



House Office Building, 9 South
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Phone: 517/373-6466

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

House Bill 5802 (Substitute H-3) First Analysis (5-25-00)

Sponsor: Rep. Terry Geiger
Committee: Education

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

In his State of the State address at the outset of the year 2000, the governor delivered a challenge to improve the educational experience of the children and adults who work in schools. Among his proposals were a promise to ensure that children in their early elementary years gained the literacy and numeracy skills necessary to school success, including the opportunity to attend a high quality summer school in reading and math (see *BACKGROUND INFORMATION*, below); a policy to make explicit the rights and responsibilities of school building principals in order to clearly identify them as instructional leaders; a distance learning program to enhance curricular options for high school students throughout the state when they enrolled in a virtual high school; and, ongoing efforts to ensure safe and effective school learning environments.

Since the State of the State address described these educational goals, other challenges have become apparent. For example, schools in Michigan--indeed, schools nationwide--have too few substitute teachers. The lack of qualified substitutes threatens school safety and academic standards, and it also limits the amount of professional development release time that can be made available to full-time faculty as they work to enhance their knowledge in the subject matter learning disciplines they teach.

To address these challenges, legislation has been proposed to revise several sections of the school code, and also to add provisions for school improvement.

THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:

House Bill 5802 would amend the Revised School Code to require elementary school testing in grades 1 to 5; to specify the work responsibilities and contractual rights of school principals; to describe the goals, courses, and enrollment options for the virtual high school which would be operated by the Michigan virtual university at the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year; to modify the school expulsion and suspension rules; and, to allow school districts to

contract with third parties to provide substitute teachers.

Elementary school testing. House Bill 5802 would require that the board of a school district, or the board of directors of a public school academy that operates any of grades 1 to 5, administer annually to all pupils in those grades a nationally-recognized norm-referenced test or another assessment, which may include a locally-adopted assessment, approved by the superintendent of public instruction at the request of the school district or public school academy. Further, under the bill, a school district or public school academy could use the Michigan Literacy Progress Profile to assess literacy in grades 1 to 3 as part of its compliance with this requirement.

House Bill 5802 also specifies that if a school is designated for participation in the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) program, the school would be required to participate as designated. An elementary school that did not comply with these requirements would not be accredited.

The bill would require that in order to comply with Section 1282(2) of the code (which concerns special assistance to students with reading disorders or difficulty on standardized tests) a school district would have to offer a pupil in grade 3 who failed by the end of that school year to meet standards for basic literacy skills or for basic mathematics skills, the opportunity to attend summer school before grade 4, in order to study language arts or mathematics, as applicable. For the purposes of this provision, a pupil's literacy skills and mathematics skills would be measured by either the Michigan literacy progress profile or another assessment adopted by the school district for this purpose, and approved by the superintendent of public instruction.

Principal's responsibilities and rights. Currently the board of a school district or intermediate school district may employ assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, guidance directors, and other

House Bill 5802 (5-25-00)

administrators who do not assume tenure. Under the law, that employment is by written contract for a term of employment not to exceed three years. If written notice of nonrenewal of the contract is not given at least 60 days before the termination date of the contract, it is renewed for an additional one-year period.

House Bill 5802 would retain those provisions but also would require that, except as otherwise provided in the bill, the term of the employment contract for a school principal be at least two years, that it not exceed three years, and that it could be renewed annually. However, under the bill the term of the employment contract for a principal who was being hired by a school district or intermediate district for the first time could be less than two years, but would be at least one year. Further, the board would be required to prescribe the duties of a school principal, subject to a new provision of the law proposed by the bill. In addition and under the bill, if written notice of nonrenewal of a school principal's contract were not given at least 90 days before the contract's termination date, the contract would be renewed for an additional one-year period.

Under a new provision of the law proposed by the bill, the board of a school district, local act school district, or intermediate school district, or the board of directors of a public school academy, would be required to ensure that each school principal it employs had at least all of the following powers and duties:

- a) the right to participate, either in person or through a designee, in the interview process for hiring staff employed at or assigned to the school. If the principal or his or her designee had participated in the interview process with respect to a particular staff member, the principal would have the right to refuse to have that person assigned to that school. However, this provision would not apply to staff assigned on a regular basis to more than one school. Further, the rights under this provision would be subject to collective bargaining agreements and state law;
- b) the right to establish incentives approved by the school board to reward staff at the school for improved pupil achievement;
- c) the right to control the expenditure of discretionary funds within the school building's budget;
- d) the rights provided in Section 1277 with respect to a school improvement plan developed for the school;

e) the right to be compensated according to his or her job performance, and to earn incentives for high pupil achievement.

