

2021 SENATE EDUCATION

SB 2090

2021 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Education Committee
Room JW216, State Capitol

SB 2090
1/11/2021

A BILL relating to records of local school districts; relating to the definition of state agency, the threshold for requiring annual reports, the ability to follow state funding, and fees for audit reviews; and to relating to audits of the state board of higher education.

Chair Schaible called the committee to order at 9:00.

Discussion Topics:

- Relating to audits conducted by the state auditor

Josh Gallion introduced and testified in support SB 2090.
Testimony: #510

Senator	Attendance
Chairman Schaible	P
Senator Elkin	P
Senator Conley	P
Senator Lemm	P
Senator Oban	P
Senator Wobbema	P

Additional written testimony:

Alexis Baxley testified against SB 2090 #423.

Aimie Copas testified against SB 2090 #429.

Adjourned at 9:52.

Lynn Wolf, Committee Clerk



Office of the
State Auditor

TESTIMONY TO SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
SB 2090 – STATE AUDITOR’S OFFICE
1/6/2021

Good afternoon, Chairman Schaible, members of the committee, my name is Joshua Gallion, and I serve as North Dakota’s State Auditor. I’m here today to discuss some of the updates and clarifications necessary to make N.D.C.C. 54-10 more effective.

As you are aware, the State Auditor is a constitutional state official elected by North Dakota citizens. My job is to lead the way in providing truthful, objective, and independent information to you and the citizens of North Dakota. Our mission is to produce informative audits to improve government through our team who is committed to generating greater value for taxpayers.

Today, I’ll walk you through the number of updates and clarifications we’d be requesting to the chapter of the North Dakota Century Code that guides the work of our team at the Auditor’s Office.

State Agency Defined

When I first started with this agency four years ago, I challenged our staff to understand what our audit universe looked like. The first thing we encountered was a lack of definition for ‘state agency.’ Including this definition in 54-10 will clarify for our team and our audit clients who exactly is required to have an audit completed by our office.

Simplify and Increase Thresholds

Currently, the political subdivision of our office conducts audits of local governments in North Dakota. Most local governments are required to have an audit completed once every two years — or instead of an audit — our office can require annual financial reports from:

- School districts with less than 100 students
- Cities with less than 500 residents
- Local governments with less than \$300,000 in annual receipts

The amendments our office is proposing would update verbiage to base the need for an audit on the revenue from cities and school districts. The current thresholds set are arbitrary numbers, and there is substantial risk that cities and school districts that are receiving significant revenue are not being audited. For examples of these, please reference the appendix on page 5.

We strongly recommend that audits are based on the risk of an entity mispending taxpayer money rather than an arbitrary threshold. Evidence of this risk was most recently seen at the Oberon Public School District (student count of 64) audit called by the governor, with our team identifying ten separate areas of concern including \$230,595 in payments with no record of work provided.

As mentioned above, currently our office can require annual reports from local governments with less than \$300,000 in annual receipts rather than a full audit. Our office is proposing raising that revenue threshold amount to \$750,000. This threshold is already familiar to all local governments as this is the current federal revenue threshold to receive a federal Single Audit.

Example of how this update would impact school districts:

- Presently, 43 Public School Districts are not required to receive an audit. Out of this number, only 27 of them choose not to. Switching to a \$750,000 threshold would only impact 13 of those 27 Public School Districts.

Example of how this update would impact cities:

- Presently, 262 cities are not required to receive an audit. Switching to a \$750,000 threshold would only impact 19 of those cities.

Cost analysis overview if these updates are implemented:

There would be 50 water, fire, park, and other districts that would no longer need an audit if these changes are implemented. The total of these audits is approximately \$500,000. Because of these savings, **the total savings to the state would be \$276,000.**

- The cost for an additional 13 audits for school districts would be \$91,000.
- The cost for an additional 19 audits for cities would be \$133,000.
- The total cost of those audits for school districts and cities would be \$224,000.

Adjustment of Fees and Cap

The local government division is specially funded and runs similar to a small business – no general funds are used. The local government division charges the local governments we work with and any revenue generated is deposited into a special fund. All related expenses — including salaries — are paid from that same fund.

