

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES**

October 10, 2000

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Voth called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 2000, in the Justice Technology Theater, Shears Technology Center, Hutchinson Community College/Area Technical School, 1300 North Plum, Hutchinson, KS.

ROLL CALL

Members present were:

Steve Abrams

I.B. "Sonny" Rundell

John Bacon

Harold Voth

Mary Douglass Brown

Bill Wagnon

Val DeFever

Janet Waugh

Linda Holloway

Bruce Wyatt

Chairman Voth introduced Mrs. Dorothy Ballard who was a member of the first elected State Board of Education.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chairman Voth asked for approval of the minutes of the September meeting. Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Dr. Abrams, that the minutes be approved as submitted. The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Voth asked for any changes or additions to the agenda. Mrs. Brown moved, with a second by Mrs. Holloway, that the Board approve the agenda. The motion carried.

RECOGNITIONS

American School Board Journal Magna Award

Chairman Voth introduced Mr. Ron Clifton, Superintendent of USD 309, Nickerson, who shared with the Board the activities undertaken by the Reno County school districts which had earned them the American School Board Journal's Magna Award. He indicated that the Magna Award is given to schools which undertake strategic planning and collaborative thinking to help all students achieve. He reported that USD 309 had teamed up with Hutchinson USD 308, Fairfield USD 310, Pretty Prairie USD 311, Haven USD 312, Buhler USD 313, and the Hutchinson Catholic Schools to develop programs which would help students see a reason for learning by finding ways to engage students at both ends of the ability scale who were not actively involved in learning. The collaboration also had as its purpose

responding to the needs expressed by the business community for students who were better prepared to work as a member of team, to be creative and to think critically. The result of this collaboration was the establishment of two academies in Reno County. One was the Cosmosphere Academy, which was developed to promote problem-solving, math, and physics skills. The other was the REDI Center, the Reno Entrepreneurial Development Institute, located within the Quest Center in Hutchinson and which focused on teaching market principles and entrepreneurial skills such as how to develop a business plan and start a new business. Mr. Clifton concluded the presentation with a video about the Magna Award.

National Vocational Training and Transition Award

John Burke, Superintendent of USD 461, Neodesha, and President of the Neodesha Building Association, Jim Flessner, building trades teacher, and Paul Martin, Technology Facilitator, made a presentation to the Board on a district building trades program which had recently won the National Vocation Training and Transition Award. The award is given in recognition of exemplary rural special education programs. They reported that fifty-one percent of students in the program must be identified as special education students and that forty-nine percent of the students were also identified as being very at risk of dropping out of school. The year-round program, as a housing partnership between the City of Neodesha, Neodesha High School, and the Neodesha Educational Foundation and was developed to help remedy the city's housing shortage. They reported that students enrolled in the program have, over the last four years, constructed four single-family homes and a greenhouse, as well as a renovated an older building in the city for use as a movie theater. They indicated that students are paid for their work and also receive an incentive each semester dependent on attendance. Students also receive from one to four credits per year during the school year, including the summer. The program was very successful in providing opportunities that have encouraged many at-risk students to stay in school. They also reported that the program had been extremely successful in increasing the employability of its graduates and that construction companies or area industries hired most students directly upon graduation. They noted that several of their students have received financial assistance from businesses for further technical and building trades education in areas such as heating and air conditioning. They showed slides of the projects the students had completed and related several student success stories.

At the conclusion of both presentations, Chairman Voth and Commissioner Tompkins presented certificates of recognition to the school representatives.

CITIZENS? OPEN FORUM

Chairman Voth opened the citizens? open forum at 10:35 a.m. Those who addressed the Board were Beverly Sutter, Chapman; Donna Davis, Chapman; and Vearl Bacon, McPherson. Chairman Voth declared the open forum closed at 10:50 a.m. and called for a break until 11:05 a.m.

RESULTS OF STATE ASSESSMENTS IN READING, WRITING AND MATHEMATICS

Assistant Commissioner Sharon Freden reviewed the background of the 2000 assessments, the results of

which reflected baseline scores for tests that were developed in the past year based on curriculum standards newly adopted by the State Board of Education. She indicated that because the tests were new, results could not be compared to scores on assessments given in previous years. Additionally, different grade levels were being tested. She reported that other changes included an expansion of the reported race/ethnicity categories in the five-reported student populations within keeping of new federal reporting requirements; a new way to calculate the standard of excellence for buildings; and new performance levels for students.

Dr. Cheryl Randall, Assessment Coordinator, handed out copies of the assessment interpretation manual that is given to districts to help them interpret the assessment data in a useful way. She also passed out information on the reading and writing assessments to replace the materials provided to the Board when the agenda was mailed. She reported that the assessment data reported on five populations of students. Those were, with the percent of students in each category which was assessed: general education and gifted, including English as a Second Language students (ESL), 98%; students with disabilities, 85%; all students, 90%; ESL students only, 83%; and migrant students only, 85%. She noted that the percentage of ESL students needed to rise for future assessments. Dr. Randall reported that on the mathematics assessments at the fourth grade level, 13.5 percent of students taking the assessment scored at the advanced level; 25.0 scored at the proficient level; 23.2 percent performed at the satisfactory level; 24.0 percent were at the basic level; and 14.4 percent were at the unsatisfactory level. The average student score for fourth graders on the math assessment was 53.8. She reported that among seventh graders