House Bill 5802 also specifies that until the expiration of a collective bargaining agreement in effect, the applicability of this provision would be subject to that collective bargaining agreement.

Currently, a school district, public school academy, or intermediate school district cannot employ a person as a superintendent, principal, assistant principal, or other person whose primary responsibility is administering instructional programs, or as a chief business officer, unless that person has completed the continuing education requirements prescribed by the state board in rules. Under the law, those rules must prescribe a minimum amount of continuing education to be completed within a five-year period. House Bill 5802 would retain those provisions, but specify that the rules would be prescribed by the superintendent of public instruction.

Further, the bill specifies that in addition to these requirements, a person initially employed as a school principal after the effective date of the bill would be required to complete at least 15 hours of continuing education, including training in leadership, during his or her first three years of employment as a school principal. Under the bill, the superintendent of public instruction would promulgate rules prescribing the types of continuing education required.

Currently the law requires that if the board of a school district wants all of the schools of the school district to be accredited, the board must adopt and implement, not later than September 1 of each year, a three- to five-year school improvement plan, and a continuing school improvement process for each school within the school district. House Bill 5802 would retain this requirement and the criteria concerning the components of the plan. However, the bill would require that before a school improvement plan for a school was finalized and submitted to the school board, a particular process be followed.

Specifically, all of the following would apply to submission of a school improvement plan for a school to the board of the school district:

- if the principal of the school attended at least 50 percent of the meetings of the participants for the development or update of the plan, the plan would be approved by the principal and by a majority vote of the other participants before it was submitted to the board.

If the principal did not approve the school improvement plan, the participants would be required to revise the plan, and the revised plan would be approved by the principal and by a majority vote of the other participants before it was submitted to the board.

- if the principal of the school had not attended at least 50 percent of the meetings of the participants for the development or update of the school improvement plan, the plan would be approved by a majority vote of the participants before it was submitted to the board.

Further, under the law each intermediate school board must adopt a three- to five-year school improvement plan that includes, among other things, a) methods to assist school districts in improving pupils' academic learning; b) assurance that all pupils have reasonable access to all programs offered by the intermediate school district, including, but not limited to, transportation if necessary; c) a plan for professional development that supports academic learning; and, d) methods to assist school districts in integrating applied academics and career and employability skills into all curricular areas. These and other components of the ISD school improvement plan would be retained under the bill, but the bill would require that these services also be made available to public school academies.

Michigan virtual high school. The bill specifies that not later than the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year, the Michigan virtual university would develop, implement, and operate the Michigan virtual high school. The virtual high school would have the following goals: a) to significantly expand curricular offerings for high schools across the state through agreements with school districts or licenses from other recognized providers; b) to create a statewide instructional model using interactive multimedia tools delivered by electronic means, including but not limited to the Internet, digital broadcast, or satellite network for distributed learning at the high school level; c) to provide pupils with opportunities to develop skills and competencies through on-line learning; d) to offer high school teachers opportunities to learn new skills and strategies for developing and delivering instructional services; e) to accelerate Michigan's ability to respond to current and emerging educational demands; f) to grant high school diplomas through a dual enrollment method with school districts or postsecondary institutions; and, g) to act as a broker for college level equivalent courses, as defined in Section 1471, and dual enrollment courses from postsecondary education institutions. (Section 1471 of the code defines the term "college level equivalent course" to mean a course offered in high school, for which a pupil receives high

school credit, that is taught at a postsecondary instruction level and is designed to prepare a pupil for a college level equivalent credit examination in a particular subject area.)

Under the bill, the Michigan virtual high school course offerings would include but not be limited to all of the following:

- information technology courses;
- college level equivalent courses, as defined in Section 1471;
- courses and dual enrollment opportunities designed for college-bound juniors and seniors;
- at-risk programs and services;
- general education development test preparation courses for adjudicated youth;
- special interest courses; and
- professional development programs and services for teachers.

