

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND REORGANIZATION Subcommittee on
Reorganization

May 14, 1993 Hearing Room E 1:30 p.m. Tapes 39 - 41

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. John Watt, Chair Rep. Delna Jones Rep. Michael
Payne Rep. Eldon Johnson Rep. Avel Gordly

STAFF PRESENT: Adrienne Sexton, Committee Administrator Kenneth
Brady, Committee Clerk

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 3641 - Abolishes Oregon Ed-Net Board.

WITNESSES: Norma Paulus, Superintendent of Public
Instruction Cindy Becker, Executive Department Ray Lewis, Director,
Oregon Ed-Net Ray Pirkel, Portland Community College

[--- Unable To Translate Graphic ---]

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. [--- Unable To Translate
Graphic ---]

TAPE 39, SIDE A

003 REPRESENTATIVE JOHN WATT, SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR: Convenes meeting at
1:35 p.m. -Opens public hearing on HB 3641.

PUBLIC HEARING - HB 3641

010 ADRIENNE SEXTON, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Explains HB 3641.

025 NORMA PAULUS, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: In support
of HB 3641. -Speaks about HB 3565 which passed in the 1991 session.
-Goal is to retrain existing workforce. -Keep Ed-Net, but don't transfer
it to the Executive Dept. -Speaks on public/private partnerships. 228
REPRESENTATIVE ELDON JOHNSON: With adequate funding, Ed-Net could stand
alone and be used for education and government.

250 PAULUS: We just want access to utilize it. We use Ed-Net more
than anyone.

274 WATT: Would you feel more comfortable with it staying the way it
is?

277 PAULUS: You need to address Dan Simmons' problem as well.

284 WATT: Is it just a management problem?

289 PAULUS: There are several options. -Needs a full legislative review.

297 REPRESENTATIVE AVEL GORDLY: How does Education use Ed-Net more than others?

301 PAULUS: Gives examples dealing with the community colleges. - Can use at all levels to retrain teachers.

333 GORDLY: Are you using it more than other agencies?

337 PAULUS: Yes. Refers to written testimony (EXHIBIT A).

351 JOHNSON: Can you operate the system more cost effectively?

353 PAULUS: Yes.

370 JOHNSON: Is the current cost higher than it would be if you had control?

376 PAULUS: I think so. - Doesn't care who controls Ed-Net as long as education is the primary customer.

403 REP. DELNA JONES: Would it be better to identify "priority usage" for the system?

415 PAULUS: Points out the importance of Education being the number one priority. - Discusses make-up of Ed-Net Board.

461 JONES: You oppose moving it to Executive Branch, but could it be left where it is and strengthened with more participation?

TAPE 40, SIDE A

021 PAULUS: Still leaves Dan Simmons' problem. - Want education to remain as principal user.

035 JONES: The purpose of Ed-Net was initially education, but the costs were not fully realized ahead of time.

047 PAULUS: It is a substantial investment and needs to be maximized.

065 CINDY BECKER, EXECUTIVE DEPT.: Submits information (EXHIBITS B & C). -Explains SB 68 A-engrossed and how Ed-Net becomes part of the

Information Resources Management Division. -Ed-Net should be combined with the management division so that

technology can be improved.

119 JOHNSON: Do you have some examples of 'leveraging'?

120 BECKER: Notes inefficient technology. -Want to incorporate better patterns of communication within agency,

field, and public. Also look at tools available.

139 JOHNSON: Repeats question about 'leveraging'.

143 BECKER: Explains 'leveraging'. -Can utilize staffing and computing resources of the Executive Department.

156 WATT: Do you anticipate that the Superintendent of Public Instruction be a member of that council?

162 BECKER: She would be welcome to be on it.

164 WATT: Can you guarantee that education would still have the access to the system they have now?

171 BECKER: We would be happy to enter into an inner-agency agreement.

189 REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL PAYNE: What needs to be fixed with Ed-Net?

194 BECKER: Ed-Net as an entity isn't broken. But we need to look at integrating technology.

203 PAYNE: Why can't you use it as it now stands? Are there prohibitions?

208 BECKER: This bill ensures that there won't be any prohibitions.

210 WATT: Explains Ed-Net system to Rep. Payne.

257 JOHNSON: You're heading in the right direction.

276 TOM BRUGGERE, ED-NET BOARD CHAIR: Submits written testimony (EXHIBIT D) in opposition to HB 3641. -Goal of Ed-Net is to be self-supporting. Ed-Net is successful in that area. -Want to continue control over programming.

404 PAYNE: Didn't Ed-Net introduce SB 68?

409 BRUGGERE: I think the governor originally introduced it.

413 RAY LEWIS, ED-NET DIRECTOR: The governor did introduce. -Submits written testimony (EXHIBIT E) in opposition to HB 3641. 420 WATT: If not for the Governor's Reorganization Package, would you have tried to get any changes?