Page 3

MINUTES

October 10, 2000

taking the test, 13.2 percent scored at the advanced level; 19.5 percent were at the proficient level; 20.9 percent were at the satisfactory level; 23.3 percent scored at the basic level and 23.2 percent performed at an unsatisfactory level. The average student score for seventh graders participating in the assessments was 50.3. Among tenth graders, Dr. Randall reported 12.6 percent performed at the advanced level; 11.1 percent were at the proficient level; 18.3 percent scored at the satisfactory level; 28.8 percent performed at the basic level and 29.2 percent scored at the unsatisfactory level. The average student score for tenth graders participating in the math assessments was 46.5. Dr. Randall indicated that mathematics scores were not as high as had been hoped for. Commissioner Tompkins reviewed efforts underway to help raise math scores by addressing the problem of curriculum alignment in districts by providing on-going training of instructors, the development and dissemination of information about models and support materials helpful with the alignment problem, and information to districts about the of sequencing of exposure. Several Board members asked questions about why the math scores were so low. Dr. Doug Glasnapp, Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation, responded there were two factors affecting scores, the first being an instructional practices alignment problem. He explained that the assessments measured only a limited number of the indicators for the standards which had been adopted. He also

stressed that it was the first year for the new standards the Board had adopted and scores represented a starting point for alignment statewide of mathematics curriculum to higher standards. Asked if tenth grade teachers were taking the assessments as seriously as they should, Dr. Glasnapp indicated that teachers were attempting a variety of things to engage students.

Dr. Randall reported that 75 buildings, or 8.4%, had meet the building level standard of excellence in mathematics at the fourth grade level; 35, or 6.9%, at the seventh grade level; and 21, or 5.4%, at the tenth grade level. She also reviewed the mathematics results data disaggregated by the five student populations and by gender, race/ethnicity, and socio-economic status, and noted that it was significant that even though the gap was closing slightly between racial and ethnic groups, it appeared to be widening between socio-economic groups, with students receiving free and reduced lunches having the lowest scores and those receiving full-priced lunches having the highest scores. Dr. Freden indicated that solutions were being studied across the country to address the widening gap. She indicated that in Kansas the Department was working with urban superintendents, as well as looking at schools who have been successful at closing the gap in order to develop models to share with districts that are struggling. Discussion continued and Dr. Randall noted that there were various factors outside the control of districts that affected the socio-economic gap in scores. Dr. Glasnapp noted that other differences in performance should also be addressed.

Dr. Randall reported that scores in reading scores were reported are subscales by four text types: narrative, expository, persuasive and technical, as well as total score, which averages the four scores. She also reviewed the performance data by subscale by grade and student population type. Noting that the assessment in reading wasn't as hard as the mathematics assessment, Dr. Randall reported that at grade five, 15.4 percent of the students tested performed at the advanced level, 24.8 performed at the proficient level, 22.1 percent scored at the satisfactory level, 24.0 percent scored at the basic level and 13.7 percent performed at an unsatisfactory level. The average student score for reading in grade five was 81.2. At the eighth grade level, 8.6 percent of students performed at the advanced level, 29.6 percent were proficient, 28.5 percent scored at a satisfactory level, 21.7 percent were at the basic level and 11.5 percent performed at an unsatisfactory level. The average student score for eighth graders taking the assessment was 81.4. Of the students participating in the eleventh grade reading assessment, 10.7 percent scored at the advanced level, 22.1 percent were at the proficient level, 24.5 percent performed at the satisfactory level, 27.4 percent scored at the basic level and 15.3 percent were at the unsatisfactory level. The average student score for eleventh grade students on the reading assessment was 79.6. Dr. Randall reported that 79 buildings, or 9%, had meet the building level standard of excellence in mathematics at the fifth grade level; 37, or 7.3%, at the seventh grade level; and 28, or 7.2% at the tenth grade level. Dr. Randall also

Page 4

MINUTES

October 10, 2000

reviewed the data disaggregated by the five student populations and by gender, race/ethnicity, and socio-economic status. The question was raised about whether the disaggregated scores could be used to measure how well instruction was doing, and what kind of comparisons could be drawn between buildings and districts. Dr. Freden responded that those comparisons have always been possible and that the Department has always strongly discouraged it because of the different factors affecting scores in different districts. Dr. Randall reported that students from disadvantaged backgrounds and those from certain ethnic groups still tended to have lower average scores on the reading as well as the mathematics assessments and that scores from those groups could average as much as 15 percent below the average score for all students.

Dr. Randall reviewed the results of the statewide writing assessment. She reviewed changes that had been made in the assessment. She also stressed why there could be no comparison between buildings because local districts were given latitude in administration of the writing assessments and statewide averages could not be computed. Instead, average scores were determined based on the method of test administration. The variables in administration were whether or not students used a word processor, exactly how much time students used to complete the assessment, and how many local reads were provided. Various combinations of those variables resulted in eight groupings or clusters, plus an additional grouping of districts for which a classification had not been made. On a five-point scale, average scores for fifth graders ranged from 2.77 to 3.28, depending on how the test was administered. In the eighth grade, average scores ranged from 2.93 to 3.52 depending on the method of administration, and in the eleventh grade the average scores ranged from 3.10 to 3.49. Dr. Randall reported that the writing results reflected that students were being afforded greater opportunities for writing and overall showed a solid performance. She reported that students who used all four days to complete their papers did better than students who completed the assessment in fewer than four days. In Grades 5 and 8, students who used a word processor did better than those who did not; however, in Grade 11 there was virtually no difference between mean scores of students who did or did not use a word processor. A slightly higher percentage of students in Grade 11 who used a word processor were classified in advanced. Dr. Randall indicated that the highest mean score at any grade level in any cluster was the 3.52 in Cluster #7 in Grade 8. Cluster #7 represented those schools that allowed completion of the assessment in four days and the use of a word processor, and had one local and one state rater provided. The highest percentage of students classified in advanced was also in Grade 8, Cluster #7. Additionally, she reported that all students who were allowed four days to complete the assessment scored better, as did those who used word processors and had two raters. In the Board discussion that followed, the idea of equating scores by determining a weighting factor for the three variables was proposed. Dr. Glasnapp noted that the Board and the legislature had found it desirable to have a lower stakes writing assessment where comparisons between schools and districts would not be an issue. He noted that the most important factor that would be useful in guiding instruction would be maintaining a standardized practice in implementing the writing assessment at the district level. Dr. Randall indicated that it was important to remember and communicate to the public the fact that there could be no conclusions drawn in trying to make comparisons between schools, though schools themselves could do some comparison within a district, and the writing assessment scores could not be used to measure how Kansas was performing as a state. Board members also discussed possible changes that could be made to the assessment that would not skew the data. When asked if the Department and the Board would develop a