House Bill 5802 would require the Michigan virtual university to fund the Michigan virtual high school from appropriations made for this purpose, and also to use funds received from other sources. The bill also would require the Department of Education to provide technical assistance, as requested by the Michigan virtual university.

Currently under the law, the board of a school district or public school academy, or the governing board of a nonpublic school must consider providing college level equivalent courses either directly, through an ISD program, or by agreement in a consortium or cooperative program. House Bill 5802 would retain this provision. Further and under the bill, if a public school pupil completed a college level equivalent course that was offered by electronic means, including but not limited to the Internet, digital broadcasting, or satellite network, and is offered by a school district, a regionally accredited college or university, or the Michigan virtual high school, and if the student had been sponsored in this process by a certificated teacher employed by the pupil's school district or public school academy, the school district or public school academy in which the pupil was enrolled would be required to grant appropriate high school credit for completion of the course, and count that credit toward the school's or

public school academy's graduation and subject area requirements.

House Bill 5802 also specifies that in addition to its other duties under the bill, the Michigan virtual university would work with the department and other appropriate state agencies to explore the development and delivery of a full curriculum for migrant pupils that would be available through distance learning. Under the bill, the Michigan virtual university and the department would submit a joint report on their findings under this provision to the legislature not later than one year after the effective date of the bill.

Provisional teaching certificate. House Bill 5802 also specifies that notwithstanding any other provision of the code or a rule to the contrary, if a person earned a provisional teaching certificate, and that certificate lapsed before the person completed the requirements for a professional education certificate, and if a school district or public school academy applied to the department on that person's behalf for another provisional teaching certificate within 10 years after the person's initial provisional teaching certificate had lapsed, the department would be required to issue a new provisional teaching certificate to the person. Under the bill, this new provisional teaching certificate would be valid for two years. The bill also would specify that the person making application would have this two-year period to complete the requirements for a professional education certificate, and the department would have to credit toward the requirements for the professional certificate any continuing education or other requirements completed while the person's initial teaching certificate was valid. The bill specifies that this would apply regardless of whether the person's provisional teaching certificate lapsed before or after the effective date of the bill. Further, it specifies that the provision would not apply to a person convicted of certain crimes that, under the code, may result in suspension of a teaching certificate.

Substitute teacher contracts. The bill also would allow school districts to contract for substitute teachers, and to exempt those substitute teachers from certain requirements under the law.

Currently, a school district hires and contracts with qualified teachers by entering into written contracts. A copy of the contract is filed with the board secretary and a duplicate copy is furnished to the teacher. A contract with a teacher is not valid unless the person holds a legal certificate of qualification, and retains that certificate throughout the contractual period. Further, the law specifies that the board of a school district may

enter into a continuing contract with a certificated teacher, after a teacher has been employed at least two consecutive years by the board. Under House Bill 5802, these provisions of the law would not apply to substitute teachers.

Also under current law, if a teacher is employed as a substitute with an assignment to one specific teaching position, then after 60 days of service in that assignment, the teacher must be granted leave time and other privileges granted to regular teachers by the school district, including a salary not less than the minimum salary on the current salary schedule for that district. Further, if a teacher is employed as a substitute teacher for 150 days or more during a school year, or is employed as a substitute teacher for 180 days or more by an intermediate school district (ISD), the teacher must be given, during the balance of the school year or during the next succeeding school year, only the first opportunity to accept or reject a contract for which the substitute teacher is certified, after all other teachers of the school district are re-employed in conformance with the terms of a master contract of an authorized bargaining unit and the employer. Under the bill, these provisions would not apply to a substitute teacher who was contracted or employed by a person or entity that contracts with a school district or intermediate school district under Section 1236a, a new section proposed by the bill.

Instead, the new Section 1236a would allow the board of a school district or ISD to enter into a contract with a person or entity to furnish substitute teachers to the district. That contract would be required to include the following: a) assurance that the person or entity would furnish the school district or ISD with certificated teachers in accordance with the act and rules promulgated under it; b) assurance that the person or entity would not furnish any teacher who, if employed directly by the school district or ISD, would be ineligible for employment by the school district or ISD as a substitute teacher; c) a description of the level of compensation and fringe benefits to be provided to employees of the person or entity who are assigned to the school district or ISD as substitute teachers; and, d) a description of the type and amounts of insurance coverage to be secured and maintained by the person or entity and the school district or ISD under the contract. [Under the bill, "entity" is defined to mean a partnership, nonprofit or business corporation, labor organization, limited liability company, or any other association, corporation, trust, or other legal entity.]

