

Submitter: Joseph Everton
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Education
Measure: SB1552

Our children were not set up for success in our local schools. We had many supportive and caring teachers, but policies and administration got in the way of my kids reaching their potential. We tried to compensate for the gaps we saw, but in the end it was less work to homeschool or find a different school. We successfully transferred to an online charter school a couple years ago, and it was a good move for our kids. We have many friends who have attempted transfers like us. Some succeeded and also had positive experiences. Others, recently, were denied because our school district had that option once 3% of students had elected to transfer.

I could go on at length about our stories, but I will instead focus on several facts:

- Our school district did not even ask why we left. It seems that they did not care why.
- While interviewing a local private school, we learned that several of our local school districts administrators actually enroll their children there (no names given, of course). There are indications that our school district does not feel it needs to "eat its own dog food," as we say in the software industry.
- Our friends who were among the 4th percent of students to attempt to transfer did nothing to deserve a lesser outcome for their students (i.e. denial of transfer leading to continued neglect). They just filed a little later.
- These friends who were denied a transfer did not even represent a loss of funding for the local schools. They were already homeschooling this year, and therefore no source of funding to begin with. The school district had nothing to lose through their transfer. They blocked it anyway.
- The 3% cap provides a school district an opportunity to exploit children they are underserving for state funding. Percents 4 and up, who may have their transfers denied, are left with only homeschooling or private schooling as options. These are among the most expensive alternatives, and only accessible to wealthier families. This undermines the equity our state strives so hard to achieve.
- The 3% cap puts Oregon children's interests secondary to running a school system that is supposedly there to support them, but in fact is not supporting them. It is pure exploitation of children, by definition.
- Schools that only stand to lose 3% of their budget by neglecting their students' needs have little incentive find out how they can do better. They can put that money to ineffective use, and never have to wonder if what they are doing is working.
- Even if the cap were lifted, local schools have the edge of in-person learning. They still have to do very poorly by a large number of students before an online

school across the state looks like a step up. There is little risk of a mass exodus from any district.

As parents, we pay the price more than any other person or entity when our kids' needs are not met at home or at school. As aware and engaged parents, many of us can see this cost coming years in advance. We have to. We don't just prepare kids for college, trades, etc. We have to support them through that phase as well, and pick up the pieces if they are unprepared. Engaged parents leaving is a good bellwether for how well schools serve ALL their students, and where things are going. No parent is perfect, but on average, they are much more vested in a child's success than any school administrator. By muffling this parent frustration statistic with an artificial and tiny cap, we silence up to 97% of our families whose needs may go unmet because the district has nothing to lose by neglecting them. By allowing schools a 3% cap on inter-district transfers, we deny our students a school system with a vested interest in student success.

We need to remember that our schools exist to serve our students, and not the reverse. Our students need accountable schools. SB1552 will deliver that.