



WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STAFF MEMORANDUM

One East Main Street, Suite 401; P.O. Box 2536; Madison, WI 53701-2536
Telephone: (608) 266-1304
Fax: (608) 266-3830
Email: leg.council@legis.state.wi.us

DATE: January 11, 2000
TO: MEMBERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
FROM: Jane R. Henkel, Acting Director, and Russ Whitesel, Senior Staff Attorney
SUBJECT: 1999 Assembly Bill 367, Relating to Public School Full-Time Open Enrollment and Tuition Waivers and Payments, and Assembly Amendments 1 and 2 to the Bill

This memorandum provides analysis of 1999 Assembly Bill 367, relating to public school full-time open enrollment and tuition waivers and payments, and two amendments to the bill (Assembly Amendment 1 and Assembly Amendment 2).

A. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Assembly Bill 367 was introduced by Representative Duff and others; cosponsored by Senator Breske and others, by request of the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). Representative Duff also offered Assembly Amendment 1 to the bill. Assembly Amendment 2 was prepared at the request of Representative Olsen.

The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Education Reform. A public hearing was held by that committee on September 8, 1999. At an executive session held on September 22, 1999, the committee recommended adoption of Assembly Amendment 1 on a vote of Ayes, 9; Noes, 0; and recommended adoption of Assembly Amendment 2 on a vote of Ayes, 8; Noes, 1. The committee recommended passage of the bill as amended on a vote of Ayes, 9; Noes, 0.

On November 2, 1999, the Assembly adopted Assembly Amendments 1 and 2 on voice votes and adopted the bill, as amended, on a vote of Ayes, 98; Noes, 0.

Upon receipt from the Assembly, the bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Education.

B. ASSEMBLY BILL 367

1. Current Law

a. Tuition Waivers for Pupils Who Move

Under current law relating to *tuition waivers*, a school board *must* permit a pupil who was a resident of and enrolled in the school district at the beginning of a school year to complete the school year at the school he or she is attending without paying tuition, even though the pupil is no longer a resident of the school district. [s. 121.84 (1) (a), Stats.] This provision applies regardless of when, during the school year, the pupil moves out of the school district even, for example, if the pupil was a resident of and enrolled in the school district for only a few days at the beginning of the school year before moving.

b. Effect of Open Enrollment Application Deadline on Pupils Who Move

Under the current *public school full-time open enrollment law*, if a pupil moves out of a school district after the open enrollment application deadline (the third Friday in February) and, before that deadline, did not know that he or she would be moving, the pupil has no opportunity to apply to continue to attend school in that school district under open enrollment in the subsequent school year. On the other hand, if the pupil knew, before the open enrollment application deadline, that he or she would be moving before the next school year, the pupil could apply to continue to attend school in the school district under open enrollment and the school district would be required to give his or her application preference. [s. 118.51 (5) (c), Stats.]

Regardless of whether the pupil moves before or after the open enrollment application deadline, if the pupil moves before the end of the school year, he or she may continue to attend school in the school district without paying tuition, until the end of the school year under s. 121.84 (1) (a), Stats., as described above.

2. The Bill

1999 Assembly Bill 367:

a. Establishes a minimum days of enrollment requirement for the provision which requires a school board to allow a pupil who moves out during the school year to continue attending his or her school until the end of the year.

b. Allows a pupil who moves out of a school district during the school year but misses the open enrollment application deadline to attend that school district during the following school year. During that following school year, the pupil could apply to continue to attend school in the school district in subsequent school years under open enrollment.

The bill is described in greater detail below.

a. Permissive Tuition Waivers

The bill *permits*, but does not require, a school board to allow a pupil who was a resident of and enrolled in the school district at the beginning of the school year to complete the current school year at the school he or she is attending without paying tuition, even though the pupil is no longer a resident of the school district.

b. Required Tuition Waivers

(1) Pupil moved during the current school year

The bill *requires* a school board to permit a pupil to complete the current school year at the school he or she is attending without paying tuition, even though the pupil is no longer a resident of the school district, if both of the following apply:

- (a) The pupil was a resident of the school district on the third Friday in September or the second Friday in January of the current school year.¹
- (b) The pupil has been enrolled in the school district for at least 20 school days during the current school year.²

As under current law, the school district that the pupil is attending counts the pupil for state aid purposes.

