

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON

HUMAN RESOURCES AND EDUCATION

February 8, 1995 Hearing Room
8:00 a.m.

Tapes 28 -31

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Dennis Luke, Chair
Rep. Frank Shields, Chair
Rep. Bill Fisher
Rep. Mike Lehman
Rep. John Meek
Rep. Patti Milne
Rep. Barbara Ross
Rep. Lynn Snodgrass
Rep. Charles Starr
Rep. Terry Thompson
Rep. Sharon Wylie

STAFF PRESENT:

Jan McComb, Administrator
Tom Mann, Administrator
Shelley Jones, Assistant

MEASURES HEARD:

Review of Education Reform Act 1991, HB 3565
HB 2100 Work Session
HB 2071 Work Session

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE 28, SIDE A

005 CHAIR LUKE: Opens the meeting at 8:15 a.m.

The following invited guest reviewed HB 3565, passed during the 1991 Legislative session, section by section with the committee.

VICKIE TOTTEN, OREGON SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
JOANNE FLINT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RON SUNSERI
MICHAEL EWERS

010 TOTTEN: Reviews Section 18 with the committee related to prekindergarten, prenatal care, parenting education, child-parent centers and funding issues.

050 SUNSERI: Paraphrases the concerns regarding prekindergarten programs, and the Head Start program income levels to be used.

147 FLINT: Section 19 (A) and the mandate that the Department of Education shall administer early childhood programs. It would be better to administered at a local level rather than a state level. (EXHIBIT A)

180 TOTTEN: Section 19(a) is an unfunded grant program.

218 ROSS: Comments that Sections 19 (A) (B) could not been activated unless funds are available.

256 SUNSERI: Comments on models for use by school districts for developmentally appropriate nongraded primary programs and on currently proposed appropriate practices.

300 STAFF: distributes (EXHIBITS B & C) on appropriate and inappropriate practices.

342 FLINT: Comments on programs implemented by local school boards with grant funds to develop nongraded primary programs and instructional practices.

360 -The majority of funds so far allocated went to work force programs within the schools under SB 87. Most of the funds requested under the grant program were determined by local school boards.

433 EWERS: The language of the grant needs to be aligned with what is specified in the bill. There are varied opinions and support for other methods of education. Submits information on Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) outcomes for science and mathematics. (EXHIBIT D)

TAPE 29, SIDE A

050 LEHMAN: Ask about developmentally appropriate practices and the history of it.

075 EWERS: States that it is a model of education that has been in practice for many, many years.

150 TOTTEN: Section 20 and the timeline for full implementation of the standards for the CIM.

200 -Standards and accommodations for home schooled students, migrant children, private schooled and out of state students.

218 MILNE: Where do the special ed. children fit into Section 20.

220 FLINT: Special ed. students are given the same opportunity to achieve the CIM.

290 LUKE: Asked if any school district has not completed the plan for the CIM, as required.

325 ROSS: Questions whether every student will be able to obtain the certificate by the deadline.

339 FLINT: There needs to be some flexibility, to allow districts to implement. It is suggested that a two tiered system be used, and some provisions in SB 98 will allow flexibility if local districts cannot meet the deadlines and requirements.

380 -CIM is pretty well underway. Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) is about a year away from implementation. Some districts are further advanced in the process than others.

430 SUNSERI: Comments on concerns with both certificate programs and the shift from graded system change to the Individual Portfolio (IP) system.

TAPE 28, SIDE B

045 EWERS: Comments on ambiguous wording in Section 20 and Section 21, such as "assure" that students exhibit knowledge.

080 -Performance based assessment system that is not a proven model.

089 FLINT: Disagrees and states that performance based learning and performance based assessment is not a new practice. Exist in fourteen other states. The intent has been to ensure that statewide, we have consistent standards established and in place.

119 -The eleven outcomes we are talking about are not new, the content standards is something that has always been apart of the Department of Education standards.

150 ROSS: Ask for clarification on the national standards and the international standards.

155 FLINT: The majority of national standards exist and will be adopted nationally this year. The international standards do not exist for all the disciplines.

175 -The Department of Education will continue to provide technical assistance to local school districts in the implementation and assurance in approving education and improving schools.

