



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

December 8, 2015

Dear ODE Staff and Board of Education Members,

I am writing about the proposed Administrative Rules for the Farm to School and School Garden Education grants, which are scheduled for review and adoption on December 10, 2015.

I have been a chief sponsor of each piece of Farm to School and School Garden legislation since 2007; the development of this program has been the highlight of my legislative career.

I appreciate the care and attention that you have put into developing these rules; however, I am concerned about several ways in which ODE has written the rules differently than corresponding language in the law. I am writing to ask you to adjust the rules before adoption so that the program will be implemented as intended by the legislators who created and funded the program.

ORS 336.431, most recently revised in SB 501 in 2015, specifies these criteria:

- (c) When awarding grants under this subsection, preference shall be given to entities that propose educational activities that:
- (A) Are well designed;
 - (B) Promote healthy food activities;
 - (C) Have clear educational objectives;
 - (D) Involve parents or the community;
 - (E) Are connected to a school district's farm-to-school procurement activities;
 - and
 - (F) Are culturally relevant to the students being served by the grant moneys.

The Final Draft of OAR 581-017-0441, Section 5, (Application process and criteria) rewrites the criteria as follows: (see bold)

Educational activities proposed by grant applicants **must:**

- (a) Be well designed;
- (b) Promote healthy food activities;
- (c) Have clear educational objectives **mapped to applicable state standards;**
- (d) Involve parents, the local community, **nutrition services staff, teachers, or school administrators;**
- (e) Be connected to a school district's farm-to-school procurement activities; and
- (f) Be culturally relevant to the students being served.





HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I feel strongly that the ODE should not change “preference shall be given” to “must,” which is a substantial change in the use of this list. I would also prefer for the list of criteria to be left exactly as the legislature approved it. If the Board of Education finds it absolutely necessary to revise the legislature’s list of criteria, I would ask that you do it by adding *new* bullet points, rather than modifying the existing items.

Specifically, these two items could be their own bullets, as additional criteria *preferences*:

- a. Are mapped to applicable state standards;
- b. Involve nutrition services staff, teachers, or school administrators

Regarding educational objectives: The intention of the approved legislation was simply that the activities have clear educational objectives, such as teaching children about food, gardens, agriculture, and food processing. We did not discuss or intend to include a requirement to map these programs to state educational standards.

Regarding nutrition services staff, teachers, or school administrators: We did not include nutrition services staff, teachers, or school administrators in the bill we passed, and we especially did not mean for them to be substitutable for the parents or other community members who we *did* include.

Nutrition services staff are addressed in bullet (e) which says: “Be connected to a school district’s farm-to-school procurement activities;”. Additionally, any programs in schools will need to communicate with teachers and administrators, so both of those additions seem unnecessary. Adding “OR” with these other entities diminishes the emphasis on parents and off-campus community, which is who legislators intended to highlight.

Thank you for your attention and your hard work. I am eager for these rules to be adopted without delay and for the funds to be awarded, but I hope you will accept all these changes on Thursday so that the program works as intended by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Representative Brian Clem, D-Salem

