

February 28, 2011

PARKROSE: Overview of Educational Vision, Budget Considerations, and Legislative Issues of Interest

COSA Education Vision & Policy Task Force Recommendations

- Rigorous Academic Standards
- Effective Teaching
- High Expectations for Students
- Strong Leadership and Effective Governance (Proposed Changes re: State Superintendent)
- Stable and Adequate Funding
- Parents and Communities as Partners

COSA Budget Documents/Graphs

- Education's Share of Oregon's State Budget declines since 2003
- Percentage Increase in Education Expenditures – fallen since 2003
- Proposed Return to Investing in Education
- Increase in School Funding needed to meet State Standards
- Education Jobs Lost / Increase in Class Sizes
- Oregon's Education Spending Declining compared to US Average
- Loss of ADM over the last decade

State School Fund Appropriations – Parkrose data

- 6.4 B = Full-year of school, no reductions in staffing or programs
- 5.8 B = \$ 3.8 million short of needed \$31 million (12% reduction)
 - 45 staff, 38 days
- 5.6 B = \$4.4 million short of needed \$31 million (14% reduction)
 - 52 staff, 44 days
- 5.4 B = \$5.0 million short of needed \$31 million (16% reduction)
 - 59 staff, 50 days

Topics Bills of interest to Parkrose School District

1. **No Unfunded Mandates** – It is essential that any legislative mandate for schools be accompanied by a clear, new funding source providing for implementation of the mandate. This includes mandates for teaching training and staff development.
2. **OEBB Opt out** – Removal of the requirement for school districts to use OEBB for health insurance (see ORS 243.886 (A)). Self-insured districts have see

lower costs for health insurance. The OEGB monopoly is not resulting in cost savings – an Opt out is needed.

3. **Special Education – Burdon of Proof** – Keep current laws that require that the parent, not the district, prove that a proposed placement is inappropriate. A change would result in an increase in inappropriate demands for due process and incur significant litigation-related costs for districts.
4. **On-line/Virtual Schools** – Opposed to legislation that would change the ADM percentage that is allocated to on-line charter schools, without consideration for two on-line charter qualities: 1) enrollment has 50% or more from resident district, and 2) Program includes some face-to-face instruction with students (hybrid model).
5. **Charter Schools – Resident districts pay for SpEd services** – Support for HB 2030 that changes resident school district of public charter school students who receive special education and related services to school district in which the public charter school is located.
6. **Charter Schools – Allow for multiple district sponsorship of a charter school.** Twenty-five full time enrolled students can be spread over the number of districts or can be counted back to resident districts. CAL and ACE are examples.
7. **ESD Regionalization** – Maintain the current ESD structure and funding levels and allow/require multiple Educational Service Districts to offer their services to school districts outside of current service areas. Opposed to SB250 “Opt Out” by larger school districts. Effect on other districts within that ESD is severe-loss of economies of scale.
8. **PERS Reform**-There is no less than 21 different bills on PERS reform. Support legislation that would allow employers relief of picking up 6% contribution and employees paying of 6% and roll over contributions (HB 2161, HB 2984 and HB 2985). Several bills declare an emergency upon passage.