

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES**

June 14, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Abrams called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. on Tuesday, June 14, 2005, in the Board Room of the State Board of Education Building, 120 SE 10th Avenue in Topeka, Kansas.

ROLL CALL

Members present were:

Steve Abrams	Iris Van Meter
John Bacon	Bill Wagnon
Kathy Martin	Janet Waugh
Connie Morris	Ken Willard
Carol Rupe	

Mrs. Gamble arrived at 10:20 a.m.

The Board stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Abrams asked for approval of the agenda.? Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mrs. Rupe, that the agenda be approved as presented.? The motion carried 9-0, with Mrs. Gamble absent.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the minutes be approved as presented.? The motion carried 9-0.

APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM COMMISSIONER

Mrs. Morris moved that Deputy Commissioner Dale Dennis be appointed Interim Commissioner.? Mrs. Van Meter seconded the motion which carried 9-0.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Interim Commissioner Dennis reported that the Consensus Estimating Group would be meeting later in the day, ahead the special legislative session.? He noted that May income tax receipts had exceeded projections.? Mr. Dennis updated the Board on various Department activities, including requests from legislators regarding proposals for the special session; and progress on the student database project.?

Mr. Dennis suggested that because there would be two Board members absent on Wednesday of the July meeting that the Board might want to consider a one-day meeting.? Mrs. Van Meter reported she would be having surgery later in June and inquired about the possibility of moving the meeting to the third week of July.? After brief discussion, it was suggested that the July meeting be held on the second Monday and Tuesday.? Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the dates of the July meeting be changed to Monday, July 11th and Tuesday, July 12th.? The motion carried 9-0.

Mr. Dennis also reported on voluntary safety checks on school buses and problems encountered in the 39 districts checked.? He indicated the Department would be following up.

MODEL PHYSICAL EDUCATION STANDARDS

Assistant Commissioner Posny introduced David Moore, USD 260, Derby, to present the model physical education standards to the Board. Mr. Moore reported that the standards writing committee was composed of K-12 physical education instructors and college professors in the areas of health, physical

Page 2

MINUTES

June 14, 2005

education, recreation and dance. He described a physically educated person as one who has learned skills necessary to perform a variety of physical activities; is physically fit; participates regularly in physical activity; knows the implications of and the benefits from involvement in physical activities; and values physical activity and its contribution to a healthful lifestyle. Mr. Moore reported that the committee had aligned the Kansas standards with the six content standards adopted by the National Association for Sports and Physical Education. He reviewed them for the Board along with the skills and concepts to be measured to assess student mastery of them. He stressed the positive effects physical activity have on student learning, as well as the lifelong benefits of a good foundation of physical education during the school years.

CITIZENS' OPEN FORUM

Chairman Abrams declared the Citizens' Open Forum open at 10:32 a.m. Those addressing the Board were: Michael Beachner, St. Paul; Vic Miller, Topeka, representing USD 101 patrons; Robyn Studebaker and Cheryl Studebaker, Thayer; Harry McDonald, Olathe, representing Kansas Citizens for Science; Keith Smith, St. Paul; Joe Heppert, Lawrence, representing the American Chemical Society; Harry Gregory, Wichita; and John Staver, Manhattan, representing Professor Carol Cleland, University of Colorado. Mr. Willard questioned Mr. McDonald about remarks made and posted on the web by a member of Kansas Citizens for Science. In response to remarks from individuals in the Erie-St. Paul district, regarding the transfer of territory the Board had approved in May, Mrs. Rupe asked if the Board might have the option of revisiting the decision. She noted that in May the Board had understood that the request for the transfer had been the unanimous decision of the two districts involved and that the Board's action granting the transfer in May had been what all those involved had wanted. She noted, though, that those who had just addressed the Board indicated that had not been the case. She expressed her desire for the people in the communities involved to get together and decide what would be best for the students affected. Mrs. Rupe added that even though it was not a Board agenda item, she felt the Board would like to do what the districts truly wanted, but was unsure how to proceed. Chairman Abrams conceded that in light of the information the Board had just received during the Open Forum, perhaps it would be best to consult the Board Attorney and the Department General Counsel about the Board's options and defer further action, if any, until a later date. It was the consensus of the Board that the attorneys be consulted before the Board proceeded with the issue. The possibility of bringing the issue up sometime during the meeting or during a special conference call meeting was mentioned, depending upon the advice the Board received from the attorneys. Chairman Abrams declared the open forum closed at 11:09 a.m.

The Board took a break from 11:09 until 11:18 a.m.

MODEL HEALTH STANDARDS

Dr. Posny introduced Dr. Cynthia Akagi, chair of the health education standards writing committee who presented the model health standards to the Board on behalf of the committee. Dr. Akagi talked about the excellent health education programs that existed in many Kansas schools and the quality of the Kansas educators and school nurses that shared their experience and expertise in producing the model standards. Dr. Akagi, discussed the need for comprehensive health education, citing factors such as poverty, abuse and neglect, and drug and alcohol addiction

in the homes of many Kansas students.? She reported that school nurses and health educators are challenged to help those students who are faced with health problems when they enter school and that it is important for those professionals to identify those students and help them in order for them to have the best educational opportunity possible while still dealing with health problems in the home.? She also cataloged the pressures and stresses even students from good homes are faced with, such as the affect on their health when involved in too many activities, or when peer pressure has led them to experiment with drugs and alcohol or to engage in other risky behaviors.

Page 3

MINUTES

June 14, 2005

She also noted the access students have to inappropriate television, music, and internet websites.? Dr. Akagi shared research that showed the connection between comprehensive health education and academic success and the positive effects of two-year social decision-making and problem-solving programs, such as character education, in elementary school that produced more pro-social behavior and less antisocial and self-destructive behaviors in high school.? Dr. Akagi reviewed the ten content areas that are covered in the model health standards being proposed.? She stressed that the instructional examples were carefully written to provide teachers with example assignment that they may use if they wish, to help them teach the standards.

Discussion followed Dr. Akagi's presentation.? Dr. Wagon suggested that the standards could be strengthened by an introduction that explained the purpose of the standards and how they are to be used and the outcomes desired.? Dr. Akagi responded that the committee had an introduction which was not yet in final form, but the committee had wanted the Board to go ahead and comment on the standards, so that the committee could make modifications, if necessary.? Mrs. Martin asked about the policy for the opt-out policy for student participation in sex education/human sexuality programs. A discussion followed about the pro's and con's of out-in versus opt-out policies. Mr. Bacon suggested that opt-in permission, with a minimum disclosure given to parents about teaching methods used and content might be preferable.? He shared his concerns about reports he had received about how sex education might currently be taught in some districts, mentioning that parents should be provided adequate information by educators in order to make decisions about their children's participation.? He questioned whether the Board should go further in defining disclosure requirements.? Mrs. Waugh stated that opt-in programs would be difficult in cases where a parents' involvement in their children's education was low.? It was also pointed out that in cases of abuse, where a child might most need the information, an opt-in policy would not be helpful.? Dr. Akagi said the committee could consider Board members' concerns and put together a recommendation.? She added that it might be helpful to gather more information from schools districts, including school nurses.? It was noted that the standards had been developed to be a basic guide for districts because choices regarding curriculum and teaching methods were decided by local boards. ?Mrs. Morris indicated she did not see the necessity of going back to local districts because she was aware of the views of her constituents and what they wanted.? Melissa Brooks, KSDE staff, suggested that the committee could include in the introduction a description of the options districts could consider to address parental permission for participation in human sexuality instruction. She indicated that a sample letter to parents might be included as an appendix to the standards.