goal based on the number of buildings achieving the standard of excellence, Dr. Freden responded that such a goal had not been established, but that the Board might want to set some targets that staff could help students achieve.

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:10 p.m. and returned at 1:30 p.m. Mrs. Holloway was not present for the afternoon session because of travel to a Healthy Schools Network meeting in St. Louis, which was being held in conjunction with the NASBE meeting. When the Board reconvened, Chairman Voth introduced several individuals present from the Hutchinson area, including Senator Dave Kerr, Mrs. Wanda Morrison, former State Board member, and Senator-elect Ruth Teichman.

Page 5

MINUTES

October 10, 2000

PRESENTATIONS BY RENO COUNTY STUDENTS

Chairman Voth introduced Jim Chadwick, Superintendent of USD 312, Haven, who introduced area high school students who had been asked to share their perspectives with the Board on several educational issues. They were Emily Matteson and Luke Watson, seniors from Haven High School; Matt Gerktken, senior, and Lindsey Busch, junior, from Hutchinson High School; Jon Ricke and Dave Swafford, seniors from Nickerson High School; Megan Schmidt and Kari Poulain, seniors from Buhler High School; Nathaniel Delzer and Nicholas Stilwell, seniors from Fairfield High School; and Steele Smith, senior, and Ron Lussier, junior, from Pretty Prairie High School. The topics they addressed included state assessments; possible changes to improve the quality of education in Kansas; elements of the ideal school; student morale; the role of sports and other extra curricular activities in public schools; violence in Kansas schools; the concern of Kansas students that as much emphasis be placed on academics as has been given to athletics; what schools might change to prevent students from dropping out; and factors contributing to the decision to home school. Robert King, Superintendent from Pretty Prairie, stated that it was important that districts and the State Board continue to search for ways to improve educational opportunities for students. Brief questions and comments followed.

Chairman Voth recognized Dr. Ed Berger, President of Hutchinson County Community College, who was present, and thanked him for the hospitality extended to Board by the college and for making it possible for the Board to hold its meeting on the college campus. The Board took a break from 2:50 p.m. until 3:00 p.m.

CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS CHECKS FOR CERTIFICATION APPLICANTS

Dr. Freden reviewed the proposal for criminal history checks of certification applicants which was presented to the Board at the September meeting and that was being presented to the Board for action.

Mr. Rundell moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever that the Board adopt the proposal as presented. In the discussion that followed, the question was raised about the proposal to run FBI background checks on candidates graduating from instate schools. Dr. Abrams stated he would have to vote against the proposal of the FBI background checks remained in the proposal. The Board also discussed why the plan only addressed criminal history checks of certified personnel. Commissioner Tompkins indicated that the legislation that required the results of KBI criminal history checks of district personnel only required that reports on certified personnel be sent to the State Board. He noted that only the local districts received reports on non-certified personnel. He also indicated that the statute would only be in effect for the 2000-2001 school year and was scheduled to sunset in July 2001. A vote on the motion to adopt the proposal carried 8-1, with Dr. Abrams voting "no". The policy adopted included:

- a. a KBI check on all educators seeking an initial license during the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 school years, with the cost being taken from the current educator fee fund;
- b. development of a legislative recommendation to be introduced in the 2002 session to increase the licensure fee to accommodate a state and national criminal history records check and any other costs associated with implementation of the revised licensure regulations; and
- c. implementation in the 2002-2003 school year of a national criminal history records check system on educators seeking an initial license, if fee legislation is passed.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mr. Rundell, that the State Board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of the Professional Practices Commission in cases No. 00-FC-14, 00-FC-15, 00-FC-16, and 00-FC-17 and approve the recommendations of the Commission. The motion carried.

Page 6

MINUTES

October 10, 2000

APPOINTMENT TO THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

Dr. Freden handed out replacement material on the request for the Board to make an appointment to the Professional Standards Board. The material reflected a change in the length of the term for the new appointment and clarified that the appointment would be for one year in order to complete the term of Dr. Karen Gallagher whose term of office would end June 30, 2001. Dr. Freden also noted that the replacement materials included a map illustrating the areas of the state currently represented by members of the Professional Standards Board. Dr. Wagon nominated Steve Scott and Mrs. DeFever seconded the nomination. Dr. Abrams, with a second by Mrs. Brown, nominated Jon Englehardt. Mrs. DeFever noted that the Wichita area where Dr. Englehardt was from was already over represented on the Standards Board and that there was only one representative from the southeast part of the state. She

noted indicated that the appointment of Dr. Scott would help correct that imbalance. A vote on the nominations failed to reach a majority for either nominee, with Dr. Englehardt receiving four votes and Dr. Scott receiving five. Mrs. Brown spoke of Dr. Englehardt's progressiveness and good reputation. Mrs. DeFever stated she understood that Dr. Scott would be the choice of the deans of the Regents schools of education in the state. Dr. Steve Scott received a majority of six votes on a second vote on the nominations and was appointed to finish Dr. Gallagher's term on the Professional Standards Board through June 30, 2001 as a representative of regents unit heads.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

