

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES

November 8, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Abrams called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 8, 2005, in the Board Room of the State Board of Education Building, 120 SE 10th Avenue in Topeka, Kansas.

Members present were:

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Abrams indicated that Board members had copies of several changes to the agenda: modifications to item 9, the schedule for the joint meeting with the Legislative Educational Planning Committee; a modification to item 13 b., approval of the science education standards; and the addition of 12 i., continuation of a contract with Pure Eloquence, Inc. for communication services. Mrs. Gamble moved, with a second by Mrs. Waugh, that action on the science standards be postponed until the document reflected the final language. Mrs. Gamble explained that her motion was based on the fact that the science education standards would not be final until changes had been made to avoid copyright infringement. The motion failed 4-6, with Chairman Abrams, Mr. Bacon, Mrs. Martin, Mrs. Morris, Mrs. Van Meter, and Mr. Willard voting no. Dr. Wagnon asked to pull item 12 i. from the Consent Agenda. Mr. Willard moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the agenda be approved as amended. The motion carried 9-1, with Mrs. Waugh voting no.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mrs. Morris moved, with a second by Mrs. Van Meter, that the minutes of the October meeting be approved as submitted. The motion carried.

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Commissioner Corkins updated the Board on the transition team, indicating that members were well-versed in education policy, and while for the initial review, only northeast Kansans were involved to better facilitate their ability to come in and conduct the current phase of the review which is to include internal staff discussions, more would be added to the team from across the state to analyze the data gathered. Mr. Corkins also reported that in addition to his District 5 tour November 14th and 15th with Mrs. Morris, he would also be touring District 7 December 19th and 20th with Mr. Willard.

In the discussion that followed, Dr. Wagnon had several questions for Commissioner Corkins and asked him to expand on his sense of the status of the Board's goals and objectives and his plans for implementing them. He also asked for more information about an article written by Mr. Corkins that had appeared in the

Salina Journal, where he had indicated that there were some things the Board should be doing which were not being done.? Mr. Corkins explained that the article referred to views on empowerment and choice he had shared with the Board during the

Page 2

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

?interview process.? Dr. Wagon was interested in Mr. Corkins? plans to use recommendations from the Communications Audit that had been conducted last spring.? He also expressed concerns about the fiscal impact of the communications contract and other commitments made regarding transition team expenses, including the contract with Dr. Harden.

Mrs. Waugh commended Commissioner Corkins for visiting Board member districts, adding that she was extremely pleased to hear that he had met with groups in her districts. She stated she was disappointed that she had not been invited and shared her concerns about views that had been reported to her that had been expressed by Mr. Corkins at the meetings.? Mrs. Waugh was troubled that Mr. Corkins was speaking for the Board about issues on which the Board had not yet taken a position. Mrs. Waugh asked that Board members be extended the courtesy of being included in the Commissioner?s meetings with constituent groups in their Board districts, particularly when the Commissioner was meeting with groups in a district for the first time.? Mr. Corkins explained that the meetings had taken place on very short notice and apologized for not notifying her.? He added that he would never advocate for anything inconsistent with the Board?s goal to redesign the K-12 education system.

Mrs. Gamble stated she did not believe, because Mr. Corkins shared his views on issues during his interview for Commissioner which was in executive session, that it meant it was appropriate for him to talk about them before the Board had publicly discussed those issues and voted on them. ?Mrs. Gamble also stated her distress about the lack of student art work in the Board Room for the first time in five years.

Chairman Abrams asked that the agenda be adjusted to move on to the Open Forum.? He indicated that Gary Musselman had agreed to postpone his presentation of the Kansas High School Activities Association annual report until December.

