



To: Senate Committee on Education
From: Richard Donovan, Legislative Services Specialist
Re: Senate Bill 129
Date: February 3, 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 Dembrow, Vice-Chairs Thomsen, 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 in opposition to Senate Bill 129, a bill that would give the Teachers, Standards, and Practices Commission broad rulemaking authority to levy fees against public school districts, Education Service Districts, public charter schools, and education preparation program providers. It would also give the agency broad capability to pursue license violations with civil penalties.

The fee expansion contemplated by SB 129 has no precedence in recent education law. The agency's three-part structure of professional practice, licensure, and educator preparatory program oversight is largely funded by the fees from only one portion of the agency, the licensure portion. Unsurprisingly, the agency has seemingly struggled in recent years to find proper funding. Recent action on the topic of TSPC funding culminated in the agency raising license fees for educators and administrators less than two years ago.

If the agency faces the problem of needing additional funding, then a general fund allocation should be considered as an answer, especially given a recent fee hike. What should not be considered is an unrestrained levy on public school districts. This ability to take money from public classrooms and students is not good policy, especially not during a time of national pandemic, statewide educational lockdown, and a greater need than ever for local school funding. That is what SB 129 would allow.

Thank you for your time and attention. Please oppose SB 129.