Tapes 39-40, (A\B) Work Session -School Distribution SENATE COMMITTEE ON REVENUE AND SCHOOL FINANCE February 12, 1991 1:00 PM Hearing Room A State Capitol Building Members Present: Senator Jane Cease, Chair Senator Joan Dukes, Vice Chair Senator John Brenneman Senator Shirley Gold Senator Ron Grensky Senator Bill McCoy Senator Tricia Smith Staff Present: Jim Scherzinger, Legislative Revenue Officer Terry Drake, Legislative Revenue Office Mary Ann Zimmermann, Committee Assistant Witnesses Present: Walter Koscher, Department of Education (DOE) TAPE 39. SIDE A 005 CHAIR CEASE called the meeting to order at 1:31 P.M. as a subcommittee until a quorum was reached at 1:40 P.M. Administrative business was conducted. 012 JIM SCHERZINGER reviewed the Committee's decision to address the Modified Plan Grant and the True Foundation Program options for funding education. Both options assume adjustments among districts for differences in needs. The request for available data indicating the varying needs among districts will be addressed by the Department of Education. 060 WALTER KOSCHER explained the Estimated 1990-91 Per Student Current Expenditures in relation to transportation. The information is presented by school districts in each county. EXHIBIT 1 149 WALTER KOSCHER clarified the data represents what the various school districts desire rather than the actual need. Discussion follows regarding assessing the transportation cost versus need. 208 Discussion and questions follow regarding transportation and factoring various needs into a formula. 253 JIM SCHERZINGER addressed questions in compiling a formula: Are there significant differences? Is there something to make an These minutes paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this meetings. Text enclosed in guotation 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 12, 1991 Page 2 adjustment for? Is there a practical way to do it? 280 Discussion continues in relation to transportation cost. 300 WALTER KOSCHER presented data depicting Application for Small School Corrections based on 1989-90 Apportionment. The information addresses the cost deferential for small schools. The choice versus necessity issue is addressed. EXHIBIT 2 379 WALTER KOSCHER referred to figures depicting summarizing school districts by size and type. The average cost per student is given in each size category. EXHIBIT 3 TAPE 40 SIDE

030 WALTER KOSHER referred to EXHIBIT 3, Page 15 offering cost per student in unified districts with less than 100 students. 046 SEN. SMITH questioned saving cost by consolidating the small school districts. 057 Discussion follows regarding consolidation. 062 JIM SCHERZINGER pointed out the figures relating to small districts versus small schools. Some schools do not meet small school criteria therefore do not receive additional funds from basic school support. 090 Discussion follows regarding small school cost data. 116 WALTER KOSCHER explained the basis for small schools going into the present formula for funding. 135 JIM SCHERZINGER suggested using the outlined goals as a resource cost model in estimating need and make adjustments accordingly. EXHIBIT 4 160 SEN. SMITH asked if there are districts where revenue could be saved on consolidation. 185 WALTER KOSCHER explained problems arise in the workforce of each district. The districts need to be addressed individually. 210 Discussion follows regarding consolidation with the need to gather more information on the issue. 224 SEN. GRENSKY asked how school districts were originally formed. Discussion and questions continued with relation to consolidation. 261 SEN. DUKES pointed out a study done on consolidation in which the results displayed little money is saved if consolidation takes place. 289 SEN. SMITH questioned how the formula works for allocating money 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 12, 1991 Page 3 to small schools. 296 WALTER KOSCHER explained how small school correction apportionment is determined. The formula has a stepping factor based on the number of students. Discussion and questions are interspersed. 345 WALTER KOSCHER pointed out various factors in relation to consolidation. Reference was made to obtain information relating to sudden changes in consolidation. 399 SEN. MCCOY asked what other points of interest could be served by consolidation rather than cost, such as quality of education. TAPE 39 SIDE R 011 WALTER KOSCHER commented on a main argument in favor of consolidation is continuity of program between grades. 020 WALTER KOSCHER continued the presentation offering available data with reference to growth and decline. EXHIBIT 5 060 WALTER KOSCHER explained how the figures dealing with growth and decline relate to cost. Increase cost usually relate to bond levies. Discussion referred to additional cost for operating new schools. 106 CHAIR CEASE asked if there were commonalities in decline. 110 WALTER KOSCHER reported the growth and decline in a school district is a factor of the area's economy. 126 SEN. SMITH questioned why costs didn't correlate with decline. 130 WALTER KOSCHER explained it being more difficult to reduce staffing due to declining enrollment. 150 Discussion follows regarding the relation of cost per student and declining enrollment. It was pointed out that maintenance cost is still a

Α

factor. 190 WALTER KOSCHER interpreted a chart offering data in reference to teachers by district, by teaching level, and by average years of experience. The teacher force can play a part in the differential in cost between school districts. EXHIBIT 6 249 SEN. GRENSKY asked what the discrepancy is for teacher's salary from district to district around the state. It was pointed out more accurate data could be obtained from the Oregon School Boards. 267 Discussion follows regarding the growth and decline of school districts in relation to teacher salary schedules. 322 TERRY DRAKE explained some necessary data may report inconsistencies therefore cautions interpreting data. 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 12, 1991 Page 4 374 WALTER KOSCHER offered data of student enrollment broken down by grade and racial-ethnic summary. EXHIBIT 7 TAPE 40 SIDE В 000 Discussion and questions follow regarding the value for gathering racial/ethnic information. Reference was made to looking at the causes of problems rather than addressing ethnic background. 037 WALTER KOSCHER reported lack of requested data in the areas of "at risk" students, Special Education, and Regional cost of living. 050 CHAIR CEASE adjourned the meeting at 2:59 P.M. Mary Ann Zimmermann, Committee Assistant Kimberly Taylor, Office Manager EXHIBIT SUMMARY Estimated 1990-91 Per Student Current Expenditures, DOE, 2/12/91 -1. School Distribution Application for Small School Correction 1989-90 Apportionment, 2. DOE, 2/12/91 - School Distribution Estimated 1991-91 per Student Current Expenditures, DOE, 1/91, 3. (See Exhibit 1, 2/11/91 Senate Revenue Meeting - School Distribution) 4. Goals & Options, LRO, 2/7/91 (See Exhibit 1, Senate Revenue Meeting, 2/7/91 - School Distribution) 5. October 1 Membership, DOE, 2/12/91, - School Distribution 6. Teachers by District, By Teaching Level, By Average years of Experience, DOE, 5/2/90, - School Distribution 7. Oregon Public School Racial-Ethnic Summary, by County, DOE, 10/1/90, -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.