

Scott Woolstenhulme, Superintendent of Bonneville School District 93.

Let me begin by thanking those people who have devoted their time and talents to develop this legislation. It has been an incredible amount of work that has resulted in many good ideas to improve our student learning outcomes.

In some aspects, the proposed formula will present new opportunities for school districts to be more flexible in meeting the needs of our students. But I am concerned that it could also set back our progress in key areas.

Over the last few years, we have seen tremendous progress from the legislature in meeting their constitutional responsibility to create a uniform and thorough system of public schools for Idaho students by raising teacher pay, providing increased funding to improve early literacy outcomes, creating college and career advising programs to improve the go-on rate, and providing for teachers' professional learning.

My biggest concern is that the proposed legislation may abandon the progress that we have made. Without dedicated funding, districts may not be able to continue these key programs.

I recently completed my doctorate degree in education technology. The most important thing that I learned in five years of course and dissertation work is that technology has a small effect on student learning but effective instructions has a large

impact. It concerns me that the proposed bill protects funding for classroom technology but not for teacher professional learning when everything we know about improving student learning tells us to do the opposite.

I am also very concerned about the ability of districts to continue programs for students who are academically at-risk. The legislation dedicates funding to programs for students who are identified as English language learners, gifted and talented, or special education. This works well for these programs. But instead of providing funding to programs for at-risk students, the bill dedicates it to economically disadvantaged students when federal Title 1 dollars are already earmarked for them.

The problem is that not all academically at-risk students are economically disadvantaged, and conversely, not all economically disadvantaged students are academically at-risk.

For example, only half of the students in our early reading intervention program are economically disadvantaged. Likewise fewer than 6 in 10 of the students who attend our alternative high school are economically disadvantaged. I am concerned that we will not have sufficient funding to continue to provide intervention programs for at-risk students unless they are specifically identified as a weighted population.

I think it would be wise to take more time to work with key education shareholders to better understand the implications and potential unintended

consequences of the proposal before adopting this landmark change to our public education system.

Thank you.