

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

February 12, 1991

Hearing Room 343 3:00 p.m.

Tapes 16-17

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sen. Shirley Gold, Chair Sen. Bill McCoy, Vice Chair  
Sen. Peter Brockman Sen. Ron Grensky Sen. Paul Phillips Sen. Cliff Trow  
MEMBER EXCUSED: Sen. Joan Dukes VISITING MEMBER: Sen. Frank  
Roberts STAFF PRESENT: Jan Barga, Committee Administrator Angela  
Muniz, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD: SB 110 - PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM - PH SB 114 - CHILD  
CARE - PH SB 115 - CHILD CARE - PH

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 16, SIDE A

005 CHAIR GOLD: Calls the hearing to order at 3:15 p.m. Comments on the  
purpose and priority of Early Childhood Education.

SB 110 - PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM - PUBLIC HEARING: Witnesses: Judy  
Miller, Department of Education Steffen Saifer, Oregon Prekindergarten  
Program research Suzanne Van Orman, Oregon Head Start Association Kathy  
Bonogofski, Salem Head Start Diane Black, Oregon Prekindergarten Program  
Rebecca Severeide, Portland Public Schools

050 JAN BARGEN, Committee Administrator: Gives an overview of SB 110.  
The interim working group resolved some concerns about coordination with  
federal head start programs as expansion occurs so that Oregon funds did  
not diminish, but would be directed to other areas. Senate Committee on  
Education February 12, 1991 - Page 2

The group did not have time to review the language Legislative Counsel  
drafted so the committee may have to make some revisions in Section 3 of  
the bill.

CHAIR GOLD: There is a subsequent referral to Ways and Means even though  
the bill does not appropriate money. When the committee begins work  
sessions, it needs to consider this and advise the President's office  
one way or the other. The President has been referring bills with the  
mere hint of money to Ways and Means.

BARGEN: Even the reduced levels of expansion in the governor's proposed  
budget would keep the state on track to meet its goals by 1999.

100 JUDY MILLER, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services,  
Department of Education: Prekindergarten programs are a priority for the  
department. Shows a brief video on prekindergarten programs in Oregon.  
Nine hundred nineteen 3 and 4 year olds are being served in the  
programs. Cost per child, per year is about \$3,200. Cost per child, per  
year for Head Start is \$3,534 because it raised teacher salaries.  
Several issues to consider: - The rising cost per child - Teacher  
salaries - Finding and keeping qualified teachers - Transportation -  
Facility development - Developing new providers - Funding sources. Are  
only reaching about 29% of the low-income 3 and 4 year olds.

287 SEN. TROW: The governor has recommended about \$10 million dollars

for the programs. How many people do you think we can provide a program for, considering the issues you just mentioned which indicate rising costs?

MILLER: The governor has recommended \$10.7 million dollars. Could serve 1,500 children in the '91-'92. By '92-'93 could serve 2,500 kids with Oregon prekindergarten dollars. In addition would have the 3,500 children in the federal Head Start program. So 6,000 children by 1993 for \$17 million of Oregon money and \$12 million of federal money.

BARGEN: Could you characterize the evaluation done in Oregon program with studies done nationally? Understands there are longitudinal studies of the national Head Start program but many state prekindergarten programs don't have this kind of information available.

MILL - : The study the state has done is not a longitudinal study. The study most often referenced looked at children in the program, then checked in every year up to age 21 to see where they were and if the program had an impact in their lives.

362 STEFFEN SAIFER, Early Childhood Education Specialist, Portland State University: Involved with research and design of the project. The project was an innovative research design (EXHIBIT A). Explains research about programs to answer question. Research design had five elements: - Hard data: Gains children made using the McCarthy Scales for Children. - Case studies: What the experience was like for the children in four programs. - Teacher and parent interviews: Perceptions and expectations about the program. Senate Committee on Education February 12, 1991 - P - e 3

- Environmental reports: What the space and neighborhood looked like. - Home visits: See what life is like for child at home. Result is an incredible amount of information about the program's strengths and weaknesses. Refers to graph in testimony (EXHIBIT A). In the graph the broken line represents results of the pre-testing done and the solid line represents the results of the post-testing. Oregon is one of the few states that has done research on a state-funded comprehensive prekindergarten program. Results shown are for the previous school year. Have done it for the year before that and this year as well. Summarizes information: - When children started the program, they were all below the average, midpoint line. - As a result of the program, the average skills, with the exception of motor skills, were at or above the average line. - Gained 10 points in General Cognitive skills. This has been true every year. Typically, child gains 5 points in the categories.