North Dakota Century Code 54-10-14 (2) states, “the state auditor shall charge the political subdivision an amount equal to the fair value of the audit and any other services rendered.” Because of rising costs over the years, it is becoming increasingly difficult to cover the costs of these audits and reviews.

Our office is proposing four adjustments to our fees to cover costs:

1. N.D.C.C. 54-10-14 (3)

Our office has not increased this fee in 12 years. We are proposing an increase of \$10 an hour to change our rate from \$80 an hour to \$90 an hour.

Background on rate: In 1993 the rate was \$50 an hour. Increased to \$80 an hour in 2009.

2. N.D.C.C. 54-10-14 (4)

Our office has not increased this fee in 12 years. We are proposing an increase of \$10 an hour to change our rate from \$80 an hour to \$90 an hour.

Background on rate: In 1993 the rate was \$50 an hour. Increased to \$80 an hour in 2009.

3. N.D.C.C. 54-10-27

Our office has not increased this fee in two decades. We are proposing an increase of \$40 an hour to update our rate from \$50 an hour to \$90 an hour.

Background on rate: In 2001 the rate was \$50 an hour. The rate has not increased since.

4. N.D.C.C. 54-10-14 (4)

This section allows our office to charge political subdivision a fee, not to exceed \$500, for the costs related to reviewing audit reports and working papers. We are proposing to increase that cap to \$1,000 both to reflect inflation since the cap was established 18 years ago and to allow us to conduct our statutory duty of reviewing working papers.

Background on rate: In 1993 the cap was added at \$500. The rate has not increased since.

Because there have been no adjustments to the cost for the past 18 years, this rate is not keeping up with inflation. Our office will lose money if an audit report is rejected because the cost of re-reviewing a report after a private firm has had to make changes exceeds \$500.

Our office is also charged with the responsibility of reviewing workpapers to ensure private firms are properly following audit standards. If this cap is raised, we would also have the opportunity to provide feedback to local governments where risk is identified. Presently because of lack of funding, our team is unable to conduct these risk assessments.

Right now, our office is limited on resources to ensure the 14 private firms conducting government audits are meeting standards by performing quality audits.

Access to Records

Section 54-10-24.1 would allow our office the ability to request supporting documentation from local school districts when conducting an audit and examining the distribution of state funding.

We encountered this situation in the 2020 Department of Public Instruction audit. The Assistant Attorney Generals assigned to the State Auditor's Office and the Department of Public Instruction determined neither agency had the authority to obtain supporting documentation from school districts for the audit. During this audit, we found state aid payments of \$1.9 billion and transportation payments of \$54 million that were made to school districts during the audit period. These are significant amounts

of taxpayer dollars yet, because of the inability to follow the records to the individual school district, our team was unable to verify whether those amounts were correct.

Elimination of NDUS Performance Division

This would eliminate the North Dakota University System Performance Division. This was purely done to satisfy the executive budget requirements. Regular audits of the North Dakota University System will continue — as always — through our Agency Division which conducts one audit of each of the public colleges and universities each biennium, including the system office.

This concludes my testimony and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

APPENDIX A: \$750,000 Threshold Examples

Examples of cities with population < 500 that would receive an audit using the \$750,000 annual receipts threshold:

- Arnegard pop. 161 2018 revenue = \$3,507,963
- Peterburg pop. 172 2018 revenue = \$4,700,072
- Oxbow pop. 308 2016 revenue = \$4,193,531
- Alexander pop. 325 2018 revenue = \$4,652,173

Examples of public school districts with student count < 100 that audit using the \$750,000 annual receipts threshold:

- Halliday PSD 23 ct. 2017 revenue = \$1,094,514
- St. Thomas PSD 45 ct. 2018 revenue = \$1,706,754
- Oberon PSD 64 ct. 2018 revenue = \$1,503,545
- Wing PSD 79 ct. 2016 revenue = \$1,875,352
- Drake PSD 80 ct. 2018 revenue = \$2,047,797



NDSBA
NORTH DAKOTA SCHOOL
BOARDS ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 7128
Bismarck ND 58507-7128
1-800-932-8791 • (701)255-4127
www.ndsba.org

SB 2090
Testimony of Alexis Baxley
Senate Education Committee
January 11, 2021

Good morning Chairman Schaible and members of the Senate Education committee. I am Alexis Baxley, executive director of the North Dakota School Boards Association. NDSBA represents every public school district and their board in North Dakota and several special education units. I am here today in opposition to SB 2090

As SB 2090 is currently written, it would provide the auditor's office access to every single record kept by a school district. This presents numerous, significant problems.