At the September meeting Dr. Freden was asked to get additional information on what districts spend on staff development per year. She reported that excluding federal funds, which might have been spent for programs such as Title I or special education, the amount paid out of the local districts' inservice fund for professional development during the 1998-1999 school year was \$12,009,291. Dr. Freden reviewed modifications made to staff recommendations, which arose from the professional development practices study presented to the Board in August and discussed last month. She noted that the Board had included one hundred percent funding for staff development in its FY 2002 budget request and it was not included in the proposal presented for Board approval. The proposal to specify a minimum number of staff development days in the school calendar year had also been removed because of the Board's comments that a specified number of days would not guarantee the quality of the staff development offered. Dr. Freden also reported that a review of the inservice law, regulations and licensure regulations was already underway and that staff would bring recommendations for changes if any were found to be necessary. The remaining two recommendations were that staff in partnership with other appropriate education organizations identify and develop four models of good staff development for presentation to Kansas schools and districts and three models of good staff development for school leaders. The cost for the development and presentation of the four models for schools and districts was estimated to be \$25,000 and would come from discretionary funds available to the department. Dr. Wagon moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever that the Board approved the recommendations as presented. The motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

2001 Legislative Proposals and Legislative Brochure

Deputy Commissioner Dale Dennis briefly reviewed the Board legislative proposal to extend the length of time between reviews of curriculum standards from three to five years. Dr. Abrams asked since it was important to districts to have longitudinal information on assessment results, why the Board couldn't request time between the reviews to be lengthened to six years instead of five. It was the consensus of the Board that the proposal should be changed to request six years between reviews. Mr. Dennis indicated that, additionally, Department General Counsel Rod Bieker was putting together a package of old and out-of-date statutes to be presented to the legislature for repeal. At the conclusion of the discussion of legislative and budget issues, Dr. Tompkins suggested that the Board consider supporting

the reenactment of legislation scheduled to sunset in the coming year that required the results of KBI criminal history checks of district personnel required reports on certified personnel be sent to the State Board and those on non-certified personnel be sent to local districts.

Page 7

MINUTES

October 10, 2000

State Board Of Education FY 2002 Budget

The Board discussed its FY 2002 budget request. Mr. Wyatt suggested that the Board reconsider its proposal to include the \$542 million in funding for special education in the base state aid per pupil and look at recommending a census-based approach to distributing the funds. He indicated that he thought it would be more efficient and better received because it would be based on actual costs. He also noted that because of the opposition to the proposal as it stood it would probably have to be changed at some time anyway. Dr. Abrams pointed out that the Board final budget proposal for FY 2002 had already been submitted. Mr. Dennis stated that the dollar amount wouldn't change, just the delivery system to the districts and that the most appropriate time to make that change would be at the Board's budget appeal in November. He indicated that the Department had already started working on the appeal. After further discussion, Mr. Dennis suggested that perhaps there could be a special education count on September 20th when all other students are counted for determination of state aid and have another count done later in the year, with funding of catastrophic aid at a three to one ratio and a flat rate on all others counted on September 20th in order to satisfy the perception of many districts that they have more or more severe special education students than other districts. There was a question about how a proposal to change from funding special education in the base to a weighting system would be viewed and if it would negatively affect the Board's emphasis on the importance of one hundred percent special education funding. Further discussion of the issue did not result in Board consensus on a change.

Several questions were asked about the proposal to fund all-day kindergarten for districts which chose to offer it. Those questions included how districts would handle the development of two curriculums for kindergarten, one for half-day and one for full-day. Dr. Freden stated that the need existed to give extended learning time for those who need it because of school and reading readiness issues. Mrs. DeFever reported that discussion at the interim legislative committee meetings stressed that all-day kindergarten would not be for all children because not every child had the same need for it at-risks children have. Mrs. Brown voiced a concern that the availability of a full-day program would eventually force all children to participate in order to keep up. When asked what benefits research showed, Dr. Freden stated that by third grade children who had attended a full-day program and those who had not were equal. She added that the question of how the children would measure up against one another if a full-day program had not been offered had not been addressed. She also noted that research has not addressed the quality of programs offered. Mrs. Waugh stated that the Kansas City Kansas school

district was very excited about the possibility of funding being available for it. She also noted that no child was required to attend kindergarten or be in school until the age of seven.

The Board took a break from 2:50 p.m. until 3:05 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

In the consent agenda, the State Board:

- Received the monthly personnel report.
- Confirmed the special projects appointments of Marita Renauer to an Education Program Consultant position under IDEA, State Program Improvement grant, effective September 5, 2000, at a biweekly rate of \$1629.60.
- Approved school construction plans for Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch, USD 231; Circle, USD 375; Louisburg, USD 416; Garden City, USD 457; Bethany Lutheran Church/School, Overland Park; Meade USD 226; Haysville, USD 261; Neodesha, USD 461; Topeka, USD 501; North Ottawa County, USD 239; Coffeyville, USD 445; Southwestern College; Riley County, USD 378; Atchison County Community School, USD 377.

