

Bill as Introduced

HB 369-FN - AS INTRODUCED

2011 SESSION

11-0373
04/01

HOUSE BILL

369-FN

AN ACT

relative to withdrawal from a school administrative unit or an authorized regional enrollment area school.

SPONSORS:

Rep. Howard, Sull 2; Rep. W. Smith, Rock 18; Rep. Bowers, Sull 3

COMMITTEE:

Education

ANALYSIS

This bill makes various changes to the procedure for school district withdrawal from a school administrative unit or authorized regional enrollment area school.

Explanation:

Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics***.

Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]

Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Eleven

AN ACT relative to withdrawal from a school administrative unit or an authorized regional enrollment area school.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 1 School Administrative Units; Withdrawal. Amend RSA 194-C:2, IV to read as follows:

2 IV. WITHDRAWAL.

3 (a) The planning committee shall:

4 (1) Study the advisability of the withdrawal of a specific school district from a school
5 administrative unit in accordance with this chapter, its organization, operation and control, and the
6 advisability of constructing, maintaining and operating a school or schools to serve the needs of such
7 school district.

8 (2) Estimate the construction and operating costs of operating such school or schools.

9 (3) Investigate the methods of financing such school or schools, and any other
10 matters pertaining to the organization and operation of a school administrative unit.

Carson
reads

11 (4) Prepare an educational and fiscal analysis of the impact of the *withdrawal on*
12 *the withdrawing district* [~~on any school districts remaining in the school administrative unit~~] and a
13 proposed plan for the disposition of any school administrative unit assets and liabilities *held by the*
14 *withdrawing district*.

15 (5) Consult with the department of education regarding any unique issues and
16 resolve such issues in a timely manner and submit a report or reports of its findings and
17 recommendations to the several school districts within the existing school administrative unit.

18 (b) If the planning committee recommends the withdrawal from a school administrative
19 unit, it shall prepare a plan for organization or reorganization. The plan [~~shall~~] *may* include
20 [~~providing~~] *provision of* superintendent services, which meet the requirements set forth in
21 RSA 194-C:4, and a transition plan and timeline, which includes consideration of transition budgets
22 and staffing for the withdrawing district, and is signed by at least a majority of the membership of
23 the planning committee.

Carson
Refers
to
this
section

24 (c) The planning committee may submit to the board of an existing school administrative
25 unit, a plan for joining the existing school administrative unit. If approved *by the board of the*
26 *existing school administrative unit*, the plan shall be submitted to the state board of education
27 [~~and~~] *which may, within 60 days of receipt of the plan, make recommendations to the*
28 *planning committee. After receiving the state board's recommendations, the planning*
29 *committee may revise the plan or submit it to the school district voters in accordance with this*
30 *section.*

1 (d) The planning committee shall submit a copy of the proposed plan to the several
 2 school districts and shall hold at least one public hearing no less than 14 days prior to submission to
 3 the state board. ~~[Within 60 days, the state board of education shall review the proposed plan for~~
 4 ~~administrative structure and to determine whether or not the proposed plan complies with the~~
 5 ~~requirements of this section and RSA 194-C:4.]~~

6 (e) If in the opinion of the ~~[state board]~~ *planning committee*, all requirements have
 7 been met, it shall forward the plan to the school district clerk for a vote at a regular or special school
 8 district meeting.

9 (f) If the ~~[state board of education]~~ *planning committee* determines that all requirements
 10 have not been properly addressed, the deficiencies shall be noted and the ~~[plan shall be promptly~~
 11 ~~returned for revision]~~ *planning committee shall promptly revise the plan*. When the plan is
 12 ~~[resubmitted, the state board of education shall promptly return the plan and]~~ *revised, the planning*
 13 *committee shall submit a copy to the state board which shall* make a *written* recommendation,
 14 *within 60 days of receipt of the plan*, for or against its adoption based on whether or not the plan
 15 complies with the requirements of this section and RSA 194-C:4. This recommendation shall be
 16 *advisory only and shall be* reported to the legislative body of the school district. ~~[The state board shall~~
 17 ~~not have veto power over any plan once it is resubmitted by the planning committee.]~~

18 (g) ~~[The state board]~~ *Within 10 days of making its recommendation, the state*
 19 *board* shall submit the plan for district withdrawal from a school administrative unit to the school
 20 board of the withdrawing district for acceptance by the district as provided in subparagraph (h).
 21 Upon such submission, the state board shall cause the approved plan to be published once at the
 22 expense of the state in media of general availability and usage within the district which proposes to
 23 withdraw from a school administrative unit.

