

LCB File No. R091-99

PROPOSED REGULATION OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Explanation: Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets ~~{}~~  is material to be omitted.

AUTHORITY: NAC 385.080

SECTION 1. NAC 389 is hereby amended by language as follows:

SECTION 2. NAC 389.664 Units required to receive standard diploma

1. Except as otherwise provided in subsections 2 and 3, to receive a standard diploma evidencing graduation from high school, a pupil must, in addition to having passed the proficiency examination required by NRS 389.015, have earned a total of ~~{14}~~ 15 units of credit for required courses and a total of ~~{8-1/2}~~ 7-1/2 units of credit for elective courses *for a total of 22 1/2 units of credit*. The units for the required courses must be earned in accordance with the following table:

Required Course	Minimum Number of Units
American government.....	1
American history.....	1
Arts and Humanities.....	1
English <i>Language Arts</i> .....	4
Health education.....	1/2
Mathematics.....	<del>{2}</del> 3
Physical education.....	2
Use of computers.....	1/2
Science.....	2
Total:	<del>{14}</del> 15

SECTION 3. ~~{2. If a pupil entered the ninth grade on or before July 1, 1988, he must earn 1 unit of credit in science, 3 units of credit in English, 1 unit of credit in American government, 1~~

~~unit of credit in American history, ½ unit of credit in health, 2 units of credit in physical education, 2 units of credit in mathematics, and a total of 10 ½ units in the required courses; in addition to 9 ½ units of credit for elective courses.]~~ 2. A pupil who entered the ninth grade on or before August 1, 1999, in order to earn a standard diploma, must earn 1 unit of credit in American government, 1 unit of credit in American history, 1 unit of credit in Arts and Humanities, 4 units of credit in English, ½ credit in Health education, 2 units of credit in Mathematics, 2 units of credit in Physical education, ½ unit of credit in use of computers, and 2 units of credit in Science for a total of 14 units in the required courses; in addition to 8 ½ units of credit for elective courses, for a total of 22 ½ units of credit.

**SECTION 4. Units required to receive advanced diploma**

3. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, to receive an advanced diploma evidencing graduation from high school, a pupil must, in addition to having passed the proficiency examination required by NRS 389.015 at a level to be established by the State Board of Education, have earned a total of 17 units of credit for required courses and a total of 7 units of credit for elective courses for a total of 24 units of credit. The units for the required courses must be earned in accordance with the following table:

<i>Required Course</i>	<i>Minimum Number of Units</i>
<i>American government.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>American history.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Arts and Humanities.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Economics/Social Studies.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>English Language Arts.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Health education.....</i>	<i>½</i>
<i>Mathematics.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Physical education.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Science.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Use of computers.....</i>	<i>½</i>
<b><i>Total:</i></b>	<b><i>17</i></b>

2. *This language becomes effective on August 1,1999, for students who enter 9th grade after August 1, 1999.*

**SECTION 5. Academic Load Requirements**

1. *A pupil must be enrolled in a minimum of six (6) courses, or the equivalent of six periods per day, in order to be counted as a full time equivalent pupil in 9th, 10th and 11th grades. A pupil must be enrolled in a minimum of five (5) courses or the equivalent of five periods per day as a senior.*

2. *A pupil's status as a member of a given class is determined by the number of credits the pupil has earned. Specifically:*

<i>In order to qualify as a:</i>	<i>A student must have earned a minimum of:</i>
<i>Sophomore (10th grade)</i>	<i>5 credits (1 in English, 1 in mathematics, 1 in science)</i>
<i>Junior (11th grade)</i>	<i>11 credits (2 in English, 2 in mathematics, 2 in science)</i>
<i>Senior (12th grade)</i>	<i>17 credits</i>

3. *A school district shall evaluate the transcripts of a pupil who transfers from a school outside of the school district to a high school within the school district to determine the pupil's status as required by subsection 2 and NAC 389.682.*