Page 8

MINUTES

October 10, 2000

- Approved Cycle 1 accredited status for USD 500: Rosedale Middle School and Arrowhead Middle School; Kansas City Catholic Diocese: Sacred Heart Elementary (Bonner Springs), St. Pauls Elementary, All Saints Cons Elementary, Holy Name, Our Lady of Unity and St. John/Holy Family; The Special Purpose School at KNI; Salina Catholic Diocese: St. Andrews Elementary; Lakemary Center Paola; and USD 402: Ewalt Elementary; and approved Cycle 2 accredited status for USD 500: West Middle School and Wyandotte High School; USD 395: LaCrosse High School; Wichita Catholic Diocese: St. Mary's Elementary (Pittsburg) and St. Thomas Aquinas Elementary; and USD 250: Pittsburg High School.
- Approved requests for waiver of state QPA regulations to extend or change their accreditation cycles from USD 281 Longfellow Middle School, with Cycle 2 accreditation in 2004-2005; USD 343, Williamstown Elementary and Grantville Elementary, now combined as GW Elementary, with Cycle 2 accreditation in 2003-2004 and a December 2001 deadline for submittal of its school improvement plan; USD 385 for Martin Elementary, Cottonwood Elementary and Meadowlark Elementary, with Cycle 2 accreditation in 2002-2003, for Sunflower Elementary

with Cycle 1 accreditation in 2002-2003, and Andover High and Andover Middle Schools with accreditation in 2001-2002; USD 435 Garfield Elementary, McKinley Elementary Abilene Middle School, with Cycle 2 accreditation in 2002-2003, and Abilene High school with Cycle 2 accreditation in 2002-2003; USD 457 Charles O. Stone Intermediate School, with accreditation in 2001-2002; St. Thomas Aquinas High School with Cycle 2 accreditation in 2004-2005 and a December 2001 date for review of its school improvement plan.

- Approved requests for waiver of state QPA regulations for the 2000-2001 school year from districts to utilize the services of individuals to teach courses as follows: USD 290-Diedre Altic to serve as Library Media Specialist at the elementary level; USD 308-Becky Lee Hetrick to teach Interrelated Special Education at the ninth grade level; USD 3235-Jeffrey Brull to teach Spanish at the secondary level; USD 345-Susan Raby to teach Gifted Education at the elementary level; USD 385-Debise Bowen to serve as Library Media Specialist at the secondary level; USD 402-Carol Camac to serve as Library Media Specialist at the middle level; Rice County Special Services Cooperative #407-Ruth Poovey to teach Gifted Education at the secondary level; USD 442-Lori Russell to teach Interrelated Special Education at the secondary level; USD 447-Thelman Mahaffey to serve as Library Media Specialist at the elementary level; Leavenworth County Special Education Cooperative #453- Janet L. Martin to serve as Coordinator of the Instructional Materials Center at the K-12 level, Frank Maskil to teach Learning Disabilities at the secondary level and Lorraine McGhee to teach Learning Disabilities at the elementary level; USD 489-DeLynn Rice to teach Interrelated Special Education at the elementary level and Kim Shannahan to teach Speech Communication at the secondary level; Butler County Special Education Cooperative #490-Stacey Scribner to teach Interrelated Special Education at the elementary level and Lynn Smith to teach Interrelated Special Education at the middle level; USD 497-Leslie Campbell and Paige Robinson to serve as Library Media Specialists at the elementary level; Tri-County Special Education Cooperative #676-Shelley Charter to teach Gifted Education at the elementary level, Janie Gillum to teach Learning Disabilities at the elementary level and Deana Sue Miller to teach Learning Disabilities at the middle level; Southeast Kansas Education Service Center #609-K.O. Fuller to teach Interrelated Special Education at the secondary level; East Central Kansas Cooperative in Education Interlocal #614-Shlley Arnold to teach Gifted Education at the elementary and middle levels and Lori Hawk to teach Interrelated Special Education at the elementary level; Prairie Hills Interlocal #635-Paula Custer to teach Interrelated Special Education at the secondary level and Marsha Hubbard to teach learning disabilities at the elementary level.
- Received a summary of the June 19, 2000 Quality Performance Accreditation Advisory Council meeting.