The bill also specifies that a school district or ISD that contracts with a person or entity to furnish substitute

teachers could purchase liability insurance to indemnify and protect the school district or ISD and the person or entity against losses or liabilities that arose out of any claim for personal injury or property damage caused by the district or ISD, its officers, employees, or agents. Under the bill, a school district or ISD could pay the insurance premiums out of its operating funds. However, the existence of any insurance policy would not be a waiver of any defense otherwise available to the school district or ISD in the defense of a claim.

Further, the bill specifies that an individual employed by a contracting entity under these provisions would be considered a member of the Michigan Public School Employee's Retirement System, and any time serving as a substitute teacher under the bill's provisions would count as credit toward meeting the person's teacher certification requirements.

The bill also would eliminate an outdated requirement that a contract in a primary school district require the teacher to keep a correct list of the pupils, grading, and age of each pupil attending the school, the number of days each pupil is present, and the aggregate attendance, and to file this information with the intermediate superintendent and with the secretary of the board at the end of the school year. This provision also specifies that a teacher cannot receive his or her last payment for services until that report is filed.

School suspension and expulsion, and school crime reports to parents. The bill would authorize the designee of a school board to expel a student from the school district, and also to give to those who have the authority to expel students the option of suspending them.

Under current law, if a student in grade 6 or above commits a physical assault at school against another student and it is reported, then the school board must expel the student from the school district for up to 180 school days. House Bill 5802 specifies that in this circumstance, the school board or the designee of the school board would have to either suspend or expel the pupil from the school district for up to 180 school days.

Currently the law requires school districts to make a school crime report to the state superintendent of public instruction, in order to obtain an accurate local and statewide picture of school crime and to develop the partnerships necessary to plan and implement school safety programs. The law also requires that at least once each semester, each school board provide a copy of the most recent report to the parent or legal guardian of each pupil enrolled in the district. House Bill 5802

would retain the parental notification requirement but require that the report be made at least annually, rather than each semester.

Further, the bill would give more discretion to a school board or its designee when it sets a period of time for a student's expulsion for a verbal assault. Under current law, if a student in grade 6 or above commits a verbal assault and it is reported to a school official, or if a student in grade 6 or above makes a bomb threat or similar threat directed at school property or a school event, then the school board or its designee must expel that student from the school district for up to 180 school days. House Bill 5802 specifies that in these circumstances, the school board or its designee would have to suspend or expel the pupil from the school district for a period of time as determined in the discretion of the school board.

MCL 380.5 et al.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Effectiveness of summer school learning interventions. In the January/February 1999 issue of the *Harvard Education Letter* entitled "Retention vs. Social Promotion: Schools Search for Alternatives," the research about the effectiveness of intervention programs to help struggling students is summarized. The report notes that "a growing number of schools are implementing alternative intervention programs intended to beef up academic skills, and in the process, reduce the retention rate. Programs such as mandatory summer school, one-on-one tutoring, after-school programs, and comprehensive school-wide reform are popping-up all over the country."

During the last few decades, scores of studies have been conducted to determine the effectiveness of grade retention. Indeed, a 1989 analysis of 63 empirical studies found that 54 resulted in overall negative effects. Retention harmed students' achievement, attendance record, personal adjustment in school, and attitude toward school. In a controlled 1992 study, a researcher found students who repeated a year were 20 to 30 percent more likely to drop out of school. Another study, conducted in 1985 in urban California districts found that students who were retained twice had a probability of dropping out of nearly 100 percent. Yet, retention is common. A 1996 study found that 16.8 percent of seniors had repeated at least one grade since kindergarten. In addition, a recent study from the National Academy of Sciences suggests the rate of retention may be higher than that. The researchers looked at 6- to 8-year old students in the 1980s and

early 1990s and found that by the time the students were ages 9-11, 25 to 30 percent were no longer in the appropriate grade for their age group (perhaps due in part to delayed entry into kindergarten).

