

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

February 19, 1991

Hearing Room 343 3:00 p.m.

Tapes 20 - 22

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sen. Shirley Gold, Chair Sen. Bill McCoy, Vice-Chair  
Sen. Joan Dukes Sen. Peter Brockman Sen. Ron Grensky Sen. Paul  
Phillips Sen. Cliff Trow STAFF PRESENT: Jan Bargaen, Committee  
Administrator Angela Muniz, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD: SB 111 - Early Childhood Improvement Program - PH SB 445  
- Breakfast Program - 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 20, SIDE A

005 CHAIR GOLD: Calls the hearing to order at 3:15 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF MEASURES:

CHAIR GOLD: Presents LC 3175-2 relating to early intervention programs  
cut from the budget for introduction.

MOTION: Chair Gold moves for committee introduction of LC 3175-2.

VOTE: In a voice vote there were no objections.

CHAIR GOLD: Presents a request from Oregon Student Lobby that will be  
submitted to legislative counsel for a bill draft. Summarizes the  
agenda. SB 111 has a subsequent referral to Ways and Means. SB 445 has a  
subsequent referral to Rules because it imposes a mandate.

SB 111- Early Childhood Improvement Program (ECIP) - PUBLIC HEARING:  
Witnesses: Rebecca Severeide, Portland Public Schools Alan Tresidder,  
Oregon School Boards Assoc. Wilma Wells, COSA Ruby Price, Salem-Keizer  
Public Schools Ruth Hewett, Board of Education

060 JAN BARGEN, Committee Administrator: Explains the purpose of the  
bill. The bill attempts Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991 -  
Page 2

to provide a pot of money available to schools on a per student basis to  
generate innovations and more developmentally appropriate practices in  
grades K-3. The schools would have to provide a plan for how they would  
use their allocation and have it approved by the Department of Education  
before they would receive their monies. If a district did not develop a  
plan or pursue their portion, their allocation would be divided among  
those who did.

075 REBECCA SEVEREIDE, Early Childhood Education Specialist, Portland  
Public Schools: Gives history and needs addressed and purpose of the  
bill. Last year there was a pot of money that the state wanted to target  
to early childhood. Used a format similar to federal 'follow through'  
programs which provided school districts with opportunities and  
incentives to build programs that met the needs of the districts'  
particular population of children. SB 111 allows for a wide variety of  
programs such as child care, comprehensive medical services, additional  
specialized training for teachers and extra materials. Explains research

base used to recommend those programs. Schools create some children at risk, about 30%, by not engaging them in the education process. Other factors such as low-income, single-parent homes and high mobility rates create another 30% of the children at risk. If don't education children in an appropriate manner for their age group and take into account what is known about how best to meet their needs, automatically pose about 60% of our children at risk. This bill looks at those research issues and what school districts can do to prevent at-risk children.

150 SEN. GRENSKY: Could you repeat what you said about dealing with children going home to empty houses?

SEVEREIDE: One of the provisions of the bill would allow school districts to look at comprehensive services for parent involvement and child care if that is what the district felt would target its children best.

SEN. PHILLIPS: You switch between class grades and age of the student in your discussion. Could you clarify the age of the students in the different grades.

SEVEREIDE: Kindergarteners are 5 and 6, first-graders are 6 and 7, second-graders are 7 and 8.

SEN. PHILLIPS: So when you say there are 5 and 6 year olds are going home to empty houses you mean kindergarteners and first-graders.

SEN. GRENSKY: What you envision is the funding of the Early Childhood Improvement Program which would be established in conjunction of administrative rules that have yet to be adopted. You're hoping we'll include things such as the extended day care.

SEVEREIDE: Yes, that's correct. An example of how that might work would be a school district without staff on hand to coordinate child care services with outside agencies. They may elect to use part of their funds to coordinate those services. Teachers in school districts continually bring up the same needs as the bill addresses.

211 ALAN TRESIDDER, Oregon School Boards Association: Testifies in support of SB 111. The success of Head Start programs is undeniable. Encourages investing resources in early childhood programs. There is a problem with investing in these programs if there is not a model in place

. . Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991- Page 3

at the K-3 level to expand on what is learned. The Early Childhood Improvement Program is a model that carries the Head Start model into the public schools. Allows schools to develop programs that address the needs of the entire child. Bill proposes to run the grants through the basic school support distribution formula.

258 CHAIR GOLD: This bill is dependent for its money on something we haven't created yet: the postMeasure 5 distribution formula.

TRESIDDER: You do have a basic school support formula in place now. Two months from now you may not have. Then you may want to look at a different funding formula. There needs to be some amount of General Fund monies allocated to this program. Don't need total funding, just part to encourage schools to participate.