CITIZENS? OPEN FORUM

Chairman Abrams opened the Citizens? Open Forum at 10:29 a.m. Those addressing the Board were: Representative Dick Kelsey, Goddard; Kathy Cook, representing Kansas Families United for Public Education, Shawnee; Missy Taylor, Roeland Park; John Richard Schrock, Emporia; Linda Holloway, Prairie Village; Leo Kerwin, Wellsville; Christy Levings, representing Kansas NEA, Osawatomie; Jack Krebs, representing the Kansas Science Education Standards? Writing Committee and Kansas Citizens for Science, Lawrence;? Anna Leitch, representing the Autism Society of Johnson County, Overland Park; Ron Johnson, Gardner; David Stevens, Leawood; Gayla Ward, Gardner; Sandra Lassiter, Topeka; Tina Richardson, Chiquita Coggs and Domingo Soto, representing Helping At-Risk Kids (HARK), Kansas City; Mark Tallman, representing the Kansas Association of School Boards, Topeka; Cynthia Akagi, representing the Kansas Health Standards Writing Committee; John Lilland Burch, Lawrence; Lisa Volland, Topeka; Shari Wilson, representing the Kansas Association for Conservation and Environmental Education, Kansas City; and Kirk Fast, Ozawkie.? Chairman Abrams declared the Open Forum closed at 11:37 a.m.

UPDATE ON BREAKING RANKS II

Eugene S. Haydock, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Secondary School Principals (KASSP), and Sally Lundblad, KASSP President and Principal at Louisburg High School, presented an update to the Board on "Breaking Ranks II: Strategies for Leading High School Reform." Mr. Haydock reported that since the statewide conference in April, regional training

Page 3

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

workshops had been held across the state and they were now working with 120 high schools. Dr. Lunblad and G.A. Buie, Principal of Anderson County Junior/Senior High School, reported on Breaking Ranks activities at their schools and the reception the reform efforts had received from their staff. Mr. Haydock reported that a statewide release of *Breaking Ranks in the Middle* is scheduled for March of 2006 and that KASSP is in the process of preparing to provide training to middle school teams in the Fall of 2006. In April of 2006, KASSP will host another statewide Breaking Ranks II conference. Mr. Haydock circulated to Board members the executive summary of *Advancing High School Reform in the States: Policies and Programs*, published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) which summarized policies that states could enact to support NASSP's federal recommendations for building the capacity of high schools.

The Board took a short break at 11:45 to set up the room for the meeting with the Legislative Educational Planning Committee (LEPC). The meeting reconvened at 11:55.

LUNCHEON MEETING WITH LEPC

The State Board hosted a luncheon meeting with the Legislative Educational Planning Committee to discuss issues of mutual concern. LEPC members present were Senators Schodorf, Teichman, Francisco, Pine, Taddiken and Vratil, and Representatives Decker, Faber, Horst, Huebert, Phelps and Pottorff. Several staff from KSDE, the Legislative Research Department and the Revisor of Statutes Office were also present. The first presentation by Dr. Diane DeBacker, KSDE Director of School Improvement and Accreditation, was on how the Department of Education was implementing the financial literacy education program mandated by the Legislature.

After comments by Board Attorney Dan Biles, LEPC Chair Jean Schodorf, and Commissioner Corkins regarding consideration of possible remedies in the school finance litigation, members of the Board and LEPC divided into four groups to discuss the issues and other issues of mutual concern. Major topics and recommendations reported from the groups when they came back together included:

Group One:

- ? Policy makers need to make the Kansas Supreme Court more aware of educational successes.
- ? Efforts must be made to overcome resistance to change in the educational community.
- ? Opting out of NCLB should be studied.
- ? The practice of publicly funded entities lobbying the legislature should be studied.
- ? The charter school law should be liberalized to give the State Board a more active role in creating charter schools.
- ? Consideration should be given to scholarships for special education and at-risk students.

Group Two:

- ? More extended learning opportunities should be available to those students who need them
- ? Professional development for teachers and administrators should be a priority.
- ? Early childhood programs should be encouraged.
- ? Involving volunteers in schools should be encouraged.
- ? More professional development and strategies to retain good teachers at the high school level is needed.
- ? School choice options should be available for at-risk students.