Several Board members shared specific concerns about portions of the standards which were noted by Dr. Akagi, who said she would take them back to the committee for review and modification, if necessary.? Some of the issues raised concerned the age-appropriateness of some of indicators; how role playing was used in certain instances; the need to cite parents as a resource to whom children could look for guidance; that sexual abstinence should be stressed in the 5-8 grade standards; the inclusion of sexual harassment and date violence in the discussion of the consequences of risky behavior; and the characterization of pregnancy as a problem.? Mrs.

Gamble asked if there was anything in the standards that districts would see as a mandate.? Dr. Akagi responded that was not the intent of the standards, adding that they were a model for districts to follow.? Mrs. Morris also noted that she was concerned about the work ethic in the state and the country and asked if the committee would look into adding a section about it to the standards.? Dr. Akagi reported that one vocational/technical program she was aware of addressed the subject in a very effective manner.? She added that she didn't know if health teachers would have the training to address the issue, but that she would take the request back to the committee.? Dr. Posny said she would contact the instructor of the program Dr. Akagi had mentioned and share information about it with the Board.

Page 4

MINUTES

June 14, 2005

Chairman Abrams indicated that the agenda item for appointments would be postponed until the afternoon, after the public hearing.? The Board recessed for lunch at 12:25 p.m. and returned at 1:32.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED TEACHER LICENSURE REGULATIONS

Chairman Abrams opened the public hearing at 1:32 p.m. on proposed amendments to 91-1-203, and new regulations 91-1-220 and 91-1-221, which would replace 91-1-213 Mr. Rod Bieker, Kansas Department of Education General Counsel, reported that the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules and Regulations had suggested clarifying language in K.A.R. 91-1-203 to establish the scale upon which the GPA requirements were based.? He handed out copies of the letter received from the Joint Committee.? Peg Dunlap, Kansas NEA, Topeka also appeared in support of the proposed regulations. Chairman Abrams declared the public hearing closed at 1:34 p.m.

APPOINTMENTS

Professional Standards Board

Mrs. Gamble moved, with a second by Carol Rupe, that the Board appoint Casey Seyfert to represent secondary teachers and Robert Sattler to represent elementary building level administrators on the Professional Standards Board.? Chairman Abrams asked for separate motions for each appointment.? Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the State Board cast a unanimous vote and appoint Casey Seyfert to represent secondary teachers on the Professional Standards Board for a three-year term, July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.? The motion carried.

Mrs. Gamble nominated Robert Sattler to represent elementary building level administrators on the Professional Standards Board.? Mrs. Martin nominated Lori Martin to represent elementary building level administrators on the Professional Standards Board. Each nomination received five votes.? On a second vote, Lori Martin received six votes and was appointed to complete a term as a result of a resignation, to serve through June 30, 2007.

Professional Practices Commission

Mr. Willard, with a second by Mr. Bacon, nominated Dan Duling to serve on the Professional Practices Commission.? Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the Board cast a unanimous ballot and appoint Mr. Duling, as a representative of elementary principals for a three-year term, July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008. ?The motion carried.

Licensure Review Committee

Mr. Bacon, with a second by Mrs. Morris, nominated Mary Tate to serve on the Licensure Review Committee.? Dr. Wagnon moved, with at second by Mr. Willard, that the Board cast a unanimous ballot and appoint Mary Tate to the Licensure Review Committee as a representative of special education teachers, with a term of office for one

year through June 30, 2006, to complete a term as a result of a resignation. The motion carried.

Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

Assistant Commissioner Posny reviewed the requirement that to comply with state and federal law, a majority of the members of SEAC must be persons with a disability or parents of a child with a disability.? She indicated that three of the six vacancies must meet the majority requirement.? She also reviewed Board districts without representation or low representation on the current Council.? A question was raised about the information included in the material on Board districts and Interim Commissioner Dennis was directed to look into the matter and to advise and make available to department staff accurate Board district boundary information.?

Page 5

MINUTES

June 14, 2005

Dr. Wagon moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the Board appoint Lawrence Meyer, representing Adult Corrections Agencies; and Andrea Urban, representing Juvenile Justice Agencies.? The motion carried. Mrs. Rupe, with a second by Mrs. Van Meter, moved that the Board reappoint Bert Moore, as an Administrator of Exceptional Programs.? The motion carried.? Mr. Willard moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the Board appoint Susan Clayton and Roni Crosser, to fill the vacancies for Parent of child or person with disability.? The motion carried.? Mrs. Martin moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the Board appoint Shelly Bradford as a Parent of a child with giftedness.? The motion carried.? All of the appointments were for three-year terms to run from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2008.?

DISCUSSION OF STATE ASSESSMENTS

Dr. Posny, in addition to discussing the differences between standards, goals, performance and achievement and how the terms were used to bring consistency in communicating with the field and for federal reporting purposes, also updated the Board on current assessment issues.? She handed out and reviewed the timeline for verification by districts of the data from the 2005 assessments.? She reported that ?check-your-data? workshops had recently concluded throughout the state to assist districts.? She indicated that final AYP reports and preliminary report cards and accreditation status would be posted August 20th for districts to view, with the final report card information brought to the Board in October.? Dr. Posny reviewed the Kansas assessment schedule and described proposed additions to the state assessment program for 2005-2006 in light of increased NCLB flexibility which would allow an additional two percent of students with disabilities to be classified as proficient or higher using the Kansas Assessment with Multiple Measures (KAMM).? She indicated that the modified assessments like those used in 2001-2005 would be replaced by KAMM.? She also noted that the KAMM would only be able to be implemented as an online assessment.

Dr. Posny reviewed proposed parameters regarding high school assessments for the spring of 2006, indicating that the goal would be to have students take high school assessments when they have had the opportunity to learn the content.? To ensure this, she reported, every content assessment will have to be offered every year.? Math, reading, and science are already required to be offered annually and writing and history/government will have to be added.?

Dr. Posny reported that 2005-2006 will be the transition year for high school assessments.? New reading and math assessments will be given and new cut score will have to be established, as well as AYP targets ? the academic achievement standards.? To ensure a sufficient sample size to determine the cut scores, she reported that all sophomores will take the high school math assessment and all juniors will take the reading assessment in 2006.?

Assessments after the opportunity to learn would begin in the 2006-2007 school year.

Beginning in 2006-2007, math, reading and writing must be taken by every student either when they have had the opportunity to learn, not later than the end of their junior year, or no later than the end of their fourth year in high school if they have not yet achieved junior status.? In 2007-2008, math, reading and science must be taken under the same time parameters.? The exception would be history/government in 2007-2008, which will be offered through the end of the student's senior year, or not later than the end of their fourth year of high school.? Dr. Posny indicated that AYP for reading and math will be based on the results of students assessed each year, regardless of grade level.? Participation rates for those content assessments would be based on the students who took the assessment each year, students who have been in high school for four years and are not yet classified as juniors, and, beginning in 2007-2008, juniors who have not taken the assessments.? It was asked how graduation rate was determined, with Dr. Posny explaining that different federal programs define it differently, though a single definition was being developed.

