

**Legislative Council on the Oregon Quality Education Model**

**February 3, 1999 Hearing Room 357**

**4:00 P.M. Tapes 5 - 8**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**Rep. Vic Backlund**

**Pat Burk**

**John Byrne**

**Tim Carman**

**David Conley**

**Gary Conkling**

**Sal Cox**

**Rep. Randall Edwards**

**Stephen Greer**

**Jonathan Hill**

**Jim Jamieson**

**Judy Kaminsky**

**Rep. Lynn Lundquist**

**Peggy Lynch**

**Frank McNamara**

**James Minturn**

**Ozzie Rose**

**Vern Ryles**

**Rep. Ben Westlund**

**Gary Withers**

**Duncan Wyse**

**MEMBER EXCUSED: Sen. Tom Hartung**

**Sen. David Nelson**

**STAFF PRESENT: Margie Hunt, Administrator**

**Kevin E. Wells, Gary Roulier, Administrative Support**

**MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: Work Group Reports**

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE#	Speaker	Comments
<b>TAPE 5, A</b>		
004	Chair Lundquist	Opens meeting at 4:19 p.m. Asks members to introduce themselves.
039	Chair Lundquist	Outline the work groups' proposed schedules ( <b>EXHIBIT A</b> ). Recaps the challenge before the committee, to determine Oregon's quality education model and the resources necessary to allow students to reach the new high standards. Reminds members of the deadline for results.
082	Chair Lundquist	Supports citizens on the committee.
107	Tim Carman	Reports on the Special Education Sub-committee. Discusses the concerns and vision of the workgroup.
125	Peggy Lynch	Reads statement: In five years, Special Education in Oregon will be characterized by treatment, family support, individualized educational support at the school site; funding will be based on identifiable need and handicapping condition without artificial constraints.
130	Carman	Explains the elements model for Special Education. Discusses funding model and strategy.
175	Chair Lundquist	Comments that Special Education is an area of concern for citizens. Notes that this is a complex issue.
188	Lynch	Comments that many of the students have minor problems that can be treated in a school situation. States need to look at ways to fund these services as well as more intensive needs students. Stresses that the committee does not need to look at their full needs, but only education needs.

220	Carman	Emphasizes that "teachers are at their limit."
228	Margie Hunt	Restates a conclusion of the workgroup: current funding is adequate for mild Special Education students; the stress comes from the most severely handicapped 25 percent of students.
248	Carman	States that his school district does not have the resources to meet the special needs population because they cost a lot more than mild students.
255	James Minturn	Relates that, in rich districts, in other states, there are Special Education students who should not be classified as such, because parents want the increased attention for their children.
266	Carman	Notes that this is only a conceptual model.
270	Vern Ryles	Asks what resource capacity is needed to address the 30 percent commitment.
277	Carman	Suggests how to get at projections to estimate needs.
283	Lynch	States that Special Education students can be better served, but also that this needs to take place at the same time as all students are better served.
295	Stephen Greer	Asks if need changes year to year.
298	Carman	Explains that the need increases year to year as programs develop.
302	Jim Jamieson	Notes that people move into a district when services are good.
320	Rep. Edwards	Asks about waivers for extra funding.
325	Carman	Answers that for any percent above 11% a district can apply for a waiver, but one does not get the double weight formula, but less.
330	Lynch	Underscores that waivers are not a solution.
326	Rep. Edwards	Asks about taking Special Education students out of funding formula.
346	Carman	States that the current double weight formula works as a disincentive.
354	Chair Lundquist	Relates concerns he heard around the state. Suggest that if double weighting was originally accurate and now more kids more severely impacted, by definition there is a problem.