24 (h) ~~[Upon the receipt of written notice of the state board's recommendation of the plan,]~~
 25 The plan shall be submitted for approval by the school district under the procedures outlined in
 26 paragraph I of this section. The question shall be in substantially the following form:

27 "Shall the school district accept the provisions of RSA 194-C providing for the withdrawal from a
 28 school administrative unit involving school districts of _____ and _____ etc., in
 29 accordance with the provisions of the proposed plan?"

30 Yes ___ No ___

31 (i) If 3/5 of the votes cast on the question in the withdrawing district shall vote in the
 32 affirmative, the clerk of that district shall forthwith send to the state board a certified copy of the
 33 warrant, certificate of posting, evidence of publication, if required, and minutes of the meeting in the
 34 district. If the state board finds that 3/5 of the votes cast in that district meeting have voted in favor
 35 of withdrawing from the school administrative unit, it shall issue its certificate to that effect; and
 36 such certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the lawful organization and formation of the new,
 37 single district school administrative unit as of the date of its issuance.

1 2 Authorized Regional Enrollment Area Schools; Withdrawal of District. Amend RSA 195-A:14,
2 III-VIII to read as follows:

3 III. After the third anniversary of the date of operating responsibility a sending or receiving
4 school district, at an annual or special school district meeting, may vote to undertake a study of the
5 feasibility and suitability of a withdrawal from the area. The study shall be conducted by a
6 committee composed of 2 school board members from each district of the area, the superintendent of
7 schools as a non-voting member, and 2 members of the town or city governing body from the school
8 district requesting the study. Within 180 days after the date of its formation, the committee shall
9 submit to the state board of education either a report that withdrawal is not feasible or suitable or a
10 report that includes a withdrawal plan prepared in accordance with paragraph IV. If the committee
11 determines that withdrawal is not feasible or suitable, the district which voted to undertake the
12 study may submit a minority report at the same time as the committee report is filed with the state
13 board of education. If the committee report does not include a withdrawal plan, the minority report
14 may include a withdrawal plan prepared in accordance with paragraph IV.

15 IV. A plan for the withdrawal of a district [~~or districts~~] from an area shall include the
16 following:

17 (a) The name or names of the withdrawing district [~~or districts~~] and the grades.

18 (b) The proposed date of withdrawal from the area, at which time the withdrawing
19 district shall be responsible for the education of its pupils and after which the area shall no longer
20 have such educational responsibility.

21 (c) The liability of the withdrawing district for its share of any outstanding indebtedness
22 of the area in accordance with paragraph V or, if the area was formed by 2 districts, provision for the
23 disposition of *jointly held* property and a statement of assumption of liabilities upon dissolution of
24 the area.

25 (d) A detailed analysis of the financial and educational consequences of the proposed
26 withdrawal *on the withdrawing district*.

27 (e) The manner in which the withdrawing district [~~or districts~~] shall provide for the
28 education of all pupils in the withdrawing district [~~or districts and a plan for the education of the~~
29 ~~pupils in the remaining sending and/or receiving districts~~]. This shall include the proposed
30 assignment of pupils and any necessary tuition arrangements or contracts.

31 (f) Modifications to the area agreement necessitated by the withdrawal plan.

32 (g) Any other matters which the committee, consistent with the law, may consider
33 appropriate to include in the withdrawal plan.

34 V. Each withdrawing sending district shall remain liable to the area, or to the receiving
35 district in the case of a dissolution of the area, for a rental charge, as determined by the area
36 agreement, for the length of any outstanding bond issue, and for the reduction of school building aid
37 based on the decrease of the annual grant for the payment of debt service for school construction.

