



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 711		DATE: 2/11/2025	
COMMITTEE: Legislative Review			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: arniedienoff@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/11/2025 11:59 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 711		DATE: 2/11/2025	
COMMITTEE: Legislative Review			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MELISSA JONES		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mjones@rockinmtack.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/11/2025 4:23 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I would first like to state that I am in favor of open enrolment. Parents should have a choice in what school their child/children attend. There are many reasons why a parent(s) would want to send their children to a different school. Some examples may be bullying, issues with school administration/faculty, repetitive disruptive classmates, class sizes, and more opportunities. I personally know multiple families that have pulled their children to homeschool, move to a different school district, or are paying tuition to send their children to a different public school district for all of the reasons listed above. To have a true free public school open enrollment, I believe the bill needs to have additional verbiage in the bill that addresses students that are already attending a nonresident public school by paying tuition and possibly already eligible to play sports at the nonresident public school in regards to MSHAA rules. With the way that the bill reads currently, a transferring student is defined as a student that is enrolled and completed one semester in their resident district immediately prior to transferring to a nonresident district. It is also noted that transferring under this bill the student is ineligible for sports for 365 days. I believe that there needs to be verbiage added that if a student has been paying tuition for a nonresident public school for a year or over and is already eligible in the nonresident school to play sports (per MSHAA transfer rules, if they play sports) that they should be able to stay at the nonresident school under this bill without having to follow the procedures for a child that is currently attending their resident district and wanting to transfer out under this bill for the first time. The money should follow the student already paying tuition to where they don't have to pay tuition anymore to the nonresident public school district and still be eligible for sports if they have already met the MSHAA transfer rules. With the way that I interpret the current bill, the student would have to transfer back to the resident school district, attend and complete the semester, hope that the lottery system picks them to be able to apply to transfer back to the nonresident school district that they were paying for, and then they would be ineligible to play sports for 365 days. With the current verbiage the parents that have already removed their child/children from the resident school district is either being forced to continue to pay tuition to a nonresident public school or will be forced to put their child/children back into a school district that did not work for them and disrupt their education/social life with transferring back. Just for the simple hope of getting drawn from the lottery system to be able to get back to the nonresident school and would also be penalized by not being able to play sports that they were possibly already eligible to play in the nonresident school district by being enrolled in the nonresident district for a year or over. To have true free open enrollment, shouldn't we also be including the families that have already taken a stand and pulled their kids from their resident district as well without being forced back into the resident district that they have already pulled out of?



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 711		DATE: 2/11/2025
COMMITTEE: Legislative Review		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: MELISSA JONES		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: mjones@jackhenry.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/11/2025 4:13 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I would first like to state that I am in favor of open enrolment. Parents should have a choice in what school their child/children attend. There are many reasons why a parent(s) would want to send their children to a different school. Some examples may be bullying, issues with school administration/faculty, repetitive disruptive classmates, class sizes, and more opportunities. I personally know multiple families that have pulled their children to homeschool, move to a different school district, or are paying tuition to send their children to a different public school district for all of the reasons listed above. To have a true free public school open enrollment, I believe the bill needs to have additional verbiage in the bill that addresses students that are already attending a nonresident public school by paying tuition and possibly already eligible to play sports at the nonresident public school in regards to MSHAA rules. With the way that the bill reads currently, a transferring student is defined as a student that is enrolled and completed one semester in their resident district immediately prior to transferring to a nonresident district. It is also noted that transferring under this bill the student is ineligible for sports for 365 days. I believe that there needs to be verbiage added that if a student has been paying tuition for a nonresident public school for a year or over and is already eligible in the nonresident school to play sports (per MSHAA transfer rules, if they play sports) that they should be able to stay at the nonresident school under this bill without having to follow the procedures for a child that is currently attending their resident district and wanting to transfer out under this bill for the first time. The money should follow the student already paying tuition to where they don't have to pay tuition anymore to the nonresident public school district and still be eligible for sports if they have already met the MSHAA transfer rules. With the way that I interpret the current bill, the student would have to transfer back to the resident school district, attend and complete the semester, hope that the lottery system picks them to be able to apply to transfer back to the nonresident school district that they were paying for, and then they would be ineligible to play sports for 365 days. With the current verbiage the parents that have already removed their child/children from the resident school district is either being forced to continue to pay tuition to a nonresident public school or will be forced to put their child/children back into a school district that did not work for them and disrupt their education/social life with transferring back. Just for the simple hope of getting drawn from the lottery system to be able to get back to the nonresident school and would also be penalized by not being able to play sports that they were possibly already eligible to play in the nonresident school district by being enrolled in the nonresident district for a year or over. To have true free open enrollment, shouldn't we also be including the families that have already taken a stand and pulled their kids from their resident district as well without being forced back into the resident district that they have already pulled out of?