383	Carman	Expresses belief that double weight funding is inaccurate.
390	Hunt	Relates comments from Steve Johnson, Associate Superintendent, Office of Special Education: We do not know if Special Education is adequately funded.
401	Jonathan Hill	Identifies ways of looking at data on costs.
425	Minturn	Asks if some of these cases can be prevented, and what the long run percentage should be.
440	Carman	Replies that no one knows. Explains the idea is that by getting to students early it will reduce the overall costs.
445	Minturn	Suggests that a portion of the budget should be devoted to prevention.
447	Carman	Agrees that is the goal.
<b>TAPE 6, A</b>		
015	Greer	States that not all students cost the same.
021	Frank McNamara	Reviews some history of funding. Emphasizes waivers do not meet funding needs. Comments that the legislature has been reluctant to cover extra costs for Special Education. Adds that double weighting began as a way to get more money from the legislature.
082	McNamara	Explains that the funding formula was averaged out for all students. States that with experience they now have better knowledge. Remarks that it is not clear if low cost and high cost students cancel out.
115	Carman	Underscores that in the proposed model the school will provide education, but other community groups will provide other services at the school.
122	McNamara	Comments that the family service model is not new, but standardizes the pockets of excellence.
157	Lynch	Summarizes the gap in funding, the diversity of Education Service Districts (ESD) funding and the legislature's role in linking various services through the school site.
195	Rep. Jeff Krupf	District 37. Asks about tracking costs.
203	Chair Lundquist	Replies that there is an effort to track costs for high needs students.

205	Ryles	Remarks that it would be beneficial to separate the two classes from a management perspective.
219	Minturn	Asks why the special needs have grown so much and suggests the need to find the cause.
253	Rep. Backlund	Asks whether there is a philosophy of mainstreaming these special needs children.
259	Lynch	Responds that the requirements are mandated at the federal level.
268	Pat Burk	Adds that the requirement is to mainstream the child as much as possible, or to place them in the least restrictive environment.
289	Hill	Remarks that parents are split in half on whether this is a good idea, as well as centralizing versus decentralizing services.
313	McNamara	Adds that the federal law has always mandated mainstreaming. Notes the lack of good data on the transitions between levels of care. States that children with lower level disabilities tend to be dealt with early, while those with severe conditions do not tend to transition out.
359	Chair Lundquist	Asks for concluding remarks and preview for next meeting.
373	Carmen	Reviews next meeting place and time.
377	Conley	Asks about the two different classes. Adds that learning disabled students should be in a different category.
422	Ryles	Asks for clarification of "learning disabled" and what percentage level they constitute.
<b>TAPE 5, B</b>		
020	David Conley	Discusses the percentages of "learning disabled."
047	Duncan Wyse	Summarizes activities of ESDs and changes necessitated by the passage of Measure 5. Notes that the current funding practices create a wide disparity of funding levels between districts. Adds that ESDs provide numerous services.
096	Wyse	Continues testimony about ESDs. Outlines that there is a need to define the role of ESDs.

118	Ozzie Rose	Summarizes the history of ESDs. States that the problem is too big to solve this session, and an interim effort will be necessary.
145	Hill	Agrees with Rose, but states that the goals set forth in the law are sound.
164	Lynch	Outlines the stated objectives of ESDs.
181	Hunt	Asks for the funding amount for ESDs.
184	Wyse	Responds that it is \$290 million per biennium.
193	Chair Lundquist	Asks about the split between local and state funding, and whether it is 75 percent to 25 percent. Discusses that the split varies by district.
202	Rose	Remarks that the ESDs may not be the best delivery vehicle.
217	Chair Lundquist	States that while funding in different ESDs is not equal, the services required in the different ESDs also varies widely.
239	Lynch	Remarks that inequities exist in services provided by ESDs.
266	Greer	Asks if they should look at a model of what regionalizing services would look like, and then let governance and budgeting trail from the model.
269	Rose	Responds that costs vary widely in the state: in eastern Oregon, for example, it may take four hours of cost to receive one hour of therapy because of geographical distances.
287	Wyse	States that they need to develop a framework of the right questions to ask to be able to advance the discussion.
289	Chair Lundquist	Remarks that they will not be able to completely overhaul the system, but can accomplish something on ESDs.
300	Rose	Responds that ESDs are working on the problem. Believes the focus should be on services provided and not on ESDs.
313	Lynch	Notes that the Legislature has been looking at different opportunities for delivering regional services.
326	Chair Lundquist	Reviews that the meeting is going to be focused on developing a model for making a decision on funding for K-12. Recesses the meeting.