(2) Pupil moved after beginning of the open enrollment application period

The bill also requires a school board to allow a pupil to whom all of the following apply to attend school in the school district in the current school year without paying tuition:

- (a) The pupil was a resident of the school district on the second Friday in January of the *previous* school year.
- (b) The pupil was enrolled in the school district continuously from the second Friday in January of the previous school year to *the end of that school term*.
- (c) The pupil ceased to be a resident of the school district *after* the first Monday in February (the beginning of the open enrollment application period) of the previous school year.
- (d) The pupil continues to be a resident of the state.

1. These are the dates used to count pupils in a school district's membership for general state school aid purposes. [s. 121.05 (1) (a), Stats.]

2. "School days" are defined, in s. 115.01 (10), Stats., as days on which school is actually taught and days on which school is closed due to inclement weather or by order of a local health officer.

Under these provisions:

- (a) State aid adjustments and tuition payments shall be made for the pupil as provided for pupils attending a nonresident school district under the open enrollment law. The pupil's new resident school district shall count the pupil for state aid and revenue limit purposes.
- (b) Children with disabilities are treated in the same manner as under the open enrollment law. The pupil's new resident school district may deny the pupil's continued attendance at the nonresident district (i.e., the pupil's former resident school district), if the costs of the pupil's special education program would impose an undue financial burden on the resident school district which must pay tuition for the pupil. The nonresident district may deny the pupil's continued enrollment based on availability of special education and related services required under the child's individualized education program (IEP). A denial may be appealed to the DPI, which must affirm the school board's decision unless it finds that the decision was arbitrary and unreasonable.³
- (c) The pupil shall be treated in the same manner as an open enrollment pupil for transportation purposes. That is, the pupil's parent is responsible for transporting the child to and from school. Either school district may elect to provide transportation for the pupil but the nonresident school district may not provide transportation to or from a location in the pupil's resident school district. A nonresident school district which provides transportation is eligible for state transportation aid in the same amount as currently specified in the statutes for transporting other pupils. If the child is a child with a disability and transportation for the child is required in the child's IEP or under s. 121.54 (3), Stats., the nonresident school district must provide transportation for the child.

c. Special Education

Throughout subch. V, ch. 115, Stats., relating to children with disabilities, the bill expands current cross-references to children attending a nonresident school district under the open enrollment program to also include children attending a nonresident school district under the tuition waiver provisions described in Sections a. and b., above. In general, these cross-references assign responsibility for ensuring a free, appropriate public education to the child to the nonresident school district attended by the child.

Under current law, when evaluating or re-evaluating a child with a disability, the child's IEP team must "collaborate with appropriate personnel designated by the school board of the child's school district of residence." The child's IEP must be developed "in collaboration" with such personnel. The bill amends these provisions to specify that the IEP team must include "at

3. Also see Assembly Amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 367, described in Section B. of this memorandum.

least one person designated by the school board of the child's school district of residence who has knowledge or special expertise about the child."

d. Other Changes to Current Law

Other changes to current law made by the bill are:

(1) The bill amends the ending date of the open enrollment application period to the third Friday in February to the third Friday following the first Monday in February.

(2) The bill amends the full-time open enrollment law to use the special phrase "special education or related services" in place of phrases such as "special education program or related services" and "special education program or services." The purpose of these changes is to make the terminology used in the open enrollment law consistent with the terminology used in subch. V, ch. 115, Stats., relating to children with disabilities.

