

—
CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON
HB 2991

June 1, 1995 Hearing Room 357
2:00 p.m. Tapes 10 - 13

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Rep. Lynn Snodgrass, Chair
Sen. Tom Hartung
Sen. Shirley Gold
Sen. Ken Baker
Rep. Barbara Ross
Rep. John Meek

STAFF PRESENT:
Janet McComb, Committee Administrator
Shelley Jones, Committee Assistant

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 10, SIDE A

005 CHAIR SNODGRASS: Calls the meeting to order at 2:53 p.m.
 -Starting with Section 23 and Section 25.

023 JOANNE FLINT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: Explains the timelines in
Section 23 relating to plans for implementation for the Certificate of
Initial Mastery.

050 -By January 1996 will have revised standards for CIM.

 -Prefer to have short timelines and have clear quality standards sooner
rather than later.

074 -Comments on subsection (4) which required school districts to submit
plans to the Department of Education setting forth the steps the district
will take to ensure the programs leading to CIM are in place and adequate.

102 REP. ROSS: Questions Section 23 and the timelines in the language. If
the Board of Education is giving local districts the standards, how will
schools be able to respond to that by the 1997-98 school year, as written
in the language.

120 FLINT: Most districts have drawn up their plans for implementation of
the CIM standards. The
majority of the planning process will not change in any substantive way and

much has been accomplished.

160 -Any school district that does not have a quality program would be
expected to request an extension.

185 -The work for the Fall of 1995 is final community approval.

197 CHAIR SNODGRASS: Recess meeting at 3:08 for call of Senate members.
 -Reconvenes committee meeting at 3:25 p.m.

212 SEN. GOLD: Question date in Section 23 (4) of January 1, 1997.

233 MCCOMB: Clarifies that line 20A, the added wording "the end of the
1996-1997 school year, " should be on line 20G. It is incorrectly placed
in the wrong place.

240 REP. SNODGRASS: So noted.

260 -Asked why kind of response did the Department of Education have to the
public hearings on the CIM standards.

265 FLINT: Attendance at the public meetings was very poor.
 -Historical way of implementing educational standards has been to go with
educational professionals, now the Department is reaching out to parents
and the communities.

293 REP. SNODGRASS: Would like to see the process done a little differently

and see more local participation.

323 -Does the language in the current bill prohibit the Department from finishing up earlier.

350 FLINT: Does not prohibit Department or districts from finishing up earlier, but you need to be mindful of allowing enough time for the Department and all districts to fulfill the requirements of the legislation.

370 REP. SNODGRASS: Comments on the cost of implementation of CIM standards to school districts.

380 FLINT: Believes this is a non-issue, because districts that are having a hard time can ask for an extension.

405 REP. SNODGRASS: Questions the definitions and the definition of "career indorsements".

420 FLINT: Responds to questions and reads definition of career indorsements.

TAPE 11, SIDE A

030 SEN. BAKER: Does not see a definition of "diploma".

035 FLINT: It is interesting that the word "diploma" is not in the statues or administrative rules.

060 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 29.

066 FLINT: The Department is comfortable with the language in Section 29.

077 REP. SNODGRASS: What about subsection (4) and the addition of the words "or exceeded all of the standards at grades 3,5,8, and 10."

080 FLINT: This language will allow the Department to include students who are achieving greater than average or above average, and the alternative educational options.

095 SEN. GOLD: Sees a redundancy in using the words "alternative educational options".

115 SEN. BAKER: In Section 29 (4), line 14 adding "or public school" between additional services or alternative educational [or public school] options, opens up a whole range of options if it is not changed.

150 REP. SNODGRASS: Confirms that the Department if comfortable with Section 29 language.

170 SEN. BAKER: Section (5) language allows "alternative education program....." which will be different language for the same thing in Section (4).

190 REP. SNODGRASS: Questions on Section 26, and comments the date was erroneously left off in transferring the amendments to the hand engrossed bill.

230 -Refers to questions on Section 40.

235 FLINT: The Department does not have a position on the use of the word "shall" or "may" in Section 40.

262 KEITH MOBILY, WORK FORCE QUALITY, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: Comments on Section 40. The work is already being done. Explains the work

of the Oregon Workforce Quality Council.

