



Initiative Measure 350

TO THE PEOPLE

Official Ballot Title:

Shall public educational authorities be prohibited from assigning students to other than the nearest or next-nearest school with limited exceptions?

The Law as it now exists:

Under existing law, school districts have broad control over matters that affect the assignment of students to schools.

Each school district board of directors has the authority to adopt reasonable regulations which establish attendance areas, the grades to be offered at a given school, and otherwise directly or indirectly determine which schools within the district students shall attend.

Statement for

Over 180,000 citizens from around the state signed Initiative petitions to enable you to decide whether forced school busing is either wise or necessary.

350 PROTECTS LOCAL CONTROL OF SCHOOLS

Initiative 350 returns the most basic decision in education (i.e., where a child is to be educated) to the parent. 350 keeps local parental control of schools from being subverted by federal bureaucrats and promoters of forced busing.

Initiative 350 ensures that smaller school districts and rural school districts will not have their transportation funds reduced to pay for forced busing in Washington cities.

350 PRESERVES LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

Initiative 350 guarantees children the right to attend the school nearest or next nearest their home. It is carefully worded so as to permit exceptions (such as special education of the handicapped student, health or safety hazards, physical barriers, unsafe conditions or overcrowding). Current essential busing in rural areas, for example, would not be affected. 350 permits the voluntary attendance of students in open enrollment or magnet programs, also.

350 SAVES TAX DOLLARS

Voters can prevent millions of tax dollars from being wasted this school year on forced busing. Those dollars could be spent on better classroom education. Children are not being taught the basics while they are unnecessarily riding a bus across town (past the school nearest their home).

350 IS EXERCISING YOUR LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CHOOSE

You have the choice between bureaucratic control and common sense. Forced busing in our state has not been ordered by the Courts . . . BUT is another product of pressure by the pro-busing lobby on local administrators. Exercise your freedom of choice and **VOTE "YES" ON INITIATIVE 350.**

Rebuttal of Statement against

Initiative 350 keeps local, neighborhood schools from coming under the control of bureaucratic busing planners. The opponents' argument avoids the real issue, i.e., the value of forced school busing. Busing children away from the school nearest their home does not make common sense. Forced busing nonsense is financed by state taxes. Your tax dollars would pay for cross-city busing. Initiative 350 is carefully written to return local control of schools to parents (where it belongs).

Voters' Pamphlet Statement Prepared by:

HUBERT F. DONOHUE, State Senator; JIM MATSON, State Senator; WILLIAM M. POLK, State Representative.

Advisory Committee: ORVILLE L. BARNES, Member, State Board of Education; J. DORM BRAMAN, former Mayor, City of Seattle; WILLIAM L. WILKINS, retired Judge, King County Superior Court; ROBERT O. DORSE, President, Citizens for Voluntary Integration Committee (CIVIC).

The effect of Initiative 350, if approved into Law:

Initiative Measure 350, if approved, would limit the control of school officials over the assignment of students to particular schools.

This initiative would prohibit school officials from either directly or indirectly requiring a student to attend a school other than the school which is geographically the nearest or next-nearest the student's residence within the school district and which offers the course of study pursued by the student. The types of "indirect" action that would be prohibited if the action would prevent a student from attending his or her nearest or next-nearest school include, but are not limited to, plans involving: (1) The redefining of attendance zones; (2) feeder schools; (3) the reorganization of the grade structure of the schools; (4) the pairing of schools; (5) the merging of schools; (6) the clustering of schools; or (7) any other combination of grade restructuring, pairing, merging or clustering.

This initiative would allow school officials to require a student to attend a school other than the school nearest or next-nearest the student's residence only in the following instances: (1) If a student requires special education, care or guidance; (2) if there are health or safety hazards or physical barriers or obstacles between the student's

residence and the nearest or next-nearest school; or (3) if the nearest or next-nearest school is unfit or inadequate because of overcrowding, unsafe conditions or lack of physical facilities. If a student is assigned to a school other than the school nearest or next-nearest the student's residence because of one or more of these reasons, the assignment must be to the next geographically nearest school within the school district with the necessary courses and facilities.

This initiative does not affect the right of a student voluntarily to attend a school other than the school nearest or next-nearest the student's residence or the right of school districts to close school facilities.

NOTE: The ballot title and explanatory statement were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. The complete text of Initiative Measure 350 begins on page 6.

Statement against

INITIATIVE 350 WOULD INTERFERE WITH EFFICIENT LOCAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

350 would hamper local management in all of the state's school districts by taking away the authority of locally elected school boards to assign students in an educationally and economically sound manner. It would disrupt schools in the middle of this school year.

