

May 7, 2025

To: Chair Frederick, Vice-Chair Weber, and Members of the Senate Committee on Education

Re: **HB 3365A**

My name is Adrienne Anderson and I am the Government Relations Counsel for the Oregon School Boards Association. OSBA represents all 197 school districts, 19 Education Service Districts, and community college. I am urging you to vote oppose House Bill 3365A.

No limiting definitions in bill

OSBA opposes the bill, not because of its topic area, but because it is an unfunded mandate on our schools. HB 3365A requires the State Board of Education to ensure that the academic content standards for “core subjects” include “sufficient” instruction on the causes and effects of climate change. Neither “core subject” nor “sufficient” are defined in the bill. I appreciate the proponents explaining that the intent of the bill is not to require climate change curriculum in every core subject at every grade level. However, the text of the bill says the opposite.

The proponents stated the intent is to model HB 3365A after similar curriculum changes passed by the legislature that required perspectives of Native Americans, Black Americans, women, LGBTQ, etc be incorporated into content standards for history, geography, economics, and civics. However, those additions were limited to *specific* core subjects. If the intent is to model this bill after previous legislative changes to curriculum, then the bill language should match that intent by including more specificity.

The State Board will rely on the text of the bill during rulemaking and without proper limiting definitions, the intended stated outcome of the proponents will not be achieved. The State Board may consider the proponents’ stated intent, but since the legislature has limited the core subjects in previous legislation and chose not to in HB 3365A, that might also be considered during rulemaking.

Unfunded mandate

Determining the fiscal impact of a particular bill to our school districts is not perfect science and it is often easier to provide context as to how a bill would impact a district than it is to provide a specific number. There are 197 school districts and 19 ESDs in Oregon, all with different budgets and staff. We often do not know the exact impact of a bill until after the bill is implemented. OSBA’s focus this session has been to raise awareness of the

unfunded mandates placed on our schools and HB 3365A is one of them. Former OSBA Legislative Director Lori Sattenspiel and Sen. Dembrow presented to the House Education committee during December legislative days explaining the difficulty in providing accurate fiscal impacts for schools.

<https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/mediaplayer/?clientID=4879615486&eventID=2024121030> (at 1:37:15).

Because HB 3365A lacks clear guardrails for the State Board, the impact of this bill during rulemaking could potentially be much larger than the proponents realize. Many school districts are still feeling the impact in the aftermath of [SB 3](#)'s rulemaking from the 2023 session. What was once believed to be a minimal impact on districts is now turning out to be a larger impact because of the 2 additional graduation requirements. School districts cannot afford any more uncertainty.

At OSBA, we understand the value of students receiving education about the science of climate change. There are already content standards and required instruction in Health, Social Sciences, and Science standards. We believe the best way for the legislature to demonstrate its commitment to climate change education would be to provide funding for implementation.

The minimal fiscal impact on the bill is a bit deceiving. We know this bill may, at a minimum, cost districts to provide ongoing professional development. When staff attend professional development trainings, districts have the added cost of the daily rate for substitute teachers. Additionally, depending on the rulemaking by the State Board, it will also be a significant cost to update the math and ELA summative assessments to include the new climate change curriculum.

Several states have adopted climate change curriculum but a key difference is they have provided funding to their districts for implementation. Maine adopted a pilot program and provided \$2 million in grants for professional development and \$94,519 to their department of education to support the grants. New Jersey allocated \$5 million to help schools implement the new curriculum. Maryland provided \$2 million for professional development and outdoor learning experiences. Our neighbors to the north and south, Washington and California, allocated \$3 million and \$6 million, respectively, for professional development and curriculum updates.¹

¹ <https://naaee.org/programs/coalition/resources/state-climate-education-policies>

School districts across the state are cutting budgets and laying off staff. We ask our districts to do a lot with a little. Without additional funding, we cannot ask our districts to do even more. Please vote No on HB 3365A.

Thank you,

Adrienne Anderson