October 10, 2000

- Approved recommendations for funding Title I School Improvement Grants 2000-2001 Kansas Character Education Program Year Two subgrants in the amount of \$11, 650 Wichita USD 259 and Southeast Kansas Service Center USD 609; in the amount of \$6,000 for the following pilot sites: Iuka Center for Excellence in Education USD 624, Three Lakes Education Cooperative USD 627, South Central Kansas Education Service Center USD 628, Smoky Hill Education Service Center USD 629, Prairie Hills Interlocal USD 635, and Smith Center USD 237; and in the amount of \$2,650 for White Rock USD 104, USD 203- Piper High School, USD 204- Edwardsville Elementary, USD 205-Leon Elementary, Blue Valley USD 229, Spring Hill USD 230, USD 231-Nike Middle School, Olathe USD 233, Goddard USD 265, Elk Valley USD 283, USD 286-Sedan Elementary, USD 298-Lincoln Elementary, USD 300-South Central Middle School, Salina USD 305, Southeast of Saline USD 306, Buhler USD 313, USD 320- Central and West Elementary Schools, Seaman USD 345, Kinsley-Offerle USD 347, USD 348-Baldwin Junior and Senior High Schools, USD 357-Belle Plaine Middle School, USD 367-Osawatomie Middle School, USD 405-Central Elementary, Atchison USD 409, Goessel USD 411, USD 426-Pike Valley High School, USD 444-Windom Elementary, Garden City USD 457, USD 460-Hesston Middle School, Arkansas City USD 470, Haviland USD 474, Geary County USD 475, USD 482 Lincoln Primary and Dighton Middle School, El Dorado USD 490 and USD 494-Syracuse Elementary.
- Approved FY 2000-2001 Educate America Act Year Two-Seven Local Reform grants in the amount of \$7,000 for Meade USD 226, Cheney USD 268, Hill City USD 281, Wheatland USD 292, Wamego USD 320, Logan USD 326, Valley Falls USD 338, Holcomb, Lyons USD 405, Hillsboro USD 410, Sabetha USD 441, Marais des Cygnes Valley USD 456-Melvern, Hesston USD 460, Lewis USD 502; and for Turner USD 202 -\$14,828, Buhler USD 313-\$9,384, McPherson USD 418-\$11,172, Leavenworth USD 453-\$17,004, Garden City YSD 457, \$31,040, Lansing USD 469-\$7,952, Liberal USD 480-\$17,080, ESSDACK 622-Hutchinson-\$32,008, \$15,768, and \$12,852; and approved Preservice Teacher Education/Professional Development Partnership grants in the amount of \$25,000 for Barnes USD 223, Burlington USD 244, Plainville USD 270, Wamego USD 320, Wathena USD 406/Elwood USD 486, Lansing USD 469, Copeland USD 476, Liberal USD 480, Shawnee Mission USD 512, Northeast Kansas Education Service Center 608, ESSDACK 622, Ft. Hays Education Development Center 633; and for Holton USD 336-\$24,996, Leavenworth USD 453-\$24,537, and Garden City USD 457-\$5,750.
- Approved recommendations for funding Title I School Improvement Grants for 2000-2001 for USD 500, Kansas City: Emerson Elementary-\$50,000, Northwest Middle School-\$72,906, Banneker Elementary-\$51,098, Hawthorne Elementary-\$74,755, Argentine Middle School-\$72,906, Quindaro Elementary-\$54,191, Mark Twain Elementary-\$52,000, and Central Middle School-\$50,067; USD 453, Leavenworth: Anthony Elementary, NettieHarnett/Ben Day Elementary, Howard Wilson Elementary and Earl Lawson Elementary at \$60,000 each; USD 253, Emporia: William Allen White Elementary-\$74,880, Maynard Elementary-\$53,520, and

Mary Herbert Elementary-\$61,440; USD 509, South Haven: South Haven Elementary; and USD 490, El Dorado-El Dorado Middle School.

- Approved Carl Perkins statewide leadership grants for Pittsburg State University for FACS and IFACS Leadership Improvement through KFCCLA Education, \$21,654; and Washburn University for an Information Source Book, \$67,740.

Contracts Approved:

The State Board authorized the Commissioner of Education to negotiate and continue a contract with:

- Research and Training Associates, Inc. to provide evaluation services for the Kansas Educate America Act program, with the contract amount not to exceed \$32,000.

Page 10

MINUTES

October 10, 2000

The Superintendent of the Kansas State School for the Deaf was authorized to negotiate and renew contracts with American Rehabilitation Center, Inc./Nova Care for:

- occupational therapy services with the contract amount not to exceed \$32,400; and
- student physical therapy services, with the contract amount not to exceed \$24,000.

RECESS

There being no further business, Chairman Voth recessed the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Harold Voth, Chairman Penny Plamann, Secretary

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MEETING MINUTES

October 11, 2000

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Voth called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 2000, in the Justice Technology Theater, Shears Technology Center, Hutchinson Community College/Area Technical School, 1300 North Plum, Hutchinson, KS.

ROLL CALL

Members present were:

Steve Abrams

I.B. "Sonny" Rundell

John Bacon

Bill Wagnon

Mary Douglass Brown

Janet Waugh

Val DeFever

Bruce Wyatt

Harold Voth

Mrs. Holloway was attending a NASBE meeting out of state and was not present.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mrs. Brown, that the Board approve the agenda. The motion carried.

USD 405 INCENTIVE GOAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Dr. Edwin Church, Superintendent, Lyon USD 405, made a presentation on the goal setting and reward process used by the district to develop measurable goals that will focus on increased student achievement and have a positive effect on student learning. He indicated that the goals should identify and align district stakeholder priorities; operate under and promote the concepts of a learning organization; align with state goals; help embed a performance culture within the district by maintaining a focus on student learning and improvement; and reward employees for the results. Dr. Church reviewed the philosophy, benefit schedule and procedure to be used in the program. He reported that each year five district goals would be developed, groups of two or more employees would establish three building or department goals, and individual certified employees would establish two goals. He noted that as the program was developed and implemented it became apparent that the process of maintaining the focus on the goals had become more important to teachers and district staff than the monetary rewards. Dr. Church reviewed the district incentive goals for 2000-2001. They were to improve student achievement in mathematics, reading, and written and oral communication, improve home/school relations, and develop student intervention teams. He also reviewed the goals developed by one school in the district, as well as his own goals. He reported that Dr. Randy Turk and ESSDACK had developed the template for using several goal indicators to calculate goal scores, which were used to determine the level of improvement. At the conclusion of his presentation Dr. Church answered Board questions about how goals were developed, how the process was connected to QPA, and if the community was involved through the site councils.

Page 2

MINUTES

October 11, 2000

RENO ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE (REDI)

Richard French, Director of the Quest Center for Entrepreneurs in Hutchinson, reported on the collaborative effort begun in 1986 between the Quest Center and the Reno County school districts which resulted in the development of the REDI Academy, now in its second year of operation. He indicated that the program was developed to address the need to educate students in basic skills for beginning and running a business, noting that today's students would be the those who will develop and start-up new business in the future and it was important that they be educated about the process. Mr. French

introduced David Patterson the teacher for the program. Mr. Patterson reviewed the background of the program, the activity of the past year, how students were recruited for the program and the status of students enrolled. He also introduced two students from area schools who had participated during the last school year and were re-enrolled for the 2000-2001 school year. Each student talked about the business they had developed. Mr. Patterson indicated that the Small Business Administration website and materials he had developed based on other similar programs were the primary curriculum resources for the program. He also commented on how indispensable mentors from the business community were to the success of the program. Mr. Patterson reported briefly on the two area businesses owned through the program, a water bottling company and a printing business. Board questions followed.