(3) The bill changes the tuition computation applicable when a *parent* pays tuition for the attendance of a pupil at a nonresident school district, pursuant to a written agreement with the nonresident school district, to be the same as the amount of state aid adjustments or tuition payments under the full-time open enrollment law. Under current law, parental tuition payments for pupils, other than pupils enrolled in special education programs, are based on the nonresident school district's net cost per pupil. Under the bill, the tuition rate for pupils, other than pupils enrolled in special education programs, is based on the statewide average per-pupil school district cost for regular instruction, cocurricular activities, instructional support services and pupil support services. Under current law, parental tuition payments for pupils receiving special education services are based on the nonresident school district's costs for the pupil's special education services. Under the bill, the tuition is either calculated in the same manner as under current law, *or* is an amount agreed to by the school board and the parent.

C. ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT 1

I. Current Law

Under the open enrollment law, if a nonresident school board denies a pupil's initial application to attend school in the nonresident school district based on the availability of, or space in, special education or related services described in the child's IEP, the pupil's parent may appeal the denial to the DPI. [s. 118.51 (3) (a), (5) (a) 4. and (9), Stats.] However, no such appeal is provided if the child's *continued* enrollment in the nonresident school district is denied, pursuant to s. 118.15 (12) (a), Stats., based on the availability of, or space in, special education or related services described in a child's IEP in cases where the IEP is developed or revised after the child begins attending school in the nonresident school district under the open enrollment program.

2. The Amendment

Assembly Amendment 1 amends s. 118.51 (9), Stats., as affected by the bill, to permit a pupil to appeal the denial by a nonresident school board of a pupil's *continued* enrollment in the nonresident school district based on the availability of, or space in, special education and related services required in the child's IEP in cases where the IEP is developed or revised after the child begins attending school in the nonresident school district. Assembly Amendment 1 applies to: (a) pupils attending a nonresident school district under the current open enrollment law; and (b) pupils attending a school district under the provisions of the bill, described in Section A. 2. b. (2) of this memorandum, which allow pupils who miss the open enrollment deadline to continue in the same school district during the following school year. (The problem corrected by Assembly Amendment 1 exists under current law as well as under the bill.)

D. ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT 2

1. Current Law

Under current law, a pupil may attend a *prekindergarten, early childhood or school-operated day care program* in a nonresident school district under the *public school full-time open enrollment law* only if the school district in which the pupil resides offers the same type of program that the pupil wishes to attend and the pupil is eligible to attend that program in his or her resident school district. [s. 118.51 (2), Stats.]

Under current law, for the purposes of the school code [chs. 115 to 121, Stats.], where reference is made to "kindergarten," the reference includes both *four-year old* and five-year old kindergarten, except as otherwise specifically provided. [s. 115.01 (2), Stats.] Since four-year old kindergarten is considered to be kindergarten for the purposes of the school code (i.e., no exception to that definition is provided for the open enrollment program), it appears clear that a four-year old kindergarten program is not a "prekindergarten, early childhood or school-operated day care program," under s. 118.51 (2), Stats. Thus, it appears that a pupil may attend a four-year old kindergarten program in another school district, under the full-time open enrollment program, regardless of whether his or her resident school district offers a four-year old kindergarten program and regardless of whether, if the pupil's resident school district does offer such a program, the pupil is eligible to attend that program.

2. The Amendment

Assembly Amendment 2 amends the full-time open enrollment law to treat four-year old kindergarten programs in the same manner as prekindergarten, early childhood or school-operated day care programs are treated. As a result under the draft, a pupil may attend a four-year old kindergarten program in a nonresident school district under the full-time open enrollment program only if the pupil's resident school district offers a four-year old kindergarten program and the pupil is eligible to attend that program in his or her resident school district.

The provisions of Assembly Amendment 2 first apply to open enrollment applications submitted during the first complete open enrollment application period beginning after the effective date of the act.

If you would like any further information on this subject, please feel free to contact the Legislative Council Staff offices.

JRH:RW:jal:ksm:tlv;rv;wu

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
TESTIMONY ON 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 367
January 25, 2000

My name is Mary Jo Cleaver. I am representing the Department of Public Instruction and I am testifying in support of Assembly Bill 367.