4. *A student who has not earned the minimum number of credits in a given year to attain status as a member of the next grade in the following year as specified in subsection 2, shall be deemed "credit deficient."*

5. *This language becomes effective on August 1,1999, for students who enter 9th grade after August 1, 1999.*

**SECTION 6. NAC 389.660 Remedial ~~[courses]~~ instruction required when proficiency is not demonstrated. (NRS 385.080, 389.015) ~~[If a pupil has not demonstrated his proficiency in English or mathematics or has not passed the appropriate proficiency examination by the end of the 11th grade, he shall enroll in such remedial courses as are appropriate.]~~**

1. *Each school district shall provide remedial instruction to each junior and senior who is credit deficient in English, including reading, composition and writing, mathematics,*

*science, or social studies, and/or who has taken the High School Proficiency Examination at least twice and failed one or more portions of the High School Proficiency Examination.*

*2. Remedial instruction may be offered during the regular school day, summer school, intersession or programs offered before and after school. Juniors and seniors described in subsection 1 of this section must not be charged for any costs associated with the remediation, including transportation.*

*3. This language becomes effective August 1, 1999.*

**SECTION 7. *Student Responsibility to Enroll in Remediation.***

*1. Every junior who has taken the High School Proficiency Examination at least twice and failed one or more portions of the test must enroll in a remediation program as outlined in NAC 389.660.*

*2. A local school district superintendent may waive the requirement in cases of demonstrated extenuating circumstances.*

*3. This language becomes effective on August 1, 1999, for students who enter their junior year after August 1, 1999.*

**PROPOSED REGULATION OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD  
OF EDUCATION/NEVADA STATE BOARD FOR  
OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION**

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS AS REQUIRED  
BY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT, NRS 233B.066  
NAC 389, High School Diploma**

**IMPACT STATEMENT**

The following statement is submitted for adopted revisions to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC):

**1. A description of how public comment was solicited, a summary of public response, and explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.**

Notice of Workshop to Solicit Comments on Proposed Regulations was sent to approximately one-hundred twenty-five individuals and educational organizations. One workshop was held October 23, 1998. There were no comments from the public. No written comments from the public were received.

The Notice of Intent to Act Upon a Regulation for public hearing on the proposed revisions was sent to approximately one-hundred twenty-five individuals and educational organizations. Two public hearings were conducted on October 24, 1998, and December 12, 1998, to provide the opportunity for comments by affected parties and the public. There were comments from the public. At the first hearing on March 6, 1999, thirty-three individuals spoke to the proposed revisions. Written comments were received.

**2. The Number of Persons Who:**

<b>a) Attended Each Hearing:</b>	Workshop: <u>34</u>	First Hearing: <u>55</u>	Second Hearing: <u>50</u>
		Third Hearing: <u>14</u>	Fourth Hearing: <u>13</u>
<b>b) Testified at Each Hearing:</b>	Workshop: <u>12</u>	First Hearing: <u>32</u>	Second Hearing: <u>21</u>
		Third Hearing: <u>6</u>	Fourth Hearing: <u>4</u> <b>and,</b>
<b>c) Submitted Written Statements:</b>	Workshop: <u>2</u>	First Hearing: <u>52</u>	Second Hearing: <u>16</u>
		Third Hearing: <u>29</u>	Fourth Hearing: <u>3</u>

There were no letters submitted with the exception of written comments in support of verbal statements submitted at the March 5, 1999, Workshop to Solicit Public Comments: 1) Dr. Eugene T. Paslov, President, EMC, Inc.; and, 2) Ernie McKenzie, Adult Education Supervisor, Carson City School District, Carson City.

