

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

April 11, 2006      LB 1024

example; the focus on integration of that learning community, even though I will quickly hasten to add that the Omaha Public Schools side is not happy with the extent to which that would be enforced, but it is addressed. The other thing that I think is important in agreement is the common levy aspects. The fact that we are going to create an organizational structure in which the levy--there is a common levy, a common financial base--is very important progress; I will tell you was extremely difficult to achieve and is something that I would like to hang onto, because I think--and I think it would, regardless--but in the event I'm wrong, I think that is very important to hang onto. I'll mention a couple other things, which...in the context, because they were brought up by Senator Bourne in some of his comments. He mentioned that net option funding is gone in the metro area. That is true. My feeling is it should be gone statewide, but that's not the way the committee decided to go. We do it within the learning community. That is an absolute plus, as far as I'm concerned, on all scores, and I would argue that it's an absolute plus from the OPS perspective. It represents a considerable sacrifice on the part of one school district in the metro area; namely, Westside. What that means is that even though there is free movement of students and transportation is provided to those students and is paid to the schools--all of that is protected; all of that is protected--it's just that every school district in the metro area is now an equalized school district. We don't have the nonequalized or wealthier districts, and the equalized or less wealthy districts. They're all equalized. So Senator Bourne is correct that net option funding is eliminated with LB 1024, but I think the appraisal of that is one of the very strong features of LB 1024, and in fact, I think many of the arguments Senator Bourne himself has made in committee over the years would strongly support that change. The other thing I'll mention that he mentioned, pick up, is accountability. He mentioned the fact that school districts would be required to show that funding they received from the state to serve high-need students is, in fact, used to serve those high-need students. He's right. That is a change, but it's a change that was unanimously agreed on by the Education Committee, and I think would be nearly unanimously agreed upon in this body. The notion that if funding is provided to a school district to serve a particular function, to