First, the sheer volume of records would create incredible burdens of time and cost for school district staff. I have with me today a records retention schedule we provide to our members. It is essentially, a list of every record a district must keep for variable periods of time. It does not represent all records a district may have, and yet, it is a 14-page list of records. If a citizen were to submit an open records request of this size, by law, the district would have the ability to charge up to \$25 per hour and \$.25 per page if copies are required.

In addition to the burdens of time and cost, there is the burden of how the record is provided. Not all records a school district keeps are kept in hard copy format. The legislature has acknowledged this, and as such, only required districts to provide records in the form in which they exist when subject to an open records request. Would the State Auditor be satisfied with this, or would school districts again carry the burden of converting these records to the auditor's desired format?

We are also concerned by the burden on any state agency asked to process these records. I cannot imagine that this would require at least one additional FTE for that agency. NDSBA does not believe this to be a prudent use of taxpayer dollars in the current climate.

But even more concerning than additional burdens or FTEs are potential violations of student and employee privacy. Both the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA) and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) are federal laws that protect student records from disclosure absent parental

consent or applicability of narrow exceptions. Under FERPA, any records maintained by a school district that directly relate to a student are education records protected from disclosure. IDEA protects records of students with disabilities, including but not limited to students' individual education plans or IEPs. Any audits performed by the state auditor that are authorized or required by state law would not necessitate access to student records protected by the IDEA or FERPA. The bill as proposed appears to give the state auditor unfettered access to school records, including student education records protected by FERPA and IDEA. If the bill passes as proposed, it may put school districts in situations where they are asked to disclose records in violation of these laws. Districts risk loss of federal funding if found in violation of these laws.

For these reasons Mr. Chairman, NDSBA has substantial objections to SB 2090. We urge the committee consider the ramifications of providing access to every single record kept by a district to the Auditor and request you give this bill a do not pass recommendation. I will stand for any questions.



1 **SB 2090 – State Auditor’s request of expansion of state auditor authority over K12 Schools**

2 Chairman Schaible and members of the Senate Education Committee. Good day. For the record,
3 my name is Dr. Aimee Copas. I serve as the Executive Director for the North Dakota Council of
4 Educational Leaders – serving our school leaders in North Dakota. I am here today to share with
5 you information regarding the protection of student information at the district level, the importance
6 thereof in the state of North Dakota, the state protections in place with regard to that data as well
7 as the Federal Protections in place with regard to that data. As an aside, nearly a decade ago, I
8 served as the Associate Chancellor for Academics and the Director of Research for the North
9 Dakota University System, so the high level of understanding regarding the protection of student
10 data is something I understand to be of critical importance to our state.

11 Uniquely in my role with NDCEL, I have a statutory role as a member on the State Longitudinal
12 Data Warehouse (SLDS) council and serve also on the governance subcommittee of that council.
13 For decades that group has hashed out student data. Specifically, the question often arises of what
14 is protected data? What is district data and is exclusive to districts? What data can NDDPI have
15 automatically? What is the rationale for sharing data? What type of effort must be taken to protect
16 student data in the sharing of other information? What is reasonable? What is needed? What is
17 “nice” to know vs. “need” to know? Over the years, it has be clearly indicated what data remains
18 protected and is at the district level and what should be allowed – with some protections in place
19 – and what should not. There are quite a few data fields that do not leave the purview of the local
20 school district – not even at the request of NDDPI. In fact, that data is fiercely protected as has
21 been assured by the legislative body for as many sessions as I can remember. To be honest, there
22 are times where things would be easier if we didn’t have to go to the extents we do to protect
23 student privacy, but these protections are in place for important reasons and these protections need
24 to remain in place even if it makes our jobs harder to do.