1 Payments in discharge of such liability shall be made in accordance with a schedule which may
 2 provide for annual payments for the length of the existing bond issue or any other schedule agreed
 3 upon by the school boards of the area, or, in the event they fail to agree, as determined by the state
 4 board of education. Such payments shall be deemed to be trust funds and shall be applied by the
 5 area solely in payment of its indebtedness which was incurred to finance area school facilities and
 6 which was outstanding on the effective date of the withdrawal vote.

7 VI. A receiving district, 4 months prior to a vote on a bond issue for construction of new facilities
 8 or additions to an area school, shall notify a sending district of a pending vote on a bond issue. Upon
 9 receipt of such notice, a sending district may initiate a withdrawal study in accordance with paragraph
 10 III. If the sending district has initiated a withdrawal study prior to the vote in the receiving district, the
 11 sending district shall not be further obligated to any bonded indebtedness as a result of such bond issue
 12 vote if the voters in the sending district approve, by a majority vote, the withdrawal plan.

13 VII. The committee established pursuant to paragraph III shall submit a copy of all reports,
 14 including any minority reports, to the state board of education. If a report includes a plan for
 15 withdrawal, the state board of education shall review the proposed plan ~~[to determine whether or not~~
 16 ~~the proposed plan meets the requirements of paragraph IV. If, in the opinion of the state board, the~~
 17 ~~requirements have been properly addressed, the state board shall recommend for or against its~~
 18 ~~adoption based on its assessment of the plan's feasibility. If, in the opinion of the state board, the~~
 19 ~~requirements have not been properly addressed, the deficiencies shall be noted and the plan shall be~~
 20 ~~promptly returned for revision. When the plan is resubmitted, the state board shall promptly review~~
 21 ~~the revised plan, return the plan, and make a recommendation for or against its adoption based on~~
 22 ~~its assessment of the plan's feasibility.] and may, within 60 days of receipt of the plan, issue~~
 23 *written recommendations to the withdrawing district noting any deficiencies that may*
 24 *need to be addressed in the plan. The state board's recommendations shall be advisory*
 25 *only. After receiving the state board's recommendations, the committee may revise the plan*
 26 *or submit it to the voters in accordance with this section. In either case, the state board's*
 27 ~~[recommendation]~~ *recommendations* shall be reported to the legislative body of the area districts.
 28 ~~[The state board shall forward the plan for withdrawal to the school board of the withdrawing school~~
 29 ~~district.]~~ The school board *of the withdrawing school district* shall publish the withdrawal plan
 30 once in a newspaper generally circulated within the area districts. The school board shall file the
 31 plan for withdrawal with the clerk of the withdrawing district and shall insert the plan in the
 32 warrant for the next annual meeting. The article in the warrant for the district meeting and the
 33 question on the ballot to be used at the meeting shall be in substantially the following form:

34 "Shall the school district accept the provisions of RSA 195-A:14, as amended, providing for the
 35 withdrawal of the sending (or receiving) district of _____ from the _____ area in
 36 accordance with the provisions of the proposed withdrawal plan filed with the school district clerk?"

37 Yes ___ No ___

1 If a majority of the voters present and voting shall vote in the affirmative, the clerk of the school
2 district shall forthwith send to the state board of education a certified copy of the warrant, certificate
3 of posting, evidence of publication, and minutes of the meeting. [~~If the board finds that a majority of
4 the voters present and voting have voted in favor of the withdrawal plan, it shall be conclusive
5 evidence of the withdrawal of the district and the continuation of the area or the dissolution of a 2-
6 district area.]~~

7 VIII. The vote to withdraw from an area shall take effect on July 1 of the calendar year
8 which shall be at least 2 years after the date on which the withdrawal vote is adopted. The plan may
9 provide for an earlier date.

10 3 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

LBAO
11-0373
01/18/11

HB 369-FN - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT relative to withdrawal from a school administrative unit or an authorized regional enrollment area school.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Due to time constraints, the Office of Legislative Budget Assistant is unable to provide a fiscal note for this bill at this time. When completed, the fiscal note will be forwarded to the House Clerk's Office.