The article notes that “the (retention) studies that report positive results share several characteristics: retained students in these studies were identified early and given special help. An individualized and detailed educational plan was prepared for remediation purposes, and the children were placed in special classes with low student-teacher ratios. However, when compared to a promoted control group that also received extra help, the retained students still lagged behind.”

These kinds of research findings about retention programs have prompted educators to look for alternatives to retention. A growing number of schools are using one-on-one tutoring programs, the best known of which is the literacy program, Reading Recovery, a preventive program that works with students who perform in the bottom 20 percent of their class. According to two studies conducted by researchers in the late 1980s, Reading Recovery students substantially outperformed control students on almost all measures of reading. Researchers found the program reduced the number of retentions by nine percent.

After-school programs have also gained popularity as a way to avoid retaining students, although there’s little research on their effectiveness. One exception is the Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI) based in Salt Lake City. This program employs teachers as tutors after school who use a variety of instructional methods in an attempt to reach all learners. In a study of students in grades 2 through 7 in Tennessee, researchers found the ECRI students significantly outperformed those in the control group on the Stanford Achievement Test in reading comprehension and vocabulary. And in North Carolina, administrators were able to track a 20 percent drop in retention over a two-year period of using the ECRI program.

According to the report, “Of all the interventions being touted as alternatives to retention, mandatory summer school is the least studied.” Some research has begun, however. For example, the Chicago school district supplies summer school teachers with lesson plans and a schedule to follow, which focuses solely on reading and math skills. The district’s approach has quickly been adopted by other urban districts, including Washington, D.C., Milwaukee, Denver, Long Beach,

CA, and the 89,000-student Gwinnett County, GA district. In 1997, the second year of Chicago’s new policy, 41,000 students were assigned to summer school. Approximately 16,000 passed the Iowa Test and were promoted; 17,700 did not pass and were retained; and about 7,000 did not finish and were automatically retained. However, a review of the program found that 70 percent of the students achieved some gains over the summer.

More information about the effectiveness of summer school and other intervention programs can be found on two websites. Current and past issues of the *Harvard Education Letter* are available at <http://www.edletter.org/past/issues/>. Another source that offers an excellent summary of recent research about the need for multi-faceted intervention programs that saturate the school culture with opportunities for second chances to ensure success is found at <http://www.csteep.bc.edu/ctestweb/retention/retention2.html>.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

Fiscal information is not available for all provisions of the bill. However, the House Fiscal Agency notes that the fiscal year 2000-2001 school aid bill, Senate Bill 1044 (H-1), contains \$38 million for early elementary summer school programs in reading and math, and \$15 million for the Michigan virtual high school, for a total of \$53 million in the coming fiscal year. Additional funding also is proposed for the future.

Specifically, Section 34 of Senate Bill 1044 (H-1) provides that from the state school aid fund there would be allocated an amount not to exceed \$38 million each fiscal year for 2000-2001 and for 2001-2002, and an amount not to exceed \$50 million for 2002-2003, for payments to districts to provide summer school instruction in reading and mathematics for pupils in grade 1, 2, 3, or 4. Senate Bill 1044 (H-1) also describes the summer school program in considerable detail in the provisions of Section 34.

Further, Section 98 of Senate Bill 1044 (H-1) specifies that from there would be allocated an amount not to exceed \$15 million for 2000-2001, and an amount not to exceed \$1.5 million each fiscal year for 2001-2002 and for 2002-2003 to the department, to provide a grant to the Michigan virtual university for the development, implementation, and operation of the Michigan virtual high school. Section 98 describes the goals of the program in considerable detail, in a manner that corresponded to the goals described in an earlier version of House Bill 5802. (5-24-00)

ARGUMENTS:**For:**

When children have inadequate literacy and numeracy knowledge and skills, they are unable to read and compute in the world. Their opportunity is severely constrained without these academic tools. Early and repeated summer school opportunities can provide children more chances to learn beyond the traditional academic year. According to a limited body of research about summer school effectiveness, it clearly provides students with extra help they need to meet standards and prevent grade retention. Although enhanced summer learning opportunities are a more effective option than either social promotion or grade retention, the research also indicates that summer school works best for struggling students when school leaders saturate a young student's school life with opportunities to access the extra help they need to succeed. Summer school, in combination with a multi-faceted strategy that attends to both academic and social needs and that is designed to prevent failure, is an optimal program to ensure literacy and numeracy. In short, opportunities for second chances must be a part of the school culture--a visible part of every adult's and every student's work in the school. A summer school program will not increase a student's literacy and numeracy if it is a district-wide remedial program that lets individual schools off the hook for ensuring that every student succeeds.