427 LEWIS: No. Ed-Net Director should participate in Executive Dept. activities however.

TAPE 39, SIDE B

035 JOHNSON: How will you handle questions about access and availability to the system?

042 LEWIS: Issue is not access, but ease of organizations being able to participate.

060 JOHNSON: Could the cost of the Ed-Net system be reduced for

user agencies?

067 LEWIS: Ed-Net costs are lower than any network we know of. -
Would still like to charge less. Maybe more for membership and less
for day to day use.

094 BRUGGERE: Three things will drive down costs: more usage,
technological changes, and more subsidizing.

116 PAYNE: What's the current relationship between Ed-Net and the
Executive Dept.? Can you oppose the Executive Dept.?

125 BRUGGERE: Explains the relationship and duties. -Want independent
board.

141 PAYNE: Again, what is your current relationship with the
Executive Dept.?

143 LEWIS: We are totally autonomous.

145 GORDLY: How do you address the questions about relationships with
cable companies? What about gavel-to-gavel coverage of the legislature?

159 LEWIS: We are aggressively pursuing relationships with cable
companies.

234 JONES: Is the problem that no one can pay the bill?

240 LEWIS: Yes, that is a problem.

242 JONES: Are you looking into partnerships with cable companies
based on what their investment into equipment is?

267 LEWIS: We are very interested in partnerships.

290 JONES: Questions whether regulations need to be changed in
order for that to work.

301 LEWIS: We haven't arrived there yet.

324 JONES: How often does your board meet?

326 BRUGGERE: Every two months.

330 WATT: Who was behind the lobbying effort on this bill?

332 LEWIS: We notified users and board members.

345 WATT: A great deal of fear was generated.

349 LEWIS: This bill, as written, if enacted would be
devastating for Ed-Net.

367 WATT: Did you try to contact Superintendent Paulus?

367 LEWIS: A few members of the board did.

372 BRUGGERE: Uniqueness of Oregon system is that it isn't just
for a particular area, it's for all.

395 WATT: Is there a way to make this work for all involved?

406 BRUGGERE: We can work it out.

315 PAULUS: Speaks on SB 68. -We operate and pay for most of the sites.

460 LEWIS: Speaks on SB 68. -Higher Ed uses the system more than K-12.

TAPE 40, SIDE B

047 WATT: Do you think Norma Paulus wants to take over the system?

052 LEWIS: No. I'm glad she wants to use it more.

060 WATT: Believes that if parties involved would have spoken ahead of doing this bill -- it wouldn't be necessary.

063 JONES: Questions whether SB 68 spawned HB 3641 or the other way around.

074 LEWIS: The points of view of Ed-Net users are important.

080 BRUGGERE: Goal is to take politics out of this. Just want a statewide system that doesn't draw on state coffers.

096 PEGGY YOUNG, EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE: Presents oral testimony in opposition to HB 3641.

131 SANDY RYMAN, NORTHEAST OREGON HEALTH EDUCATION CENTER: Submits written testimony (EXHIBIT G) in opposition to HB 3641.

192 RAY PIRKL, PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE: Submits written testimony (EXHIBIT H) in opposition to HB 3641.

232 VICKI LIND, LINDFIELD COLLEGE: In opposition to HB 3641.

270 PAYNE: Do you see any need to move Ed-Net to the Executive Department or could it just stay where it is?

277 LIND: Autonomy and decision making on programming matter to people in the education field.

288 JON ROOT, ED-NET COORDINATOR: In opposition to HB 3641. (EXHIBIT I). -Need reasonable cost and access to all.

342 DOUG OVERLOCK, EASTERN OREGON HUMAN SERVICES CONSORTIUM: In opposition to HB 3641. - Ed-Net is working now. Doesn't need to be changed. - Was never asked to comment on HB 3641 before it was drafted.

453 PETER KOHLER, OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY: In opposition to HB 3641. - System is expensive, but it works well. TAPE 41, SIDE A

041 WATT: Between Ed-Net and the Executive Department language can be crafted for SB 68 that will meet the needs of the Superintendent of

Public Instruction.

050 JONES: We need to find out how much of the system the educators use and how much they expect to use.

060 WATT: Can't criticize old equipment, because new technology moves through quickly. It is probably good to wait.

069 WATT: Closes the public hearing on HB 3641. Adjourns the meeting at 5:00pm.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Betina Rothauser
Administrator

Adrienne Sexton Coordinator

EXHIBIT LOG: A - Testimony on HB 3641 - Norma Paulus - 17 pages B - Testimony on HB 3641 - Cindy Becker - 1 page C - Testimony on HB 3641 - Cindy Becker - 1 page D - Testimony on HB 3641 - Tom Bruggere - 1 page E - Testimony on HB 3641 - Ray Lewis - 2 pages F - Testimony on HB 3641 - Oregon Ed-Net - 4 pages** G - Testimony on HB 3641 - Sandy Ryman - 2 pages H - Testimony on HB 3641 - Ray Pirkel - 2 pages I - Testimony on HB 3641 - Jon Root - 2 pages

** Submitted without testimony.