CHAIR GOLD: Could you review the funding mechanism?

TRESIDDER: Wanted a way for all districts to have an equal access to the funds. If the districts have to compete by way of preparing large grants, it is predictable which districts will get the funds because some districts have greater expertise and resources to go after additional funds. Money allocated through the basic school support formula is a more encouraging way of bringing more people into the program. Doesn't want it for just 10 districts, wants it for most of the districts in the state. If some districts don't want to participate, the bill would just shift their funds into the pot for those who do participate.

307 CHAIR GOLD: It typically would be the big districts that get the money the other way.

TRESIDDER: Could accurately predict which districts would be successful and which wouldn't. It wouldn't necessarily be big and small, although that would often be a large factor.

CHAIR GOLD: So this method is more equitable.

TRESIDDER: Equity is the issue. Depending on how you redistribute basic school support, you may want to look at this method differently. The whole idea of grants has changed in the post-Measure 5 world.

SEN. GRENSKY: Last session this was initiated because the Legislature had a \$15 million opportunity. What do you consider a minimum level of funding to initiate this program?

TRESIDDER: Formula used last time was almost \$14.5 million.

SEN. GRENSKY: Could you tie that money to an estimate of the number of children assisted.

TRESIDDER: When you get below \$10 million don't have much left. Doesn't have the number of children that money would assist.

Staff presents information about how the \$15 million breaks out per district (EXHIBIT A).

SEN. GRENSKY: Has the governor proposed funding this?

Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991Pye 4

367 TRESIDDER: No, it is not in the governor's proposed budget.

SEN. GRENSKY: If some funding could be attained below \$10 million, would you consider doing this on a pilot basis?

TRESIDDER: Yes, would prefer getting something started to show that this program works.

CHAIR GOLD: In the previous governor's proposed budget before Measure 5 passed there were funds for this program under a different name.

SEN. GRENSKY: At a previous hearing, heard a representative from the governor's office saying the governor was a strong advocate of these issues, and now there's no money for them. Are we going to have someone from the governor's office explain why were not funding this great idea?

CHAIR GOLD: The ball is in our court at this point.

SEN. GRENSKY: Not trying to be cynical. Gets tired of people making grand statements but then not following through when it's time to do something. If the money isn't here, would like to know why?

CHAIR GOLD: We did get them to come through on the prekindergarten programs.

SEN. TROW: When you think of all the good things to do for education, what's the justification for starting another program that we can't implement fully and that would be in competition for dollars that aren't there?

TAPE 21, SIDE A

016 TRESIDDER: True, there are wonderful programs created that have not been funded on both the state and federal level. This program is a restructuring of existing programs more than a 'new' program overlaid onto 'old' programs. Schools already offer a K-3 education. The bill suggests there is a different way to offer that education. It offers a different structure of the education. Believes this intervention saves money in the long run.

SEN. TROW: So you think some money to get this program started is needed even if it means that we can't fund other things to the extent we would like to?

TRESIDDER: Doesn't think Oregonians want the Legislature to stop making policy decisions because of Measure 5. Will have to make some cliffifficult priority decisions. Believes that everyone thinks serving young children is a priority. It is an investment in our future.

SEN. TROW: This gets close to being a mandate doesn't it? It talks about restructuring, and it's not really a mandate but we want everyone to do it.

TRESIDDER: Doesn't think so. Wants to encourage districts to do it, but they don't have to. There is nothing in the bill that requires a districts to implement anything in the bill. Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991- P - e S

SEN. TROW: If the districts don't respond, then would you favor a mandate? TRESIDDER: No. The point is that when districts initiate programs and start experiencing success in those programs, their experience will be duplicated in more districts.

Chair Gold leave the room and Sen. McCoy assumes the chair.

060 WILMA WELLS, COSA: Have choices to make. Need to set priorities for what is necessary for our children. If the Legislature offers districts a small incentive to start the program, the districts will be more likely to do it than if they are mandated. Explains some of the effect of Head Start. -- Takes advantage of interagency agreements because they provide health, social and educational services. -Provides for parent participation. -- In follow through programs the child's acceleration was maintained longer. If the funds distributed as said in bill, will have equity. Will have accountability through the plans the districts submit and their evaluation by the Department of Education. Even small amounts of money can do a lot for smaller districts. The bill gives

districts the option of using the money for areas they need most. A pilot program would be worthwhile if it were the only thing available.

192 SEN. TROW: How would a small school get involved with the program? What would it have to do?

WELLS: Couldn't tell exactly what the plan submitted by the districts would include until the administrative rules were written. Personally, would get principals, teachers and parents together to decide what services were most needed at the district.

