

	<b>As Introduced (H. Education)</b>	<b>Ways &amp; Means</b>	<b>Ed Suggestions to Approps (1.1)</b>
<b>Section stating: Realignment SHALL occur</b>	yes (Sec. 2)	no explicit statement	yes (Sec. 1; § 4052)
<b>Legal &amp; Fiscal Research Team</b>	yes (Sec. 4)	no	no
<b>Size, etc.</b>	estimated 45-55 new districts  1,250 adm or 4 districts BUT waivers  <i>responsible</i> for preK-12 education	at least 45 / no more than 55  “endeavor to have” 1,000–4,000 adm  <i>responsible</i> for preK-12 education	estimated 45-55  <b>[decided?]</b> – & adds flexibility  <i>responsible</i> for preK-12 education
<b>Voluntary Realignment</b>  process:  REDs  assurances	explicitly addressed (Sec. 5)  creates process modifying existing statutory & RED processes  go through process with others  Plan shall not realign voluntary realignment	referred to in Statewide Plan (Sec. 1; § 4054)  existing statutory & RED processes    “To the extent feasible, the ... Plan shall endeavor not to realign” a RED	explicitly addressed (Sec. 1; § 4055)  existing statutory & RED processes (same as W&M but provides detail from As Introduced (articles, etc.))    Plan shall not realign a RED – except Plan is permitted to realign if there is a stranded district
<b>Design Team</b>	9 members appointed by Speaker, COC, & Gov	same + 2 school board & SBE Chair  can delegate to one or more members	same as HWM  delegate but quorum at hearings

	<b>As Introduced (H. Education)</b>	<b>Ways &amp; Means</b>	<b>Ed Suggestions to Approps (1.1)</b>
<b>Statewide Plan</b>	<p>public engagement / monitors voluntary</p> <p>DT submits to SBE for rulemaking which must</p> <p>rulemaking complete and Plan approved by LCAR – Plan takes effect no later than 7/2018</p>	<p>at least 10 public hearings / direct engagement with locals</p> <p>prelim plan submitted to SBE and Gen Assembly for review 4/2016</p> <p>at least 10 more hearings / more engagement</p> <p>final plan submitted to GA 1/2017</p> <p>Plan takes effect 7/2017 unless GA disapproves of Plan</p>	<p>same as HWM</p> <p>same as HWM, but submits 4/2017</p> <p>same as HWM</p> <p>same as HWM, but submits 1/2018</p>
<b>Incentives</b>	<p>\$20,000 transition if voluntary (from Act 156)</p> <p>\$50,000 for ALL districts upon implementation (new)</p> <p><i>NO</i> RED or other Act 156 incentives preserved</p>	<p><i>ALL</i> RED and other Act 156 incentives preserved</p>	<p><i>ALL</i> RED and other Act 156 incentives preserved</p> <p>RED deadline for incentives changed from Act 153/156's requirement for <i>operation</i> by 7/1/17 to <i>affirmative vote</i> by 7/1/2017</p>

	<b>As Introduced (H. Education)</b>	<b>Ways &amp; Means</b>	<b>Ed Suggestions to Approps (1.1)</b>
<b>“Choice” &amp; Operating Dists</b>	embedded in Statewide Plan section	embedded in Statewide Plan section	puts all in its own section (Sec. 1; § 4057)
“choice” districts	current “choice” districts are never required to change tuitioning practices – full protection for “choice” districts	language different but effect is same	same language as in As Introduced
operating districts	no language – so if State Plan realigns an operating district with a “choice” district, then <u>all</u> students in district would have “choice”	no language – so same effect As Introduced	creates same protection for districts that decide to operate a school as for “choice” districts  ADDS: statement that nothing in the bill shall be construed as limiting or changing “choice” or decision to operate  ADDS: State Plan can be flexible in order to protect both types of districts AND ALSO to address areas of the State where size will be an issue