As you know, public school open enrollment became law in Wisconsin just about two years ago. The program that passed in the 1997 biennial budget was the result of the work of a legislative council study group that examined Wisconsin's previous unsuccessful efforts to enact public school choice, as well as the experiences of other states that have enacted and successfully implemented it. The study group listened carefully to the advice of state open enrollment administrators from Minnesota, Iowa and Nebraska. All of these administrators testified that open enrollment was popular and successful in their states. All of them told the study group that they could not possibly foresee every possible problem and that, in fact, the problems that arose would probably not be the ones that were anticipated. Each of them recommended that Wisconsin enact the program that could pass the legislature and then, with experience, refine it to meet the unique need of the students of this state.

The work of that study group brought public school choice to Wisconsin. I am here to testify that it is been an excellent law. It is working, and it has been my privilege to be part of its implementation in Wisconsin. But I am also here to testify that those other states' administrators spoke the truth. There are problems.

AB 367 addresses some of the most significant problems that have arisen in the first year of the program. We identified these issues from our experiences in administering the program, from conversations with parents and school district administrators, as well as from surveys of parents and school district administrators. The bill doesn't address every problem that has

arisen and it's not intended to. Many problems with the program are growing pains and may ease with time and experience. Some problems are the inevitable result of balancing the goal of providing more educational options for children and parents with the goal of enabling school districts to maintain high quality educational programs for the children who choose to remain in the district. For this reason, we believe that we should approach changes with caution, making them incrementally, letting them settle and then stopping to see where we are and how we want to take the next step.

The first problem the bill addresses relates to a major reason that parents apply for open enrollment. Many families seek open enrollment because they have moved or plan to move out of a school district but want their children to continue to attend school where they have been successful and happy. In this situation, open enrollment works for families who move out of a district prior to the February application period. The child can complete the current school year in the district and apply for open enrollment for the next year. It works for families who know in February that they will be moving prior to the beginning of the next school year. They can apply in anticipation of a move—if they know they are moving and the district they are moving to. But open enrollment doesn't work for families who move after February but before the beginning of the next school year. The students are permitted to finish the current school year, but there is no way for them to remain in the same school district for the next school year. This is totally at odds with most provisions of the open enrollment statute that strongly support parents in their attempt to maintain continuity of their children's education.

AB 367 would solve this problem by guaranteeing that in most cases a student who moves out of a school district can continue to attend that school district long enough to apply for open enrollment. For students who move before the February open enrollment application

period, this is a guarantee to finish a school year already begun. For students who move after the February open enrollment application period, this is a guarantee of an additional school year in the district. With respect to funding, students who are continuing a school year already begun will continue to be counted by the school district of attendance for the remainder of the year—the same as under current law. Students who attend for the additional year are funded as if they were open enrollment—the resident district counts the student in membership and the open enrollment per pupil amount is transferred from the resident district's state aid to the nonresident district's state aid. This single change in the statutes may also go a long way in reducing some of the work associated with handling applications--by making it unnecessary to apply for open enrollment "just in case" the family moves.

The second problem relates to what is sometimes called "first day residency." State tuition statutes require school districts to allow a student who is a resident of a school district and enrolled in the school district at the beginning of the school year—that is on July 1—to complete the school year in the district even if the student moves out of the district after the beginning of the school year. This provision is instrumental in allowing the continuity of education I just talked about. But the statute, as it exists, invites abuse by some who deliberately establish short-term residency in a district and then use that to get a tuition waiver for one year followed by preference when they apply for open enrollment. It is true that school districts could challenge the legality of such residency and probably refuse the waiver. But it can be difficult and expensive to pursue residency abuses. AB 367 would assist school districts by providing some structure to this waiver provision. In order to be *entitled* to a tuition waiver, a student must have been enrolled in the district for at least 20 school days, one of which must be either the third Friday in September or the 2nd Friday in January school district count date. The bill would still

permit school districts to grant tuition waivers in other circumstances when they believe it is appropriate.