Page 6

MINUTES

June 14, 2005

Dr. John Poggio, from the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation, University of Kansas, discussed issues related to on-line assessments, including district participation rates and perceived barriers to on-line participation, such as the lack of computers, lack of technical administrators, and the unpredictability of the internet in some areas.? Dr. Poggio suggested that conducting workshops with those districts that have been reluctant to use the on-line assessments might be helpful in assessing needs and addressing some of the problems that exist. ?In the first two years of using on-line assessments, positive reactions had been received from teachers because of instant results and from administrators because of decreased paper management.? Dr. Poggio indicated that teachers are becoming more critical consumers of the on-line assessments and have begun offering constructive and valuable criticism that is leading to improvements in on-line administration.? One of the main frustrations teachers have experienced has come from the instantaneous results.? Dr. Poggio noted that the natural use of the online assessment would be to test, teach, retest, and reteach to improve student performance.? Limits of NCLB prevent that he noted, but the release of two old test forms to be used as formative assessments had offered schools the opportunity to test to assess students' strengths and weaknesses ahead of the state assessment, with more than .5 million administrations of the old forms during the past testing window.? He predicated that the impact of the use of the early release of the formative exams prior to the state assessment will be seen in student results.

Dr. Poggio reported that pilot testing of items had begun in the past spring, with items embedded in the real assessments.? He reported that 5% of the items needed to be modified or replaced.? More items will be piloted in the fall, particularly in reading in order to have enough items for two forms for next spring.? Dr. Poggio also reported that the Kansas English Language Proficiency Exam (KELPA) was piloted in the spring of 2005 and will be administered to students annually.? He said the dominate issue with it was that the assessment might be too easy.

In response to a request from Chairman Abrams, Dr. Poggio provided an update on adaptive testing.? Other than the federal requirement for a fixed form test, challenges about having enough items to cover all the skills that need to be assessed still has to be addressed.? A pilot will begin next spring.

The Board took a break from 3:00 to 3:15 p.m.

Chairman Abrams announced that the Board would be discussing the Erie-St. Paul issue with the Board Attorney in executive session at the end of the day.? No action, if any, would be taken at least until the following day.

LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

Preliminary Discussion of the FY 2007 Budget

Interim Commissioner Dennis opened the discussion about the FY 2007 budget.? He indicated it would be hard for the Board to make any decisions with knowing the results of the special legislative session at the end of the month.? He told the Board that if it did nothing, state aid to schools would go down \$17.5 million as property valuations go up.? He reviewed options for the Board to consider and projected increases for K-12 education of between \$63.8 and \$93.3 million if the legislature funded current law.? He also reviewed projected state revenues and obligations for FY 2006 and FY 2007.

Definitions of Underserved and Underperforming Areas of the State

Mr. Dennis reported that in order to comply with 2005 Senate Bill 138 the staff had prepared recommendations for underserved areas and underperforming urban areas in science and math.? Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mrs. Martin that the Board authorize the Department to forward to the State Department of

Page 7

MINUTES

June 14, 2005

Revenue the following definitions of underserved areas and underperforming urban areas:?
Underserved Areas -- the entire State of Kansas in the areas of mathematics and science, physics, chemistry, and biology; and
Underperforming Urban Areas -- School districts with enrollment over 10,000 students who exceed the free and reduced price lunch application percentages by the state average for the preceding school year.? The motion carried.

Discretionary Grants

Mr. Dennis explained that for FY 2006 the Board had requested \$130,000 from the state general fund for discretionary grants. He reported that the Legislature approved the amount, as well as appropriating an additional \$375,000 to fund after-school programs.? Mrs. Waugh moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the Board approve the distribution of discretionary grants as follows: Kansas Association for Conservation & Environmental Education -- \$35,000; Communities in Schools of Kansas -- \$35,000; Kansas Teacher of the Year and Kansas Horizon Award Programs -- \$10,000; Kansas State Historical Society -- \$50,000; and After-School Programs, Non-Local School Districts -- \$187,500 and After-School Programs, Local School Districts -- \$187,500.? The motion carried.

Proposed Request for Applications for School Enhancement Programs

Dr. Posny explained how staff proposed to award the \$375,000 for afterschool grants that was appropriated by the 2005 Legislature.? She reported that an amount equal to not less than \$187,500 must be awarded for existing afterschool programs that target low income, at-risk children. Additionally, the grantees cannot be part of any unified school district or any other state agency or be part of any political subdivision of the state. Additionally, a unified school district shall have no administrative oversight nor contribute funding to such programs and the program shall not receive any state or federal childcare subsidies. ?She reported that the remaining \$187,500 would be awarded to existing afterschool programs that may be a part of any unified school district. ?Competitive priority points would be awarded to programs that have decreased their services due to the expiration of federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant funding and a 50-50 cash match would be required.

Chairman Abrams reported on a visit he made with Mrs. Rupe and others to the Francis Tuttle Vocational Technical School in Oklahoma City.? Mrs. Rupe joined in the report of the visit and discussion followed about technical programs, and what more can be done in Kansas programs.

2006 NASBE Dues

Dr. Wagon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the Board approve payment of 2006 NASBE membership dues of \$21,021, 2006 NCOSEA dues of \$130, and a \$20 subscription to the NASBE Standard, as well as \$5,000 for the Professional Development Fund, for a total of \$26,171.? Mr. Willard explained that the professional development fund was established by NASBE in order to allow more state board members to become involved in NASBE activities by establishing state accounts to help pay travel and related meeting expenses.? The motion carried 9-1, with Mrs. Morris voting ?no?.

Legislative Coordinator

Mr. Willard reported that he?d had numerous phone calls and meetings with legislators and some superintendents.? He said there appeared to be movement by the Senate to avert a constitutional crisis and, with revenues being projected upward again, there may be money available to fund the first year of the Court?s Order without a tax increase.? He also noted that the cost study ordered by the legislature would inform the action of the legislature next year.? Dr. Wagon asked if Mr. Willard had communicated with the legislature that the Board?s Quality Performance Accreditation regulations needed to guide the cost study and if there was any movement to direct the study within the parameters of the Court?s Order.? Mr. Willard indicated he had.? Mrs. Gamble asked if the Board would get a report about how the Legislative Post Audit group was gathering information and what kind of information was being gathered for the cost study.? Interim Commissioner Dennis reported that information on school budgets, special education, certified teachers and teacher salaries was being requested, but he couldn?t verify that there were inquiries about the Board?s regulations.

Page 2

MINUTES

June 15, 2005

Board Attorney?s Report

Mr. Biles reported that when the Senate Education Committee meets, Post Audit will discuss what the Supreme Court requires of the education cost study and how it intends to comply.? He pointed out that this was the first time a court opinion had included the order that the State Board?s standards for accreditation of schools must be part of the funding of schools.? Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the Board pay Mr. Biles? fees for services and expenses for May as presented.? The motion carried.

