



To: House Committee on Education
From: Richard Donovan, Legislative Services Specialist
Re: House Bill 2060
Date: February 2, 2021

OFFICERS

President
Maureen Wolf
Tigard-Tualatin SD

President-elect
Scott Rogers
Athena-Weston SD

Vice President
Sonja Mckenzie
Parkrose SD

Secretary-Treasurer
Patti Norris
Crook County SD

Past President
Kevin Cassidy
Baker SD

DIRECTORS

Sami Al-AbdRabbuh
*Oregon School Board
Members of Color Caucus*

Chris Cronin
John Day SD

Jackie Crook
South Coast ESD

Terry Deacon
Linn Benton Lincoln ESD

Katrina Doughty
Multnomah ESD

Libra Forde
North Clackamas SD

Linda Hamilton
Lane ESD

Kris Howatt
Gresham-Barlow SD

Greg Kintz
Vernonia SD

Melissa LaCrosse
Jefferson SD

Jesse Lippold
Salem-Keizer SD

Erika Lopez
Hillsboro SD

Brandy Penner
Newberg SD

Lori Theros
Klamath Falls City Schools

Dawn Watson
Phoenix-Talent SD

EX-OFFICIO DIRECTORS

COSA/OASE
Craig Hawkins

OAESD
Kelly Bissinger

State Board of Education
Kimberly Howard

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Jim Green

**DEPUTY EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR**
Mary Paulson

Chair Alonso Leon, Vice Chairs Neron and Weber, and members of the committee:

On behalf of OSBA membership, including 197 school districts and 19 Education Service Districts, thank you for the opportunity to testify on House Bill 2060. Generally, OSBA supports the ideas contained within HB 2060. The goals represent modest policy choices for legislators, at the request of the Department of Education and Gov. Brown. However, some parts of the bill raise concerns for local district operation.

The Student Success Act of 2019 created, among other things, the Student Investment Account. It also required, in order to access SIA funds, that local school districts consult with the Oregon Department of Education in setting performance growth targets for students. Legislators deliberately chose to keep these decisions local.

Sec. 2(4) of the proposed HB 2060, which can be found on pg. 3 Ins. 33-37, would add State Board of Education rulemaking ability around mental and behavioral health performance growth target setting by local districts. Given the recent history of the SIA and Student Success Act implementation, this change should be seriously considered.

Since the SIA process came into effect in early 2020, school districts have navigated the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, resulting economic downturn, and consequent upheaval and loss of learning caused by the requirement to deliver instruction and services to students remotely. This has not been a normal year. SIA revenues are much lower than was projected in 2019 and school districts have not had the opportunity to genuinely implement the measures that would meaningfully address student mental and behavioral health needs.

It is not clear that this is the time for the State Board of Education to exercise greater control over local processes. Student mental and behavioral health is crucial to student success and is a bedrock concept of the Student Success Act. Increasing centralized control, at the expense of local expertise, is not a decision that should be taken lightly.