

not a due process hearing such as we have for tenured teachers. It does not require lawyers. It does not allow lawyers to be there and that doesn't change whether you call it a conference or whether you call it a hearing. There is no formal presentation of evidence and that won't change whether you call it a conference or whether you call it an informal hearing. There is no formal cross examination. In short there is no formal, there is no legal obstacle course whatsoever at this particular informal hearing and by calling it a conference all of these things that are written into the bill are going to be just the same. The probationary teacher will have the right to discuss, to explain, present information and to ask questions. That is what it simply states in the bill and that is what they will have the right to do whether you call it a conference or whether you call it an informal hearing. Under the provisions of the bill that informal hearing can be confidential at the request of either the teacher or the superintendent, the administration, and it will be that way whether you call it an informal hearing or whether you call it a conference. In short, no claim has been made that changing it to conference changes anything at all and, in fact, it doesn't change anything at all and I would suggest that you not adopt it for the simple reason that it does make twenty or thirty word changes in the sixteen different pages of the amendment and whether those are done correctly or not I don't know but I don't see the point of fooling around with language that has been in the statute for years which we understand in favor of an amendment which makes sixteen to twenty changes in the bill and which in effect does nothing. So I would ask you to reject the amendment and let's move on to the substantial questions that remain before us. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, we all know that this legislation process is made up of compromises and I am ready to make one compromise. That is, the three year deal, and I am going to offer an amendment to make certain it is followed at least by a minimal prescription. But for us to now adopt a second Goll amendment, as far as I'm concerned you might as well just kill the bill because up until 1981 people who lived under a continuing contract law were entitled to informal hearings. They were and then there was a court case and the court said the law was not constructed correctly so, therefore, it was then deleted. I just can't believe that this body who speaks so often about education, those who teach, administer and serve, are not willing to provide a person an informal hearing if they request it. Because in most occasions when the