

I am a member of the Board of Directors for Hillsboro School District 1J, and I am providing testimony in a personal capacity in opposition of SB 1572.

1. **There is too much ambiguity in SB 1572 for it to be passed as law or voted into school district policy.** It is the responsibility of School Districts to educate the students in their district, and removing a student from the classroom based on a teacher's personal determination of what is of "disruptive behavior" is too loose a definition to risk jeopardizing a student's education. District administrators have school behavior plans guiding their responses to student behaviors, but SB 1572 would allow classroom teachers alone to decide if a student can return to their class. In making the determination of which behaviors are acceptable, or disruptive, vary from classroom to classroom and teacher to teacher, Districts could be violating their students' legal right to an education.
2. **SB 1572 is an unfunded mandate that would create a financial burden for School Districts.** Establishing placement review committees and finding alternative placements for students would cost not only licensed staff and administrator time, but also the significantly increased cost of providing out-of-District placement for that student. Districts would be much better served by legislators raising the cap for Special Education funding, which would allow them to hire more educators to address the needs of students experiencing dysregulation and demonstrating "disruptive behavior." In Hillsboro School District, 15.11% of students have IEPs: increasing SpEd funding over the current cap of 11% would pave the way for better systems of support for students.
3. **Evaluating Essential Learning Skills would cost School Districts money.** Re-commencing the assessment of Essential Learning Skills would cost districts time and money. If this assessment is going to be required of Districts, it should come with funding to implement it and train staff, as well as other ways to demonstrate these Essential Skills, such as in languages other than English.
4. **Legislation should not determine reading proficiency.** Although third-grade reading proficiency is recognized as an indicator of successful academic outcomes for students, this is too nuanced an issue to sign into law. SB 1572 mandates that students must demonstrate third grade reading proficiency, or they will not be allowed to advance to the next grade level (retention) until they receive high-dosage tutoring to achieve proficiency. In many School Districts, including Hillsboro School District, students are learning English as a new language, and demonstrating reading proficiency would take them additional time. SB 1572 does not make provisions for alternative assessments of students in Dual Language or ELD programs, who learn to read at a different rate than their peers. The decision to retain a student, which can have a significant impact on a child's social-emotional learning, should not be a one-size-fits-all solution in a law. And without a financial component attached to it, SB 1572 would compel School Districts to assume the burden of cost associated with high-dosage tutoring.

For these reasons, I oppose SB 1572. Resolving classroom behavior issues and demonstration of critical academic skills could be achieved more meaningfully with an increase to the SpEd and High-Cost Disability caps for Districts, funding for staff members to support students and

implement assessments, and methods to measure skills and proficiencies that accurately reflect Oregonians' diversity of languages and ability levels.

Katie Rhyne, Director
Hillsboro School District 1J