Committee Minutes

**SENATE CALENDAR NOTICE
EDUCATION**

Senator Nancy Stiles Chairman
 Senator James Forsythe V Chairman
 Senator Sharon Carson
 Senator Molly Kelly
 Senator Russell Prescott

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| For Use by Senate Clerk's Office ONLY | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Bill Status |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Docket |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Calendar |
| Proof: <input type="checkbox"/> | Calendar <input type="checkbox"/> Bill Status |

Date: March 28, 2011

HEARINGS

Tuesday

4/5/2011

EDUCATION

LOB 103

1:00 PM

(Name of Committee)

(Place)

(Time)

EXECUTIVE SESSION MAY FOLLOW

1:00 PM HB505-FN

making charter schools eligible for grants for leased space.

1:30 PM HB542-FN

(New Title) prohibiting a school district from requiring that a parent send his or her child to any school or program to which the parent may be conscientiously opposed.

2:00 PM HB369-FN-L

relative to withdrawal from a school administrative unit or an authorized regional enrollment area school.

Sponsors:

HB505-FN

Rep. Timothy Comerford

Rep. Donna Schlachman

Rep. Jason Antosz

Rep. Kenneth Weyler

HB542-FN

Rep. J.R. Hoell

HB369-FN-L

Rep. Thomas Howard

Rep. William Smith

Rep. Spec Bowers

Education Committee

Hearing Report

TO: Members of the Senate

FROM: Tom Prasol, Legislative Aide

RE: Hearing report on HB 369-FN-L – relative to withdrawal from a school administrative unit or an authorized regional enrollment area school.

HEARING DATE: 4/5/2011

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE PRESENT: Senator Stiles
Senator Forsythe
Senator Carson
Senator Prescott
Senator Kelly

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ABSENT: No one

Sponsor(s): Rep. Howard, Sull 2; Rep. W. Smith, Rock 18; Rep. Bowers, Sull 3

What the bill does: This bill makes various changes to the procedure for school district withdrawal from a school administrative unit or authorized regional enrollment area school.

Who supports the bill: Catherine Peschke
Rep. Spec Bowers, Sull. 3
Rep. Thomas Howard, Sull. 2
Jim Peschke

Who opposes the bill: Rep. E. Belvin, Hills. 6
Mark Joyce, NHSAA
Dean Michener, NHSBA
Kathy Murphy, NHDOE

Summary of testimony received:

Senator Stiles opened the hearing at 3:04pm and recognized Representative Howard as the prime sponsor.

Representative Thomas Howard

Rep. Howard provided a brief indication of how this legislation came to fruition. The town of Croydon was faced with a choice of where their students would go. SAU43's hands were tied in going through the process of RSA195 which allows withdrawals from SAUs. The beauracratc red tape was overwhelming. Rep. Howard stated that technically if the process is started when a child is in 1st grade, the process will be completed by the time they are a senior. This legislation streamlines the process and is a concerted effort to return local control to parents. This legislation is most important in smaller towns that do not receive a fair shake. The bill provides and expedited process.

Senator Carson referred to the first page of the bill as introduced. There is not a timeline listed to come up with a plan. Section 5c states 60 days, but in the process for a committee to establish a commission there is no timeline. Representative Howard stated that he believes it is incumbent on the committee.

Senator Kelly asked to be clear of the intent of the legislation. She thought she heard it stated that families want children at different schools, but also heard that voters went to the polls for withdrawal. Rep. Howard responded that the voters in the district want withdrawal.

Senator Stiles asked Representative Howard to point to the statute that provides the board of education with veto power. Rep. Howard did not know the statute offhand, but confirmed that it must be submitted to them and they must okay it. Senator Stiles then pointed to RSA194 C:2 that stated the board of education solely identifies that the requirements are met. Rep. Howard responded that there is a long process which this bill eliminates. When it first goes to the board, the initial proposal can stand and not take the recommendations of the board. Senator Stiles then noted that the statutes have been revised and the bill says "may" recommend services, rather than "shall." Rep. Howard responded that this changes it. Senator Stiles stated that the other statute must be changed first. Rep. Howard proclaimed his confusion.