350 prohibits assignment of students outside their district; thus, it would restrict interdistrict cooperative programs.

350 would in some cases prohibit changing the grades offered in particular schools, such as converting some three-year to four-year high schools. It would prohibit most disciplinary transfers and the redrawing of school boundary lines to make efficient use of buildings. It would mean costly interference with location of special education programs. Because it is so poorly drafted, 350 would trigger costly court battles, interfere with school operation, and would present many implementation problems.

350 WOULD CAUSE SEGREGATION AND FEDERAL COURT INTERFERENCE JUST TO SOLVE A SEATTLE PROBLEM

350 was specifically written to rescind Seattle's locally developed desegregation plan.

Applying 350 to Seattle, Tacoma, Pasco, and other desegregated school districts would significantly increase racial segregation. This resegregation of schools could easily result in the initiative being found unconstitutional. This would mean that desegregation plans in Seattle and elsewhere would continue but the rest of the state would still be saddled with the initiative.

350 litigation could lead to court ordered busing between Seattle and surrounding districts, as well as to court imposed costs to the State.

The best way to avoid interference with local control of your own school policies and the possibility of court ordered busing is to vote no on 350.

Rebuttal of Statement for

Initiative 350 threatens every school district. 350 restricts all school districts' power of pupil assignment, severely damaging local control. 350 could require *massive school closures*, and *increased*, not decreased, mandatory busing. By restricting local options, 350 would *increase*, not decrease, bureaucratic control. 350 would cause extensive and expensive court battles which would burden Washington taxpayers. To save neighborhood schools, keep costs down, and prevent elaborate court-ordered busing plans, vote NO on 350.

Voters' Pamphlet Statement Prepared by:

JOHN S. MURRAY, State Senator; ALAN THOMPSON, State Representative; EBEN CARLSON, Chairman, State Committee for Local Control.

Advisory Committee: DR. FRANK B. BROUILLET, Superintendent of Public Instruction; CAROL COE, President, Washington Education Association; DR. GEORGE T. DANIEL, President, Washington Association of School Administrators; DAVID J. WHITMORE, President, Washington State School Directors' Association; WALTER H. LEWIS, State Board of Education.



COMPLETE TEXT OF

Initiative Measure 350

AN ACT Relating to school attendance; creating new sections; adding new sections to chapter 223, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and a new chapter to Title 28A RCW; and providing penalties.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

NEW SECTION. Section 1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the effective date of this act no school board, school district, educational service district board, educational service district, or county committee, nor the superintendent of public instruction, nor the state board of education, nor any of their respective employees, agents or delegates shall directly or indirectly require any student to attend a school other than the school which is geographically nearest or next nearest the student's place of residence within the school district of his or her residence and which offers the course of study pursued by such student, except in the following instances:

(1) If a student requires special education, care or guidance, he may be assigned and transported to the school offering courses and facilities for such special education, care or guidance;

(2) If there are health or safety hazards, either natural or man made, or physical barriers or obstacles, either natural or man made, between the student's place of residence and the nearest or next nearest school; or

(3) If the school nearest or next nearest to his place of residence is unfit or inadequate because of overcrowding, unsafe conditions or lack of physical facilities.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. In every such instance where a student is assigned and transported to a school other than the one nearest his

place of residence, he shall be assigned and transported to the next geographically nearest school with the necessary and applicable courses and facilities within the school district of his or her residence.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 3. For purposes of section 1 of this act, "indirectly require any student to attend a school other than the school which is geographically nearest or next nearest the student's place of residence within the school district of his or her residence and which offers the course of study pursued by such student" includes, but is not limited to, implementing, continuing, pursuing, maintaining or operating any plan involving (1) the redefining of attendance zones; (2) feeder schools; (3) the re-organization of the grade structure of the schools; (4) the pairing of schools; (5) the merging of schools; (6) the clustering of schools; or (7) any other combination of grade restructuring, pairing, merging or clustering: PROVIDED, That nothing in this chapter shall limit the authority of any school district to close school facilities.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 4. For the purposes of section 1 of this act "special education, care or guidance" includes the education, care or guidance of students who are physically, mentally or emotionally handicapped.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 5. The prohibitions of this chapter shall not preclude the establishment of schools offering specialized or enriched educational programs which students may voluntarily choose to attend, or of any other voluntary option offered to students.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 6. This chapter shall not prevent any court of competent jurisdiction from adjudicating constitutional issues relating to the public schools.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 7. Sections 1 through 6 of this act are added to chapter 223, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and shall constitute a new chapter in Title 28A RCW.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 8. If any provision of this act, or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.