Written letters and memoranda submitted for the March 6, 1999, public hearing: 1) letter from Jackie Kearns, Adult Diploma Coordinator, Humboldt County School District in support of the proposed reduction of elective credits from 8-1/2 to 4 credits, but with concern for increasing the requirements for mathematics and science based on facility

and faculty availability; 2) letter from Kathleen Frosini, Director, School-to-Work Programs, Clark County School District, opposing the proposal to increase the core requirements and to reduce the elective credits for the high school standard diploma; 3) letter from Gertrude M. Vinci, Educator, Glenn Hare Occupational Center, opposed to the decreasing of the graduation requirements; 4) letter received from Christena Wiseman, Educator, Reno High School and President, Nevada League Association with a concern for requiring additional mathematics and science credits; 5) Denice Slaina, Parent, Reno with concern for possible withdrawal of fine arts credit; and, 6) forty letters mailed to individual Board members signed by individuals opposing changes to graduation requirements and submitted for Board records. Written comments in support of verbal comments: 1) Nevada Vocational Association, Don Noorda, President; 2) Jerry Hubbard, Chair, Joint Occupation Council and Business Education Advisory Committee; 3) Mike Pointer, Reno, Nevada; 4) Roy Casey, Assistant Superintendent, Douglas County School District; 5) Kathleen Frosini, Clark County School District - a chart of occupational education drop out rates versus statewide dropout rates; 6) Joanna Dunlap, Student, McQueen High School, Reno; and, 7) Gerry Dunlap, Owner-Producer, Ichthyus Productions.

Written letters and memoranda submitted for the April 16, 1999, second public hearing: 1) letter from Pendary Clark, President, Nevada Association of School Superintendents; 2) memorandum from Roy Casey, Assistant Superintendent, Douglas County School District; 3) letter from Phillip Haines, Las Vegas; 4) memorandum from Jim Parry, Superintendent, Carson City School District; and, 5) ten letters mailed to Board members signed by individuals, opposing changes to graduation requirements and submitted for Board records. Written comments in support of verbal comments: 1) Dick Echols, parent; and, 2) Fay Reeves, teacher/coordinator, Boulder City High School.

Written letters submitted for the May 22, 1999, third public hearing: 1) "Survey of Results of District Boards of School Trustees, May 21, 1999;" and, 2) twenty-five letters from students at Glenn Hare Occupational Center, that were mailed to individual Board members opposed to changes to graduation requirements and submitted for Board records. Written comments in support of verbal comments: 1) Audrey Cornia, Member, Board of Directors, Southwest Conference on Language Testing; 2) Christina Wiseman, Nevada Language Association Advocacy Committee; and, 2) Todd Sweeney – a) Educational Perspectives News by Sweeney-Rose Architects; and, b) NASSP Report on Breaking News; New Designs for the Comprehensive High School, an article in "National Center for Research in Vocational Education," University of California at Berkeley.

Written letters and memoranda submitted for the July 9, 1999, public hearing: 1) Memorandum from Roy Casey, Assistant Superintendent of Education Services, Douglas County School District, reiterating previous statements on behalf of the school district to not make any changes to the units required to receive a standard diploma, and expressing concerns for the proposal for language on "academic load requirements," "school district responsibility to provide remediation," "student responsibility to enroll in remediation," and "curriculum review and reporting;" 2) letter from Richard Stokes, Superintendent,

Mineral County School District, providing a copy of the adopted resolution relating to “Mineral County School District and its Relationship in Matters of School Policy & Government,” urging the Board to delay consideration of changes to graduation requirements or diploma options; 3) letter from Tim Sweeney, Sweeney-Rose Architects, providing his concerns for the proposals (the letter was read into the record per his written request).

A copy of any written comments may be obtained by calling LaDonna Byrd, Board Secretary, at the Department of Education (775) 687-9225, or by writing to the Department of Education, 700 East Fifth Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096.

**3. A description of how comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of the response and an explanation how other interested parties may obtain a copy of the summary.**

Comment was solicited through the workshop notice of February 2, 1999, and public hearing notices of February 2, 1999, March 15, 1999, April 19, 1999, and June 4, 1999.