Other Board Member Reports

Mrs. Gamble reported that she had attended a joint meeting of the Kansas City Civic Council with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation on high school reform.? Dr. Wagon reported he had attended a presentation by Douglas Reeves in Salem, Massachusetts.? He reported that Dr. Reeves who has Topeka ties, was a highly respected authority on role of research on leadership?s affect on achieving standards.? He indicated that in light of the Board?s goal for effective leadership, it would be beneficial to invite Dr. Reeves address the Board at some future date.

Report of the Science Hearing Subcommittee

Chairman Abrams reported that the Subcommittee had met on June 9th and had incorporated its report into the draft of the science standards that had been mailed to Board members.? He invited questions, comments and additions or corrections.?? Mrs. Morris said she had just received the transcript of the hearings and that she would be taking the next month to review it to see if there were any additions or changes that needed to be made to the

standards, so she would not be making any changes until July.? Chairman Abrams stated he did not anticipate any action on the standards at this meeting.

Mrs. Gamble said she had been fascinated in 1999 to watch the word evolution left in the science standards, but the key concepts removed.? She noted that the Subcommittee?s proposed draft stated in the introduction that intelligent design would not be introduced, yet changes to the standards themselves, appeared to contain its key concepts and the Nature of Science contained language that indicated scientific explanations could be other than natural.? She said she felt that in both cases, science education in the state had been devalued which she found sad.

Dr. Wagnon said he was grateful for the opportunity to again share his deep reservations about the direction the Board had taken over the last few months.? He said that seeing the events of the past months play out, he had moved from being indignant to being extremely saddened that the Board had allowed itself to be used by ?a Discovery Institute set of agendas which were designed to discredit the credibility of mainstream science. He pointed out that the subcommittee had fallen into the trap of attacking science based on a whole lot of misinformation.? He referred to a letter read in the Citizens? Open Forum on Tuesday from a philosopher of science from Colorado about how the testimony at the hearing completely distorted her position.? He expressed his concern over Board members who said they had been enlightened by the attacks on Darwin they had heard in the subcommittee?s hearings.? He said he felt the revised standards were not good science and that it was sad that the Board was taking the direction it was when science and the need for encouraging people to come into science with enthusiasm rather than with doubts about its credibility has never been greater if the country is to maintain the quality of life and competitive advantage the economy and society has enjoyed over the past centuries.? He added that is was a disservice to science when Kansas officially recognizes the Intelligent Design movement in way that helps to enhance it credibility by saying that Kansans support it, further adding that it discredits what science has done to improve the quality of life.? He also stated his objections to money and energy spent on the hearings and the time given to the issue when issues such as school improvement were more important.?

Page 3
MINUTES
June 15, 2005

Mrs. Waugh indicated she would like the science standard writing committee to comment on the subcommittee?s proposal.? Dr. Abrams said that he thought the writing committee would see and comment on the proposed revisions.? Asked if and when the standards would go out for external review, Chairman Abrams indicated it had always been his intention to have the standards externally reviewed, though his was only one vote.? He said he wasn?t sure when the Board would take action on it, perhaps in July.? Mrs. Waugh noted that the proposed changes dealt with how evolution was to be taught, asking that evolution be thoroughly discussed, as well as other alternative theories.? She asked if it was the intent of the subcommittee that the alternatives be discussed if brought up by the student.? Dr. Abrams indicated that was the way it was currently handled in the classroom, but that the thrust of the changes was to present the scientific evidence that involved evolution.? Mrs. Waugh reported that she had received calls from concerned science teachers who did not feel qualified to discuss alternative theories if brought up by students.?? She added that the teachers indicated they currently direct students to their pastor or their parents.? She asked if the revised standards were directing teachers to open up the discussion to alternative theories in the classroom.? Dr. Abrams reiterated that if there is scientific evidence that a teacher would like to discuss, he had no objections to it being brought up, but if a question did not deal with science, it should be dealt however the teacher felt was appropriate.? Mrs. Waugh said science teachers are interpreting the revisions as requiring that they need to be knowledgeable about all forms of creationism.? Dr. Abrams responded that revisions were clear that teachers should deal with the scientific evidence.

Mrs. Rupe, referring to a section in the standards that had been revised where the directions were to explain proposed scientific explanations of origins as well as scientific criticisms of those explanations, said she felt most Kansas science teachers educated in biology at Kansas universities wouldn't have the training to teach about criticisms of something they hold to be a unifying concept of science. She added she didn't understand where they would get the information about criticisms. She asked if it was the intent of the Board to require high school science teachers to take other information in college, adding she didn't know where they would get it. Dr. Abrams said that there were a lot of journals and articles dealing with criticisms of evolution and teachers not understanding them was a different question; the standards were only dealing with scientific criticisms that had scientific support. Referring to a section of the standards where the revisions dealt with science being truly open-ended, Mrs. Rupe said she knew from the discussions of the science hearing subcommittee that they wanted a more critical analysis of evolution, but, she added, to imply that science teachers weren't already teaching higher order thinking skills and asking their students to think critically did the teachers a disservice because getting their students to critically analyze things in terms of science was where they spent the bulk of their time. She reported that what they teach is what they believe to be science and she questioned whether the members of the subcommittee, or any Board member, were qualified to determine what science was. She said questions should be sent to the science community to determine what science is and that is what should be taught. Mrs. Martin added some clarification to Mrs. Rupe original questions, by explaining that the section of the standards to which Mrs. Rupe referred asked that "students" explain proposed scientific explanations of origins and their criticisms.

Mrs. Gamble asked Dr. Abrams why the section of the introduction regarding the nature of science had been rewritten and why the new language was better than what the writing committee had done. Dr. Abrams indicated that he thought the change was better because it stated things more clearly. Mrs. Gamble indicated she didn't see the need for the change, adding that she felt the science committee was better qualified to write that section of the introduction to the standards. Regarding Mrs. Gamble's objections, Mr. Willard pointed out that the wording in that section was almost exactly what had been adopted by Ohio and twenty other states. He stated that it was important that the Board not continue to

Page 4
MINUTES
June 15, 2005

ignore the controversy over evolution, adding that students needed to know about it so they could make an informed assessment. Mrs. Gamble disagreed with his assertion that states other than Ohio had adopted the proposed language. Mrs. Rupe expressed concern over the use of the word "logical" in the section, stating that what was logical to some might not appear to be so to others.

Mrs. Morris objected to Mrs. Gamble's, Mrs. Waugh's, Dr. Wagon's, and Mrs. Rupe's criticisms of the science hearing subcommittee's work, stating that if they had attended the hearings, they would understand the changes in the standards had nothing to do with religion, creationism, or Intelligent Design, but dealt with real scientific criticisms of evolution. She added that there were many problems with evolution and students needed to be informed.