25 What the state auditor is asking for is stepping outside of the lines of what is allowable information
26 for a school district to disclose. With regard to information needed to perform a state audit on
27 distribution of funding, all of the information needed to do so is already shared with NDDPI in

*NDCEL is the strongest unifying voice representing and supporting administrators and educational leaders in pursuit of quality education
for all students in North Dakota.*

Executive Director: Aimee Copas-----Assistant Director: Russ Ziegler



1 accordance with state law, administrative rules, and funding formula rule reporting requirements.
2 The information shared by local school districts to NDDPI has the appropriate required state and
3 federal protections in place to protect our ND Student's data to the degree the state and federal
4 legislative bodies have deemed appropriate. To request that dive deeper into district level data is
5 a request beyond the audit needs and would require unallowable disclosure of data.

6 Distribution of state funds for education on a per pupil basis are based on a students ADM
7 (Average Daily membership). That is calculated and shared with the state in a real time format
8 through our statewide student information systems. That information lives in a shared context
9 with the state and local districts. The state auditor has full access to that information.

10 Distribution of state funds for transportation are distributed based on a percentage basis.

11 **15.1-27-01. Payments to school districts - Distribution.**

- 12 1. *The superintendent of public instruction shall estimate the total state payments to which*
13 *a school district is entitled each year.*
- 14 2. *The superintendent of public instruction shall pay each district ten percent of the amount*
15 *determined under subsection 1, within the limits of legislative appropriation, on or before*
16 *August first and September first of each year. The superintendent shall pay each school*
17 *district twenty percent of that amount, within the limits of legislative appropriation, on or*
18 *before October first of each year.*
- 19 3. *The superintendent of public instruction shall estimate the amount that, in addition to the*
20 *payments already made, is necessary to constitute the remainder of the amount due*
21 *each district for the current school year.*
- 22 4. *On or before November first, the superintendent of public instruction shall pay to each*
23 *district, within the limits of legislative appropriation, an amount that, in addition to the*
24 *above payments, constitutes sixty percent of the sum due under this chapter.*
- 25 5. *On or before the first day of December, January, February, March, and April, payments*
26 *equal to twenty percent of the total remaining payments must be made to each district.*



1 6. *If funds appropriated for distribution to districts as state aid become available after April*
2 *first, the superintendent of public instruction shall distribute the newly available*
3 *payments on or before June thirtieth.*

4
5 Beyond just what we've decided in North Dakota – it is important to keep in mind that every
6 district in North Dakota must be mindful of laws outlined in Family Educational Rights and
7 Privacy Act commonly known as FERPA. FERPA is the federal student data protection law.
8 According to the US Department of Education at this link:

9 <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>

10 *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)*

11
12 *The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) is a*
13 *Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. The law applies to all schools*
14 *that receive funds under an applicable program of the U.S. Department of Education.*

15 *FERPA gives parents certain rights with respect to their children's education records. These rights*
16 *transfer to the student when he or she reaches the age of 18 or attends a school beyond the high*
17 *school level. Students to whom the rights have transferred are "eligible students."*

- 18 • *Parents or eligible students have the right to inspect and review the student's education*
19 *records maintained by the school. Schools are not required to provide copies of records*
20 *unless, for reasons such as great distance, it is impossible for parents or eligible students to*
21 *review the records. Schools may charge a fee for copies.*
- 22 • *Parents or eligible students have the right to request that a school correct records which*
23 *they believe to be inaccurate or misleading. If the school decides not to amend the record,*
24 *the parent or eligible student then has the right to a formal hearing. After the hearing, if the*
25 *school still decides not to amend the record, the parent or eligible student has the right to*



1 *place a statement with the record setting forth his or her view about the contested*
2 *information.*

- 3 • *Generally, schools must have written permission from the parent or eligible student in order*
4 *to release any information from a student's education record. However, FERPA allows*
5 *schools to disclose those records, without consent, to the following parties or under the*
6 *following conditions (34 CFR § 99.31):*

- 7 ○ *School officials with legitimate educational interest;*
- 8 ○ *Other schools to which a student is transferring;*
- 9 ○ *Specified officials for audit or evaluation purposes;*
- 10 ○ *Appropriate parties in connection with financial aid to a student;*
- 11 ○ *Organizations conducting certain studies for or on behalf of the school;*
- 12 ○ *Accrediting organizations;*
- 13 ○ *To comply with a judicial order or lawfully issued subpoena;*
- 14 ○ *Appropriate officials in cases of health and safety emergencies; and*
- 15 ○ *State and local authorities, within a juvenile justice system, pursuant to specific State*
16 *law.*