At the March 6, 1999, Workshop to Solicit Public Comments, the following individuals gave comments: 1) Dan Piel, Superintendent, Storey County School District, presented an alternative school year schedule for high school called “75-30-75-(15), and stated that increasing the credit units will not necessarily increase student performance or achievement, emphasizing that the school districts should be focusing on their delivery of instruction with the goal to increase test scores and overall performance; 2) Todd Cutler, Principal, Virginia City High School, supported Mr. Piel’s statements; 3) Dr. James Hager, Superintendent, Washoe County School District, advised that, on March 2, 1999, the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees took action to oppose the proposed change to high school graduation requirements in general and to request that the State Board of Education table the proposal until the school districts have had the opportunity to align the curriculum with the newly adopted standards; 4) Dotty Merrill, Director, Testing Services, Washoe County School District, advised that rather than focus on summer school, the school district has chosen to accommodate the students through school-wide plans for remediation that will utilize the resources and facilities available; 5) Kendyl DePoali, Curriculum Coordinator, Washoe County School District, stated that the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees would like the opportunity to be able to teach to the new standards within the guidelines of two mathematics credit, such as removing all general math classes for math credit and requiring that all students must pass Algebra I, II and geometry in order to receive the credits. 6) Dr. Eugene T. Paslov, President, EMC, Inc. and former Nevada State Superintendent of Public Instruction, urged the State Board not to change the current graduation requirements; 7) Marcia Bandera, Superintendent, Elko County School District, stated that the Elko County School District would like the opportunity to have the flexibility to do what is good for the children, such as re-configuring secondary education as grades seven through twelve; 8) Ernie McKenzie, Adult Education Supervisor, Carson City School District, Carson City, addressed the proposed changes to the adult diploma, stating that an additional credit each for mathematics and for science could cause a difficulty in finding teachers.

there is also a concern that the students may not be able to meet the new standards, particularly with the five test limit for the Proficiency Examination; 9) Chris Etchegoyhen, Curriculum Coordinator, Douglas County School District, stressed the need for the school districts to be given the time to focus on incorporating the new standards into the curriculum and for professional development for the teachers prior to revising the credit requirements; 10) Dr. Robert S. McCord, Deputy Assistant Superintendent, expressed appreciation to the Board for allowing the opportunity through three public hearings to look at the topic of graduation standards from many perspectives; 11) Lauren Kohut-Rost, Director, Secondary Curriculum and Professional Development, Clark County School District, advised that recently, the Clark County School District changed its graduation requirements by increasing mathematics to three units and reducing electives credits by one, keeping the total credits at 22 ½; and, 12) Debbie Cahill, Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association, stated that there is a concern for the impact on teacher availability if the math and science credits were increased.

At the March 6, 1999, first public hearing the following individuals gave comments: 1) Ray Bacon, E.D., Nevada Manufacturer's Association, Carson City, supported the concept of multiple diplomas; 2) Don Noorda, President, Nevada Vocational Association, Elko, advised that the Nevada Vocational Association does not support the reduction of total credits, but favors adding math and science credits; 3) Jerry Hubbard, Chair, Joint Occupational Council, Reno, advised that the council opposes the proposed revision to reduce electives, but agreed with the flexibility in Option II; 4) Peter Kinczyk, Representative, Reno High Band Parents Association, stated that the elective classes draw students to school, not the core classes and expressed concern for the dropping of elective classes if the credits is not required; 5) Clay Redfield, President, Nevada Band Directors' Association, and Educator, Swope Middle School, Reno, voiced concern for the possible impact on music programs if electives are reduced; 6) Mike Pointer, Reno, Nevada, did not support any change to the elective credit requirements, but felt that the second option presented would meet the needs of students; 7) Steve Knight, Nevada Adult Education Association, was encouraged by the proposal for a two diploma system and did not agree with reducing the number of credits; 8) John Herdener, Auto Shop Instructor, Washoe County School District, stated that dropping electives will be regretted in the future; 9) Wayne Allen, Service Manager, B.U.S./Joint Occupational Council, Truckee Meadows Community College, cautioned about making changes to elective credits as these classes are important to many students in meeting the graduation requirements; 10) Bill Midgard, Service and Parts Director, Reno Subaru, Reno, and Co-Chair, Automotive Advisory Board at Truckee Meadows Community College, commended the Board for looking at raising the academic standards and urged allowing academic credit for science and/or math for auto shop classes; 11) Bill Kaa, parent, Reno, felt that lowering the number of credits will impact the funds available to school districts, especially for elective credit courses; 12) Ron Krump, CEO, Krump Construction, Reno, and member of the School to Careers Council and the Washoe County K-16 Council, felt that a two diploma system would cause discrimination, and asked that the elective credits be kept as high as possible so students will have the opportunity to determine what they want as a career; 13) Mark Green, student, Wooster High School, Reno, felt that