Mrs. Morris responded to a concern of Mrs. Gamble's that religion, Intelligent Design or Creationism had been integrated throughout the science standards. Mrs. Morris asked Mrs. Gamble to point what page and line number she felt pointed to religion, Intelligent Design or Creationism in any manner because she would like to work to have it removed. Mrs. Gamble said she could not provide specific references. Mrs. Morris asked Mrs. Gamble to please e-mail her references and she would make an effort to have them removed. Mrs. Gamble declined to do

so.? Mrs. Morris stated that religion, Intelligent Design or Creationism do not appear in the standards.?

Mr. Willard questioned a reference to Intelligent Design in a section of the introduction, stating his preference for language which had been in the minority report.? Dr. Abrams suggested he bring his suggestion in writing to the July meeting when the Board could vote on it.

A motion was made by Mr. Bacon, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the science standards be sent back to the science writing committee to embed botany, anatomy, physiology, zoology and microbiology into the standards.? Dr. Wagnon asked that the science writing committee be asked to comment on the changes made to the standards by the Board science hearing subcommittee.? Neither Mr. Bacon, nor Mr. Willard objected to adding Dr. Wagnon's request to the motion.? In the discussion that followed, Dr. Wagnon talked about the need for the standards to address the core ideas of science and not become weighted down in an attempt to address all the branches of science. ?Mrs. Gamble stated she thought that the instructions to the committee were that the existing standards had been too broad, and that the Board wanted the new standards to have more central science theory.? Mrs. Martin said she thought some of the sciences were already embedded in the standards and she was satisfied without the committee doing further work.? The motion carried on a vote of 7-3, with Mrs. Gamble, Mrs. Waugh, and Mrs. Martin voting ?no?.

Because the discussion had become somewhat heated, Mrs. Waugh stated she would like to have the Policy Committee review the language used when opening the Citizens' Open Forum where the public was cautioned that personal attacks would not be tolerated.? She asked that the Committee develop a similar statement for Board members.

Communications Committee Report

Mr. Bacon reported that the Communications Committee had met in May and reviewed the recommend--ations from the communications audit.? He reviewed some of the Committee's recommendations for the Board to consider, including continuing the video clips after each Board meeting; reviving the Key Communicators Network; scheduling regular meetings with editorial boards around the state; developing key messages for the State Board based on the Board's strategic goals; and developing a web page,

Page 5

MINUTES

June 15, 2005

accessible only to those with the appropriate sign-on, that will contain education facts and statistics for Board members to access as needed.? Mrs. Kathy Toelkes, Director of Communications and Recognitions Programs, explained a suggested structure for the Key Communicators Network.? In the discussion that followed, it was the consensus of the Board to continue the video clips.?

?

Future Agenda Items

Dr. Wagnon asked that time be provided at a future Board meeting for a full discussion of the recommendations of the Communications Committee and the results of the Communications Audit.? Dr. Wagnon also asked for a discussion of a system to ensure district financial accountability, and that staff be given adequate time to prepare options for Board consideration.

Dr. Wagnon also questioned the appropriateness of taxpayer funds being used for a newsletter sent out by Mrs.

Morris, that he felt crossed the line between basic constituent services and partisan politics.? He asked that the Policy Committee examine Board member use of stationary, stamps, and long distance telephone privileges provided at state expense.? Chairman Abrams asked Mr. Biles for direction on the issue.? Mr. Biles gave a general outline of issues to be considered when addressing the question and added that he would like to be involved if the Policy Committee examined the question.? Chairman Abrams directed the Policy Committee to review the Board's guidelines for Boardsmanship and policy on constituent communications.? Mrs. Waugh asked that the Policy Committee also consider a definition of Board member constituents because she understood that Mrs. Morris' newsletter was sent to individuals outside her Board district.? She also asked that the Committee consider misstatement, inaccuracies, and attacks on individual Board members that were contained in the letter as they studied the constituent communications issue.?

The Board took a break from 10:50 to 11:01 a.m.

ADOPTION ON TEACHER LICENSURE REGULATIONS

Mrs. Rupe moved, with a second by Mrs. Waugh, that the State Board adopt the revisions to regulation 91-1-203 and new regulations 91-1-220 and 91-1-221, and revoke 91-1-213, with the addition of clarifications regarding GPA as requested by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules and Regulations.? The motion carried on a roll call vote as follows:

Steve Abrams ? ?yes?	Carol Rupe ? ?yes?
John Bacon ? ?yes?	Iris Van Meter ? ?yes?
Sue Gamble ? ?yes?	Bill Wagnon ? ?yes?
Kathy Martin ? ?yes?	Janet Waugh ? ?yes?
Connie Morris ? ?yes?	Ken Willard ? ?yes?

CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Rupe moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the Board approve the consent agenda, with the recommendations of the Evaluation Review Committee voted on separately as requested by Dr. Wagnon.? The motion carried.

In the consent agenda, the State Board:

- ? Received the monthly personnel report.

Page 6
 MINUTES
 June 15, 2005

- ? Confirmed the appointment of Craig Gerdes to the position of Information Resource Specialist III on the Computer Information and Communications Services team, effective June 13, 2005 at an annual salary of \$52,229; established the annual salary for Melinda Stanley, Information Resource Specialist, at \$52,229 effective on June 5, 2005; and approved a 1.25 percent salary increase effective December 4, 2005.
- ? Approved an increase in compensation for unclassified special project temporary positions of 1.25 percent effective June 5, 2005 and an additional 1.25 percent effective December 4, 2005.
- ? Approved salary increases for unclassified staff for FY 2006 as proposed.

- ? Approved school construction plans for USD 263, Mulvane; Sacred Heart Catholic Parish, Shawnee; USD 379, Clay Center; Prairie Moon School, Lawrence; USD 247, Cherokee; USD 443, Dodge City; USD 308, Hutchinson Public Schools; USD 253, Emporia; USD 259, Wichita; USD 437, Auburn-Washburn; and USD 500, Kansas City (2).
- ? Approved the modification of the Smoky Hill/Central Kansas Education Service Center Cooperative #629 to add the Fort Hays Educational Developmental Center #633 districts and to disorganize #633.
- ? Approved the proposed FY 2006 salary schedules for the Kansas State School for the Deaf.
- ? Approved the Kansas State School for the Blind's proposed Teacher Salary Schedule for the 2005-06 school year.
- ? Approved accredited status for USD 202 Oak Grove Elementary; USD 231 Wheatridge Middle School; USD 232 Mize Elementary, Starside Elementary, Monticello Trails Middle, Lexington Trails Middle, and DeSoto High School; USD 234 Winfield Scott Elementary, Fort Scott Middle School, and Ft. Scott Sr. High School; USD 244 Burlington Elementary, Burlington Middle and Burlington High; USD 259 White Elementary, Hadley Middle School, Wilbur Middle School, and Northeast Magnet/Downtown Campus; USD 265 Amelia Earhart Elementary, Oak Street Elementary, Dwight D Eisenhower Middle, and Goddard Middle; USD 285 Cedar Vale Elementary School and Cedar Vale High School; USD 293 Quinter Jr-Sr High; USD 309 Nickerson Elementary, South Hutchinson Elementary, and Reno Valley Middle; USD 342 McLouth Middle School and McLouth High School; USD 345 East Indianola Elementary, Elmont Elementary, Lyman Elementary, and Seaman High School; USD 348 Marion Springs and Vinland Elementary; USD 366 Yates Center High; USD 382 Pratt Sr. High; USD 383 Manhattan High; USD 395 LaCrosse Middle and LaCrosse High School; USD 411 Goessel Elementary; USD 412 Hoxie Elementary and Hoxie High School; USD 415 Hiawatha Sr. High; USD 457 Garden City Sr. High; USD 461 Neodesha High School; USD 465 Whittier Elementary; USD 479 Crest West Elementary, Crest East Elementary, and Crest High School; USD 482 Dighton Elementary; USD 490 El Dorado Middle and El Dorado High School; USD 497 Prairie Park Elementary and Lawrence High School; USD 512 Indian Woods Elementary; Z0026 Bethany Lutheran School [1859] and St. Johns Lutheran [3676]; Z0029 The Lawrence Catholic School, STS Peter and Paul Elementary, St. Gregory Elementary [4570], St. Ann School [9016], and Cure' of Ars School [9002];and Z0031 Holy Name Catholic Elementary [7340] and Sacred Heart Catholic Elementary [7486].

