

Tapes 25-26, (A\B)
Public Hearing -
School Distribution
SENATE COMMITTEE ON REVENUE AND SCHOOL FINANCE

February 1, 1991 1:00 PM Hearing Room A State Capitol Building

Members Present: Senator Jane Cease, Chair
Senator Joan Dukes, Vice Chair
Senator Shirley Gold
Senator Ron Grensky
Senator Bill McCoy
Senator Tricia Smith
Members Excused: Senator John
Brenneman

Staff Present: Jim Scherzinger, Legislative Revenue
Officer
Steve Bender, Legislative Revenue
Office
Mary Ann Zimmermann, Committee
Assistant

Witnesses Present: Senator Jim Bunn

Wes Smith, Superintendent Newberg Schools Robert Leroy Benham, Newberg
School Board Melinda Lee-Van Bossuyt, Oregon State Parent Teacher
Association (PTA)

TAPE 25. SIDE A

005 CHAIR CEASE called the meeting to order at 1:16 P.M. and conducted
administrative business.

SCHOOL DISTRIBUTION - PUBLIC
HEARING

050 SEN. BUNN presented a group of school administrators from Newberg who
have developed an equalization formula for Measure 5 funds that are to be
returned to the districts.

059 LEROY BENHAM read a letter addressed to the committee on equitable
distribution for school funds. EXHIBIT 1

081 SEN. DUKES asked if it was desired to distribute these funds for both
school years in the coming biennium.

093 LEROY BENHAM responded to find a solution in the first year of the
biennium and start out immediately with an appropriate formula.

102 Discussion and questions follow regarding equitable distribution.

These minutes paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this
meetings. Text enclosed in quotation marks reports the speakers exact
words. For complete context of proceedings, please refer to the tape
recording.

Senate Committee on
Revenue and School Finance
February 1, 1991 Page 2

134 SEN. GRENSKY asked for specific funding figures for Newberg Schools and
it was clarified that they will receive some relief from Measure 5.

150 WES SMITH read testimony to the committee regarding an equitable school
funding program. A new school finance equalization formula was presented
referring to it as a Foundation Grant Approach using a state average
expenditure per student. EXHIBIT 2

220 WES SMITH presented and discussed the proposed Equalization Formula.
EXHIBIT 3

280 WES SMITH presented the proposed Equalization Formula with monetary
figures included. EXHIBIT 4

300 SEN. BUNN addressed the committee with comments in support of the

proposed Equalization Formula.

315 SEN. SMITH commented on the time element of the legislative process of deciding on what is equitable. This proposed formula strongly discourages funding schools in the next year on a status quo basis.

354 WES SMITH responded it being easier to live with the uncertainty of the starting budget than the potential of cutting further programs that other school districts take for granted.

390 SEN. SMITH commented on not presently knowing what the budget will be for next year.

400 WES SMITH explained knowing next years budget would be helpful but the interest of the students is what is important.

TAPE 26 SIDE

A

004 Discussion and questions follow regarding the Equalization Formula.

060 SEN. BUNN expressed desire to find the best formula before locking into a budget for this first year.

079 SEN. DUKES noted that Newberg Schools are gambling on coming out ahead by using this formula.

089 WES SMITH commented on the different educational opportunities in the various districts in Oregon. Equity is right.

107 SEN. DUKES liked the formula but there is a significant fiscal impact and asked if Newberg was still wanting this redistribution formula the first year.

118 WES SMITH referred to figures of replacement funds being distributed. EXHIBIT 2, page 5

These minutes paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this meetings. Text enclosed in quotation marks reports the speakers exact words. For complete context of proceedings, please refer to the tape recording.

Senate Committee on
Revenue and School Finance
February 1, 1991 Page 3

140 Discussion and questions follow regarding distribution.

182 CHAIR CEASE asked if it would be helpful have a dollar figure for the level of basic school support.

192 WES SMITH responded yes and another aspect of this formula is it can be progressive by using the state average of expenditure per student.

225 CHAIR CEASE asked if there other factors to be considered in the distribution formula.

235 WES SMITH addressed how factors could be worked into the proposed formula. EXHIBIT 2, Page 4

350 Questions and discussion follow regarding Foundation Grant Determination formula. EXHIBIT 2, Page 4

293 CHAIR CEASE asked if local revenue and property value growth could be a factor in the formula. The response was the factor is already present.

340 SEN. BUNN commented on education becoming a state funded program and district equity is the issue.

367 SEN. GRENSKY expressed concern in relying on another revenue source. It was asked if the Newberg District had input in developing HB 2431.

403 WES SMITH commented that he was part of the decision.

TAPE 25 SIDE

B

006 SEN. SMITH addressed the equity question of not being a dollar amount but an opportunity for education.

019 WES SMITH thinks money determines the quality of educational opportunities in Oregon.

030 SEN. SMITH asked how educational equity fits into this formula.

050 Discussion and questions following regarding educational equity versus monetary equity.

080 SEN. SMITH referred to the formula having a state average expenditure per student and asked about modification for a growth in future years.

098 WES SMITH explained how the allowance for growth is present in the formula.

100 SEN. GRENSKY asked about the need for addressing local control.

;

These minutes paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this meetings. Text enclosed in quotation marks reports the speakers exact words. For complete context of proceedings, please refer to the tape recording.

Senate Committee on

Revenue and School Finance

February 1, 1991 Page 4

110 WES SMITH responded to the importance of local control and it is present in this formula because there is a foundation level.

128 SEN. GRENSKY commented on the loss of local control because of the passage of Measure 5 and how do we insure this average cost per student provides the same education throughout the state.

151 LEROY BENHAM responded to the concern of lost local control but there are other questions regarding the quality of education which are a balanced responsibility between the state and local systems.

173 Discussion and questions follow regarding decisions of the state and local control.

215 MELINDA LEE-VAN BOSSUYT read the position statement of The Oregon Parent Teacher Association (PTA) which deals with school equity. EXHIBIT 6

230 MELINDA LEE-VAN BOSSUYT presented the handout used at the conference of the Oregon State PTA. EXHIBIT 7

280 CHAIR CEASE adjourned the meeting at 2:34 P.M.

Mary Ann Zimmermann, Committee Assistant

Kim Taylor, Office Manager

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

1. Testimony from Robert LeRoy Benham, 2/1/91 - School Distribution
2. Testimony from Wes Smith, 2/1/91 - School Distribution
3. Testimony from Wes Smith, 2/1/91 - School Distribution
4. Testimony from Wes Smith, 2/1/91 - School Distribution
5. Testimony from Wes Smith, 2/1/91 - School Distribution
6. Testimony from Melinda Lee-Van Bossuyt, 2/1/91 - School Distribution
7. Testimony from Melinda Lee-Van Bossuyt, 2/1/91 - School Distribution
8. Ballot Measure 5 Impact, Office of Community College Services, 2/1/91 - School Distribution

These minutes paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this meetings. Text enclosed in quotation marks reports the speakers exact words. For complete context of proceedings, please refer to the tape recording.