475 SEN. TROW: Why would we be below average in motor skills?

TAPE 17, SIDE A

023 SAIFER: Theorizes that the norms in this test do not correspond to the norms in Oregon. Or it could be a real area of weakness for our children. Some studies suggest that children today are more sedentary and don't exercise their motor skills. SEN. TROW: But more in Oregon than in other areas of the nation? SAIFER: According to the McCarthy Scales and the norms there, which are based on a diverse population, yes. Continues explaining graph: -3-year-old children seem to make the biggest gains. SEN. TROW: Is that a developmental thing or a peculiarity of the program? 051 SAIFER: Assumes the program is challenging and meeting the needs of 3 year olds in a greater way. Could be the age mix of 3, 4 and 5 year olds. There is no classroom where there are only 3

year olds. SEN. TROW: Is that typical here for 3 year olds to make the biggest gains, or is it typical throughout the country? SAIFER: Is typical in preschool programs with mixed age groups. Also the lowest functioning children, the ones with the biggest problems, make the biggest gains. This is true across the country. Lowest area of gains were in math skills, the highest in verbal skills. Doesn't know how that compares with other areas of the country. Displays math items on the overhead. Demonstrates some of the items on the test. -- Asks progressive counting questions such as 'how many ears do you have? how many noses do you have?' Then: 'If you have two toys and I give you one more, how many toys do you have?' The McCarthy test goes up to 8-and-a-half year old level. An advantage for follow through because other tests do not go up that high. Can see how the program works for bright children Senate Committee on Education February 12' 1991 - Page 4

as well as children with fewer skills. Test shows that high-functioning children also make gains in the program. -- Asks auditory memory questions such as repeating a number backwards. -- Test focuses on children's ability to attack problems, not whether they get the answer right.

165 BARGEN: How long do you spend with each child? What is the testing process?

SAIFER: The test is about 45 minutes to an hour long.

BARGEN: Do you do this twice, before and after?

SAIFER: Interviews children in the fall and spring. Gives another math test example. Refers to written testimony about comments from parents about the program (EXHIBIT A). Can't measure self-esteem of child or parent with the test, but interview part of the research reflects that it does improve. Program does more than give kids a boost. It saves lives.

262 CHAIR GOLD: The video and research examples show that the program is working.

BARGEN: This research and evaluation was funded by the program itself? Wasn't that to comply with the legislation?

MILLER: Yes, it was.

CHAIR GOLD: There was an accountability factor in the current legislation which should be in all legislation.

SAIFER: This year's research was only the McCarthy testing. Each year there is less money put in for research. There are a lot of questions to answer if research could be expanded: What are the factors that attribute the most success, are there differences between classrooms, and follow up on children's progress.

CHAIR GOLD: Have you had experience with follow through programs in the federal government?

SAIFER: No.

SEN. TROW: Could you sense any differences in performance related to levels of nutrition and environment?

SAIFER: Have some information that hints about that with the home visits and the parent interviews. But it will take work to extrapolate that information out of the research.

318 SEN. TROW: Is there a range in the poverty level of these children?

MILLER: A minimum of 80% of the children in the program must be at or below the poverty level. No breakdown of poverty levels below national standard, but most of the children are in families on public assistance or in working families making less than the poverty level. About 14% of the participants are handicapped as well. Saute Committ a Educ~tioo  
February 12, 1991- P - e S

SEN. MCCOY: What did you say the poverty level was?