354	Chair Lundquist	Reconvenes the meeting.
387	Conley	Presents and summarizes the development of the funding model ( <b>EXHIBIT C</b> ).
<b>TAPE 6, B</b>		
002	Conley	Continues discussion of model development. Discusses the three stages in the development of the hypothetical model ( <b>EXHIBIT C, p. 1</b> ).
045	Conley	Presents <b>EXHIBIT D</b> and discusses some proposed assumptions. Notes that the number for high school populations was misprinted, and should be 1,000 instead of 401.
090	Conley	Discusses assumed levels of Social Economic Status (SES), special education levels, facility age, and other assumptions of the model ( <b>EXHIBIT D, p. 2</b> ).
144	Conley	Continues discussion of the model, to include the quality of the teacher force and teacher experience ( <b>EXHIBIT D, p. 3</b> ). Notes that on item 10, the numbers expressed are in hours and not in percentages.
193	Conley	Continues testimony on the model ( <b>EXHIBIT D, p. 3</b> ), and notes that there is no data available on FTE allocated to remediation or failures. Clarifies that item 13 assumes that 87 percent of the schools are connected to the internet. Remarks that they will need to rework the data.
241	Burk	States that connectivity issues are different depending on the age of the building.
264	Conley	Continues to outline model assumptions ( <b>EXHIBIT D, pp. 3 &amp; 4</b> ).
272	Lynch	Comments that item 16 is based on time spent on completing homework, rather than a reflection on how much homework is assigned.
281	Conley	Continues discussion of model assumptions, to include attendance, discipline and dropout rates ( <b>EXHIBIT D, p. 4</b> ). Asks for a discussion of the specific assumptions in the model.
343	Greer	Asks if the overall size of the district would be a variable.
349	Conley	Responds that it may be a variable.
354	Gary Conkling	Asks whether these variables can be objective, and whether the variables can be costed out.

370	Conley	Answers that this model is not designed at this stage to assign costs.
380	Conkling	Asks about the statistical approach for measurement of costs. Discusses with Conley how the model would be used to determine costs.
<b>TAPE 7, A</b>		
002	Rose	Discusses the variable of class size.
027	Bryne	Outlines how one may assign costs in the model.
044	Rep. Hill	Asks about the staff development aspects of the model.
045	Conley	Responds that even if the quality of the teacher force was high, it does not necessarily mean that the teachers know how to deal with students who do not meet the standards.
061	Rep. Siegal	Remarks that teachers feel that they lack the time for professional development.
071	Hill	Remarks that many individual teachers talk about additional training but will not take advantage of it even if it is offered.
083	Sal Coxé	Relates that the development of teachers is a complicated issue.
106	Burk	Discusses that the number of hours for staff development could be targeted.
126	Reverend Hobson	Discusses the figures in the model with Conley, particularly the assumptions regarding high school size, SES, and teacher experience.
164	Greer	States that the community does not understand benchmarking, and that this model could be used to help explain the standards.
179	Conley	Responds that the model can be used to explain standards, as opposed to simply ranking schools.
198	Rose	States that the problem is how to use the standards to bring about improvements.
221	Burk	Discusses the SES assumptions ( <b>EXHIBIT D, p. 1</b> ).
261	Conley	Admits that the model is limited in the assumptions one can make.

273	Rep. Edwards	Discusses with Conley the geographical assumptions ( <b>EXHIBIT D, p. 3</b> ).
300	Rep. Siegal	Discusses item 20 of the model ( <b>EXHIBIT D, p. 4</b> ).
320	Conley	Emphasizes that the model is simply the next step.
342	Chair Lundquist	Adds that the model figures are simply a way to determine the impact of resources.
356	Wyse	Remarks that the model is not an outcome.
373	Chair Lundquist	Explains that the model is designed to show us where we are.
389	Byrne	Adds that the model is designed for an overall picture.
396	Lynch	Argues that the dropout rate is not relevant to the model.
413	Greer	States that the graduation rate is more relevant.
<b>TAPE 8, A</b>		
006	Conley	States that the dropout rate does affect other elements of the assumptions.
009	Hunt	Asks about the discipline variable.
016	Conley	States that it is a variable that affects costs because discipline problems are disruptive, and the amount of disruption varies by school. Adds that these figures can be used as an indicator of the disorder in the school.
044	Rep. Edwards	Asks about the variable regarding the size of the district.
052	Wyse	Responds that overhead costs in a district are not that variable.
056	Hill	Adds that the size of the district is not a factor.
062	Rose	States that the committee needs to focus on the larger picture.
071	Chair Lundquist	Remarks that the model will not reflect an individual school for funding purposes.