17 *Schools may disclose, without consent, "directory" information such as a student's name, address,*
18 *telephone number, date and place of birth, honors and awards, and dates of attendance. However,*
19 *schools must tell parents and eligible students about directory information and allow parents and*
20 *eligible students a reasonable amount of time to request that the school not disclose directory*
21 *information about them. Schools must notify parents and eligible students annually of their rights*
22 *under FERPA. The actual means of notification (special letter, inclusion in a PTA bulletin, student*
23 *handbook, or newspaper article) is left to the discretion of each school.*

24 ****** caveat******

25 *As you look at line 2 above, you may naturally think that this would allow this to the auditor. In*
26 *fact, the definition does not. The below provided by USED and Cornell Law outlines the following*
27 *as deeper definitions of the following. What you find in the below must be a legitimate educational*
28 *interest to seek the information.*



1 **§ 99.31 Under what conditions is prior consent not required to**
2 **disclose information?**

3 **(a)** An [educational agency or institution](#) may disclose personally identifiable information
4 from an education [record](#) of a student without the consent required by [§ 99.30](#) if
5 the [disclosure](#) meets one or more of the following conditions:

6 **(A)** The [disclosure](#) is to other school officials, including teachers, within the
7 agency or institution whom the agency or institution has determined to have
8 legitimate educational interests.

9 **(B)** A contractor, consultant, volunteer, or other [party](#) to whom an agency or
10 institution has outsourced institutional services or functions may be considered a
11 school official under this paragraph provided that the outside [party](#) -

12 **(1)** Performs an institutional service or function for which the agency or
13 institution would otherwise use employees;

14 **(2)** Is under the direct control of the agency or institution with respect to the
15 use and maintenance of [education records](#); and

16 **(3)** Is subject to the requirements of § 99.33(a) governing the use and
17 redisclosure of personally identifiable information from [education records](#).

18 **(ii)** An [educational agency or institution](#) must use reasonable methods to ensure
19 that school officials obtain access to only those [education records](#) in which they
20 have legitimate educational interests. An [educational agency or institution](#) that
21 does not use physical or technological access controls must ensure that its
22 administrative policy for controlling access to [education records](#) is effective and
23 that it remains in compliance with the legitimate educational interest requirement
24 in [paragraph \(a\)\(1\)\(i\)\(A\)](#) of this section.

25 **(2)** The [disclosure](#) is, subject to the requirements of [§ 99.34](#), to officials of another
26 school, school system, or institution of postsecondary education where the student
27 seeks or intends to enroll, or where the student is already enrolled so long as
28 the [disclosure](#) is for purposes related to the student's enrollment or transfer.



1 **Note:**

2 Section 4155(b) of the [No Child Left Behind Act of 2001](#), [20 U.S.C. 7165\(b\)](#), requires
3 each State to assure the [Secretary](#) of Education that it has a procedure in place to
4 facilitate the transfer of disciplinary [records](#) with respect to a suspension or expulsion
5 of a student by a local educational agency to any private or public elementary or
6 secondary school in which the student is subsequently enrolled or seeks, intends, or is
7 instructed to enroll.

8 **(3)** The [disclosure](#) is, subject to the requirements of [§ 99.35](#), to authorized
9 representatives of -

10 **(i)** The Comptroller General of the United States;

11 **(ii)** The Attorney General of the United States;

12 **(iii)** The [Secretary](#); or

13 **(iv)** State and local educational authorities.

14 **(4)**

15 **(i)** The [disclosure](#) is in connection with financial aid for which the student has
16 applied or which the student has received, if the information is necessary for such
17 purposes as to:

18 **(A)** Determine eligibility for the aid;

19 **(B)** Determine the amount of the aid;

20 **(C)** Determine the conditions for the aid; or

21 **(D)** Enforce the terms and conditions of the aid.

22 **(ii)** As used in [paragraph \(a\)\(4\)\(i\)](#) of this section, financial aid means a payment of
23 funds provided to an individual (or a payment in kind of tangible or intangible
24 property to the individual) that is conditioned on the individual's [attendance](#) at
25 an [educational agency or institution](#).