Jim Peschke, Croydon School Board

Mr. Peschke is in support of the legislation and provided written testimony for the permanent record. He believes this bill restores local control of two critically important areas in public education: AREA agreements and school administration. As a Croydon School Board member, he has seen first hand the flaws of the current statute. He has been working to change the AREA agreement since 2006 and they have not made any progress.

Mr. Peschke also noted that his committee to revise AREA agreements conducted a mail survey on the issue who returned a margin of 2:1 in favor of parental choice in education. They since developed a solution for withdrawal from the AREA agreement, which was denied by the board of education. This legislation would restore the rightful authority of the community while preserving the board of education's value in reviewing proposals. He concluded by asking for a vote of OUGHT TO PASS and restoration of local education control.

Senator Carson asked if they plan to withdrawal from the AREA agreement upon passage of this legislation. Mr. Peschke confirmed that notion and stated that they expect to submit their plan to the state board. Senator Carson then asked what would be done upon withdrawal from the AREA agreement. Mr. Peschke announced that they had worked out a detailed plan by making contact with every public and private school in a certain radius. Each school said that students could attend their school. The plan is to send the students to Newport unless the parents say no. If the school costs less, the town saves money; and if it costs more the parents will pay the difference. Senator Carson asked if this was a discussion on parental choice in school which was confirmed by Mr. Peschke.

Mark Joyce, NHSAA

Mr. Joyce is opposed to this legislation for the fundamental reason is its addressing two problems and the overlap is creating a confusing purpose. The first part deals with SAU withdrawals. SAUs are administrative structures that help school districts meet the requirements set forth by the state in a cooperative way. They can form and dissolve by a unique set of rules. They are concerned that in this legislation the word "shall" is substituted with "may" in providing superintendent services. They support the requirement but it is services rather than superintendent. He would submit that it is in the state's best interest to keep this requirement because their laws make impositions on school districts that can only be relayed through the superintendent's office. He believes this position weakens the state's position.

The second part of the bill deals with AREAs which is essentially a long term lease. It is a binding agreement that is cooperatively entered by the voters in a district. In the past, AREAs have dissolved and the state is left with orphan school districts with no place to take the students. The state has said there needed to be a guaranteed assigned school. Long term contracts provide for Croydon to enter with another school district if they choose to leave. Mr. Joyce also mentioned that there are several legal vehicles that satisfy the need for a place of attendance. He essentially believes this bill is confusing because it marries two separate things.

Senator Carson noted that she understands his position regarding orphan schools due to the situation in which Windham, NH was forced to build a high school because no one would take their students. She then asked what the solution would be to such a problem. Mr. Joyce agreed with her sentiment and suggested a solution. A school can withdraw from an AREA without withdrawing from an SAU, but when they do so they should have a long term plan in place.

Senator Stiles then asked in they wanted to leave the AREA and make another arrangement with Newport, could they still send students to other schools if they choose. Mr. Joyce replied that they could and used Barrington as an example because the student's home base is Dover; however they could still attend Coe-Brown or Oyster River if they chose. Senator Stiles followed up by inquiring if this can be done without the legislation proposed. Mr. Joyce responded that it is available under current legislation.

Dean Michener, NHSBA

Mr. Michener is opposed to this legislation. The School Board Association has worked extensively with the SAU oversight committee and the NHDOE to clarify the SAU issue. Historically the state assigned districts and provided financial support to SAUs. Superintendents have been hired by the NHDOE and when the financial support dwindled the school boards relinquished DOE support and took upon sole control of said SAUs.

Mr. Michener believes there is a tough issue in how to address the big district/little district dilemma. He stated that the law was designed to allow for independence. The withdrawal plan required that the other issues for surrounding areas have worked. He pointed to lines 11-14 on page 1 to identify that any withdrawal plan must address the impact on all the districts involved in this. He also noted on lines 19 and 20 the plan must show how they will provide for the superintendent services, not that a superintendent must exist. He concluded pointing to line 16 and 17 on page 2 where it was specifically noted that the state board has an independent review of the plan and offer a critique. He believes this bill is unnecessary and closed his remarks.