additional credit requirements should be in technology and computers and recommended that the additional mathematics and science credits should begin at the middle school level; 14) Roy Casey, Assistant Superintendent, Douglas County School District, urged the Board to delay any changes to the graduation requirements until the school districts have had the opportunity to align local curricula and standards to the new high content and performance standards; 15) Debbie Peters, President, Cymbal/Incline Music Program, Incline Village, was encouraged by the recommended two diploma system; 16) Judy Lindquist, Music Educator and representative of Washoe County Music Coalition, supported keeping the current elective requirements and to accept the proposed increase in credit requirements for math and science; 17) Kathleen Frosini, Director, School to Work Programs, Clark County School District, asked the Board to carefully consider how to achieve greater academic success and still keep students motivated to stay in school; 18) Rebecca Reynolds, Incline High School, was not in favor of lowering elective credits; 19) Sam Folis, President, Musicians Union Local 368, Incline Village, encouraged the Board to continue holding public hearings and to make the arts part of the core curriculum; 20) Shawna Hafen, student, McQueen High School, Reno, and member of Advanced Theatre and Advanced Choir, agreed with prior speakers; 21) Russell DeCaprio, student, Incline High School, Incline Village, opposed the raising of requirements for graduation. 22) Mark Sullivan, Local Government Affairs, Association General Contractors, Sparks was encouraged by the two track system proposal, but noted that only 35% of the students go on to college; 23) Emery Rogers, student, Incline High School, opposed the reduction of electives; 24) Jennifer Jacobsen, student, Incline Village High School, stated that the proposal to reduce electives directly impacts the opportunities for students to take these courses; 25) Jessica Karlsson, student, Incline Village High School, Incline Village, noted that without elective courses, students will not be able to compete in college as the universities look at how well-rounded the student is; 26) Erik Beyer, Civil Engineer, Reno, relayed his daughter's concern for the proposed changes to requirements, that she would not have been able to serve as a foreign exchange student in Australia for six months if she had to take additional core credits; 27) Dr. Jane A. Nichols, Vice Chancellor, University and Community College System of Nevada, felt that the 37% college entrance rate in Nevada is not high enough, making Nevada fiftieth in the nation; the national average is 55%; 28) Paul Christensen, Principal, Glenn Mare Occupational Center, Reno, was concerned that the increase in academic credits will not provide students the opportunity to attend occupational programs and he endorsed any efforts to keep the arts and occupational education as electives for graduation requirements; 29) Joanna Dunlap, student, McQueen High School, Reno, opposed the proposal for the additional credit requirements for mathematics and science, as well as the reduction of elective credits; 30) Robert Dennis, educator, stated that the comprehensive high school gives students the opportunity to look at their options; 31) Gerry Dunlap, Owner-Producer, Ichthyus Productions, and classified employee for the Washoe County School District, was not in favor the lowering of the elective credit requirements; and, 32) Christopher B. Smith, Principal, Gerlach High School, Washoe County School District, suggested changing the overall curricula standards before raising graduation requirements.

