

I stand to object to two sections of this long bill.

1) Page 4, line 9 of Amendment #1 says:

*“Sec. 7. (a) A school corporation shall continue debt service payments on school corporation debt that is attributable to a turnaround academy.”*

I object to a situation in which taxpayers are providing a good school building and paying the debt while a for-profit corporation takes a large profit by using the building. The General Assembly could fix this problem in two ways: #1: limit turnaround operators to non-profit corporations such as Ed Power, or

#2: require the for-profit company to give 50% of the profit back to the taxpayers that provided the building. I believe that for-profit companies have no place in the operation of schools because the ever present question will always linger over their involvement: What money was diverted from helping students so that the private corporation could make a bigger profit?

2) Page 4, line 31 says:

*“(d) A special management team and a school corporation may enter into a contract for the school corporation to provide any services for a school that are in the best interest of the students who attend the school. A contract shall specify the length of time, level of services, and entity responsible for providing necessary services, including the following services:*

(1) *Food service.*

(2) *Educational and administrative technology and technology support.*

(3) *Special education services.*

(4) *Career and technical education services.*

(5) *Custodial services.*

(6) *Instructional services in a particular curriculum area.*

(7) *Textbooks and supplemental materials.*

(8) *Student services.*

(9) *Police and probation services.*

(10) *Any other provisions the school corporation and the special management team consider necessary.”*

Please note this is a “may” provision.

Then shortly after this section, page 6, line 4 reads:

*“Sec. 9. (a) A school corporation may not take an action adverse to a special management team's operation of a school, services provided by lead partners, or implementation of an intervention ordered by the state board, including refusing to enter into a contract for services under section 7 of this chapter.”*

This language cancels the “may” provision and makes a contract mandatory based on the wishes of the special management team. I strongly object to this mandatory language. If an entity is going to run a school it should take responsibility to contract for services without the coercion of this provision. This would indicate that IPS or Gary Schools would be forced to provide special education services under a contract if the special management team didn't want to provide special education services on its own. Any service which cut their profit could be contracted back to the host school district. Disagreements about the value of such services are not addressed. The threat of coercion should be removed from this bill.

I suspect that the original bill changing accreditation is motivated in part to provide an easier path to state accreditation to allow more private schools to participate in IHSAA sports. I believe that this is the biggest change in state accreditation policy since the concept was devised in the 1930's. It deserves more study in a summer study committee before passage.