Page 7

MINUTES

June 15, 2005

- ? Approved the waiver of K.A.R. 91-31-24 for Quinter Elementary School and Quinter Jr/Sr High School, USD 293, to allow them to conclude their Cycle 3 of state accreditation by June, 2005.
- ? Approved the Inservice plans for USD 204 Bonner Springs, USD 300 Commanche, USD 471 Dexter, USD 474 Haviland, and USD 480, Liberal.
- ? ?Authorized dissemination and continuation funds for charter schools as follows: *Dissemination Grant Funds* in the amount of \$33,000 each for USD 287 - West Franklin Learning Center, USD 312 - Pleasantview Charter School, USD 361 - The Learning Center of Harper,? USD 382 - Productivity Academy, and USD 501 -

Hope Street Academy; *2nd Year Charter School Funding* for USD 267 - Colwich Grade School, \$101,393, USD 465 - Community Learning Center, \$102,596, USD 373 - E3: Entrepreneurial Education Enterprise, \$153,060, USD 490 - E-CATS, \$77,364, USD 200 - Greeley County Junior High Charter School, \$71,922, USD 261 - Haysville Charter School, \$99,627, USD 501 - Hope Street Academy Charter Middle School, \$82,806, USD 497 - Lawrence Public Schools Virtual Charter School, \$106,059, USD 263 - Mulvane Charter School, \$129,808, USD 218 - Point Rock Academy, \$205,504, USD 400 - Smoky Valley Charter School, \$84,786, USD 315 - Thomas County Academy, \$76,835, USD 253 - Turning Point Learning Center, \$80,332, and USD 332 - Zenda Grade School, \$136,840; and *3rd Year Charter School Funding* for USD 321- Delia Charter School, \$225,000, USD 308 - Hutchinson Cyber Charter School, \$73,100, USD 424 - 21st Century Learning Academy, \$156,000, and USD 101 - Galesburg Charter School, \$127,500.

? Approved the IDEA Title VI-B Special Education Leading Edge grant awards for FY 2006 in for Haysville School District - \$80,000; Leavenworth County Special Education - \$90,000; Flint Hills Special Education Coop - \$88,828; Turner School District - \$90,000; and Beloit Special Education Coop - \$90,000.

? Approved funding for FY 2006 Four-Year-Old At-Risk continuation grants for 135 districts to serve 6,000 children, as recommended.?

? Approved FY 2006 Parents as Teachers grant awards for 72 continuation programs (including the addition of \$13,192? for 1 new school in the USD 273 Consortium) totaling \$7,247,251, and 1 new stand-alone program in the amount totaling \$42,249, as recommended.

? Approved 2005-06 Reading First continuation grants for USD 250, Pittsburg - \$192,119; USD 253, Emporia - \$217,938; USD 259, Wichita - \$1,038,931; USD 260, Derby - \$178,316; USD 295, Prairie Heights - \$13,906; USD 305, Salina - \$140,778; USD 457, Garden City - \$273,364; USD 470, Arkansas City - \$295,339; USD 497, Lawrence - \$605,780; USD 500, Kansas City - \$657,704; USD 501, Topeka - \$974,530; USD 503 Parsons - \$259,620; and USD 512, Shawnee Mission - \$173,080.

? Approved funding the 2005-06 21st Century Community Learning Centers Continuation Grants: *2nd Year Grants*: USD 210, Hugoton - \$267,083, USD 218, Elkhart - \$288,187, USD 257, Iola - \$358,470, USD 434, Santa Fe Trail - \$286,779, USD 435, Abilene - \$115,948, USD 475, Geary County - \$286,669, USD 493, Columbus - \$277,760, USD 497, Lawrence - \$218,298 and USD 500, Kansas City - \$355,247; and *3rd Year Grants*: USD 244, Burlington \$243,723, USD 387, Altoona Midway - \$66,007, USD 428, Great Bend - \$271,124, USD 446, Independence - \$124,105, USD 497, Lawrence - \$156,248, USD 353, Wellington - \$257,661, USD 382, Pratt - \$264,726, USD 383, Manhattan Northview Elementary - \$194,420, USD 383, Manhattan Ogden Elementary - \$138,015 and USD 393, Solomon - \$81,730.

Page 8

MINUTES

June 15, 2005

? Approved 2005-2006 Learn and Serve America School-based grants in the amount of \$10,000 each for Burlington USD 244, Flint Hills Special Education Cooperative, Geary County Schools USD 475, JC Harmon High School USD 500, LeRoy/Gridley USD 245, Manhattan USD 383, McLouth USD 342, Olathe USD 233, Spring Hill USD 230, Valley Center USD 262, and Valley Heights USD 498; and Northeast Kansas Education Service Center - \$9,960, Southern Cloud USD 334 - \$9,810 and Valley Falls USD 338 - \$5,000.

? Approved the 2005-2006 Learn and Serve America Community-based grants in the amount of \$10,000

each for Accessible Arts, Inc., Kansas City, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Topeka, Bonner Springs-Edwardsville USD 204, Communities in Schools, Wichita, Class LTD, Columbus, ECKAAA, Ottawa, ECKAN, Osawatomie, Shawnee County Family Resource Center, and Unified Support Agency, Hugoton; and Youth Volunteer Corps of Greater Kansas City; and Boys & Girls Club, Lawrence - \$9,964, Hutchinson USD 308 - \$9,868, Ulysses USD 214 - \$7,400 and United Way Volunteer Center, Wichita - \$8,460.

? Approved the 2005-2006 AmeriCorps*Kansas grants ? *Competitive Grants*: Fort Hays Educational Development Center - \$36,400, Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks - \$490,694, Wichita Public Schools - \$247,828, InterFaith Ministries - \$347,199, and *Kansas Association for the Med Underserved \$255,678 (in the event Competitive funding is not awarded, this application will be funded from available Formula funds); and *Formula Grants*: Kansas State University/Campus Compact - \$102,300, ECKAN - \$24,800, *Kansas Association for the Med Underserved \$255,678, Hope Street Youth Development - \$49,600, United Way of Douglas County - \$12,400, Sterling College - \$70,571, United Way of Wyandotte County - \$310,000 and Partnership for Children (KC) - \$260,385.