SEN. TROW: Would there need to be cooperative funding with the local district, or would the state funding provide for the entire service?

WELLS: If asked for local funds, the poorer districts could not participate.

SEN. TROW: It's not in the bill that there has to be a match. This money pays for the entire service?

WELLS: Yes. Thinks you will get more than you pay for.

SEN. TROW: Sounds like a good program.

236 RUTH HEWETT, State Board of Education: Also served on interim committee that presented these bills. SB 111 builds on the prekindergarten bills. This bill takes the same group of children into the school and looks at services that can be provided for at-risk children to provide a comprehensive education program. Likes the ideas of the site committees. Likes the temporary advisory committee to the board made up of professionals in the field.

274 RUBY PRICE, Teacher, Salem-Keizer School District: There is a diverse population at the Richmond Elementary School. It has innovative teachers working with the children, and with Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991- Psge 6

support and encouragement they can build on that creativity. It doesn't take a lot of money to do new and different things in innovative programs. SB 111 gives districts the flexibility to meet the needs of the children. Need to start somewhere. Describes coordination groups she is involved in with other teachers and schools. Sits on the Early Childhood Education Transitional Planning Team. Richmond has a self-study process where teachers meet to address the needs of the children.

SEN. GRENSKY: What does this bill do, other than provide money, that you can't already do?

PRICE: The self-study process that the teachers at Richmond have found productive may be cut as funds diminish despite proven success. Also it could provide training to administrators on early childhood techniques.

SEN. GRENSKY: Not sure it provides for that kind of training. Looks like you have to submit a proposal which is either approved or not. Seems like most of the bill, aside from the funding and day care after school hours, can already be done. It sounds like you're already doing some of it in the groups you are voluntarily involved in.

360 PRICE: The group envisions itself as a model. Key to the bill is the parent involvement. Only so much you can do in isolation. It would

be better if there was some coordination.

JAN BARGEN, Committee Administrator: Thanks Ms. Price for testifying and representing the teachers' point of view, in absence of the teachers who had participated in the interim work group.

SB 445 - Breakfast Program - PUBLIC HEARING: Witnesses: Elizabeth Hogeland, Hunger Task Force Rachelle Bagley, Hunger Task Force Kevin Concannon, Department of Human Resources Mari Ann Gest, Oregon School Employees Association Phyllis Goodell, OSEA Ellen Knepper, Food for Lane County Sue Marshall, Citizen Doug Rogers, Snow-Cap Karen Haffier, Oregon School Boards Association Bill Dierdorff, North Clackamas School District Marvin Evans, COSA

403 ELIZABETH HOGELAND, Executive Director, Hunger Task Force: Presents report produced by the Hunger Task Force (EXHIBIT B). Presents testimony highlighting areas of the report and describing the hunger problem in Oregon (EXHIBIT C).

475 SEN. DUKES: How do you know that the parents of children participating in breakfast and lunch programs are using the public assistance money to purchase food at home?

HOGELAND: The 1984 President's Task Force on Food Assistance cites studies that show this. Offers to refer Sen. Dukes to those studies. Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991- P - e 7

SEN. DUKES: Would be interested in seeing them. How do you know? If you ask the families they will say the money's going to food whether it is or not.

TAPE 20, SIDE B

030 HOGELAND: When ask families what they do with food stamps and why they do not have enough to last the entire month, they answer openly. The studies are based on in-house interviews. Continues presentation of testimony (EXHIBIT C).

117 RACHELLE BAGLEY, Member, Hunger Task Force: Presents testimony in favor of SB 445 (EXHIBIT D). Explains program and costs.

Chair Gold returns to the hearing.

265 SEN. TROW: Why not just leave the breakfast program as it is, now? Why make it mandatory?

BAGLEY: The schools are slow about implementing the program. If it is mandatory, they are more likely to implement it. Many states already make it mandatory because they want to encourage the program.

SEN. TROW: How many states have made it mandatory?

BAGLEY: Not sure about exact number. At least 10 or 15.

SEN. TROW: Every school would have a breakfast program? Has there been any effort to provide more incentives to the schools rather than mandate it since the program would be paid for by the federal government?

BAGLEY: In some states they have provided additional reimbursements as an incentive. Others provide the matching funds that schools are required to pay.

CHAIR GOLD: How does the program work in Colorado? Has heard they serve breakfast on the bus.

304 BAGLEY: Yes, they serve a sack breakfast as the children get on the bus. Children are happy to get a meal even if it is cold rather than hot food.