Although open enrollment has replaced parent-paid tuition for the most part, there are still occasional instances where a parent might have to pay tuition for a child to attend a nonresident school district. The most obvious example is when a parent, for whatever reason, missed the open enrollment deadline. Under current law, parents must pay full tuition to a school district—that is a prorated portion of all fixed and variable, instructional and administrative costs. This can range from about \$5,000 a year to \$10,000 or more—the state average is about \$6,800. Full tuition can be a considerably larger amount than what one school district pays to another under open enrollment. AB 367 would make the parent-paid tuition amount the same as the open enrollment per pupil transfer amount—about \$4,689 for this year. It's still a lot of money, but it may put public school tuition within the reach of a few more parents. As a note, it would be extremely rare for a parent to have to pay tuition for more than one year—it is assumed that they would apply for open enrollment in subsequent years.

Another problem with current law relates to the calendar. No, it's not the Y2K bug, but it does happen that in February of 2000, the first Monday falls on February 7. This means that the first Monday in February to the third Friday in February allows only two weeks for open enrollment applications rather than the three weeks intended. AB 367 would ensure that there is a three-week application period in every year.

The final two provisions in AB 367 relate to special education. The first is a technical change that brings the language in open enrollment law in line with recent changes to state and federal special education law. The other change relates to the development of an IEP for children participating in open enrollment who are receiving special education. Current law

requires that the nonresident school district develop the IEPs for open enrolled students “in collaboration” with the resident school district. This collaboration is sometimes as minimal as a phone call after the process is nearly completed. We believe that the resident school district should be represented on the IEP team, for two reasons. First, the resident school district is responsible to pay for the special education program provided by the nonresident school district under open enrollment. It should at least have a place at the table and not have the extent of the “collaboration” defined by the nonresident school district. Second, and more importantly, the resident school district is never really “off the hook” with respect to its responsibility to provide the student with a free, appropriate, public education. Each time a new IEP is developed, the potential exists for the student to return to the resident district---either voluntarily or because of space and program concerns in the nonresident district or because of undue financial burden to the resident district. Having a person from the resident school district be part of the IEP team can significantly benefit the child if and when the child returns to the resident school district.

We believe that AB 367 will go a long way toward improving open enrollment in Wisconsin. But it is a cautious bill. It doesn't try to rewrite the program as it struggles to get off the ground. It is a balanced bill. It is family-friendly and school district friendly. It improves the operation of the program for a significant number of families. It has a minimal fiscal effect, and while it may add administrative work in some ways, it reduces it in others.

Again, these are not the only problems with open enrollment. A major problem with the program has to do with the amount of work it takes to administer it---both in school districts and the department. We are working very hard to improve materials and communications to make it easier for school districts to administer the programs locally. We will be looking for ways to reduce or eliminate work whenever possible. We will be examining our administrative

rules and will probably amend them. We may seek additional legislative changes in a year or so. The first year was very hard, the second year was a little better, and I hope the third year will be easier yet.

Open enrollment has come to Wisconsin and I trust it is here to stay. If we mirror the experiences of Minnesota, Iowa and Nebraska, within a few years open enrollment will cease to be a novelty and will have become a regular part of the way we do business.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the bill.

Madison Metropolitan School District

Doyle Administration Building
545 West Dayton Street
Madison, WI 53703-1995

September 20, 1999

TO: Joe Quick, Customer Services/Communications Specialist


FROM: John J. Gaffney, Registrar

SUBJECT: AB 367, Changes to Open Enrollment Law

Our opposition to the proposed changes in AB367 to the Open Enrollment Law is based on the following:

1. The current Open Enrollment Law and reporting requirements has our staff doing something related to open enrollment almost on a weekly basis throughout the entire calendar year. This bill will just add more things to do in verifying where people resided on a date and whether they were verified for a 3rd or 2nd Friday count. This may not be a "big deal" for a small school district with only two or three open enrollment applications, but it is for a larger school district like Madison (we have over 100 applications both to enter and to leave our school district).
2. The law is working and we support leaving things as they are. If you move after July 1 you can stay at your present school district for the rest of the upcoming school year and apply through the open enrollment process in February to continue at that school district "forever." There is only a 4-1/2 month window (mid-February through June) where parents may miss open enrollment opportunity by not planning ahead. Remember prior to the existing open enrollment law parents had no choice.
3. While D.P.I. has come out in support of this change, they only deal with those applications that have been denied and are being appealed. This is no additional work for them as it will be for the local school district.
4. If staying in a particular school district is so important to parents/students, then parents must take some responsibility in planning their move, or live where their students go to school.

