



Date: March 16, 2017
To: Senate Education Committee, Chair Roblan and Members
From: Laurie Wimmer, OEA Government Relations
RE: *SB 746 [Education Governance Reform]*

On behalf of OEA's 44,000 members, it is my honor to speak in support of a bill they have requested to continue Oregon's conversation about optimal governance of public education. We thank the chairs of the Senate and House Education Committees for their sponsorship of SB 746.

In 2011, then-Gov. John Kitzhaber urged the legislature to pass his governance revamp package. Among its provisions were the creation of the ill-fated Oregon Education Investment Board, the invention of a Chief Education Officer and staff, and the disenfranchisement of Oregon voters with respect to one of our six statewide elected officers: the Superintendent of Public Instruction. By doing so, the gavel was passed from one non-educator, the incumbent SPI, to another non-educator, the governor.

It soon became clear that the vision this package represented proved to be less than it promised. In 2015, Legislators enacted SB 215, to end the OEIB experiment and sunset the Chief Education Office.

Now, we are asking for Part Two of the repair work education governance needs.

As it stands now, thanks to the 2011 changes, the governor serves as the Superintendent, the governor appoints a Deputy Superintendent, the governor appoints a Chief Education Officer, the governor appoints a Chief Innovation Officer, and the governor appoints all members of the

State Board of Education. Not a single working educator has a vote on the very important education matters that affect the system, their colleagues, and their students.

Our members believe that Oregonians need to be re-enfranchised. We believe that the best way to select a superintendent is to ensure that a qualified educator be elected by the people and that the best way to assemble a State Board is to enable the governor to appoint half and the people to elect half. The appointees would be educators, who understand the current conditions of our students, and the elected members would be accountable to voters from each region of the state.

Finally, we ask that the process for deliberation on education policy by the State Board be more democratic, by improving the public input process at SBE meetings.

We know that this proposal and Sen. Kruse's also great concept for Part B are both worthy and ambitious efforts, and we also know that this is just the beginning of the conversation on how best to achieve better governance. We welcome an SB 215-style workgroup of key stakeholders to craft the perfect work product together, in time for enactment this year, just as you did two years ago.

Some interesting information about the board as we envision it from NASBE:

States with Hybrid SBE Selection Systems

Louisiana:	8 elected by nonpartisan ballot; 3 appointed by governor
Mississippi:	5 appointed by governor and 4 appointed by legislature
Nevada:	4 are elected; 7 are appointed
Ohio:	11 elected by nonpartisan ballot; 8 appointed by governor
Washington:	5 elected by local school board members, 7 appointed by governor and confirmed by Senate; 1 elected by private schools
Guam:	6 elected at large; 3 appointed by governor, 1 voting student

States with Elected SBEs

Alabama, Colorado, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, Texas, Utah, Northern Marianas, and Virgin Islands

States with No SBE

Minnesota, New Mexico, and Wisconsin

The rest of the states are appointed, some with Legislative Advise-and-Consent provisions.

Thank you so much for your consideration of this proposal.