81	-49.09
38089	Stark County, North Dakota	5,411	4,032	-1,379	-25.49
38091	Steele County, North Dakota	381	250	-131	-34.38
38093	Stutsman County, North Dakota	4,717	3,725	-992	-21.03
38095	Towner County, North Dakota	628	272	-356	-56.69
38097	Traill County, North Dakota	1,751	1,354	-397	-22.67
38099	Walsh County, North Dakota	2,589	1,688	-901	-34.80
38101	Ward County, North Dakota	16,495	13,832	-2,663	-16.14
38103	Wells County, North Dakota	920	508	-412	-44.78
38105	Williams County, North Dakota	4,339	2,769	-1,570	-36.18
38000	North Dakota Statewide Total	151,888	127,390	-24,498	-16.13

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Date

10/2/03

Population Trends of Children Under Age 18 in North Dakota: 1950 to 2000

Area	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Change: 1990-2000	
							Number	Percent
Adams	1,886	1,822	1,394	1,021	827	601	-226	-27.3
Barnes	5,666	6,349	4,747	3,644	3,092	2,624	-468	-15.1
Benson	4,136	3,945	3,351	2,845	2,502	2,513	11	0.4
Billings	689	675	490	380	364	221	-143	-39.3
Bottineau	4,428	4,521	3,252	2,601	2,063	1,587	-476	-23.1
Bowman	1,387	1,690	1,499	1,361	1,009	780	-229	-22.7
Burke	2,332	2,298	1,686	1,040	742	467	-275	-37.1
Burleigh	8,869	13,494	15,497	16,383	16,744	17,175	431	2.6
Cass	18,068	24,826	24,792	23,021	25,690	28,848	3,158	12.3
Cavalier	4,656	4,176	3,176	2,263	1,633	1,188	-445	-27.3
Dickey	3,279	3,112	2,386	2,090	1,527	1,369	-158	-10.3
Divide	2,088	2,153	1,542	897	692	462	-230	-33.2
Dunn	3,072	2,958	2,055	1,493	1,237	986	-251	-20.3
Eddy	1,947	2,011	1,546	980	738	651	-87	-11.8
Emmons	4,125	3,811	3,124	1,940	1,243	1,075	-168	-13.5
Foster	1,935	2,250	1,979	1,415	1,094	985	-109	-10.0
Golden Valley	1,326	1,312	966	752	651	545	-106	-16.3
Grand Forks	12,554	17,675	20,856	18,276	18,377	15,735	-2,642	-14.4
Grant	3,138	2,748	1,972	1,341	942	666	-276	-29.3
Griggs	1,881	1,969	1,393	958	857	621	-236	-27.5
Hettinger	3,008	2,847	2,105	1,269	900	634	-266	-29.6
Kidder	2,506	2,324	1,708	1,201	916	638	-278	-30.3
LaMoure	3,548	3,514	2,632	1,893	1,465	1,138	-327	-22.3
Logan	2,656	2,353	1,706	1,034	706	522	-184	-26.1
McHenry	4,945	4,642	3,401	2,311	1,770	1,434	-336	-19.0
McIntosh	2,845	2,585	1,923	1,145	873	656	-217	-24.9
McKenzie	2,612	3,081	2,354	2,382	2,111	1,756	-355	-16.8
McLean	7,367	5,884	4,211	3,832	3,053	2,212	-841	-27.5
Mercer	3,554	2,739	2,218	2,928	3,179	2,513	-666	-21.0
Morton	7,504	8,993	8,404	8,275	7,161	6,823	-338	-4.7
Mountrail	3,392	4,279	3,266	2,392	2,108	1,860	-248	-11.8
Nelson	2,711	2,458	1,876	1,304	1,027	820	-207	-20.2
Oliver	1,292	1,163	938	842	800	566	-234	-29.3
Pembina	5,241	5,335	3,901	3,033	2,591	2,140	-451	-17.4
Pierce	3,470	3,183	2,482	1,935	1,287	1,115	-172	-13.4
Ramsey	5,187	5,348	4,729	3,811	3,345	3,019	-326	-9.7
Ransom	3,000	2,987	2,374	1,911	1,531	1,471	-60	-3.9
Renville	2,020	1,905	1,441	1,097	873	609	-264	-30.2
Richland	6,869	7,009	5,876	4,805	4,917	4,437	-480	-9.8
Rollette	4,902	5,143	5,616	4,899	4,877	4,985	108	2.2
Sargent	2,915	2,771	2,182	1,681	1,224	1,155	-69	-5.6
Sheridan	2,109	1,766	1,120	777	516	366	-150	-29.1
Sioux	1,744	1,869	1,831	1,602	1,621	1,630	9	0.6
Slope	919	861	654	367	272	194	-78	-28.7
Stark	6,469	8,035	7,758	7,443	6,773	5,781	-992	-14.6
Steele	1,826	1,715	1,335	895	632	624	-8	-1.3
Stutsman	7,687	9,215	8,128	6,743	5,785	5,005	-780	-13.5
Towner	2,323	2,254	1,734	1,118	975	708	-267	-27.4
Traill	3,758	3,616	2,855	2,525	2,244	2,104	-140	-6.2
Walsh	6,458	6,713	5,738	4,343	3,817	3,091	-726	-19.0
Ward	11,814	18,282	21,681	17,918	16,252	15,423	-829	-5.1
Wells	3,791	3,613	2,956	1,973	1,434	1,149	-285	-19.9
Williams	5,743	9,356	7,514	6,606	6,326	5,172	-1,154	-18.2
North Dakota	223,647	251,633	226,350	190,991	175,385	160,849	-14,536	-8.3

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Decennial Censuses.