26 (Authority: [20 U.S.C. 1232g\(b\)\(1\)\(D\)](#))



1 **(5)**

2 *(i) The [disclosure](#) is to State and local officials or authorities to whom this*
3 *information is specifically -*

4 *(A) Allowed to be reported or disclosed pursuant to State statute adopted before*
5 *November 19, 1974, if the allowed reporting or [disclosure](#) concerns the juvenile*
6 *justice system and the system's ability to effectively serve the student*
7 *whose [records](#) are released; or*

8 *(B) Allowed to be reported or disclosed pursuant to State statute adopted after*
9 *November 19, 1974, subject to the requirements of [§ 99.38](#).*

10 *(ii) [Paragraph \(a\)\(5\)\(i\)](#) of this section does not prevent a State from further*
11 *limiting the number or type of State or local officials to whom [disclosures](#) may be*
12 *made under that paragraph.*

13 **(6)**

14 *(i) The [disclosure](#) is to organizations conducting studies for, or on behalf of,*
15 *educational agencies or institutions to:*

16 *(A) Develop, validate, or administer predictive tests;*

17 *(B) Administer student aid programs; or*

18 *(C) Improve instruction.*

19 *(ii) Nothing in the [Act](#) or this part prevents a State or local educational authority or*
20 *agency headed by an official listed in [paragraph \(a\)\(3\)](#) of this section from entering*
21 *into agreements with organizations conducting studies under [paragraph \(a\)\(6\)\(i\)](#) of*
22 *this section and redisclosing personally identifiable information from [education](#)*
23 *[records](#) on behalf of educational agencies and institutions that disclosed the*
24 *information to the State or local educational authority or agency headed by an*
25 *official listed in [paragraph \(a\)\(3\)](#) of this section in accordance with the*
26 *requirements of [§ 99.33\(b\)](#).*

27 *(iii) An [educational agency or institution](#) may disclose personally identifiable*
28 *information under [paragraph \(a\)\(6\)\(i\)](#) of this section, and a State or local*

*NDCEL is the strongest unifying voice representing and supporting administrators and educational leaders in pursuit of quality education
for all students in North Dakota.*

Executive Director: Aimee Copas-----Assistant Director: Russ Ziegler



1 educational authority or agency headed by an official listed in [paragraph \(a\)\(3\)](#) of
2 this section may redisclose personally identifiable information under paragraph
3 (a)(6)(i) and (a)(6)(ii) of this section, only if -

4 **(A)** The study is conducted in a manner that does not permit personal
5 identification of [parents](#) and students by individuals other than representatives of
6 the organization that have legitimate interests in the information;

7 **(B)** The information is destroyed when no longer needed for the purposes for
8 which the study was conducted; and

9 **(C)** The [educational agency or institution](#) or the State or local educational
10 authority or agency headed by an official listed in [paragraph \(a\)\(3\)](#) of this
11 section enters into a written agreement with the organization that -

12 **(1)** Specifies the purpose, scope, and duration of the study or studies and the
13 information to be disclosed;

14 **(2)** Requires the organization to use personally identifiable information
15 from [education records](#) only to meet the purpose or purposes of the study as
16 stated in the written agreement;

17 **(3)** Requires the organization to conduct the study in a manner that does not
18 permit personal identification of [parents](#) and students, as defined in this part,
19 by anyone other than representatives of the organization with legitimate
20 interests;

21 and

22 **(4)** Requires the organization to destroy all personally identifiable information
23 when the information is no longer needed for the purposes for which the study
24 was conducted and specifies the time period in which the information must be
25 destroyed.

26 **(iv)** An [educational agency or institution](#) or State or local educational authority or
27 Federal agency headed by an official listed in [paragraph \(a\)\(3\)](#) of this section is not



1 required to initiate a study or agree with or endorse the conclusions or results of
2 the study.

3 **(v)** For the purposes of [paragraph \(a\)\(6\)](#) of this section, the
4 term organization includes, but is not limited to, Federal, State, and local agencies,
5 and independent organizations.

6 **(7)** The [disclosure](#) is to accrediting organizations to carry out their accrediting
7 functions.

8 **(8)** The [disclosure](#) is to parents, as defined in [§ 99.3](#), of a dependent student, as
9 defined in section 152 of the [Internal Revenue Code of 1986](#).

