

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
HUMAN RESOURCES AND EDUCATION

March 6, 1995     Hearing Room  
8:00 a.m.         Tapes   - 52

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Dennis Luke, Chair  
Rep. Frank Shields, Vice-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, Committee Administrator  
Tom Mann, Committee Administrator  
Shelley Jones, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD:

HB 2991 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 , SIDE A

010         CHAIR LUKE:   Calls meeting to order at 8:08 a.m.

             HB 2991 WORK SESSION

040         SUSIE GARRISON, JOHN DAY:   Testifies on Section 60 of HB 2991 related to  
site councils.

111         Explains the process and input of parents involved in the site council  
in John Day.

             -Supports site councils as they are outlined.

150         SHIELDS:   Asked about the balance of teachers and parents on the site  
council structure.

160         GARRISON:   Supports and encourages parents involvement in the local site  
councils.

169 SHIELDS: Ask if the ratio of parents and teachers should be equal.

195 SNODGRASS: She has received comments from parents serving on site councils and their concern of being in the minority. Asked if speaker would be in favor of letting each local site council make up their own ratio of parents to teachers serving on the local site councils.

250 McCOMB: Explains the process of developing amendments. Met with Bonnie Grossen to strengthen the assessment language.

280 BONNIE GROSSEN, EUGENE: Reviews the list of suggested amendments to strengthen the assessment language in the draft amendments. (EXHIBIT A)  
-Comments that Section 20 & Section 21 in Rep. Milne's draft includes some important things.

318 LUKE: Comments that Section 20 and Section 21 come out of the original ORS 329.000.

320 GROSSEN: Transition should be to develop standards by local school boards.  
-State develops a set of standards, and local school boards review, amend and/or adopt.  
-Standards should be referred for local review to ensure they are acceptable and valid.

380 -Whole point of this process was to improve student achievement, and seems to be getting lost in the shuffle.

400 -Models should be developed that increase student achievement.

426 SNODGRASS: Asked about line 12 referring to use of word performance or assessment .

456 LUKE: Refers to Section 9 and school visits in the draft amendment document previously submitted by the workgroup.(EXHIBIT B)

TAPE 50, SIDE A

050 GROSSEN: Suggest deleting site visits unless they are accreditation visits.

060 LUKE: Begins review of the amendments suggested by Bonnie Grossen to the workgroup document. (EXHIBIT A)

090 GROSSEN: Page 6, line 16 referring to early education programs, the programs need some research and criteria.

150 -Page 21, line 24 referring to waiving the use of such instructional materials. If there are no teaching methods or practices prescribed, there would be no waiver necessary.

166 -CIM standards and benchmarks for mastery levels. CAM is depended upon standardized criteria and testing.  
-Changing "performance" to "assessment".

189 MEEK: Page 28, line 12, add computer technology to list.

220 MILNE: Asked about the National Assessment of Educational Progress testing.

289 McCOMB: Comments on page 64, line 11 and work force quality.

354 LUKE: Questions staff on the working copy the committee has been working on is 102 pages long, the amendments are only 37 pages long. Ask what is the difference.

360 McCOMB: Explains the working document is the full chapter ORS 329.000, and the LC-1 amendments are only those sections changed and the amendment language.

400 LUKE: Begins review of the LC-1 amendments draft document. (EXHIBIT C)

TAPE 49, SIDE B

050 VICKIE TOTTEN, OREGON SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION: Submit and reviews recommendation language changes and possible solutions to add clarity to HB

2991. (EXHIBIT D)

081 CINDY HUNT, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL: Explains changes to Section 33; workgroup made changes to a section that had been deleted.

150 -Explains conflicts amendments process.

175 TOTTEN: Reevaluate CIM standards in light of changes to statutory language reflecting content.

225 -what if students are unable to achieve the standards.

-extending school year

-relationship between CIM, CAM, diploma and GED.

287 LUKE: Comments that some of the problems occurred when school districts proceeded on their own before the state standards were set.

300 TOTTEN: Implementation plans before standards did cause problems, but some school districts felt compelled because of the original timelines established.

363 -Reviews Roseburg model and policy for parent advisory group. (EXHIBIT E)

390 SNODGRASS: Comments that her legislative district includes five school districts, they are asking to each have their own policy on the structure of the site council.

400 TOTTEN: School Board Association supports allowing local districts to make up the composition of the site councils depending upon available staff

and local parental involvement.

TAPE 50, SIDE B

030 LUKE: Procedural process, explains the amendments must be approved to HB 2991 for public hearings and amendments to occur.

065 MOTION: REP. WYLIE: MOVES to adopt the LC-1 amendments to HB 2991.

VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

100 LUKE: Begins the process of reviewing section by section amended HB 2991.

-Section 1- Rep. Milne will submit amendments deleting Section 1.

-Section 2- Rep. Milne will submit amendments deleting Section 2.

150 -Section 3- Asked about line 24 and definition of linguistically and culturally appropriate.

165 JOANNE FLINT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: Clarifies definition of wording

on line 24.

195 LUKE: Continues reviewing section by section HB 2991.  
-Section 3- Removed a "high degree of mastery", and replaced it with  
"rigorous academic content standards".  
260 Section 4- Removed "appropriate learning opportunities", replaced with  
"held to rigorous intellectual standards". Discussed line 9, related to  
early education programs. Discussed line 12 and the use of the language  
rigorous academic standards.  
300 -Asked about deleting CIM/CAM wording.