Page 4

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

- ? Funding should follow the child and consideration should be given to a second enrollment count date.
- ? Attention should be paid to what the Supreme Court said in its decision, including the identification and use of actual cost data and comparisons of budgets among districts.

Group Three:

- ? Extended learning opportunities, including extended day and summer school, need to be expanded, and smaller classes should be encouraged for students who need them.
- ? Classroom support for ESL students should be provided.
- ? A student growth model should be used to determine improvement.
- ? Leadership must come from administrators.
- ? Standards and achievement levels should be clearly defined.
- ? There should be less rigidity in schools.
- ? All students should have personalized learning plans, beginning with the students who need it most and extra support should be provided to them.

Group Four:

- ? Additional funding should be provided to help high schools which need to institute reforms or are not making annual yearly progress goals.? Reforms and improvements need to be accelerated at the high school level, perhaps through a legislative grant program.
- ? Best practices should be shared with schools, particularly those in need of improvement.
- ? Attention should be paid to recruitment of teachers issues.
- ? The importance of administrators as instructional leaders should be stressed.

Brief discussion followed regarding some of the recommendations that had come from the small groups.? In response to a request from Senator Vratil, Chairman Abrams reviewed some of the issues the State Board would be considering the next day for inclusion in the Board?s recommendations for the 2006 legislative session.? Senator Vratil indicated that LEPC would be interested in knowing what the Board adopts as it 2006 legislative proposals.? The joint meeting concluded at 1:25 p.m. and the State Board took a short break until 1:35 p.m.

2004-2005 NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND?BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS

The Board heard presentations from representatives of five public and one private school which have been recognized As 2004-2005 No Child Left Behind?Blue Ribbon Schools.? Commenting on the factors they found most significant in raising student achievement in their schools were: Ms. Pam Klenda, Principal

Roosevelt Elementary School, USD 418, McPherson; Mr. J.K. Campbell, 2004-2005 Principal of IXL Elementary School, USD 470, Arkansas City; Mrs. Deb Gustafson, Principal of Ware Elementary School, USD 475 Geary County; Ms. Karen Norton of The Independent School (K-12), Wichita; Ms. Neadia Riley, 2004-2005 Principal of White Church Elementary School, USD 500, Kansas City; and Mr. Jamie Carlisle, Principal, Baxter Springs High School, USD 508, Baxter Springs.? At the conclusion of their presentations they answered questions from the Board.? Chairman Abrams presented each one with a certificate of recognition and stood for pictures the educators and Commissioner Corkins.??

Page 5

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

KANSAS MODEL CURRICULAR STANDARDS FOR FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES (FACS)

Deputy Commissioner Posny introduced Robin Harris, KSDE Education Consultant, responsible for working with the committee revising the FACS standards, Committee Chair Sharon Frankenberg, Fredonia High School, and Sub-Committee Chairs Connie Neiman, Olathe North High School, Jason Gray, Eudora and De Soto Technical Education, and Michelle McDaniel, Junction City Middle School.? Mrs. Frankenberg reviewed the process for revising the standards which had first been implemented in 1992 and were last revised in 2000.? She explained that the model Kansas FACS standards linked competencies in the four main program areas of? 1) Work and Family Studies, 2) Culinary Arts and Hospitality Management, 3) Education, Early Childhood Education and Human Services, and 4) Fashion, Textiles, and Interiors Production and Services,? to leadership, process, 21st Century and core academic skills.? The primary focus of FACS, she reported, is on building strong families and a productive workforce.? Competencies profiles used as accountability measures of what students should know and be able to do are included as part of the model standards Mrs. Frankenberg reported and, though not intended as a curriculum, are intended to assist educators and advisory committees in developing and planning local programs while integrating academic skill areas. Footnotes included with the profiles are used to identify the application of Kansas academic standards to program competencies.? In the discussion that followed Mrs. Frankenberg?s presentation, Dr. Wagnon noted that a reference in the program linkages to academic standards should be changed from social studies to history government.? Mrs. Rupe asked that the problem solving benchmarks be re-examined to include linkages to the financial literacy standards.? ?

