

SATURDAY, JANUARY 25, 2020
Salem Convention Center, Salem OR

OSBA committee members in attendance at meeting start: Chair Liz Hartman, Jessica Arzate, Mike Blackaby, Fred Brick, Kevin Cassidy, Satya Chandragiri, Chris Cronin, Jackie Crook, Terry Deacon, Mark Everett, Sarah Finger McDonald, Libra Forde, Bill Graupp, Linda Hamilton, Glenn Holum, Kris Howatt, Greg Kintz, Melissa LaCrosse, LeeAnn Larsen, John Lindenthal, Erika Lopez, Annette Mattson, Sonja Mckenzie, Dianne Mihocko, Rita Moore, Tass Morrison, Judy Newman, Patti Norris, Brandy Penner, Rebecca Piros, Craig Prewitt, Chrissy Reitz, Betty Reynolds, Scott Rogers, Courtney Snead, Lori Theros, Mark Truax, Becky Tymchuk, Mark Watson, Rose Wilde, Maureen Wolf

OSBA staff in attendance at meeting start: Executive Director Jim Green, Deputy Executive Director Mary Paulson, Chris Davidson, Richard Donovan, Dave Harvey, Peggy Holstedt, Steve Kelley, Jane Leonhardt, Haley Percell, Alex Pulaski, Lori Sattenspiel, La’Nell Trissel

Guests in attendance at meeting start: Barbara MacKay, Rangineh Azimzadeh Tosang

OSBA committee members not in attendance: Yesenia Delgado, Craig Hawkins, Steve Lowell, Anthony Veliz, Michelle Vo

President Kevin Cassidy called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

I. Introduction of LPC Chair

Kevin Cassidy, OSBA President, introduced the Liz Hartman, Chair of the Legislative Policy Committee.

II. Welcome

Liz reviewed the OSBA mission statement and gave a brief introductory statement. She then invited committee members, by region, to come up to the front and introduce themselves.

III. Approve agenda

Motion: Craig Prewitt moved the committee to approve the agenda as presented. Seconded by Kris Howatt.

The committee voted, and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Consent agenda

Motion: Kevin Cassidy moved the committee to approve the consent agenda as presented. Seconded by Melissa LaCrosse.

The committee voted, and the motion passed unanimously.

V. Facilitated discussion of the Legislative Priorities

Liz reviewed the meeting packet materials and introduced Barbara MacKay and Rangineh Azimazadeh Tosang, North Star Facilitators, as the facilitators for the meeting.

Barbara welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the agenda and objectives for the next two days, and reviewed the group guidelines.

Rangineh started the facilitation with a warm-up activity.

Liz led the committee in review of the OSBA Code of Conduct.

Lori briefly reviewed the LPC Roles and Responsibilities. Barbara led a discussion designed to familiarize and clarify the understanding of a LPC member's roles and responsibilities.

Richard gave a brief review of the 2019 Legislative Session and directed the committee's attention to the memorandum included in the meeting packet (p. 28). Rangineh led a discussion designed to identify key points.

Lori reviewed the 2020 Legislative Policies and Priorities Input Survey and directed the committee's attention to the memorandum included in the meeting packet (p. 30). Barbara led individual and table discussions that took a deeper dive into the survey summary.

The meeting recessed at 3:00 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 3:15 p.m.

Jim introduced the OSBA staff in attendance at the meeting.

Lori gave a brief overview of the current and proposed priorities. Barbara introduced the current priorities and led the committee through an activity and discussion to determine what to keep and what to remove, and why.

Richard gave a brief overview of the proposed priorities. Rangineh further introduced the proposed priorities and led the committee through an activity and discussion to gain better general understanding of the proposed priorities.

Rangineh brought the facilitation to a close and gave an overview of tomorrow's agenda.

Lori reviewed the logistics for dinner and the start of tomorrow's meeting.

Chair Liz Hartman recessed the meeting at 4:42 p.m.