Comments from the April 16, 1999, second public hearing: 1) Denise Fullington, parent, urged the Board not to reduce graduation requirements and felt that the reduction of elective credits would remove opportunities for student to take those classes; 2) Craig Yancey, teacher, spoke regarding the proposal to lower elective credit, advising that students take fine arts courses to plan for college; 3) Ron Krump, CEO, Krump Construction, Reno did not agree with a two-diploma system; 4) Dick Echols, parent, agreed with the need for additional math and science requirements, but was concerned that not all student could meet the standards, and opposed the lowering of credit requirement; 5) Marsha Borovicka, teacher, Director of Choral Activities, Chaparral High School, advised that the overall grade point average for the concert choir students is 3.43, with an average daily attendance of 1.18; 6) Sheila Moulton, Trustee, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, expressed concern that the proposed reduction of elective credits would limit students being able to take those classes; 7) Marcia Webb, teacher, Chaparral High School, pointed out the correlation between the arts and academic, noting that the elective classes give students the opportunity to look at their options; 8) Shellee Lewis parent, opposed the language as proposed, stating that increasing the requirements for mathematics and science will not necessarily increase the students' knowledge and understanding of the material; 9) Leslie Fritz, Learning and Public Policy Specialist, Nevada State Education Association, agreed with the increase in standard, but opposed any change in the high school graduation requirements; 10) Bobbi Whitney, teacher, VocTech High School, and Vice President, Nevada Vocational Association and Treasurer, Clark County Vocational Association, read a statement from JerriAnn Black, Admissions Counselor, opposing the proposed changes; 11) Dr. Becky Pintar, Nevada Association of Alternative Education, supported the two diploma system; 12) Kelly Bain-Lacoff, Choir Director, Clark High School, relayed the importance of electives; 13) Miss B. J. Greiner, student, Valley High School, spoke in opposition of the proposal to increase math and science credits as well as the proposal to reduce elective opportunities, and read a statement from Nathan McClendon, Band Director, Valley High School, opposing the reduction in the amount of electives; 14) Fay Reeves, teacher/coordinator, Boulder City High School, provided a student survey that shows approximately sixteen core classes would be lost (affecting three teachers, as well as twenty-one elective classes (affecting four or more teachers) if the proposal is adopted; 15) Gloria Williams, teacher, Las Vegas Academy, supported the increase in math and science credits, but felt that lowering the number of electives would pull students away from the academy which emphasizes fine arts; 16) Ben Devlin, Director of Band, Cimarron Memorial High School, supported the two diploma proposal, and opposed cutting back on electives; 17) Jose Torres, student, felt that the graduation requirements should remain as they are; 18) Kathleen Frosini, Director, School to Work Programs, advised that the Clark County School District changed the credit requirements in mathematics to three and reduced the number of electives by one; 19) Darlene Johnson, parent, opposed any reduction in elective credits; 20) Robert Bray, teacher, Las Vegas High School voiced his opposition to the changes being proposed; and, 21) Diane Orgill, foreign language teacher, Silverado High School, advised that the foreign language program is already impacted with competition for electives.

Comments from the May 22, 1999, third public hearing: 1) Dr. Robert S. McCord, Assistant Deputy Superintendent, noted that there may be a fiscal impact on the school districts if remediation is required; 2) Dotty Merrill, Testing Director, Washoe County School District expressed a desire to have the proposal presented to the school districts prior to the fourth public hearing; 3) Audrey Cournia, Ex-Director, SWCOLT, Sparks, felt that minimizing the graduation requirements places less emphasis on a broad education; 4) Christena Wiseman, Immediate Past President, Nevada Language Association, opposed the proposal to add additional math and science credits to lowering the overall graduation requirements; 5) Janette Holman, Department Leader of Foreign Language, Music, P.E. and Social Studies, Incline Village, spoke in favor of keeping the current elective credits; and, 6) Tim Sweeney, Sweeney-Rose Architects, Reno, opposed the proposed change in graduation requirements.