10 **(9)**

11 **(i)** The [disclosure](#) is to comply with a judicial order or lawfully issued subpoena.

12 **(ii)** The [educational agency or institution](#) may disclose information
13 under [paragraph \(a\)\(9\)\(i\)](#) of this section only if the agency or institution makes a
14 reasonable effort to notify the [parent](#) or [eligible student](#) of the order or subpoena
15 in advance of compliance, so that the [parent](#) or [eligible student](#) may seek
16 protective action, unless the [disclosure](#) is in compliance with -

17 **(A)** A Federal grand jury subpoena and the court has ordered that the existence
18 or the contents of the subpoena or the information furnished in response to the
19 subpoena not be disclosed;

20 **(B)** Any other subpoena issued for a law enforcement purpose and the court or
21 other issuing agency has ordered that the existence or the contents of the
22 subpoena or the information furnished in response to the subpoena not be
23 disclosed; or

24 **(C)** An **ex parte** court order obtained by the United States Attorney General (or
25 designee not lower than an Assistant Attorney General) concerning investigations
26 or prosecutions of an offense listed in [18 U.S.C. 2332b\(q\)\(5\)\(B\)](#) or an [act](#) of
27 domestic or international terrorism as defined in [18 U.S.C. 2331](#).

28 **(iii)**



1 (A) If an educational agency or institution initiates legal action against
2 a parent or student, the educational agency or institution may disclose to the
3 court, without a court order or subpoena, the education records of the student
4 that are relevant for the educational agency or institution to proceed with the
5 legal action as plaintiff.

6 (B) If a parent or eligible student initiates legal action against an educational
7 agency or institution, the educational agency or institution may disclose to the
8 court, without a court order or subpoena, the student's education records that
9 are relevant for the educational agency or institution to defend itself.

10 (10) The disclosure is in connection with a health or safety emergency, under the
11 conditions described in § 99.36.

12 (11) The disclosure is information the educational agency or institution has
13 designated as "directory information", under the conditions described in § 99.37.

14 (12) The disclosure is to the parent of a student who is not an eligible student or to
15 the student.

16 (13) The disclosure, subject to the requirements in § 99.39, is to a victim of
17 an alleged perpetrator of a crime of violence or a non-forcible sex offense.
18 The disclosure may only include the final results of the disciplinary proceeding
19 conducted by the institution of postsecondary education with respect to that alleged
20 crime or offense. The institution may disclose the final results of the disciplinary
21 proceeding, regardless of whether the institution concluded a violation was
22 committed.

23 (14)

24 (i) The disclosure, subject to the requirements in § 99.39, is in connection with a
25 disciplinary proceeding at an institution of postsecondary education. The institution
26 must not disclose the final results of the disciplinary proceeding unless it
27 determines that -

28 (A) The student is an alleged perpetrator of a crime of violence or non-forcible
29 sex offense; and



1 **(B)** *With respect to the allegation made against him or her, the student has*
2 *committed a violation of the institution's rules or policies.*

3 **(ii)** *The institution may not disclose the name of any other student, including a*
4 *victim or witness, without the prior written consent of the other student.*

5 **(iii)** *This section applies only to disciplinary proceedings in which the [final](#)*
6 *[results](#) were reached on or after October 7, 1998.*

7 **(15)**

8 **(i)** *The [disclosure](#) is to a [parent](#) of a student at an institution of postsecondary*
9 *education regarding the student's violation of any Federal, State, or local law, or of*
10 *any rule or policy of the institution, governing the use or possession of alcohol or a*
11 *controlled substance if -*

12 **(A)** *The institution determines that the student has committed a disciplinary*
13 *violation with respect to that use or possession; and*

14 **(B)** *The student is under the age of 21 at the time of the [disclosure](#) to*
15 *the [parent](#).*

16 **(ii)** *[Paragraph \(a\)\(15\)](#) of this section does not supersede any provision of State*
17 *law that prohibits an institution of postsecondary education from disclosing*
18 *information.*

19 **(16)** *The [disclosure](#) concerns sex offenders and other individuals required to register*
20 *under section 170101 of the [Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of](#)*
21 *[1994, 42 U.S.C. 14071](#), and the information was provided to the [educational agency](#)*
22 *[or institution](#) under [42 U.S.C. 14071](#) and applicable Federal guidelines.*

23 **(b)**

24 **(1) De-identified records and information.** *An [educational agency or institution](#),*
25 *or a [party](#) that has received [education records](#) or information from [education](#)*
26 *[records](#) under this part, may release the [records](#) or information without the consent*
27 *required by [§ 99.30](#) after the removal of all personally identifiable information*
28 *provided that the [educational agency or institution](#) or other [party](#) has made a*



1 reasonable determination that a student's identity is not personally identifiable,
2 whether through single or multiple releases, and taking into account other reasonably
3 available information.