Sunday, January 26, 2020
Salem Convention Center, Salem OR

OSBA committee members in attendance at meeting start: Chair Liz Hartman, Mike Blackaby, Fred Brick, Kevin Cassidy, Satya Chandragiri, Chris Cronin, Jackie Crook, Terry Deacon, Mark Everett, Sarah Finger McDonald, Libra Forde, Linda Hamilton, Glenn Holum, Kris Howatt, Greg Kintz, John Lindenthal, Erika Lopez, Annette Mattson, Sonja Mckenzie, Dianne Mihocko, Rita Moore, Tass Morrison, Judy Newman, Patti Norris, Brandy Penner, Rebecca Piros, Craig Prewitt, Chrissy Reitz, Betty Reynolds, Scott Rogers, Courtney Snead, Lori Theros, Mark Truax, Becky Tymchuk, Mark Watson, Rose Wilde, Maureen Wolf

OSBA staff in attendance at meeting start: Executive Director Jim Green, Deputy Executive Director Mary Paulson, Richard Donovan, Jane Leonhardt, Lori Sattenspiel, La’Nell Trissel

Guests in attendance at meeting start: Barbara MacKay, Rangineh Azimzadeh Tosang,

OSBA committee members not in attendance: Jessica Arzate, Yesenia Delgado, Bill Graupp, Craig Hawkins, Melissa LaCrosse, LeeAnn Larsen, Steve Lowell, Anthony Veliz, Michelle Vo

Chair Liz Hartman called the meeting to order at 8:01 a.m.

I. Welcome

Liz welcomed everyone back, thanked staff for their attendance, and shared logistical information.

II. Facilitated discussion of the Legislative Policies

Rangineh welcomed everyone back and reviewed the agenda for the day.

Barbara led the committee in a warm-up activity.

Rangineh led the committee in activities and discussion groups to wrap-up the conversation on the priorities, with the inclusion of time to develop action words that complete the proposed priority statements.

Lori gave an overview of the past Legislative Policies and the new Legislative Principles.

Lori and Richard invited the committee to walk in their shoes, those of the OSBA lobbyist, through an example and a small group exercise. Lori gave a brief history the Legislative Policies, how and why they were generated, and how they were designed to be used. She then briefly overviewed the change in how lobbying functions and what that looks like today; gave testimony on the creditability that OSBA has recently been able to generate at the Capitol; and related the group exercise to the need for updating the format of the Legislative Policies into guiding principles – Legislative Principles.

The meeting recessed at 9:50 a.m.

Lori Theros exited the meeting at 9:50 a.m.
Maureen Wolf exited the meeting at 9:50 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:05 a.m.

Rangineh led the committee in activities and discussions to ensure that the proposed principles were inclusive of the concepts addressed in the previous policies.

The meeting recessed at 11:30 a.m.

Mike Blackaby exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
Fred Brick exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
Terry Deacon exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
Dianne Mihocko exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
Tass Morrison exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
Brandy Penner exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
Craig Prewitt exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
Becky Tymchuk exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

The meeting reconvened 11:30 p.m.

Barbara touched on the process of change and gave clarification to the steps that the committee is being guided through to achieve the transformation of the Legislative Policies into Legislative Principles. Lori gave further example and confirmation for the need to concentrate the policies into more inclusive principles in order for OSBA to remain relevant at the capitol in today's climate.

Barbara led the committee through additional activities and discussion to ensure that the proposed principles are inclusive of the issues that are affecting districts today.

III. Closing

Barbara recapped all the work that had taken place over the last two days.

Rangineh summarized next steps anticipated in the upcoming committee meeting.

Staff gave closing remarks that were inclusive of general appreciation and acknowledgement of the work that the committee accomplished over the duration of the meeting.

Barbara then led the committee in a closing exercise.

Chair Liz Hartman adjourned the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

The following are handouts that were distributed during the meeting.



