



House Education Notes on Act 173 Implementation

Jan 12, 2022

Jay Nichols

I offer just some basic comments re. Act 173 not as a member of the 173 Advisory Group but in support of school leaders.

1. I am concerned that many schools and school systems do not have the necessary amount and quality of professional learning in place to implement the changes in practice that the law will require. A specific step would be to *Fund a [coordinated professional learning plan and targeted coaching support](#) for Act 173 implementation* across the state.
2. I am also concerned about the impact of the Pupil Weighting study and any subsequent changes in the funding system that may arise out of that.
3. We need to be very careful not to implement Pupil Weighting and the Census Based Funding Model in a manner in which certain school districts take huge financial hits that ultimately impact our most vulnerable students. I'm hoping the legislature can make sure no school districts take huge financial hits with the implementation of either law through using other funding sources to mitigate the impact of any changes.
4. Our Executive Council does not have a formal position on whether to delay implementation of Act 173 again but that issue is on our agenda for our meeting on [Jan 21, 2022](#) . We could give you a recommendation after that should you desire one. At this time though, most principals seem to be in favor of delay, at least in part, because of the overwhelming burden on school staff and school leaders. Just the thought of what seems like major change could push some people past the breaking point.
5. The Secretary is correct that a lot of work has been done on the 2200 rules series and the subcommittee of the Advisory Group along with a subcommittee of the State Board is very close to resolution on issues concerning independent schools and inclusion for all students.