MILLER: The poverty guidelines for a family of four is about \$12,000 per year. Some of the research done last year was done with outside grant funds, so more intensive work was possible. Now are operating with limited funds in the Education Department.

BARGEN: Were disabled children included and identified in the testing?

SAIFER: Yes. The significance with the federal Head Start research is that the federal research did showed long-term gains. The Oregon research shows initial gains. The gains tend to level off at the third grade and the children who were not in comprehensive, preschool programs catch up. There has been some criticism about use of funds if the gains level off anyway. Don't know if this is true in Oregon and the new national research shows that looking at the third grade is short-sighted. Tremendous gains occur much further down the road, such as less teenage pregnancy and lower unemployment rates.

400 BARGEN: Would you say that doing this research the way we do it lays the groundwork for building a longitudinal study?

SAIFER: Yes.

SUZANNE VanORMAN, Oregon Head Start Association: Introduces a teacher and parent in the Head Start program to testify about their experiences.

420 KATHY BONOGOFSKI, Teacher, Salem Head Start: Is also a parent of a child who was in the Head Start program. When first got involved with Head Start, it was for child to go to school. Didn't think there would be anything in it for the family or have an effect that lasted past preschool. Volunteered as a parent in the classroom because it was required. Had a low self-esteem coming from an abusive family. Through the home visits, was challenged to think about her own life and future life as well as her child's. The people in the program believed in her and she set goals of becoming a teacher and going to school. Got a part-time job in the Head Start program. Will graduate in one year. genefits to family enormous. Doesn't receive public assistance anymore and are productive in the community. Child who was in the Head Start program is now on the third grade honor roll. His self-esteem is high and she doesn't believe the effects of the program will level out as he gets older. The family has learned it can do anything it wants to do.

TAPE 16, SIDE B

048 CHAIR GOLD: You are pointing out the second part of the program

which is the value to the parent. Hadn't thought about that before.

BONOGOFSKI: It came in two pieces. The first was wanting something better for my children and the second was wanting something better for the whole family. The whole picture is what is important. Not only encouraging children to be active in society, but to change and help people want a better life. It is important to break the cycle of poverty and abuse.

SEN. GRENSKY: What was it about the prekindergarten program that gave you the self-esteem - Senate Committee on Education February 12, 1991 - Page 6

you didn't have before.

BONOGOFSKI: There was a lot of parent training available and training as a staff person. Learned how not to be abusive to my children through the program.

SEN. GRENSKY: You're a staff person with the program. Do you think that enhanced your self-esteem and involvement with the training?

BONOGOFSKI: Chose not to be with Head Start last year to test if self-esteem was really hers and not related to the program. Was a director of a child care program in the community and was successful. Came back to Head Start this year because believed in what it was doing.

092 SEN. FRANK ROBERTS: Has an intense interest in the program. It is essential that prekindergarten programs have two components: the child and the family. Parents with a low self-esteem will not build self-esteem in their children. Need to be sure those elements are always present. Can extend that principle into other grades. A lot of the criticism made of public schools may be because children not prepared for it. Investment in these programs may be the best investment the Legislature can make. It may seem strange to use lottery funds, economic development funds, to invest in Head Start, but in the years ahead there will be a payoff.

168 BARGEN: Presents a fact sheet of information about money invested in Head Start (EXHIBIT B).

DIANE BLACK: Reads a letter from her oldest son about his brother in the Head Start program. Was involved in the home visits through the prekindergarten program. Gave him a sense of self-worth and parenting skills he now uses with his own child. The program also gave him the self-esteem needed to complete his GED. She had been on Welfare for 17 years, but that started to change when volunteered for the program. Gained parenting skills and self-esteem. Is starting own business and will be off Welfare completely in the fall. Is just one of many parents in the same situation.

SEN. TROW: It is encouraged to hear this testimony.

225 VanORMAN: Presents written testimony in support of SB 110 (EXHIBIT C).

SEN. PHILLIPS: Other than money, is there something else we should be looking for that may be done differently in another state?