CONSENT AGENDA

Dr. Wagnon had asked that item 12 i, continuation of a contract with Pure Eloquence, Inc. for communication services, be pulled from the Consent Agenda for further information.? He inquired about the Commissioner?s need for services outside the Department to assist with public communications and the status of the search for a permanent Director of Communications.? Mr. Corkins indicated there continued to be an immediate need for help in handling the large number of inquiries from the press.? He also reported that besides advertising for a permanent Director, he had also personally extended invitations to several potential applicants and that he hoped to make an appointment in the near future.? Mr. Willard moved, with a second by Mrs. Morris, that the consent agenda be approved as amended.? Mrs. Waugh asked to divide the vote, with 12 i. voted on separately. ?Mr. Willard declined the request and the motion carried 6-4, with Mrs. Gamble, Mrs. Rupe, Dr. Wagnon and Mrs. Waugh voting ?no?.

In the Consent Agenda, the State Board:

- ? Received the monthly personnel report.
- ? Approved school construction plans for USD 274, Oakley; USD 475, Geary County Schools; USD 230, Spring Hill Schools; a USD 448, Inman.
- ? Accepted the recommendations of the Licensure Review Committee and granted approval in cases 2229-2232, 2234-2235, and 2239-2242; denied requests in cases 2206-2207, 2209, and 2225-2226; and approved an initial PK-12 physical education license in case 2218, but denied a request for a PK-12 health license; and approved the addition of 5-8 English language endorsement in case 2227, but denied a request for a 5-8 mathematics endorsement.
- ? Received the first quarterly reports of FY 2006 from the Kansas State School for the Blind and the Kansas State School for the Deaf;

Page 6

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

- ? Received the first quarterly reports of FY 2006 from the Kansas State School for the Blind and the Kansas State School for the Deaf;
- ? Approved the Ed-Flex waiver requests from USD 248, Girard to continue its schoolwide program for Haderlein Elementary; and USD 512, Shawnee Mission to continue its schoolwide programs for Crestview Elementary and South Park Elementary.
- ? Approved the out-of-state application for the 2005-06 school year for Leah Porter, USD 505-Chetopa-St. Paul.

?

Contracts Authorized

The State Board of Education authorize the Commissioner of Education to:

- ? negotiate and enter into a contract with Roderic L. Elder to provide school construction plan review services in an amount not to exceed \$18,000;
- ? negotiate and enter into a contract with the University of Kansas Center for Research for the purpose of developing and evaluating structural equation models and other data analysis models needed for the school readiness study, with the contract amount not to exceed \$25,000; and
- ? negotiate and continue a contract with Pure Eloquence, Inc. in the amount of \$5,000 for communication services to run from November 18, 2005 to December 17, 2005.

KANSAS SCIENCE EDUCATION STANDARDS

Dr. Posny reviewed the results of the external review by McRel of Draft 2d of the Kansas Science Education Standards.? McRel rated the standards on eight criteria: applicability of the standards for all students;

appropriate for assessment; appropriate challenge based upon the grade level; clarity; guidance for teachers using the document; the high quality of the standards; measurability so that students might demonstrate mastery; and specificity.? A 1 to 4 rating scale was used, with 4 being exemplary in meeting the criterion being addressed, with minimal or no revisions recommended; and 1 indicating that significant revisions would be necessary to meet the criterion addressed.? McRel gave a 4 rating to applicability and appropriate challenge, and a 3 rating (the document generally meets the criterion addressed with a few revisions recommended) to appropriate for assessment, measurability and specificity.? Clarity, guidance and high quality received a 2 rating, indicating some revisions to the document would be necessary in order to meet the criterion being addressed.? Dr. Posny noted that the McRel comments regarding clarity indicated that some of the wording used was awkward or that grammatical corrections were needed. She reported that recommendations regarding the guidance rating dealt with benchmarks and indicators where the accompanying instructional examples introduced new content or were not clearly related to the indicator.? Dr. Posny explained that in determining the rating for high quality six to eight other standards documents were used for comparison.? She added that the Kansas document had some items that were specific to Kansas and might not appear in other standards, giving as an example an indicator for weather safety, which in a state such as Kansas, is important because of the high occurrence of tornados.?