315 GROSSEN: Agrees the CIM comes with education baggage and set teaching  
practices. Possibility of deleting reference to CIM.

330 SNODGRASS: Referring to OAR standards already adopted for CIM, if the  
standards are not performance based, does not want to keep the CIM language  
in then.

378 MILNE: Concerned with the fact that the CIM is based on the National  
Center of Education and Economy and our relationship with the New Standards  
Project. Would like the Department of Education to respond and explain the  
current contract with the National Center of Education and Economy.

407 WAYNE NUEBURGER, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: Explains the relationship  
between the state of Oregon and the National Center of Education and  
Economy.  
460 -Carnegie study resulted in recommendation for education reform in the  
United States.

TAPE 51, SIDE A

035 -History of CIM/CAM and the way we assess students.  
-New Standards Project and the re-focusing of assessment systems.

065 MILNE: Ask what is the objective of the New Standards Project.  
084 -Asked when the first test were given from the project.

088 NUEBURGER: Responded that only pilot testing has been done at about a  
dozen locations through out Oregon.

128 MILNE: Asked for an accounting on what dues have been paid to the  
National Center of Education and Economy and the New Standards Project  
cost.

140 FLINT: Explains the previous payments paid to the National Center of  
Education and Economy  
and the contract termination this budget year.

190 SHIELDS: Discusses life skills class provided in the Columbia River  
corrections facility and responds to Section 4, line 9 and providing early  
education opportunities that prevent human and social cost.

263 LEHMAN: Comments on Section 4, line 12 related to rigorous academic  
standards and the difference between performance based testing versus  
academic content standards.

280 GROSSEN: The system should include the content plus the problem  
solving.

390 NUEBURGER: Comments on the direction the department was given. It is  
hard to assess application plus problem solving. Not all test serve all

purposes.

450 -Criterion reference test fit the criteria we are trying to achieve currently.

TAPE 52, SIDE A

038 LEHMAN: Comments on the three levels that he sees, the state Department of Education's level with goals and guidelines, the legislative level and the local school districts level. The interpretations are different on each level.

083 LUKE: Comments on Section 5 and control over teaching methods.

100 LEHMAN: If establishing state wide assessment standards aren't you dictating to the local level.

109 GROSSEN: The standard would be the outcome, how the goal is achieved can be different in different districts.

123 LUKE: Section 6- research feasibility of extending school year.  
-Section 8- Amendments for suggest changes to line 8 and line 10.  
-Section 8- Line 13 and testing came from SB 98 as recommended by Department of Education.

160 LUKE: Asked speaker to comment on Rep. Milnes recommendation of testing every two years.

165 NUEBURGER: Cost is an issue, and testing benchmarks at certain times

200 ROSS: Asked what is the testing schedule now and what was the Departments rational on changing test to different grade levels.

205 NUEBURGER: Current is 3,5,8,10. SB 98 changes to 4,8,10 and had extensive input from school districts.  
280 -Cost is currently \$1.5 per subject tested, averaging \$4 per student.  
-There are currently 40,000 students per subject. If testing the \$4 average cost per student, additional cost would be \$160,000 per year or \$320,000 per biennial budget.

320 SNODGRASS: Asked if testing changes to include or delete new requirements that will increase the budget.

335 NUEBURGER: The department has testified before the Committee on Ways and Means and is asking for an additional \$1.3 million in their budget for testing.

390 FLINT: Explains qualitative level testing. Has two parts, the qualitative assessment and the state assessment.

432 LUKE: Section 9- Deals with accrediting and should remain.  
472 -Section 10- Public school choice

TAPE 51, SIDE B

040 FLINT: Public school choice refers to any student being able to attend schools of their choice.  
Intent was to make it more apparent and defined.

073 LUKE: Section 11- Self evaluation on a biennial basis.  
-Section 12- Removing (1) on self evaluation process  
-Section 13- Oregon Report Card to monitor trends.  
140 -Section 14- Language added to make it recommended but not required.

-Section 15- Leaves local school districts to "provide" but are "not required to provide" programs for children and families at the school site.

221 -Section 16- Head Start program

-Section 17- State Commission on Children and Families

260 WYLIE: Comments on Section 17, line 8 and use of the word comprehensive and developmentally appropriate fashion.

300 LUKE: Section 18- Funding of Oregon prekindergarten programs and the requirement date is deleted.

-New wording will say "as funds become available".

350 -use of the word "shall" versus "may" in Section 18, line 23. If use of the word shall, is it a mandate.

370 CHAIR LUKE: Adjourns meeting at 11:32 a.m.

Submitted by,

Reviewed by,

Shelley Jones  
Committee Assistant

Jan McComb  
Committee Administrator

#### EXHIBIT LOG:

A- HB 2991, Amendments- Grossen- 1 page  
B- HB 2991, Amendment Document- Staff- 102 pages  
C- HB 2991, LC-1 Amendments- Staff- 37 pages  
D- HB 2991, Amendments- Totten- 2 pages  
E- HB 2991, Testimony- Totten- 12 pages