4 **(2)** An educational agency or institution, or a party that has received education
5 records or information from education records under this part, may release de-
6 identified student level data from education records for the purpose of education
7 research by attaching a code to each record that may allow the recipient to match
8 information received from the same source, provided that -

9 **(i)** An educational agency or institution or other party that releases de-identified
10 data under paragraph (b)(2) of this section does not disclose any information about
11 how it generates and assigns a record code, or that would allow a recipient to
12 identify a student based on a record code;

13 **(ii)** The record code is used for no purpose other than identifying a de-
14 identified record for purposes of education research and cannot be used to
15 ascertain personally identifiable information about a student; and

16 **(iii)** The record code is not based on a student's social security number or other
17 personal information.

18 **(c)** An educational agency or institution must use reasonable methods to identify and
19 authenticate the identity of parents, students, school officials, and any other parties to
20 whom the agency or institution discloses personally identifiable information
21 from education records.

22 **(d)** Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section do not require an educational agency or
23 institution or any other party to disclose education records or information
24 from education records to any party except for parties under paragraph (a)(12) of this
25 section.

26 (Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1232g(a)(5)(A), (b), (h), (i), and (j)).

27 [53 FR 11943, Apr. 11, 1988; 53 FR 19368, May 27, 1988, as amended at 58 FR 3189, Jan. 7, 1993; 61 FR 59296,
28 Nov. 21, 1996; 65 FR 41853, July 6, 2000; 73 FR 74852, Dec. 9, 2008; 74 FR 401, Jan. 6, 2009; 76 FR 75641, Dec.
29 2, 2011]

NDCEL is the strongest unifying voice representing and supporting administrators and educational leaders in pursuit of quality education
for all students in North Dakota.

Executive Director: Aimee Copas-----Assistant Director: Russ Ziegler



1 Lot's of information – what does it mean?

- 2 • Even for audit purposes – the requesting group must have educational interest. NDDPI
- 3 already receives all needed information to satisfactorily perform their duty in delivering
- 4 funds for both state aide and transportation grants. The local districts report the numbers.
- 5 All the allowable information is already transmitted to execute the formula.
- 6 • Any additional information would require the signature and consent of every parent in
- 7 question with regard to further requests for data.
- 8 • This is outside of allowable information sharing with regard to the intent to protect student
- 9 information in North Dakota.

10 Based on this information – and likely more data if requested, we are respectfully asking that you

11 consider this information as you decide whether allowing this type of carte-blanche access to

12 school district and student information to the state auditor. Information that agreeable has been

13 protected to the extent that it is not even shared with our state agency for education. Thank you

14 for your time and consideration.

15

16

2021 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Education Committee
Room JW216, State Capitol

SB 2090
1/13/2021

A BILL relating to records of local school districts; relating to the definition of state agency, the threshold for requiring annual reports, the ability to follow state funding, and fees for audit reviews; and to relating to audits of the state board of higher education.

9:00 AM

Discussion Topics:

- Relating to audits conducted by the state auditor

Motion by **Senator Oban**, second by **Senator Lemm**
Do Not Pass SB 2090

Motion Passed 6-0-0

Senator Schaible will carry the bill.

9:12 AM

Lynn Wolf, Committee Clerk

Senator	Attendance
Chairman Schaible	P
Senator Elkin	P
Senator Conley	P
Senator Lemm	P
Senator Oban	P
Senator Wobbema	P

Senator	Vote
Chairman Schaible	Y
Senator Elkin	Y
Senator Conley	Y
Senator Lemm	Y
Senator Oban	Y
Senator Wobbema	Y

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2090: Education Committee (Sen. Schaible, Chairman) recommends **DO NOT PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2090 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.