Dr. Posny also explained the document that contained the KSDE response to the McRel review.? She noted that in the cases where staff had concurred with comments from McRel the changes were contained in the document provided to Board members and were highlighted in blue. Where staff did not agree with

Page 7

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

the McRel recommendation and no changes had been made, a statement of nonoccurrence was included, except for the material that had been recommended by the KSBE science subcommittee, which remained unchanged and was highlighted in yellow.? Mr. Willard commended Dr. Posny and the KSDE staff for the work.? Mrs. Gamble asked if the McRel review had included the section of the standards that contained the nature of science.? Dr. Posny indicated it had not.

Chairman Abrams handed out copies of a resolution, ?a copy of which is attached to these minutes, that ?he proposed for use in adopting the science standards.? Comments concerning the resolution included an objection from Mrs. Rupe regarding a statement it contained that indicated that ?expert witnesses supporting the majority draft ? were not willing to present testimony?..? She noted that they had chosen not to testify at the Board Science Sub-committee?s hearing because they felt the science standards as written stood on their own merit. Chairman Abrams indicated that many supporters of the majority report viewpoint, in addition to members of the science standards writing committee, had been invited to present testimony, but had declined to participate.? Mrs. Rupe stated that she believed all had declined because the science standards as proposed by the writing committee were all that was necessary to represent their position.? Mrs. Rupe also objected to a statement in the resolution that referred to consideration of public opinion polls in adopting the science standards.? Chairman Abrams indicated that providing the rationale for taking an action was the function of an elected body.? Dr. Wagon objected to being presented with a resolution for adoption without prior consideration and the opportunity to study it.? He added that if the resolution was the rationale for why the Board was taking action, it would have been more helpful to distribute it beforehand so that members could reflect on it and work together on more acceptable language.? Chairman Abrams indicated that he hadn?t

completed the resolution until just before the Board meeting, noting that regardless of the wording, he doubted that Dr. Wagnon would have voted to adopt it. Mrs. Waugh stated she didn't understand the need for a resolution when a motion to adopt the standards, as provided in the Board materials, was sufficient. Chairman Abrams explained he had prepared the resolution because, of the unusual amount of interest generated by the Board's activities regarding the science standards. Mrs. Waugh also mentioned her concern about the lack of response by the Board to those in the mainstream science community who had stated their work had been taken out of context. Chairman Abrams again mentioned the opportunity offered to testify at the sub-committee hearings. Mrs. Waugh mentioned a Colorado scientist who wrote to the Board after the hearings who had not known her work was being used.

Mrs. Gamble asked if there would be a discussion before the standards were voted on concerning the removal of copyright authority for material in the standards by National Academies of Science. Chairman Abrams indicated that had not been included on the agenda, but the standards would be reviewed by attorneys and changes would be made to avoid any copyright issues. Mrs. Gamble recalled that science standards had been passed in 1999 before similar changes were made and she felt the document had been made weaker than it was when it had been adopted. She added that she feared, based on reading a communication from the National Academies, that because of the extensive use of copyrighted material, the Board would end up with a document composed of only the Board Science Sub-committee's definition of science, which she felt by the use of the "logical arguments", instead of "natural explanations", allowed for supernatural explanations of natural phenomena, and the material that the six member majority had approved for inclusion in the sections for additional specificity and the teachers notes. Chairman Abrams stressed that nothing allowing supernatural explanations had been mentioned anywhere in the standards and that science was to discuss ideas, origins and explanations of natural phenomenon. He added he did not share Mrs. Gamble's concern about the copyright issues and he felt

Page 8

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

that changes would be relatively minor. Dr. Wagnon agreed with Mrs. Gamble about adopting a document that had portions yet to be written.