VanORMAN: Washington's funding is less than Oregon's, but they serve

more children with lots of support services. An example of the difference: In Washington can have public health come into the center and do the children's physicals in one day. In Wasco County can only schedule two children a week.

SEN. PHILLIPS: It's because they don't have the facilities, not because they don't want to help, correct?

VanORMAN: Yes. They don't have the funding.

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 Senate Committee on Education February 12, 1991 - Page 7

331 REBECCA SEVEREIDE, Early Childhood Specialist, Portland Public Schools: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT D). Portland Public Schools offers preschool programs to 1,800 children. 1,300 spaces are funded through general funds, so this bill is all that more important.

SB 114, SB 115 - CHILD CARE - PUBLIC HEARING: Witnesses: Nancy Monroe, Oregon Commission for Child Care Juanita Santana, Migrant and Indian Coalition Juanita Constante, Citizen 419 NANCY MONROE, Oregon Commission on Child Care: Seasonal, agricultural workers, who currently have no child care support funds from the state or federal governments and mobile migrant workers have an annual income of \$7,128 for a family of four. That's \$5,000 less than the federal poverty line of \$12,000. The population also has special needs such as language and cultural isolation. Describes proposed amendments to SB 114 and SB 115 (EXHIBIT E). The state has responsibility to invest something for this population. In light of Measure 5, is deleting funding for biennium expenses. It will come from federal funds. TAPE 17, SIDE B 048 SEN. TROW: Do you think federal funds are available? MONROE: Not to the extent we are asking for. CHAIR GOLD: These bills have a subsequent referral to Ways and Means. SEN. GRENSKY: These programs will have an entry level and require a certain percent of the federal poverty level to qualify for the day care. What will happen? Will people who are accepted get to bring their children to day care and those who are not accepted don't? MONROE: You take the most needy. The programs will be in areas of the state determined to have the greatest need. SEN. GRENSKY: So some counties will not have this at all. MONROE: Yes. SEN. TROW: Do the bills specify seasonal workers? MONROE: Some of the amendments ask that, yes. SEN. TROW: It would specify the money to those people? MONROE: Yes. CHAIR GOLD: Please describe what the amendments to SB 114 and SB 115 do. MONROE: Explains the amendments (EXHIBIT E AND EXHIBIT F).

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. Senate Committee on Education February 12, 1991 - Page 8

118 JUANITA SANTANA, Executive Director, Migrant and Indian Coalition: Supports SB 114. There is a tremendous lack of services for farm workers in Oregon. -- Migrant Head Start is federally funded. Has coordinated services with state funds to provide services to migrant families during the summer months, but the eligibility criteria is restrictive. As soon as a family establishes itself in a community, they are no longer

eligible. The regulations penalize families that decide to stay in a community to have the opportunity to educate their children. -- Schools are filling up with children with limited English skills. Has a proposal for state Head Start to take more of these children into the program. -- Hard for families to access services because they live in rural areas. -The programs are not structured for migrant families who work all day. -Child care services need to be provided with Head Start programs. To reach this population, need to provide something for the children during the second half of day. -Need to be an array of child care providers. -Must have coordination between what is already in place and what is developed.

183 JUANITA CONSTANTE, Ex-migrant: Speaks from experience as a migrant and a parent of 10 children. One of the barriers for migrant children is English. Many times in migrant families, the mother tries to help by going to work, but there is no place to leave the children. Older children have to miss school to care for the younger children. They end up being held back in school and there is the incentive to drop out.

CHAIR GOLD: Appreciate comments from those who are not a regular part of the legislative system. Adjourns the hearing at 4:55 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Bargen Assistant

Reviewed by: Angela Muniz  
Administrator

Jan

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Testimony on SB 110 - Steffen Saifer - 2 pages B - Memo on Early Childhood Education programs - Staff - 4 pages C - Testimony on SB 110 - Suzanne VanOrman - 2 pages D - Testimony on SB 110 - Rebecca Severeide - 1 page E - Testimony and amendments on SB 114 - Nancy Monroe - 3 pages F - Testimony and amendments on SB 115 - Nancy Monroe - 2 pages

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