? Approved the request from USD 320, Wamego, to hold an election on the question of issuing bonds in excess of the district's general bond debt limitation.

? Approved 2005-2006 School Breakfast Program Waivers as recommended by the School Breakfast Program Waiver Review Committee.

Contracts Approved

The State Board authorized the *Superintendent of the Kansas State School for the Blind* to negotiate and renew a contract for the 2005-2006 school year with USD 500 for psychological, para, and speech services, with the contract amount not to exceed \$66,283;

KSSB was authorized to receive payment for services as follows:

- ? One Student, 2005 Extended School Year: Oak Grove, Missouri School District - \$695.00;
- ? One Student, 2005 Extended School Year: Kansas City, Missouri School District - \$695.00;
- ? One Student, 2005 Extended School Year and Extended Day Program: Parkville, Missouri School District - \$1,501;
- ? One Student, 2005 Extended School Year and Extended Day Program: Bethany, Missouri School District - \$1,120;
- ? One Student, 2005 Extended School Year and Extended Day Program: Knobnoster, Missouri School District - \$1,332;
- ? Two Students, 2005 Extended School Year and Extended Day Program: Lee's Summit, Missouri School District - \$2,196; and
- ? One Student, 2005 Extended School Year and Extended Day Program: Coffey, Missouri School District - \$1,332.

Page 9

MINUTES

June 15, 2005

The State Board authorized the *Commissioner of Education* to:

- ? negotiate and continue the contract with the University of Kansas for development of reading, mathematics, science and history/government assessments and administration of state reading and mathematics assessments, including the alternate and modified assessments needed for students with

disabilities and the English language proficiency assessment, with the contract amount not to exceed \$4,800,300;

? negotiate and continue the contract with WestEd for assessment item development and standards review, with the contract amount not to exceed \$2,090,000;

? negotiate and continue a contract with TLK Interpreting and Mentoring to provide training and support for educational interpreters who provide services in Western Kansas public schools in a contract amount not to exceed \$40,200;

? negotiate and continue a contract with Families Together, Inc., to continue to provide training for educational advocates as well as locate and match advocates with children; and to increase dissemination and knowledge of the program to the Juvenile Justice Authority and Social and Rehabilitation Services administrators statewide, with the contract amount not to exceed \$105,025; and

? negotiate and enter into a contract with the University of Kansas Center for Research Inc., and the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, Emporia State University to train 25 reading coaches, with the amount not to exceed \$200,000.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs. Waugh moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon. that the State Board accepted the recommendations of the Evaluation Review Committee for "Continuing Accreditation" for Pittsburg State University through December 31, 2010, "Continuing Accreditation" for Sterling College and Wichita State University through December 31, 2009, "New Program Approved with Stipulation" for Bethany College and Washburn University through December 31, 2008, and "New Program Approved with Stipulation" for Wichita State University through December 31, 2007.? The motion carried 9-0-1, with Dr. Wagon abstaining.

RECONSIDERATION OF TRANSFER OF TERRITORY

Dr. Wagon moved, with a second by Mrs. Rupe that the Board reconsider its action in May to approve the transfer of territory from USD 101, Erie-St. Paul to USD 505, Chetopa.? Speaking to the motion, Mrs. Rupe said she believed everyone on the Board wanted to do what they believed the local people wanted when the transfer of territory was approved in May, though she hadn?t believed it wasn?t a good idea at the time because of the distance between the transferred area and Chetopa.? It now appeared, she said, from information heard in the Open Forum on Tuesday, that there was not unanimous agreement in the transferred territory, contrary to testimony in May.? Dr. Wagon added that he wants to defer to local authorities in transfer matters and that the Board had now heard lots of criticism about its action.? He stated he thought the Board had acted in haste and that he would like to give the issue a little more consideration.? Mr. Willard stated the Board ran the risk of litigation if it changed direction at this time and that he was not comfortable with it.? Chairman Abrams noted that the application was submitted in May in good faith, the information that accompanied it was in order, and he did not want to reconsider the issue.? The motion failed on a vote of 3-6-1, with Mrs. Gamble, Mr. Bacon, Chairman Abrams, Mr. Willard, Mrs. Morris and Mrs. Martin voting ?no?, and Mrs. Van Meter abstaining.? Defending her abstention, Mrs. Van Meter said because all the districts involved were in her Board district, it wouldn?t be fair for her to put one?s interests over the others.

Page 10

MINUTES

June 15, 2005

RESOLUTION IN RESPONSE TO THE KANSAS SUPREME COURT SCHOOL FINANCE DECISION

Mr. Willard passed out a resolution he said he had been working on for some time.? Mr. Willard said his rationale for developing the resolution was his discomfort with the Board sitting on the sidelines during the debate in the legislature about what was suitable and what was not, adding he hoped the resolution would help to clarify things.? The resolution stated that the Kansas State Board of Education believes that

Kansas students are provided an opportunity for a suitable and an improving education; that the legislature should fund 100 percent of the reasonable costs of all mandated academic items that the Kansas State Board of Education uses in defining suitability and accrediting schools; and that local districts should be authorized to raise local taxes to fund extra-curricular activities and non-mandated co-curricular activities, if sufficient funds are not available under the BSAPP formula.? Mr. Willard pointed out that Kansas didn't have any schools that were not accredited because of performance, so it was difficult to say that proper education wasn't taking place.? He added though, that many would say it was occurring because districts were having to use their Limited Option Budgets (LOB) to accomplish performance goals and that should not be the case.? Mrs. Rupe was concerned that the resolution left the decision of what were "reasonable costs" to the legislature.? She stated she did not want to go on record narrowing the definition of what was suitable.? Mr. Willard said he felt it did not narrow the definition, only provided clarification. He also responded that Kansas was faced with a constitutional crisis, with the Kansas Supreme Court ordering what amounted to a tax increase, though it may have been averted by the new revenue estimates received the day before.? Mr. Willard said he didn't believe a narrow definition of suitable would be a part of the upcoming special legislative session and that by the 2006 session the legislature would have its cost study, which should answer a lot of questions.?

Dr. Wagon stated his reservations about the resolution, and disagreed with Mr. Willard's reading of the Supreme Court's action as a constitutional crisis.? He noted that Mr. Biles had spoken for the Board in its brief before the Court and made the Board's position very clear.? Dr. Wagon was concerned about the resolution being tied to school accreditation, particularly when 40 percent of Kansas students were less than proficient in reading and other academic areas.? In that regard, he said he felt that the resolution departed from the Board's own policies for school improvement.? He added that the Board had made previous budget decisions that reflected its belief that schools were under-funded.?? He also said he was opposed to authorizing local taxes to fund schools and against LOBs and other taxing options districts have available which tend to disequalize funding.? Mr. Willard said he didn't agree that the resolution was tied solely to accreditation, because it addressed the narrowing of the achievement gap and NAEP performance and ACT and SAT scores.? Mrs. Waugh asked for clarification about the use of LOBs.?