Mrs. Waugh mentioned that since the science writing committee members removed their names from the standards, national science organizations objected to their materials being used, and McRel in its external review didn't agree with what the Board was doing, perhaps the Board should stop and consider if it was doing the right thing. She added she felt that if the Board members in favor of the current standards were honest they would admit that their decision was faith-based. She cited several comments made publicly by some members of the Board that she felt supported that view. Stating that she personally believed in the Biblical version of creation, she added she did not believe it should be taught in the science classroom. She encouraged Board members in favor of the standards to be honest about the faith issues involved and require science teachers to take a comparative religion class so they would be able to intelligently lead the discussion of them. Chairman Abrams strongly emphasized that standards were not about faith, but about what is in peer-reviewed journals and articles. Mrs. Gamble questioned the credibility of the peer review Chairman Abrams referred to. She stated that there was much talk about issues regarding origins, but that the standards had been mute on origins until the additions from the Minority Report and the Board Science Sub-committee. Any confusion, she noted, arose from those additions, not the original standards. Mrs. Gamble

also expressed concern that the Minority Report had received no scientific scrutiny.

Mrs. Rupe, pointing out that Kansas students need to be prepared to compete around the world, predicted that it would be a sad day for education in Kansas if the current standards were passed. She added that she believed that all ten members of the Board want a good education for students in Kansas and that the majority in favor of the standards are strong believers, as were all members of the Board, but she indicated she felt if the changes to the writing committee's standards were about scientific inquiry and critical analyses they should be applied to other areas of science and theories other than origins. She noted that critical thinking was one of the first things taught in Kansas science classrooms because science teachers want their students to learn to think the way scientists think. She agreed with Mrs. Waugh that the withdrawal of support from mainstream science should make a difference in the Board's decision if it was truly based on science and not on faith. She shared with Board members several books and documents which she felt illustrated that there did not have to be a conflict between understanding science and one's faith. She included a letter from the science department in the Maize district to parents explaining its reasoning about the separation of science and belief in the biology classroom. She added that a student's faith is not destroyed by learning good science, just as questioning evolution will not make students faithful who aren't already religious.

Chairman Abrams stated that with passage of the standards it would be a great day for education in Kansas. He added that he felt it was one of the best things that the Board could do because it would raise the quality and teach more about science. Mr. Bacon agreed, stating that passage of the standards would help eliminate scientific dogma. He also addressed questions that had been raised about the qualifications of those testifying in the hearings, noting that Dr. Harris who had served on the science writing committee as well as presenting testimony at the hearings, had 91 papers in peer-reviewed journals, as well as authoring or co-authoring many other scientific documents. Mr. Bacon urged people to visit the KSDE website and get the facts about the hearings and the individuals who had made presentations.

Mrs. Waugh expressed concern about the negative attention being drawn to Kansas. Mr. Willard noted that he had just returned from a national meeting and had been encouraged to continue in the Board's efforts with the science standards. He indicated that he was puzzled by those who were opposed to

Page 9

MINUTES

November 8, 2005

allowing peer-reviewed ideas critical of evolution into the science classroom. Mr. Willard said there appeared to be a concerted effort to direct attention away from the real issue by turning the science standard debate into an issue about faith, noting that religious faith was found nowhere in the standards. He added that it was important to talk about the real issue of introducing peer-reviewed science in the classroom, not the introduction of creationism. He suggested that the only faith being challenged was that in evolution. Mr. Willard stated that he was pleased to be on the front edge of trying to bring some intellectual and academic integrity and honesty into the classroom rather than requiring students to check their questions at the door and not address them because they challenged the sanctity of evolution. Mr. Willard indicated he felt that Chairman Abrams' resolution made some very good points about the reasons for adopting the science standards, but he felt the need to address the concerns about the life science standard which had been raised by Dr. John Richard Schrock during the Open Forum. He added that he would like to propose in any motion to pass the resolution that the issue be studied for future insertion into the standards. Chairman

Abrams agreed.