2021-2022 Legislative Priorities

Proposed: January 2020

1. Current Priorities

- a. Promote predictable, stable funding for the state school fund - Funding for public schools rises and falls every two years because our revenue-raising and funding systems have wild variance. Reliable investment that increases over time is crucial to public education in Oregon.
- b. Support local control - Locally elected officials, local education professionals, and the local community are in the best position to respond to the needs of and maximize opportunities for students.
- c. Oppose mandates - Mandates are often costly and prioritize one part of the education system over another. New mandates must be evidence-based, have full funding attached, and be beneficial to the entire education community.
- d. Contain cost drivers - Benefits costs for school employees are controlled at the state level and are beyond the control of local school districts. Cost increases eat into program offerings and instructional opportunities for students.
- e. Support capital improvements - Students need buildings that are comfortable, safe, and appropriate for a modern learning environment.

2. Proposed Additional Priorities

- a. Student Success Act - The passage of the Student Success Act in 2019 gives local communities an unprecedented opportunity to make new education investments. School board members are in a unique position to implement the Act in an accountable way that leads to increased academic success for all public education students.
- b. Equity (closing achievement gap)¹ - In every community there is a disparity in the achievement levels between certain student groups. That achievement gap should be eliminated.
- c. Post-secondary (access to credits and credit transfer) - Students should have access to learning-appropriate post-secondary credit opportunities that will fully transfer and be recognized across Oregon's public post-secondary system.
- d. Workforce shortages (Licensed, Classified, Administrators, and Others) - There is a shortage of high-quality staff in Oregon that, if left unaddressed, will negatively impact students in the near-future.

¹ The following information has been included for reference and has been condensed for clarity:

SSA language, Sec. 9(2)(b): Economically disadvantaged students; students from racial or ethnic groups that have historically experienced academic disparities; students with disabilities; students who are English language learners; students who are foster children; students who are homeless; and any other student groups that have historically experienced academic disparities, as determined by State Board of Education.



2021-2022 Legislative Priorities

Review Questions

Current Priorities

1. Review current priorities and determine:
 - a. Keep: What is working now and needs no substantial change? You agree these stay on the list.
 - b. Remove: Does anything need to be removed from the list? And why?
2. Write recommendation on full sheet of paper and post on sticky wall

Proposed Additional Priorities

1. Ask for a volunteer scribe to write down group's responses for guiding questions b. - d. and complete a separate handout for each of the Proposed Priorities.
2. Review all current priorities and guiding questions below:
 - a. From your district's perspective, share an example of why the priority is important.
 - b. What is the window of opportunity for this priority for 2021-2022?
 - c. What challenges might Lori and Richard face with this priority?
 - d. Should this priority continue to move forward? Why or why not?



Legislative Policy Committee

January 2020

Legislative Example

Issue:	Children's Service District
Background:	<p>Special service districts are formed to provide one service – financed through property taxes, fees for services, or a combination – and all funds collected are used to support the particular service. Most special service districts are directed by a governing body elected by voters. Current law allows for a wide variety of special districts, including irrigation districts, fire districts, weed control districts, and soil and water conservation districts.</p> <p>Oregon's Constitution dedicates property tax revenues toward funding the public school system – pre-kindergarten through post graduate – so long as such revenues are used exclusively for educational services, including support services, that are provided by a unit of government. Oregon's Constitution also limits the amount of property tax that may be collected to fund public schools, to \$5 for every \$1,000 in real market value.</p>
Bill:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Permits the formation of Children's Special Districts to deliver children's services. 2) Defines "children's services" as services provided outside school hours in support of children's total health and well-being. 3) Provides that Children's service districts may be formed to provide funding for programs that offer children's services. 4) Requires local petition to form district to be signed by greater of 10 percent or more of electors in territory or 100 electors.
Policies for:	2.9 (student wellness)
Policies against:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 (adequate investment) 1.2 (reforming tax policy) 4.2 (local governance)
Final position:	<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local municipalities already have this right, generally, to make this choice. • Creation of new form of special district could impact property tax revenues for local school district(s), specifically by compression for districts close to property tax cap. • Providing that the children's service districts can be formed "to provide funding" is a way of permitting these districts to direct streams of existing property tax income. • General policy position that we have children's districts, we call them school districts. • Technical points in bill, including no specific provision to dissolve this district, a right of action that could freeze revenue indefinitely, and uneven treatment of other municipal districts, including unclear if cities could/should have ability to exclude themselves from district.