HOGELAND: This program makes good common sense, but the experience of other states has been that it's not a program schools buy into by themselves. The states that have breakfast programs did so through their legislatures. When you look at the long-term good and that it won't cost the state much, then you have to look at the greater good and not at whether people have bought into it on their own.

335 KEVIN CONCANNON, Director, Department of Human Resources: Presents testimony in support of SB 445 (EXHIBIT E). The 80s has produced parents and children who are more poor and more hungry. This program is beneficial even in the wake of Measure 5 because it basically pays for itself. . Senate Committee on Education January 20,1991- Page 8

387 MARI ANN GEST, Oregon School Employees Association: Presents testimony in support of (EXHIBIT F).

400 PHYLLIS GOODELL, Food Service Coordinator, Lincoln County School District: Refers to personal experiences in school district about breakfast programs in the county. Reads letters from principals in the schools about the program (EXHIBIT F). Has a problem with mandating the program, but in elementary schools it is baneficial. Would like to see some mechanisMwhere the school would not have to participate if the participation was not fair to the school because of costs.

474 SEN. DUKES: Is there any way to accommodate children with special diets?

TAPE 21, SIDE B

025 GOODELL: Both the breakfast and the lunch program accommodate for special diet needs. Have an 'offer versus serve' program. Offers four items for breakfast and the child must take three. In place of milk, could have juice. Not sure about replacing cereal for a lactose sensitive child. Hasn't had to address that.

SEN. DUKES: Looking at the examples of the breakfast menus (EXHIBIT D), a diabetic child may not have many sugar-free options.

GOODELL: That problem hasn't come up in her district.

059 ELLEN KNEPPER, Assistant Director, Food for Lane County: Presents testimony in support of SB 445 (EXHIBIT G).

119 SUE MARSHALL, Citizen: Presents testimony in favor of SB 445 (EXHIBIT H).

SEN. TROW: Didn't a bill like this pass the Senate?

MARSHALL: Yes, it passed in the Senate in 1981, but it didn't pass the House.

160 DOUG ROGERS, Director, Snow-Cap: Also a member of the Hunger Task Force. Gives personal experiences working with families struggling to

survive. Need both public and private resources. Represents a charity group in the private sector that provides emergency food supplies to families. Sees an increase in need for emergency food provisions when children are out on school vacations. There is no adjustment in food stamps during school vacation to compensate for lack of school lunch programs. Private sector would be worse off in efforts to help if schools did not have the lunch a breakfast programs. Healthy children grow up to be healthy adults.

220 SEN. DUKES: Thought this program wouldn't cost the school districts anything because federal funding would pay for it. But there is a waiver in the bill for districts with financial hardships. School districts do not like mandates. To convince them, needs to know it won't cost them anything. What would be the criteria for financial hardship?

KNEPPER: If you mandate a school breakfast program and only one person in the district participates, then the cost for that one person is prohibitive. That's were the waiver comes in. . . Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991- P - SEN. DUKES: At what point would they receive the waiver? Would they have to start the program to see how many children participate before they could ask for the waiver?

MAR - ALL: It hasn't been determined yet, but believes there would be some assessment of participation before the program is implemented. The cost depends on participation rate and management of the program.

CHAIR GOLD: Other legislation has had similar waiver procedures, we can look into that. Submits testimony from Sen. Jim Bunn for the record (EXHIBIT I).

280 KAREN HAFNER, Oregon School Boards Association: Not opposed to feeding hungry children; is concerned with mandates in general. Concerns: - Having two sets of students requiring double transportation especially in schools with only 25% participating. Seems like 10 or 20 minutes is a short time for a child to finish a meal. -- Required supervision of the program. It would create a change in working conditions that would have to be bargained. If meals were handed out on the bus, it would also be a change in working conditions. -- If federal funds removed, that would not remove the mandate. This has happened in the past when federal funds are pulled from programs to use the money elsewhere. Referring to question about waiver, it seems the waiver would only be good for two years. Instead of a mandate, suggests creating incentives. - State would pick up additional costs after the federal funds.

368 SEN. DUKES: How does giving out breakfasts on the bus end up on the bargaining table? Is it because the bus driver would be saying 'you can pick up your lunch here?'

HAFNER: Concern is that suddenly they would be supervising a breakfast program instead of just driving a bus. That would be a change in working conditions.

SEN. DUKES: Doesn't think anyone expects the drivers to supervise the program.

HAFNER: If the bus driver does not supervise, is concerned an additional staff person would be hired to supervise the program.

SEN. PHILLIPS: If you have a child that is hungry, will have a lack of attention and discipline problems that arise. It would be dollar wise to



invest in food programs instead of spending money on discipline and additional staff.