Comments from the July 9, 1999, fourth public hearing: 1) Dotty Merrill, Testing Director, Washoe County School District, gave recommendations to the proposed language a) to leave the standard high school diploma credit requirements as is; b) to revise the academic load requirements to 5, 10 and 15; c) to identify the number of minutes per school day; and, d) to give the school districts flexibility in meeting the remediation requirements; 2) Len Paul, Clark County School District, stated that the official position of the school district is that there be no change to graduation requirements with the exception of one additional credit requirement for mathematics as this is already required in Clark County School District, and with the academic load requirements, but was concerned with the remediation requirements; 3) Anne Loring, Trustee, Washoe County Board of Trustees and President, Nevada Association of School Boards, expressed concern for the proposals, identifying that the advanced diploma does not meet the standards in Washoe County School District; and, 4) Roy Casey, Deputy Superintendent, Douglas County School District, reiterated that the school district does not feel there should be any change to graduation requirements at this time, and that remediation should be a local decision based on funding availability.

A copy of the summary and/or minutes of the public hearing may be obtained by calling LaDonna Byrd, Board Secretary, at the Department of Education (775) 687-9225, or by writing to the Department of Education at 700 East Fifth Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096.

**4. If the regulation was adopted with or without change to any part of the proposed regulation, a summary of the reasons for adopting.**

The temporary regulation was adopted by the Nevada State Board of Education at the public hearing on July 7, 1999, with changes to the proposed language: 1) to revise the units required for a standard high school diploma by increasing the number of credits in mathematics from two to three, for a total of fifteen academic credits, and to lower the electives from eight and a half to seven and a half, keeping the overall credits at twenty-two and a half; 2) to put in place an advanced diploma with seventeen academic credits (in addition to the requirements for a standard diploma, requiring one unit in economic/social studies, and three units in science), and requiring seven elective units,

for a total of twenty four credits; 3) to establish academic load requirements for high school of five credits (one in English, one in mathematics and one in science) for a student to qualify as a sophomore (10<sup>th</sup> grade), eleven credits (two in English, two in mathematics and two in science) for a student to qualify as a junior (11<sup>th</sup> grade); and, seventeen credits for a student to qualify as a senior (12<sup>th</sup> grade); 4) to adopt language for school district responsibility to provide remediation for juniors or seniors who are credit deficient in English, including reading, composition and writing, mathematics, science or social studies, to be offered in summer school, inter-session or programs offered before and after school, at no costs to students, including transportation, and to include flexibility for school districts in meeting the remediation requirements; 5) to adopt language on student responsibility to enroll in remediation courses; and, 6) to have the language effective August 1, 1999, for students entering ninth grade after August 1, 1999.

**5. The estimated economic effect of the adopted regulation on the business which it is to regulate and on the public. These must be stated separately, and each case must include:**

There is a possible economic effect on the school districts for providing remediation courses for students who are credit deficient in summer school, inter-session or programs offered before or after school, including transportation. There is no estimated economic effect on the public.

**6. The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the adopted regulation.**

There is no additional cost to the agency for enforcement of this regulation.

**7. A description of any regulations of other state or government agencies which the proposed regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlapping is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulation, the name of the regulating federal agency.**

No other state or government agency regulations will be overlapped or duplicated by the above noted regulations. There is no duplication or overlap of federal regulations.

**8. If the regulation includes provisions which are more stringent than a federal regulation which regulates the same activity, a summary of such provisions.**

There are none.

**9. If the regulation provides a new fee or increases an existing fee, the total annual amount the agency expects to collect and the manner in which the money will be used.**

This regulation does not provide or involve a new fee.