Legislative Policy Committee

January 2020

Legislative Exercise

Issue: Vaccinations

Background: Oregon currently allows both medical and non-medical exemptions. Oregon has the highest rate of nonvaccinated kindergarten students in the country. Some private schools see exemption rates near 50 percent.

As a condition of attending any school in Oregon, every child through grade 12 is required to be immunized against 11 vaccine-preventable diseases: diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis, polio, measles, mumps, rubella, varicella, hepatitis A and B, and Hemophilus influenzae type b (Hib).

For a child to be exempt from all or part of the immunization requirements, a parent or guardian of a child enrolled in a public, private, or charter school must provide one of the following:

- Certification of immunizations received;
- A statement that a child should be exempted due to medical diagnosis as the child has a medical condition that puts them at risk of harm; or
- A statement to decline one or more immunizations for non-medical purposes. The document to decline immunizations for nonmedical purposes may include reasons for declining the immunization (e.g., religious or philosophical belief) and must include either a signature from a health care practitioner verifying that they have reviewed information with the parent about risks, benefits, and the contents of a vaccine educational module; or a certificate verifying the parent has completed the vaccine education module.

Bill: HB 3063 removes nonmedical exemptions for vaccinations required for school-aged children in Oregon.

Exercise: Based on the 2019-20 Legislative Policies and Priorities:

- State what position Richard or Lori should take: For, Against, or Neutral.
- State what level of engagement should be used:
 - Actively (provide written/verbal testimony on the bill, lobby legislators for the position, etc.); or
 - Passively (legislative team will track the bill as it moves through the process, but may only provide a logo on a document, attend an occasional meeting to keep in the loop, or may talk with a legislator, as needed).
- State the Policy or Priority was used to base your decision.



2021-2022 Legislative Guiding Principles

Proposed: January 2020

1. **Finance** – OSBA supports the allocation of state resources to ensure school districts have the necessary resources to equitably and fully support all students’ instructional, behavioral, and programmatic needs. OSBA supports appropriate financial tax policy to make Oregon schools competitive nationally and globally, including the preservation of other funding options for local district consideration and the common school fund.
2. **Students and Programs** – OSBA supports high-quality programs that equitably serve all students in obtaining a comprehensive and well-rounded education, with a focus on closing the achievement gap. OSBA supports services that promote social, emotional, and behavioral health of students.
3. **Personnel** – OSBA supports local management control over employee rights and benefits, with the goals of attracting and retaining high-quality employees to a safe, healthy, and sustainable workplace.
4. **Governance and Operations** – OSBA believes locally elected school district, ESD, and community college boards are best equipped to make decisions in the best interest of students and communities. OSBA supports collaboration between state level policy makers, education experts, stakeholders, and members of local communities; including parents, educators, students, and business leaders.
5. **Federal Education Issues** – Federal government should prioritize and increase the federal share of funding for special education programs like Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Title I programs that serve students who are experiencing poverty, child nutrition programs, Carl D. Perkins technical education acts, the Secure Rural Schools Act, and other programs that support students. These programs should be a top priority for the U.S. Department of Education, Congress, and the President.



2021-2022 Legislative Guiding Principles

Review Questions

-
1. What is your gut reaction to the summary statement?
 2. What were some key words that stood out to you?
 3. What resonates?
 4. What is essential to keep?
 5. What is the key message or theme we want to convey?
 6. What, if any, is missing from the statement?

Proposed Priorities Feedback Form

Name of Proposed Priority: _____

Group Members: _____

Instructions: *For each proposed priority, review all four questions and ask a volunteer to **record responses for questions 2-4 only**. Please complete a separate handout for each priority.*



1. Share an example from your district perspective of why the priority is important.



2. What is the window of opportunity for this priority for 2021-2022?



3. What challenges might Lori and Richard face with this priority?



4. Should this priority continue to move forward? Why or why not?