Mrs. Gamble pointed out that the new accreditation regulations had not yet gone into effect and that their impact on accreditation status of schools had not yet been felt.? She also felt she couldn't agree to the statement in the resolution that students were being provided with the opportunity for a suitable and improving education for several reason, including providing sufficient funding for additional learning time and professional development for teachers. ?Mrs. Gamble was also concerned about the section of the resolution that urged the legislature to fund 100 percent of the reasonable costs of all mandated items that the Board uses in defining suitability and accrediting schools, because instead of looking at student achievement and outcomes, it focused on inputs.? Mr. Willard responded that determining the cost of outcomes was undoable and not verifiable.? Mr. Bacon stated that he felt that the legislature had funded 100 percent of the costs to accredit schools under the Board's regulations and was concerned that the use of the word "should" in the section under discussion would imply that the legislature had not been providing suitable funding.? Mr. Willard said the intent was not to narrow what was suitable.? The need for

June 15, 2005

clarification and specificity about non-mandated activities was raised.? Mrs. Martin said she thought the resolution was a good way to give affirmation to the legislature for the work it had done during the last session.? She also added that she had spoken to several legislators about specifically funding teacher salaries.? Mrs. Waugh pointed out that it was Board practice to not vote on items without giving Board members time to consider them.? She told Mr. Willard, that since he had been working on the resolution for some time, it might have been helpful for Board members to have had some input prior to it being presented with it at the meeting.? Mrs. Waugh indicated she wouldn't vote for the resolution because of the procedural issue.? Mrs. Gamble said she objected to the resolution and felt more time was needed for the Board to understand its local and statewide ramifications.? Mrs. Van Meter moved, with a second by Mrs. Morris, that the State Board adopt the resolution with minor corrections.? The motion carried 6-4, with Mrs. Gamble, Mrs. Rupe, Dr. Wagnon, and Mrs. Waugh voting "no".? A copy of the resolution is attached to these minutes.

LETTER FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. Biles reported that he had received a copy of a letter that the Attorney General had sent to the Governor and members of the legislature regarding the Supreme Court decision and possible action he might take depending on the outcome of the upcoming legislative session.? Mr. Biles said he wanted to make the Board aware that depending on how events transpired in the legislature, the Board might have to make some sort of response prior to its regularly scheduled meeting in July and that a special meeting could be necessary.

APPROVAL OF BOARD TRAVEL

Mrs. Rupe raised the issue that Board members approve travel and can look at a request and have a good idea of what it will cost for mileage and per diem, but it never examines expenses related to out-of-state travel.? After discussion of the issue, Chairman Abrams suggested it would be good to have the Policy Committee look into it. ? Mrs. Rupe moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the Board travel requests be approved.? The motion carried 9-1, with Dr. Wagnon voting "no".

The Board took a break from 11:50 a.m. until 12:00 p.m.

POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Willard reviewed a minor change the Policy Committee was suggesting to Board Policy 1010, regarding the calling of special meetings by the Chair; elimination of a reference to board membership on the Breakfast Waiver Committee since Board members no longer participated on that committee; and minor changes in wording in the statutes for admission to the School for the Deaf and School for the Blind.? He indicated the changes would be brought back to the Board for action in July.

WHITE PAPER ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

As part of the Board's continued study of the issues related to the Core Principles of Redesign, the Board received the summary of a white paper on community involvement presented by Nan Harper and Deb Elder.

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:25 p.m.

The Board meeting resumed at 2:00 p.m. in the Wheat Room of Maner Conference Center, Capitol Plaza Hotel, 1717 SW Topeka Boulevard, Topeka, Kansas.

Dr. Wagnon was out of the room and returned at 4:03 p.m.? The open meeting resumed at 4:30 p.m. Dr.

suitability and accrediting schools.

Be it further resolved that local districts be authorized to raise local taxes to fund extra-curricular activities and non-mandated co-curricular activities, if sufficient funds are not available under the BSAPP formula.

This resolution approved by the Kansas State Board of Education this 15th day of June 2005.?

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES

June 16, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Abrams called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. in the Wheat Room of Maner Conference Center, Capitol Plaza Hotel, 1717 SW Topeka Boulevard, Topeka, Kansas.

ROLL CALL

All members were present:

Steve Abrams	Carol Rupe
John Bacon	Iris Van Meter
Sue Gamble	Bill Wagnon
Kathy Martin	Janet Waugh
Connie Morris	Ken Willard

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Willard moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the Board recess into Executive Session at 9:35a.m. for a period of two hours for the purpose of discussing personnel matters of non-elected personnel so the privacy, confidentiality and other rights of such personnel would not be violated, and that the open meeting of the Board resume 11:35 a.m.? The motion carried.? ?The open meeting resumed at 11:30 a.m.? Mrs. Martin moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the Executive Session be extended for 15 minutes and that the open meeting resume at 11:45 a.m.? The motion carried.? The open meeting resumed at 11:45 a.m.

The Board recessed for lunch from 11:45 a.m. until 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Willard moved, with a second by Mrs. Martin, that the Board recess into Executive Session at 12:30 p.m. for a period of four hours and 30 minutes for the purpose of discussing personnel matters of non-elected personnel so the privacy, confidentiality and other rights of such personnel would not be violated, and that the open meeting of the Board resume at 5:00 p.m.? The motion carried.?? The open meeting resumed at 5:00 p.m.?

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Abrams adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

??

Steve Abrams, Chairman?? Penny Plamann, Secretary

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

June 29, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Abrams called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. on Thursday, June 29, 2005, in the Board Room of the State Board of Education Building, 120 SE 10th Avenue in Topeka, Kansas.

ROLL CALL

Members present were:

- | | |
|---------------|----------------|
| Steve Abrams | Iris Van Meter |
| Sue Gamble | Bill Wagnon |
| Kathy Martin | Janet Waugh |
| Connie Morris | Ken Willard |
| Carol Rupe | |

Mr. Bacon arrived at 1:40 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR DISCUSSION OF COMMISSIONER CANDIDATES

Mr. Willard moved, with a second by Mrs. Rupe, that the Board recess into Executive Session at 1:37 p.m. for a period of 30 minutes for the purpose of discussing personnel matters of non-elected personnel so the privacy, confidentiality and other rights of such personnel would not be violated, and to protect attorney-client privilege, and that the open meeting of the Board resume 2:07 p.m.? The motion carried 9-0, with Mr. Bacon absent.?? The open meeting resumed at 2:07 p.m.? Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mrs. Waugh, that the Executive Session be extended for the purpose of discussing personnel matters of non-elected personnel so the privacy, confidentiality and other rights of such personnel would not be violated, and to protect attorney-client privilege for 15 minutes and that the open meeting resume at 2:22 p.m.? The motion carried.? The open meeting resumed at 2:22 p.m.? Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mrs. Waugh, that the Executive Session be extended for the purpose of discussing personnel matters of non-elected personnel so the privacy, confidentiality and other rights of such personnel would not be violated, and to protect attorney-client privilege for 15 minutes and that the open meeting resume at 2:37 p.m.? The motion carried.? The open meeting resumed at 2:37 p.m.?

APPROVAL OF BOARD TRAVEL

Mr. Wagon moved, with a second by Mrs. Rupe, that the supplemental Board travel for June be approved as