417 HAFNER: Not arguing that children are more productive when they eat. Is merely concerned about mandating a breakfast program when 25% of the students are eligible.

428 BILL DIERDORFF, Business Manager, N. Clackamas School District: Concerned about mandating with limited dollars if there are additional costs in transportation. If you mandate the breakfast program then will have to cut something else to pay for it. For example, his district has more than half of it's students transported. The school bus schedules are tight and there is no margin for handing out a breakfast. Issue is a balance of many greater good such as safety and education, not just nutrition. If add to one area you take away from the other. Thinks schools have not voluntarily gone with the breakfast program because there are other areas that - Senate Committee on Education January 20, 1991 - Page 10

draw on the school's resources. His district addresses nutrition concerns on an individual basis. When a child is identified as in need of nutrition, the school provides food for the student.

TAPE 22, SIDE A

061 SEN. TROW: Doesn't like mandates either, but are time when it is necessary. Remembers the kindergarten programs as an example. Some school districts said it wasn't necessary and didn't get them until it was mandated. DIERDORFF: In times past, when you could ask districts for additional dollars there was an effort to provide everything for everyone. Now it is not always possible; dollars are limited. Not opposed to adding the breakfast program, but it will be added at the expense of something else. Wants to let the community determine the needs of the school district. SEN. TROW: A lot of additional money would come for this program. In the long run agrees that the spin-off effects of feeding children will pay for the additional costs. DIERDORFF: If you do that at the cost of safety or instruction, you could make that argument for any program. 093 MARVIN EVANS, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators: Wants to support the bill, but can't because there are some costs involved. True that most schools that have the breakfast program break even or better. Supervision is an additional cost not covered in federal subsidies. Conditions vary from district to districts. Some not capable of handling the costs that are involved. It is a bargaining issue. Bus drivers are responsible for cleaning the buses and having children eating on the bus becomes a negotiated issue. Participation in secondary schools lower than in elementary schools. Suggests that there are areas of marketing the programs to schools that have not been done: -- Having principals or administrators attest to the benefits of the program and ways to keep costs down. The opt out provision is a concern. Schools faced with the argument of anything in the education program is less important than feeding children. Believes statistics cited may be for both public and private schools. In the state, 892 schools eligible and 386 are participating. If you mandate it you will put it on schools that have good reasons for not implementing the program. 172 SEN. PHILLIPS: The large suburban districts with a diverse population would be most affected by extraneous costs, correct? DIERDORFF: His district has a different situation than Beaverton because most of the students in the district are transported. SEN. PHILLIPS: Seems the greatest need is the younger children just starting the school process. Would you still oppose the bill if we had the program just in elementary schools and put in a caveat saying if the federal government

pulled its funds, the mandate would not be in effect? DIERDORFF: Doesn't oppose it because it is mandated. Opposes it because would have to cut something else out to make room for the mandate. In his community transportation and safety Senab Committece on Educatioa January 20,1991- Page 11

are considered priorities. To shift away from that wouldn't be meeting the needs of the community.

200 SEN. PHILLIPS: Could turn around what you've said to mean that you would rather get your students to school safely than to get them there safely and in a position where they are most able to learn.

DIERDORFF: Believes he is doing both in the district. Gets the students there safely and is addressing individual nutrition problems as they arise.

SEN. PHILLIPS: Is your program of identifying children adequate?

DIERDORFF: It doesn't identify everyone in need, but it meets the needs of those the district identifies.

SEN. PHILLIPS: Do you educated your teacher that the program is available if they identify children who are not well fed? DIERDORFF: Hasn't promoted it district wide. It is done through the principals.

EVANS: Has a hang up about mandates. If the committee did the things Sen. Phillips mentioned and dealt with some of the overhead costs incurred, would encourage COSA to support the bill.

CHAIR GOLD: Adjourns the hearing at 5:30 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Assistant

Reviewed by: Angela Muniz  
Administrator

Jan Bargaen

EXHIBIT LOG: A - Budget information on SB 111 - Staff- 5 pages B - Report: "Hunger in Oregon" - Elizabeth Hogeland - 75 pages 65 C - Testimony on SB 445 - Elizabeth Hogeland - 2 pages D - Testimony on SB 445 - Rachelle Bagley - 15 pages E - Testimony on SB 445 - Kevin Concannon - 1 page 445 - Kevin Concannon - 1 page F - Testimony on SB 445 - Mari Ann Gest - 12 pages F - Testimony on SB 445 - Mari Ann Gest - 12 pages G - Testimony on SB 445 - Ellen Knepper - 2 pages H - Testimony on SB 445 - Sue Marshall - 2 pages I - Testimony on SB 445 - Sen. Jim Bunn - 1 page