No questions were asked.

Kathleen Murphy, NHDOE

Ms. Murphy clarified that when the bill was heard they were in support, but have since retracted that support due to a confusion between the SAU version and the AREA support. She stated that the role of the state board of education is approval and making sure the plan includes all of the requirements of the education department.

Senator Stiles asked if the reason this legislation is not required is because it can be accomplished under present law. Ms. Murphy responded affirmatively. Senator Stiles then requested the NHDOE work directly to provide support for the town of Croydon. Ms. Murphy provided assurances that the Secretary of Education would hear the concerns regarding Croydon.

Senator Stiles then called Jim Peschke back to testify.

Senator Kelly requested Mr. Peschke further clarify the legislation. She understood the first part is in regards to SAUs. She believes the part of the plan as it comes forward is confusing. She inquired if she was correct in hearing that the town of Newport was willing to accommodate the students, but parents wanted individual control over where to send their kids. Mr. Peschke acknowledged that there isn't a single district to pick that would satisfy more than a small minority.

Senator Stiles inquired if this was essentially a school voucher issue. Mr. Peschke acknowledged that a voucher system isn't a perfect analogy because there are certain limitations.

Senator Carson asked how many students this would affect. Mr. Peschke noted approximately 70 students would need placement.

Senator Stiles then asked if the town of Croydon would be willing to work with the DOE directly to get results. Mr. Peschke sees the value in this legislation, and if the opponents suggest it is ineffectual there should not be concern if it passes. Senator Stiles then read RSA 194:C:2 that the state board does not have veto power. Mr. Peschke concluded the hearing by reiterating that they have encountered red tape and do not want to be in a position where the state board is the judge, jury, and commissioner.

Funding: See fiscal note.

Action: Senator Prescott made a motion of INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE which was seconded by Senator Stiles. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0 and Senator Stiles will take the bill to the Senate floor.

TRP

[file: HB369-FN-1, report]
Date: 4/8/2011

Speakers

Testimony

Members of this committee,

(1)

I have come before you to offer support for HB369. This bill restores local control of two critically important areas in public education: AREA agreements and school administration. As a Croydon school board member, I have first hand experience with the fatal flaws in existing statute. HB369 remedies these faults in a balanced manner, providing flexibility to local districts while maintaining assurances of responsible educational policy.

Our struggle to address Croydon's AREA agreement showcases the need for HB369. Shortly after moving to Croydon in 2006, I joined a citizen committee charged with modifying or scrapping the AREA agreement. Yet here we are, four years hence, facing an almost total restart of the process. Under the most optimistic application of existing laws, the earliest Croydon could make modifications is late 2014. A child entering first grade when we started will be a high-school freshman. This is simply unacceptable.

Early on, our committee conducted a mail survey to assess public sentiment. By a margin of over 2:1, residents wanted parental choice in education. Driven by this mandate, we produced a practical, legal, and wholly suitable solution for withdrawal from the AREA agreement. The state BOE, through its veto power, denied our citizens the right to adopt or modify this proposal. The principles of parental responsibility, local control, and the sovereignty of our town demand rectification of this injustice.

HB369 places the state BOE in an advisory role. It restores the rightful authority of the community while preserving the BOE's value in reviewing proposals. Our initial submission contained a total of eight concerns sent back to the Croydon committee to be addressed. Some points were obviously problematic; we corrected those. Others were contentious based on one's interpretation of the law. In at least one case, the BOE could produce no point of law to support their opposition.

As things stand today, we have no recourse or appeal of the BOE's interpretation of the law. Due process would ordinarily afford us a chance to defend ourselves in court. Not so here, the non-judicial BOE gets the last word. A good example is the circular logic behind a primary complaint of our proposal, that without an AREA agreement, we could never guarantee a place for every student. Our study showed ample capacity and interest among regional schools to accept Croydon students, yet this standard could never meet a 100% perfect guarantee. In effect, we were told that the only guarantee suitable for this proposal to leave an AREA agreement was a proposal that *contained* an AREA agreement. Clearly this was not the intent of laws designed to permit districts to leave AREA agreements.

