

## EDUCATION COMMITTEE

March 7, 1977

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m., with all members present.

Senate Bill 243 was discussed first. Senator Murphy, chief sponsor, said the bill repeals language that was passed in 1975, which has not done what teachers wanted it to do. It is becoming a problem to boards because they do not have sovereign immunity. If something is written or on public record it puts boards in a defensive position. There should be no written reasons for non-renewal of a teacher's contract that might follow the teacher. The question is whether local school districts should control local education. Tenure was built in years ago and is working fairly well. after a few years the administrators know whether a teacher will be satisfactory and in that case they generally are granted tenure. In the first few years the school must have flexibility in making decisions about the operation of their school. Nonrenewal of contract is not firing the person. School board members are not villains against the teachers, they are unpaid volunteers who try to run the schools as their constituents wish.

Proponents were Chad Smith and Len Sargent. Opponents were Leroy Corbin and Maurice Hickey. Their testimony is attached.

Senate Bill 138 was discussed next. Senator Mathers, chief sponsor, introduced the bill at the request of the Board of Public Education. It would allow them to hire an executive secretary and staff to enable them to function properly as a board. He said it will not create more bureaucracy but will give the Board the tools to work and fulfill their Constitutional and statutory duties. Rep. Eudaily suggested amending page 1, line 23, and Senator Mathers agreed. Proponents were Ed Nelson, Harriett Meloy, Marjorie King, Floyd McDowell and Rep. JoEllen Estenson. Opponents were Leroy Corbin and John Malee. Their testimony is attached.

Senate Bill 300 was discussed next. Senator Watt, chief sponsor, said the bill eliminates county boards of school budget supervisors, and transfers their functions to boards of trustees. The law was that every county should have a high school and it would be separate from city high school districts, which were then part of elementary school districts. They were placed under the control of county commissioners. In 1949 the foundation program law was passed and limits on amount of money school could spend were set except for additional locally voted levies. County commissioners do not have much authority over county high schools any more and have become a rubber stamp as far as that function goes.

Proponents were Chad Smith and Gary Steuerwald. Gregg McCurdy testified as an opponent. Their testimony is attached. Senator Watt requested the committee to amend page 8, lines 19-21 by reinserting the stricken material.

Senate Bill 144 was discussed next. Senator Watt, chief sponsor, said it is a bill to authorize county superintendents to act for districts that do not have a district superintendent. Large school districts are getting money from the federal government because they have the staff to go after the funds, but small districts do not have the ability to do so. He suggested an amendment to page 1, lines 8 and 17, after "superintendent" to add "or other districts". Gary Steuerwald testified as a proponent, and his testimony is attached. Maurice Mickey rose in support of the bill.

Bob Stockton submitted the fiscal data requested by the Committee last Friday. He said the non-current expenditures were larger because \$22,044,894 was included from 3 programs that were not classified under this heading last year. Also, it includes a small endowment fund, federal fund VIII, and spending for vocational technical centers. The reporting form was changed to include these items and that is why the non-current jumped so much.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

---

ANN MARY DUSSAULT, Chairperson