311 -The program is moving along in a very productive way.

325 SEN. GOLD: If I understand correctly, the work is already being done. Asked if there are any problems in implementing.

360 REP. SNODGRASS: Asked where some language should be inserted to clarify.

370 MOBILY: Suggest placing language in Subsection (2) line 28.

400 REP. ROSS: It would be helpful to have an annual report of the

Workforce Quality Council's work provided to the Legislature.

424 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 15.

MOTION: SEN. HARTUNG: To return to the language [and] on line 14 in
Section 15 and adopt Section 15 as conceptually amended.

VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

TAPE 10, SIDE B

040 SEN. HARTUNG: Comments on Section 23 and the timelines. Would like to
keep the timelines as they are.

065 REP. MEEK: Timelines in Section 23 coincide with Section 23 (a) dates
for implementation..

075 SEN. GOLD: Clarifies timelines in Section 23, Section 23 (A).

100 -Would like to address line 28 in Section 23 and use of the words
"shall" or "may".

123 SEN. BAKER: Comments on portfolio's development and that they will be
highly individualized.

130 SEN. HARTUNG: Asked why "shall" would be better than "may".

140 REP. MEEK: CIM's are based on a series of assessments and benchmarks,
which can be gauged by work samples, tests and portfolio's. Cannot see
development of portfolio's over a seven year period and not have a
standardized assessment system in place. Therefore it should say "shall"
and not leaving it up to "may" to have assessment process in place.

189 REP. SNODGRASS: The way it is written, a teacher may just collect
"test". Use of the word "shall" is a directive, that they will do more
than one method, such as giving test and not using portfolio's.

200 SEN. GOLD: Comments on assessment process and use of the various
methods.

230 REP. MEEK: If the structure of the sentence changed it would clarify
that the assessment does consist of various things.

253 SEN. HARTUNG: Agrees that if it was possibly in two sentences it might
clarify.

263 SEN. GOLD: Suggest after line 27 after "and 10" a period be placed and
reword the following sentence.

290 REP. ROSS: Use of the word shall or may is not very important, as much
as to be consistent and clear, and develop a document that parents can read
and understand.

320 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 29.

329 MOTION: SEN. BAKER: Moves to adopt Section 29 excluding the hand
engrossed language on line 15 of subsection (4) "or public school".

350 REP. SNODGRASS: Explains the use of those words.

380 VOTE: In a voice vote, SEN. BAKER, SEN. HARTUNG, SEN. GOLD, REP.
SNODGRASS, REP. ROSS vote Aye. REP. MEEK votes NAY.

414 CHAIR: The motion CARRIES.

420 REP. SNODGRASS: Refers to Section 33 and changing from 21st Century
Schools Program to "Oregon" 21st Century Schools Programs.

430 FLINT: Has discussed this with Greg McMurdo and they would change some
of the printed information, but would only make changes as information is reprinted.

460 SEN. HARTUNG: Does not have a problem with use of the word "Oregon"
added to the current title of the program.

TAPE 11, SIDE B

030 SEN. BAKER: Refers to the opening relating clause and use of the word

"Oregon" in the opening statements. Seems that it is already in the current language.

050 CINDY HUNT, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL: If the changes were made only in Section 31 A, (2), it would authorize the name change through out the document.

071 REP. ROSS: Clarifies what section.

100 HUNT: Clarifies the additions and removal of language.

105 SEN. HARTUNG: Asked for clarification.

115 REP. SNODGRASS: Recesses at 4:42 p.m. for call of the House members.
129 -Reconvenes the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

137 HUNT: Clarifies the use of the word "Oregon" 31B, 32A and 33A would need to be deleted.

152 MOTION: SEN. BAKER: Moves conceptually to delete 31B, 32A, and 33A.

VOTE: Hearing no object, the motion CARRIES.

180 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 30.

190 MOTION: SEN. GOLD: Moves to restore the language on line 41,
and delete the engrossed language that relates to "a waiver, or".

VOTE: In a voice vote SEN. HARTUNG, SEN. BAKER, SEN. GOLD, REP.
AYE. REP. MEEK, REP. SNODGRASS vote NAY.

ROSS vote

CHAIR SNODGRASS: The motion FAILS.

