

Representative Manweller,

I am very concerned about HB1305. I will be traveling to Washington D.C. to attend the Rural Education Policy Summit so I will not be able to testify on this coming Monday. I understand and appreciate that parents do not like half-days. But here are some reasons we have partial days:

- ✓ The state no longer provides funding for Learning Improvement Days. Therefore, professional development is funded with local dollars. With all of the mandates and reforms, quality professional development should be funded by the state. Districts that don't have the funding will use partial days. We still have to meet the minimum instructional hours. This should be a local control issue.
- ✓ Our regular instructional day in Davenport provides 383 minutes (6.38 hours) daily. This allows us to "bank" some time. If HB 1805 becomes law, I worry that districts will scale back to exactly 6 hours per day. I don't think that is good policy to discourage districts from having longer days.

While researching RCW 28A.150.220, I found the following language in the "Notes" section of the law

Notes:

**Finding -- Intent -- 2014 c 217:** "The legislature recognizes that preparing students to be successful in postsecondary education, gainful employment, and citizenship requires increased rigor and achievement, including attaining a meaningful high school diploma with the opportunity to earn twenty-four credits. The legislature finds that an investment was made in the 2013-2015 omnibus appropriations act to implement an increase in instructional hours in the 2014-15 school year. School districts informed the legislature that the funding as provided in the 2013-2015 omnibus appropriations act would result in only a few minutes being added onto each class period and would not result in a meaningful increase in instruction that would have the positive impact on student learning that the legislature expects. The school districts suggested that it would be a better educational policy to use the funds to implement the requirement of twenty-four credits for high school graduation, which will result in a meaningful increase of instructional hours. Based on input from school districts across the state, the legislature recognizes the need to provide flexibility for school districts to implement the increase in instructional hours while still moving towards an increase in the high school graduation requirements. **Therefore, the legislature intends to shift the focus and intent of the investments from compliance with the minimum instructional hours offering to assisting school districts to provide an opportunity for students to earn twenty-four credits for high school graduation and obtain a meaningful diploma, beginning with the graduating class of 2019, with the opportunity for school districts to request a waiver for up to two years.**" [2014 c 217 § 1.]

Matt,

The language I highlighted in yellow and in this section seems to contradict HB 1805. I am interested in your thoughts and I do appreciate the hard work you are putting in each and every day of session (and beyond). We can't get our students to where they need to go if we don't have on-going training for staff. My community holds me accountable and this is a local control issue that school boards need to be responsible for. We receive no state funding for professional development, yet we are being asked to re-tool our system. I look forward to hearing from you.

REC Members,

Please contact me if you have any questions about this bill or need any further information. Thank you!

Jim K.



**Jim Kowalkowski, Director**  
*Rural Education Center*