For:

The virtual high school will not grant a high school diploma. Neither will it compete with the state's public schools and public charter schools. Instead, the virtual high school will exist to supplement the courses offered in existing high schools, by helping school districts to identify high quality on-line courses that can be offered to students in distance learning classrooms. The virtual high school will be especially welcome in remote areas of the state where small school districts often are unable to offer students advanced placement courses. Once it gets underway, access to high quality instruction that is offered by Michigan teachers in learning environments of between eight and 25 students will be possible. Designers of the school envision courses offered between school districts at little or no cost, sometimes in barter arrangements in which one district would provide an excellent teacher and course, in exchange for a number of "seats" for students who could enroll in other courses offered by another district's teacher.

For:

In January 2000, the governor made his State of the State Address, and among the policy initiatives he proposed was one that would establish a Principal's Bill of Rights. The executive office developed the proposal for a principal's bill of rights, working together with representatives from the organization that represents 96 percent of the secondary and middle school principals in Michigan -- more than 2,025 school administrators. As the principals developed their bill of rights, they welcomed the challenge posed by greater accountability. However, in order to be accountable, the principals stressed the need for more authority in the school buildings they govern. They argued they needed a stronger voice in staffing their buildings; a definitive role in the development of the school improvement plans; an opportunity to participate in budget development at the beginning of the budget-making process in their local school district; and the opportunity to allocate the often small but important pool of discretionary funds assigned to a building.

The principals point out that they are accountable for learning under the school code. Only they among the school employees who are charged to improve teaching, learning, curriculum and assessment can be fired at will. They suggest that more authority for principals is necessary if the stakeholders in schools wish to ensure greater accountability. According to committee testimony, scores of principalships stand unfilled today. Indeed, some schools have substitute principals on short-term 90-day contracts. Part of the difficulty filling the positions can be attributed to the significant demands placed on principals, coupled with their attenuated authority and limited ability to meet expectations--both their own, and those of others. A Principals' Bill of Rights is necessary. What is more, it is urgent.

Against:

Although school administrators should be empowered, the best way to accomplish this goal is not to pass a state law to mandate certain powers in every school district. Education policy experts have known for some time (and industry is coming to know, as well), that true authority emanates from a complex balance of leadership and teamwork, not from bequeathing powers to a single person. For example, giving the principal the right to modify a school improvement plan really removes any incentive for wholehearted involvement from parents, residents of the community, and other employees including teachers and the principal. A better model for authority within the school improvement plan is for the principal to be the leader of

the planning efforts, helping produce a positive outcome with buy-in from all parties by virtue of the quality of his or her input, not because the principal is vested with extraordinary power. Recent research indicates that “distributed leadership” is necessary in effective schools.

Against:

Portions of the principal’s rights section of this legislation seem to make the principal into the “employer” under the Public Employees Relations Act (PERA). This would inappropriately and unlawfully conflate the role of the principal with that of the local school board (or the public school academy board of directors). Under the law, the school boards, alone, are charged to hire personnel in a school district. Both the hiring and the assignment of teachers are clearly duties reserved under the law for an employer. A principal is not the employer in schools. Rather, he or she is the building leader whose main purpose should be to coordinate curriculum and instruction.

Against:

Already, too much time is given over the tests in elementary schools. While summer school should be an opportunity for those school children with inadequate literacy and numeracy skills, the children who would be eligible for summer enrichment programs can be identified without administering norm referenced tests. Instead, teachers can make these evaluations and assessments, based on their classroom knowledge of the children’s work and their growth and development as learners.

POSITIONS:

The Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals supports the bill. (5-24-00)

The Michigan Association of School Administrators (which represents school superintendents) opposes the section of the bill concerning the Principals’ Bill of Rights. (5-24-00)

The Michigan Education Association opposes the bill. (5-24-00)

The Michigan Federation of Teachers and Related School Personnel opposes the bill. (5-24-00)

Analyst: J. Hunault

■This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.