The Board took a break from 10:05 a.m. and returned at 10:20 a.m.

DISCUSSION OF KCTAF RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr. Tompkins led the Board in discussion of Goal III from the Kansas Commission on Teaching and America's Future report. Dr. Martha Gage, Team Leader for Teacher Certification and Education also participated." Recommendations about which Board members had comments follow:

Goal III. "Overhaul Teacher Recruitment and Put a Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom

I.1. Establish a statewide system to determine, evaluate, and make public the supply of, demand for, and turnover rates of qualified teachers in Kansas, representing the diversity of the students they will be teaching, in the various licensing/endorsement fields and geographic areas of the state.

III.1.1. Design an integrated Educational Management Information System for the entire Kansas State Department of Education. Dr. Tompkins indicated that the Department had begun to develop good data.

III.1.2. Annually analyze Kansas' teacher supply and demand, and retention. There was some discussion about whether the Department or the Jones Institute should do the annual study. The problem of funding the study was discussed, with Dr. Tompkins noting that the Department had supplied some of the funds in the past to support its preparation by the Jones Institute. He also noted that the Planning and Research Team had assisted in the survey upon which this year's report was based. Dr. Martinez, Team Leader for Planning and Research, indicated that the Department is already collecting most of the data separate from the Jones Institute.

III.1.3 Distribute supply, demand and retention data to all Kansas stakeholders. Staff indicated that this was not yet being done.

III.1.4 Analyze recruitment and hiring practices in Kansas school districts. Dr. Tompkins indicated there was no active system in place at present to implement the recommendation due, partly, to the fact that it was difficult to find answers to recruitment factors because there were so many contributing factors. Hiring individuals as second career teachers with expertise in specialized fields was discussed as a possible solution. Dr. Tompkins cited the visiting scholar program and the current provisions for limited

licenses as efforts to deal with some shortage problems. He also noted that studies show that fifty percent more learning is accomplished with qualified teachers. Reasons for shortages were also discussed. Dr. Gage and Commissioner Tompkins stated that state teacher preparation institutions were producing enough teachers to meet the need in Kansas, but that many were not entering the right field. Additionally, the market in some areas was extremely competitive, with neighboring districts offering higher salaries as an incentive. Dr. Tompkins also noted that the problem was not solely with the lack of teachers in certain fields, but that there was also a need to help schools understand retention issues such as benefits and working conditions, and that raising salaries might encourage more people to go into the teaching field.

Page 3

MINUTES

October 11, 2000

Dr. Tompkins reported that the Department will work on how to develop strategies to address retention and recruitment issues, but even though the State could develop some incentives, raising salaries was a local issue.

III. 2.1 Provide incentives for teachers to enter the profession in high-need areas: subject content, diversity, and geographic location. Staff indicated that programs were already in place but were not promoted and were underfunded. The discussion concerned the issue of what role the Board could play when funding was provided to districts through the base state aid per pupil formula and how the funds were used was determined by local districts. Dr. Tompkins suggested that the Department could ask the legislature for a study of the factors creating high need areas, including the lack of teachers in certain subject areas, and areas of need because of geographic location or salaries.

III.2.2 & III .2.3 Increase the every Kansas teacher salary to meet at least the national average and enhance the total compensation for Kansas teachers. Dr. Tompkins reported that Kansas teacher salaries averaged \$3,000 below the national average and the problem competition because of higher salaries in some surrounding states was discussed. The fact that few districts offered health insurance benefits was also discussed. Dr. Tompkins indicated that two reasons for this was that districts did not have a history of offering it and that it was too expensive.

III.2.4 Initially discourage, and by 2006 prohibit, districts from assigning teachers to levels or subject areas for which they are not licensed. In the discussion the difficulties of addressing the goal, Board members and staff again discussed shortages, and the factors contributing to them, and possible solutions. Dr. Tompkins indicated that it was important to have certified teachers whose qualifications were guaranteed by the licensing process. He also indicated that teacher quality should be part of the accreditation process. The question was asked that since private schools don't use certified teachers and do well, why public schools couldn't explore that option. Dr. Tompkins indicated that all accredited

schools, including accredited private schools, were required by law to use certified personnel and that the private schools that didn't were not accredited. In response to Board member interest, Dr. Tompkins volunteered for staff report to on the program in New Jersey that allows non-certified personnel to teach. He also stated that staff would conduct a study of how other states are addressing teacher shortages and if programs have been developed, how long they have been implemented and their success rates. Dr. Gage suggested that the report on a survey of teachers not currently employed in education would be a good resource to revisit.

III.2.5 Require districts to notify parents whose child has a teacher who is not licensed for the level or subject area being taught. Suggestions regarding this included having teachers post their licenses in their room and the development of a license that looks comparable to other professional licenses. The need to let parents and the community know the problems a district may have hiring qualified teachers and how it was addressing it was discussed. The need to deflect the attention in those situations from the teacher and the local board, with the responsibility resting with the district, was also suggested.

III.4 Design a statewide process for collecting data related to factors impacting preK-12 student achievement, including teacher quality.

III.4.1 Continue using the QPA system as a measure of student achievement and teacher quality in Kansas public schools. To the question about whether teacher quality was factor of education or performance in the classroom, Dr. Tompkins responded that he believed that both elements were envisioned in the KCTAF recommendations. It was noted that Lyons USD 405 incentive goal improvement program could perhaps provide a good basis for an integrated system. Additionally, it was suggested that staff consider using the scoring template used by the Lyons district for evaluating teacher quality. It was agreed that the recommendation should be brought back to the Board at a future date to continue an in-depth discussion.