216 TOTTEN: Section 21, and the assessment system for these standards including performance based standards.

280 ROSS: Questions on Section 21, and whether the section is binding on all school districts to provide additional services to reach the performance level stated in Section 21.

290 TOTTEN: Does think that the wording is binding, and districts are obligated to provide services to assist students that are not achieving the established performance requirements.

330 THOMPSON: This will compound the problem of getting good teachers to work in districts that have a history of lower standards or are not as strong as other districts.

377 ROSS: Points out Section 37, and the wording that "Nothing in this act is intended to be mandated without adequate funding support" and if funding is not provided, there will be situations where implementation will not occur or be able to occur as quickly.

417 SUNSERI: Concern of the loss of local control and implementation cost to develop the assessment tool cost.

TAPE 29, SIDE B

070 MILNE: Directs Ms. Totten to group the sections and finish the presentation today.

100 EWERS: Raised concerns about Section 22 on the employment of minors and encouraging students to remain in school rather than seek employment before graduation.

122 FLINT: Department of Education is recommending that Section 22 be deleted. It is proposed in SB 98 to repeal that section. Also proposed OAR 581, Employment of Minors is distributed to the committee. (EXHIBIT E)

170 LEHMAN: Questions on the reform of the educational system and the ability to fulfill the requirements of the bill. Staff distributes article on education reform. (EXHIBIT F)

200 TOTTEN: Section 25, Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). High school diploma and certificates.

250 -Academic professional technical indorsements

280 -College Prep indorsement, Professional/Technical indorsement

308 -Section 28, outlines the two year to five year academic professional technical indorsements and associate degrees. Also the six broad occupational categories referred to in the bill are outlined in this section.

380 FLINT: Reviews the two year to five year academic professional technical indorsement concept.
Suggest someone who is more involved in the development of these be asked to testify before the committee.

415 SUNSERI: Comments on why he is opposed to the concept of Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) and concerns for students who will have to make choices at an early age of 15 or 16 on a career choices or training choices that will be hard to change.

463 -Also raised concerns that small communities might not be able to meet the CAM requirements.

TAPE 30, SIDE A

040 EWERS: Students are questioning if there will be a single college CAM available. Explains the concerns of the occupational CAM versus the college CAM.

060 LUKE: Raised the question, what schools are accepting the CAM? States that he has received feedback from constituents that the military is currently not accepting the CAM.

118 TOTTEN: Section 27, and the requirement for the two years of study is a concept that is fundamentally the same as in practice now, the college prep or professional technical tracks are where implementation discussions are on going.

160 EWERS: Good example is trying to provide services to students that are not going to college, but has concerns of students choosing a vocation or career in the 10th grade.

193 ROSS: Section 25, questions if this bill allows a student to chose just a college prep course rather than one of the vocational tracks.

220 MEEK: Comments that we are not there yet, in implementing the reforms outlined in HB 3565, but three years into developing it. How do we respond

to the questions about what will a student know when he/she gets a CIM or a CAM.

280 TOTTEN: Responds that fundamental program features are not in the reports to date, but still under construction to build this new system as outlined in the bill.

308 -How to take the law and put it into action, need to have the Department of Education respond on how they are implementing.

349 SNODGRASS: Questions about choosing a technical training track in the 10th grade and many years later the former student wants to switch to a college degree. Asked how that process would work.

391 SHIELDS: Does it really make any difference what the previous diploma was when someone switches into a professional career.

400 FLINT: Does not think it will be much different, there are fundamental basic's in each program.

440 TOTTEN: Explains that the person would probably do what is done now in order to switch career tracks.

TAPE 31, SIDE A

060 FLINT: Answers questions of CIM and CAM from committee.

100 TOTTEN: Sections 33, amended an existing statute with previously adopted HB 2020, modified definitions and added the word "parent" to school council. Section 34, established building site committees and the definition.