Hopefully this answers your questions. If you need to discuss this with me give me a call at 266-6263.


John J. Gaffney/Registrar

JJG: sjg

cc: Roger Price, Assistant Superintendent for Business Services
open_enr

Vote Record

Senate Committee on Education

Date: 1-26-00
 Moved by: Huelsman Seconded by: Darling
 AB: 307 Clearinghouse Rule: _____
 AB: _____ SB: _____ Appointment: _____
 AJR: _____ SJR: _____ Other: _____
 A: _____ SR: _____

A/S Amdt: _____
 A/S Amdt: _____ to A/S Amdt: _____
 A/S Sub Amdt: _____
 A/S Amdt: _____ to A/S Sub Amdt: _____
 A/S Amdt: _____ to A/S Amdt: _____ to A/S Sub Amdt: _____

- Be recommended for:
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage | <input type="checkbox"/> Indefinite Postponement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction | <input type="checkbox"/> Tabling |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adoption | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concurrence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection | <input type="checkbox"/> Nonconcurrency |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmation |

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Aye</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Not Voting</u>
Sen. Richard Grobschmidt, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Robert Jauch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Kevin Shibilski	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Jim Baumgart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Judy Robson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Jon Erpenbach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Alberta Darling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Carol Roessler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Joanne Huelsman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Mary Lazich	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Margaret Farrow	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Totals:	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	_____	_____



**MARC
DUFF**
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Member:
Joint Committee on Finance

Date: January 26, 2000

To: State Sen. Richard Grobschmidt, Chair
Members of the Senate Committee on Education

From: State Rep. Marc Duff

Re: Assembly Bill 367 relating to making technical changes to
Wisconsin's Open Enrollment law

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of Assembly Bill 367. Earlier in 1999, I heard from various people regarding some technical problems with the open enrollment law. As a result, I met with Legislative Council Attorney Jane Henkel and Mary Jo Cleaver from the Department of Public Instruction in order to draft technical changes to the policy. Those are included in AB367.

The first problem results from families who move from one school district to another after the February open enrollment application deadline. The current law precludes a family facing this situation from attempting to use the open enrollment system to keep their children in the school they had been attending. AB 367 would allow students to continue attending that district for an additional year if they had moved away after the February application deadline. This additional year would give parents time to apply under open enrollment for the following year.

The second problem was that the open enrollment law required school districts to allow students enrolled in the district at the beginning of the year to complete the school year without paying tuition, even though they may no longer be a resident of the district. I heard from some of my local school board members that there were some abuses of this provision where a student may technically be a resident for a day, even though the family is not a true resident of the school district. AB367 requires school districts to only accept those students if they were a resident of the school district on the third Friday in September or second Friday in February and if the student had been enrolled in the district for at least 20 days. A waiver is also provided to give districts the ability to waive tuition to allow a student to complete a current school year.

Finally, some technical changes recommended by DPI were included in AB367. Those relate to special education language and clarifying the date for open enrollment application deadlines. A technical amendment to the bill has been prepared by Jane Henkel. In addition, Rep. Luther Olson has an amendment that I support which maintains the intent of the open enrollment law in the area of 4 year old kindergarten.

CAPITOL OFFICE: P.O. Box 8952
Madison, WI 53708-8952
(608) 266-1190

HOME: 1811 South Elm Grove Road
New Berlin, WI 53151
(262) 782-0763

TOLL-FREE: (888) 534-0098

FAX: (608) 282-3698

E-MAIL: Rep.Duff@legis.state.wi.us

WEB SITE: <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/assembly/asm98/news/index.html>