248 REP. MEEK: Will not support that.

272 MOTION: SEN. GOLD: Moves to restore the language on line 41 only.

VOTE: In a voice vote SEN. HARTUNG, SEN. BAKER, SEN. GOLD, REP.
AYE. REP. MEEK, REP. SNODGRASS vote NAY.

ROSS vote

CHAIR SNODGRASS: The motion FAILS.

300 MOTION: SEN. GOLD: To restore Section 5, lines 40 and 41 and adopt conceptually Section 5.

VOTE: In a voice vote SEN. HARTUNG, SEN. BAKER, SEN. GOLD, REP.
AYE. REP. MEEK, REP. SNODGRASS vote NAY.

ROSS vote

CHAIR SNODGRASS: The motion FAILS.

323 REP. ROSS: Questions the use of the language in the sentence. The sentence does not have any real effect.

341 MOTION: REP. ROSS: Moves to conceptually adopt Section 5 as presented.

374 VOTE: In a voice vote SEN. HARTUNG, SEN. BAKER, SEN. GOLD,
REP. ROSS, REP. SNODGRASS vote AYE. REP. MEEK votes NAY.

CHAIR SNODGRASS: The motion CARRIES.

391 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 25.

405 REP. MEEK: Moves to conceptually adopt the language presented
by the Department of Education on the definition of "career indorsements."

REP. MEEK; Moves the adoption of Section 25 with typo correction on 38J,
the new definition for career indorsement to be used for (4) and the
deletion of (5) completely.

TAPE 12, SIDE A

065 REP. ROSS: Asked where the definition comes from for career indorsement.

077 FLINT: Definition comes from the Department of Education.
100 -Life long learning rather than work force preparation.

131 SEN. GOLD: Questions if Legislative Council could come up with some

other word to use beside CIM/CAM.

150 FLINT: Comments that this is an issue that has been discussed. The discussion has been that students would get something to recognize what they have achieved as opposed to what they have not.

180 SEN. BAKER: Suggest "a certificate".

195 REP. MEEK: Comments there is only one other section where the word certificates are mentioned.

 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Amends motion to amend line 38 (1) to "a certificate".

 VOTE: Hearing no objections, Section 25 is conceptually adopted as amended.

223 MOTION: SEN. GOLD: Moves that where ever the words CIM or CAM are used, it merely say "a certificate".

 VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

254 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 17.

255 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Moves the adoption of Section 17, delete a portion of line 3 [at the earliest possible time], deletes line 5 A and 5 B and adopt the hand engrossed language on line 6 and 7.

 VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

308 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 39.

317 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Moves to adopt Section 39 as engrossed and presented.

327 SEN. GOLD: Will object, use of the word "may", leaves the local school boards arguing how it should work. If "shall" is used, it is taken care of and gives them a basis to start.

340 REP. ROSS: Does the Senate have a problem with the hand engrossed language 45A through 45BB.

360 SEN. HARTUNG: Would like to see a majority of teachers on the councils, and have site councils working properly if they are to be used to strengthen interest in local school issues.

385 REP. MEEK: Some people find it ironic that some teachers have used this as a bargaining issue. If it is "may" it will stay volunteer.

414 SEN. GOLD: This is not a mandate, the wording in the opening of this section (1) states "Nothing in this section shall interfere with the duties, responsibilities and rights of duly elected school boards."

440 REP. ROSS: Can we use another word.

460 SEN. BAKER: Use of the word "may" basically guts the intention. Thinks that "shall" is an important word.

TAPE 13, SIDE A

043 SEN. HARTUNG: As we look at the 250 school districts and 2000 board members, it might be worth it to try the "may" and not lose the momentum we have in adopting these amendments.

060 REP. SNODGRASS: Points out the language in Section 39 (4) allows for school districts boards to establish site council in the best manner.

070 REP. MEEK: Amends motion to amend language to add language at the end of 45T and line 35 to leave the word "shall" in the original language.

090 VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

100 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Moves the adoption of Section 2.

VOTE: In a voice vote SEN. HARTUNG, REP. ROSS, REP. MEEK, REP. MEEK vote AYE. SEN. BAKER, SEN. GOLD vote NAY.

CHAIR SNODGRASS: The motion FAILS.