150 -Building site committees and their responsibilities, the conflict between the building site committees and local school committees. (EXHIBIT G)

200 SUNSERI: Raised concerns about the concept violating our very form of government by establishing conflicting boards or committees. People who have a dissenting view are not allowed to serve on building site committees. Site committees were established to implement the bill. Comments that dissenters would not be welcome on the committees

240 TOTTEN: Clarifies the difference in the roles on local school boards authority and the site committees.

250 Staff distributes copy of OAR 581-22, Department of Education. (EXHIBIT H)
-Written testimony submitted by Gayna Flake. (EXHIBIT I)
-HB 2001, passed 1989. (EXHIBIT J)

286 SNODGRASS: Section 34, (1) and questions the delegation of teacher professional development to building site committees. She thinks that local school committees have that authority.

300 TOTTEN: Clarifies Section 34, and the authority of building site committees.

-Grant-in-aid for professional development of teachers.
350 -No grants-in-aid funding is being released.

400 LEHMAN: Comments on school boards authority.

430 TOTTEN: Responds on school board authority, and the conditions of the current grant programs; they are currently inoperative programs.

460 MILNE: Comments on the building site committees authority and the local school committees authority.

TAPE 30, SIDE B

050 TOTTEN: If we are talking about solutions, then removing the cross reference in Section 34 would clarify the language or the intent of the original language.

080 -Section 31, extended school year models.

140 SNODGRASS: Concerns that this committee and the whole system is not dealing with funding questions that need to be discussed.

145 MILNE: Thanks the invited guest for their presentation and testimony.

HB 2100 WORK SESSION

McCOMB: Staff submits preliminary staff measure summary, fiscal impact and revenue analysis. (EXHIBIT K)

155 SNODGRASS: Reviews HB 2100 with the committee which adds a student to

the State Scholarship Commission.

170 GARY ADEEN, OREGON INDEPENDENT COLLEGES ASSOCIATION: Request that one
of the two students on the Scholarship Commission be an independent college
representative.

200 SHIELDS: Comments on allowing public and private representation on the
Commission.

220 ROSS: Ask what portion of our students are independent college
students.

230 MILNE: Proposes amendment to allow one of the two appointments be an
independent college representative.

250 WYLIE: Likes the ideas of expanding the number of students represented
on the Board, but not in favor of the proposed amendment to open
representation to one of the smallest groups.

300 ADEEN: Not asking for special treatment, just equal treatment, and
therefore a representative
from the independent college.

340 MEEK: Pretty simple amendment, the history has been to include minority
groups.

380 MOTION: REP. MILNE: Moves the ADOPTION of amendments to HB 2100 to
require specific appointment of one private school student and one public
school student to the two student positions allotted.

VOTE: In a roll call vote, REPS. FISHER, MEEK, MILNE, SNODGRASS, STARR,
SHIELDS vote AYE. REPS. LEHMAN, ROSS, THOMPSON, WYLIE, LUKE vote NO.

385 CHAIR LUKE: The motion CARRIES, HB 2100 is referred back to the
Education Subcommittee for public hearing on amendments.

HB 2071 WORK SESSION

390 MANN: Staff submits staff measure summary, fiscal impact, revenue
analysis and testimony from subcommittee hearing from Jeffery Kushner,
Assistant Director, Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs. (EXHIBITS L
& M)

420 MOTION: REP. FISHER Moves HB 2071 be sent to the Committee on Ways and
Means in accordance with its prior referral with a DO PASS recommendation.

VOTE: In a roll call vote all members are present and vote AYE.

CHAIR LUKE: The motion CARRIES.

450 CHAIR LUKE: Adjourns the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Shelley M. Jones
Committee Assistant

Jan Mc Comb
Committee Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG:

A- HB 3565, Testimony- Flint- 6 pages
B- HB 3565, Background Material- Staff- 3 pages
C- HB 3565, Background Material- Staff- 4 pages
D- HB 3565, Testimony- Ewers- 1 page
F- HB 3565, Background Material- Staff- 5 pages
G- HB 3565, Testimony- Totten- 4 pages
H- HB 3565, Background Material- Staff- 1 page
I- HB 3565, Testimony- Flake- 2 pages
J- HB 3565, Background Material- Staff- 6 pages
K- HB 2100, SMS/Fiscal/Revenue Analysis- Staff- 2 pages
L- HB 2071, SMS/Fiscal/Revenue Analysis- Staff- 3 pages
M- HB 2071, Testimony- Kushner- 5 pages