Our small town has already suffered without the protections afforded by HB369 and will suffer again should we wish to leave SAU 43. Please vote OTP on HB369 and restore our rich tradition of local education control within our communities.

Jim Peschke
Croydon School Board Member

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SENATE
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Date: April 5, 2011

THE COMMITTEE ON Education

to which was referred House Bill 369-FN-L

AN ACT relative to withdrawal from a school administrative unit
or an authorized regional enrollment area school.

Having considered the same, the committee recommends that the Bill:

IS INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE

BY A VOTE OF: 5-0

AMENDMENT # 0s

Senator Nancy Stiles
For the Committee

Tom Prasol 271-3093

New Hampshire General Court - Bill Status System

Docket of HB369

Docket Abbreviations

Bill Title: relative to withdrawal from a school administrative unit or an authorized regional enrollment area school.

Official Docket of HB369:

| Date | Body | Description |
|-------------|-------------|---|
| 1/21/2011 | H | Introduced 1/6/2011 and referred to Education; HJ 11 , PG. 184 |
| 2/9/2011 | H | Public Hearing: 2/22/2011 11:00 AM LOB 207 |
| 2/18/2011 | H | Executive Session: 3/3/2011 10:00 AM LOB 207 |
| 3/8/2011 | H | Committee Report: Ought to Pass for Mar 15 (Vote 11-4; RC); HC 22 , PG.549 |
| 3/15/2011 | H | Ought to Pass: MA VV; HJ 26 , PG.781 |
| 3/23/2011 | S | Introduced and Referred to Education; SJ 11 , Pg.192 |
| 3/29/2011 | S | Hearing: 4/5/11, Room 103, LOB, 2:00 p.m.; SC18 |
| 4/6/2011 | S | Committee Report: Inexpedient to Legislate, 4/13/11; SC19 |
| 4/13/2011 | S | Inexpedient to Legislate Not Voted On; SJ 12 , Pg.246 |
| 4/13/2011 | S | Sen. Stiles Moved Laid on Table, MA, VV; SJ 12 , Pg.246 |

NH House

NH Senate

Other Referrals

COMMITTEE REPORT FILE INVENTORY

H 3309-FH-2 ORIGINAL REFERRAL RE-REFERRAL

1. THIS INVENTORY IS TO BE SIGNED AND DATED BY THE COMMITTEE AIDE AND PLACED INSIDE THE FOLDER AS THE FIRST ITEM IN THE COMMITTEE FILE.
2. PLACE ALL DOCUMENTS IN THE FOLDER FOLLOWING THE INVENTORY IN THE ORDER LISTED.
3. THE DOCUMENTS WHICH HAVE AN "X" BESIDE THEM ARE CONFIRMED AS BEING IN THE FOLDER.
4. THE COMPLETED FILE IS THEN DELIVERED TO THE CALENDAR CLERK.

DOCKET (Submit only the latest docket found in Bill Status)

COMMITTEE REPORT

CALENDAR NOTICE

HEARING REPORT

HANDOUTS FROM THE PUBLIC HEARING

(1) PREPARED TESTIMONY AND OTHER SUBMISSIONS

(1) SIGN-UP SHEET(S)

ALL AMENDMENTS (passed or not) CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE:

___ - AMENDMENT # ___ ___ - AMENDMENT # ___
___ - AMENDMENT # ___ ___ - AMENDMENT # ___

ALL AVAILABLE VERSIONS OF THE BILL:

AS INTRODUCED ___ AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE
___ FINAL VERSION ___ AS AMENDED BY THE SENATE

OTHER (Anything else deemed important but not listed above, such as amended fiscal notes): _____

IF YOU HAVE A RE-REFERRED BILL, YOU ARE GOING TO MAKE UP A DUPLICATE FILE FOLDER

DATE DELIVERED TO SENATE CLERK 7/22/2011


BY COMMITTEE AIDE