Because of times constraints it was agreed that discussion of the final KCTAF goal would be postponed until the November Board meeting.

Page 4

MINUTES

October 11, 2000

SUCCESSFUL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND STRATEGIES FOR HIGH-ABILITY STUDENTS

Dr. Sherrill Martinez, Team Leader, Planning and Research, presented a brief overview of the findings

which had resulted from a literature review of educational programs and strategies for high-ability students. She reviewed the characteristics of high-ability students and discussed factors that were reported as affecting their achievement. Those include the student's socio-economic status and cultural background; the student's self-perception, motivation and level of anxiety about their schoolwork or their home environment; teacher skills in working with high ability students; curriculum and organization for instruction; classroom placement and involvement; negative peer pressure; and characteristics of the school. Dr. Martinez also reported on several theories about why high ability students fail to reach their potential or drop out of school. She noted that the current reform movement and its emphasis on ensuring that all students master a common set of standards provides little incentive for assisting high ability students to advance beyond the standards. Additionally, she reported, many educators resist as inequitable developing and providing additional resources to high-ability students to enable them to gain even more of an academic advantage than their peers. She also noted that much of the curriculum in the country is too broad for the in-depth investigation and understanding of subjects that many high ability students require. Dr. Martinez reported that educators have made being identified as high ability the goal of many students and once identified, those who are high ability are not taught the importance of task commitment, hard work, and a positive attitude in developing their abilities to the fullest. Dr. Martinez also reported that many of the services provided for high ability students are often not the most effective. She reported that a differentiated curriculum, ability grouping, moderate grade skipping, and special schools or programs appear to have a beneficial effect on the high ability student. In the discussion that followed, Dr. Martinez was asked for recommendations to provide more support for the high ability student. She responded that teachers are now required to have training for students with disabilities and that suitable training to help identify, motivate, challenge and address the different types of abilities and learning needs of high ability students should be encouraged or required as well. She noted that mixed classes, instead of pullout programs were effective, but that those classes should represent a narrower range of abilities than are found in most classrooms. She also reported that some multiage grouping was being done. She suggested that a district pilot program in the state could be helpful. Dr. Tompkins stated that an important task of the Department is to help local districts understand the loss of potential by not addressing the needs of these students and to disseminate to districts what is being learned across the country in effective programs. Discussion also examined the different learning needs of high ability students and the frustration of watching some become behavior problems or dropouts. How to identify high ability English as a Second Language (ESL) students was also discussed and a intensive program in the Wichita school district to identify those students was mentioned. Dr. Tompkins reported that an advanced placement grant will increase the number of advanced placement classes in the state over the next two or three years and provide more opportunities for high ability students.

BOARD REPORTS

Board Chairman

Chairman Voth reported that Board members had received an invitation from Mike Scott to attend a luncheon at the Cosmosphere following conclusion of the meeting.

Commissioner

Commissioner Tompkins reported that the Board would have a recommendation on the Carl Perkins funding to be shared between the Department and the Board of Regents at the November meeting. He reported that the November meeting was also the time when personnel evaluations of the Commissioner, Board Attorney and Board Secretary were conducted. He indicated that evaluations forms to be filled out and mailed to Chairman Voth, a summary of the annual staff evaluation of the Commissioner, and a progress report on his performance goals would be sent to members shortly. Commissioner Tompkins also briefly reported on the new federal law requiring teacher preparation institutions to report annually

Page 5

MINUTES

October 11, 2000

information on program completers, including pass rates on required assessments and faculty to student ratios. Because of provisions regarding the way the information is to be reported, the Department is working with the U.S. Department of Education to develop a modified reporting system within the state that all teacher preparation institutions can accept.

Board Attorney

Mr. Biles reviewed his recent activity on behalf of the Board, including activity on the federal school finance case, the KSSD personnel issue, the Board's appeal of the Chapman school district lawsuit, and the Wichita special education case that has been dismissed. He indicated that the plaintiffs in the special case have filed to be heard before U.S. Supreme Court and noted how expensive it would be to just print the brief if a response is required from the Board. Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mrs. Waugh, that Mr. Biles' fees for services and expenses for September be paid as presented. The motion carried.

Legislative Coordinator

Mrs. DeFever reported that she and Dr. Wagon had attended the Governor's Task Force on School Finance meeting in Iola. She reported that she had also attended the meeting of the interim legislative committee on early childhood and preK education. She also reported on comments favorable to the Parents as Teachers program that she had heard made by the Chairman of the Kansas Workforce HI Partnership at a recent meeting of the group.

Other Board Member Reports

Mrs. Brown reported that she had attend the Education Leaders Council annual meeting in Phoenix at the end of September and had had the opportunity to talk with a representative of the Fordham Foundation, the organization that had given the new Kansas science standards an unfavorable review. She reported that he had said the review was written by only one individual who had not read any of the standards except those dealing with evolution.

Dr. Abrams asked if there was reason students without English proficiency were now being referred to as English Language Learners (ELL) instead of English as Second Language (ESL) students. He requested that the Department return to the use of ESL.

APPROVAL OF BOARD TRAVEL

Mrs. Brown asked that attendance at a Kansas Association of School Boards meeting on Religion in Public Schools and a meeting of the Kansas Teacher of the Year Selection committee be added to her travel request. Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mr. Rundell, that the travel requests be approved as amended. The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Voth adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

Harold Voth, Chairman

Penny Plamann, Secretary