131 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 4

137 SEN. BAKER: Same issue as the previous section discussion.

142 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 40.

144 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Moves Section 40 with conceptual
amendments with "may" in line 9 and "shall" under (2) with the same
sentence repeated as in Lines 10 and 11.

165 VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

173 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Moves Section 45, as hand engrossed.

189 SEN. GOLD: The problem is the deletion of second language and the arts.

209 -This speaks to curricula development to be available to districts that
wish to avail themselves.

223 REP. ROSS: Does the Department of Education already provide curricula
in second language and the arts.

238 FLINT: The Department does have curricula goals for language and the
arts.

280 -Specific discipline areas are not as important as to improving
achievements.

290 SEN. BAKER: In reviewing the list of what is being outlined, what if we
just eliminated (f)

315 FLINT: There are a couple of options. Originally this section related
to "significant outcomes". It does say "other subjects" and just include
the second language and the arts under the "other subjects" language.

340 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Amends original motion to changes lines
30/31 and 25/26 and 27.

373 VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

393 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Moves the adoption of Section 26.

410 SEN. GOLD: Question about the difference in Section 27 and Section 26
in both versions.

420 HUNT: Explains the difference in the versions.

445 -Levels of proficiency determined by State Board of Education versus
determined by local school districts.

TAPE 12, SIDE B

038 REP. MEEK: Comments on both versions and levels of proficiencies being
determined by State Board.

060 -Problem with Senate version is the proficiency requirement for second
language.

080 SEN. GOLD: Comments and explains the Senate version of the bill to
committee.

090 REP. MEEK: No problem if the State wants to have standards, but does
not want to see it as a proficiency requirement.

110 SEN. GOLD: Question on Section 26. Question to Joanne Flint.

120 FLINT: There are three differences between the versions.

160 -Proficiency requirements and ability to assess is available and
currently used.

184 REP. ROSS: Is the inclusion of the foreign language requirement
important.

190 FLINT: Inclusion of the requirement of the foreign language requirement
seems very important to parents. It sends a message.

210 REP. SNODGRASS: Clarifies that the proficiency standards do exist for

second languages.

220 FLINT: Correct.

250 SEN. GOLD: Fundamental difference is "be able to demonstrate a
proficiency" versus "by grade 12 having two years of language" Also local

districts determining proficiency versus Department of Education
determining.

287 REP. SNODGRASS: Suggest changes to language.

313 REP. MEEK: If we eliminate two year requirement, and leave the level of
proficiency issue.

340 SEN. BAKER: Issue is who makes the decision and the two years of
language requirement.

370 SEN. GOLD: You have a state standard and the local school districts
adapt to them, sometimes modifying them.

409 REP. ROSS: Not comfortable having the Department have a high standard
that the local districts need to adhere to, sometimes that is cost
prohibitive to local districts.

430 FLINT: Suggest language that students demonstrate the level of
proficiency set by the local school districts.

460 REP. MEEK: That deletes the two year requirement.

TAPE 13, SIDE B

050 REP. SNODGRASS: If the requirement is in place, it would be up to the
local district to decide on the proficiency standards.

070 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Amends motion to delete language in 38HH
through 38KK. (withdrawn)

110 REP. MEEK: In there is concurrence to delete 38 FF and 38 GG.

116 SEN. GOLD: Wants to see "shall demonstrate proficiency".

131 REP. SNODGRASS: What if we keep the minimum of two years and continue
to keep the shall demonstrate proficiency as determined by the school
districts.

141 REP. MEEK: Withdrawals original motion.

150 MOTION: REP. ROSS: Moves to adopt Section 26 with the conceptual
amendments eliminate (2) (3) and (4) is re-worded.

VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion CARRIES.

177 REP. SNODGRASS: Reviews Section 27.

190 MOTION: REP. MEEK: Moves to adopt Section 27.

200 FLINT: Department of Education is fine with the dates.

213 HUNT: Comments on Section 27 as compared to Section 43. In the
amendments both sections are retained.

244 -Prior to January 1997 they are submitting standards.

256 VOTE: Hearing no objections the motion CARRIES.

300 CHAIR SNODGRASS: Adjourns meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Submitted by, Reviewed by,

Shelley Jones Jan McComb
Committee Assistant Committee Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY:

None