The Population Bulletin

Vol. 17 No. 3, May 2001

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Date

City Size North Dakota, 1960 to 2000

North Dakota
State Data Center
Bismarck, ND 58105
Phone: (701) 224-2200
Fax: (701) 224-2201

Population	1960		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25,000+	4	1.1	4	1.1
10,000-24,999	3	0.9	5	1.3
5,000-9,999	5	1.4	4	1.1
2,500-4,999	3	0.9	4	1.1
2,000-2,499	7	2.0	6	1.6
1,500-1,999	15	4.3	10	2.7
1,000-1,499	26	7.4	22	5.9
500-999	45	12.8	50	13.4
200-499	114	32.5	75	20.2
Less than 200	129	36.8	192	51.6
Total	351	100.0	372	100.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yalosta Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

**TESTIMONY ON HB 1034
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
By Paul K. Johnson, Superintendent
Bismarck Public Schools**

Madam Chair and Members of the House Education Committee,

I am Paul Johnson, Superintendent of the Bismarck Public Schools and am speaking on behalf of the Bismarck School Board. The Bismarck School Board opposes HB 1034 for at least four reasons. First, when conditions are changing so fast that business and industry typically do not dare to plan further than three years into the future, it is not realistic to expect school districts to plan ten and twenty years into the future. Second, the public may interpret the long-range plan to be a pledge or guarantee of future action or future protection. Third, crafting the plan may unnecessarily cause dissention as possible scenarios and actions far into the future are discussed. Fourth, the effect, if not the intent, of this bill is to require the present board to potentially obligate a future board to plans that may not seem feasible or desirable to the future board.

The Bismarck School Board suggests a DO NOT PASS recommendation from this committee.

Yolanda Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

**2003 North Dakota Legislative Assembly
House Education Committee
Testimony HB 1034**

House Bill 1034 establishes a requirement that school districts plan, anticipate the effects of changing demographics, and share that planning with the community. Most school districts are involved in this process at the present time.

The language in this bill, however, does present some concern for school districts and school boards. First, will the requirement to report this information to the superintendent of public instruction result in another massive reporting process that includes details impossible to predict five, ten and twenty year from now, and will this information create unnecessary concern in local communities by including predictions that will never happen. School districts do plan, and that plan can be shared, in the format determined locally by the district. This bill should not create another defined report that will need to be completed by the district.

Second, the bill asked districts to identify program changes, staff changes, facility repairs, remodeling, closures, and new construction, and taxation changes five, ten, and twenty years from now. It is not possible to determine that kind of specificity twenty years out. The parents of some of the children we will serve have not even been born. The planning process needs to include generalities not specifics that far out.

Dan Huffman, Asst. Supt.
Fargo Public School District #1
415 N. 4th St.
Fargo, ND 58102

Phone: 701-446-1026
e-mail: huffinda@fargo.k12.nd.us

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Valista Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

4

Anita Thomas
HB 1034

INTERIM 1034	ENGROSSED 1034
Jan 1-Jun 30 of even number years	Jan 1-Jun 30 of even number years
School board to hold a public hearing	School board to invite public to participate in a planning process
Consider effects of demographics & responses	Address effects of demographics in 5 & 10 years
Prepare and file report with DPI	Prepare report
Report to set forth 5, 10, 20 year plan for addressing effects of demographics	
Plan: academic, athletic, extracurricular program changes; instructional & administrative changes; facility repairs, remodeling, closure, or new construction; taxation changes	Address: academic, athletic, extracurricular programs; instructional & administrative staffing; facility needs and utilization; district tax levies
Publish notice in paper that report is available	Publish notice in paper that report is available
Make report available upon request	Make report available upon request

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yolanda Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee:

I am appearing on an interim education committee bill that was hoghoused by the house education committee.

The interim committee spent a great deal of time considering what education would and should look like in the upcoming 5, 10, and 20 years and it determined that school boards and school districts should be doing the same thing. So, it crafted a bill calling for a long-term planning process.

Both the interim version and the house education version require that an activity take place between Jan 1 and June 30 of even numbered years.

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Yolanda Rickford

10/2/03
Date

The interim bill directed that that activity be a public hearing to consider the effects of demographics and appropriate responses.

The house bill directed school boards to invite the public to participate in a planning process.

The interim bill was to focus on a 5, 10, and 20 year plan.

The house bill was to consider just a 5 and a 10 year plan.

The interim bill was to specifically address academic, athletic, and extracurricular program changes. The house bill was to consider academic, athletic, and extracurricular programs.

The interim bill was to specifically address instructional and administrative changes.

The house bill was to consider instructional and administrative staffing.

The interim bill was to specifically address facility repairs, remodeling, closure, or new construction.

The house bill was to consider facility needs and utilization.

The interim bill was to specifically address taxation changes.

The house bill was to consider district tax levies.

Both versions require school boards to publish notice in the official newspaper of the district indicating that the report is available and to make the report available upon request.

The interim bill required that the plan be filed with dpi.
The house bill eliminated this requirement.

Mary Wahl
HB 1034

Pursuant to North Dakota Law School District Z invites you to participate in a planning session addressing the effects of demographics on our school district.

This planning is for discussion purposes only. Board action would be required for any of these plans to go into effect.

DEMOGRAPHICS

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
May 2004	150	147	130	165	145	154	148	167	170	172	167	172	180
May 2009	125	132	115	144	124	134	138	147	128	160	143	152	140

By May of 2009 we anticipate our enrollment to be:

127 fewer students in grades k-6

62 fewer students in grades 7-8

96 fewer students in grades 9-12

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

1. Academic, athletic and extracurricular considerations
2. Instructional and administrative staffing consideration
3. Facility needs and utilization considerations
4. District tax levies considerations

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Yalosta Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date