081	Burk	Asks about the issue of extracurricular activities. Discusses with Conley the relationship of participation in activities and academic performance, and that it should be costed. Continues with a discussion of class size.
128	Conley	Discusses differences between assumptions and program elements.
139	Burk	Remarks that the costs of extracurricular activities need to be included in the model.
153	Conley	States that an assumption for extracurricular activities in high schools is valid.
159	McNamara	Asks about the costs of janitors, cooks, and other services.
166	Conley	Remarks that those fixed costs could be included in the model.
176	Wyse	Comments that this particular data will be included in the data on the building.
204	Chair Lundquist	Remarks that the communities' interest will be in the final product, not on the assumptions made in the model.
217	Wyse	States that the funding model creates a sense of accountability.
222	Chair Lundquist	Relates an anecdote about establishing the credibility of the process.
237	Conley	Adds that this process can change the dynamics of discussions about school funding. Discusses the need for additional data at future subcommittee meetings. Adds that they will revisit many of the assumptions on the model.
294	Hunt	Asks the committee if they are comfortable with the general assumptions.
312	McNamara	Relates that he worries that the model will create unrealistic expectations for every school, and that the legislature could use the model to proscribe certain programs.
356	Chair Lundquist	Discusses the February 4, 1999 subcommittee meeting.
<b>TAPE 7, B</b>		
006	Wyse	Presents and summarizes the Draft Oregon Business Council 1999-2001 Budget & Legislation Recommendations ( <b>EXHIBIT E</b> ).
042	Wyse	Continues testimony outlining the status of Oregon schools today. Demonstrates

		where Oregon ranks among other states.
079	Wyse	Demonstrates the differences in test scores by school for the same amount of spending per student ( <b>EXHIBIT E, pp. 3 &amp; 4</b> ).
101	Wyse	Continues by outlining what it will take to reach high performance standards ( <b>EXHIBIT E, p. 4</b> ).
155	Wyse	Discusses the historical development of benchmarks.
184	Wyse	Continues by outlining a new budget system. Demonstrates the use of the hypothetical model to determine funding based on desired levels of class size and other variables.
230	Byrne	States that he questions the assumed goals.
237	Wyse	Answers that the goals are realistic.
245	Bryne	Adds that the socio-economic levels have a great impact on performance.
253	Wyse	Responds that is an important factor. Continues discussion of the uses of the model and database.
286	Rose	Remarks that the process is changing in regard to uses of data for measurement.
303	Jamieson	Asks if there are differences built into the model regarding differences in SES and regions.
312	Wyse	Answers that they have taken those factors into account.
317	Jamieson	Asks how the model accounts for differences in SES.
330	Wyse	Answers that they factor in the differences in SES such as levels of parent education.
356	Rose	States that salaries can also be a variable.
368	Wyse	Acknowledges the benefits of discussing the model. Summarizes factors to be considered to establish a funding level ( <b>EXHIBIT E, p. 7</b> ).
<b>TAPE 8, B</b>		

003	Lynch	Asks about the budget. Questions the Current Service Level (CSL) figure of \$4.38 billion.
007	Wyse	Answers that those are the CSL figures used by the Governor and the President of the Senate.
009	Chair Lundquist	Remarks that the figures are political. Adds that one important function of the committee is to remove the arguments about baseline figures. Adjourns the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Administrative Support Majorie Hunt,

Kevin E. Wells, Gary Roulier Administrator

#### **EXHIBIT SUMMARY**

**A - Council Schedule, Margie Hunt, 1 p.**

**B - Special Education Sub-Committee minutes, Tim Carman, 2 pp.**

**C ñ Legislative Council Funding Model, David Conley, 2 pp**

**D ñ Proposed General Assumptions, David Conley, 4 pp**

**E ñ Draft Budget & Legislative Recommendations, Duncan Wyse, 9 pp**