Mrs. Martin stated that she liked Chairman Abrams' resolution because it provided good reasons why the science standards were being adopted ? the reasons why it was important that Kansas science be the best.? She added that she believed the standards would give critical thinking time to all students in all subjects, not just those that it is assumed are always discussed in science class, but some that have not ever been allowed because they went against some tenet of evolution.? She noted that the Kansas science standards were not against evolution and that micro-evolution was important and used every day in Kansas.? She stated she felt the problem arose when micro-evolution was extrapolated and made to pertain to origins theory or macro-evolution, adding that? she felt that students should not be exposed to it without the opportunity to respond or question.? Mrs. Martin said she felt that the standards being considered say to teachers and students that they can look at and analyze all research and scientific data without it mattering that the explanation might not give a naturalistic, materialistic outcome or viewpoint that only certain people in science adhere to.? She said she felt the Board was being very brave and was going to do a great job for students in Kansas by letting them consider and discuss all areas of science.?

Mrs. Gamble argued that mainstream science does not break down evolution into micro- or macro-evolution and there is no controversy about evolution itself, only with details about how it works. ?She maintained that the standards were not honest and that Intelligent Design concepts had been inserted into them without attribution.?

Mrs. Morris directed the Board members' attention to the Grades 8-12 Life Science Standard, Benchmark 3: ?The student will understand the major concepts of the theory of evolution.?? She read several of the indicators, which illustrated that it was not the Board's intent to exclude or devalue evolution in the science standards, as well as clarifying that there were no religious references in the standards.

Mrs. Morris moved, with a second by Mrs. Martin, that the Board adopt the resolution presented by Dr. Abrams to approve the Kansas Science Education Standards as reflected in Draft 3 with the provision that the document will be reviewed by the Board's attorneys for copyright approval.? Mr. Willard moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the motion be amended to include the addition of a Grades 8-12 Life Science Standard as proposed by Dr. John Richard Schrock. The vote on the amendment carried 6-4, with Mrs. Gamble, Mrs. Rupe, Dr. Wagon and Mrs. Waugh voting ?no?..?? Mrs. Waugh raised the concern mentioned earlier about the Board adopting the standards without first seeing a final document reflecting what could be significant changes due to the copyright issue.? Chairman Abrams stated he understood the the changes would be minor. The motion to adopt the resolution carried 6-4, with Mrs. Gamble, Mrs. Rupe, Dr. Wagon and Mrs. Waugh voting ?no?..?

Page 10
MINUTES
November 8, 2005

The Board took a break from 3:40 until 3:55 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Bacon moved, with second by Mr. Willard, that the Kansas State Board of Education recess into Executive Session for a period of thirty minutes for the purpose of discussing personnel matters of nonelected

consistent with the obligation of the state to provide education that is secular, neutral and non-ideological;

Whereas, the Board has considered a variety of written objections to the Changes, the expert testimony regarding those objections, and the written replies of the Authors of the Minority report;

Whereas, the Board has found merit in some of those objections, which have been incorporated in the July 12 draft, but have not found other objections to the Changes scientifically or pedagogically persuasive;

Whereas, polls sponsored by news organizations within Kansas indicate that the patrons of public education favor a scientifically objective approach to origins that will expose students to the scientific controversies about Origins;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, with the caveat that the document must be reviewed by our attorneys for copyright approval, that Draft 3 of the Kansas Science Education Standards presented to this Board is hereby approved and adopted as the Kansas Science Education Standards, November 8th, 2005, for use throughout the state.

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES

November 9, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Abrams called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 9, 2005, in the Board Room of the State Board of Education Building, 120 SE 10th Avenue in Topeka, Kansas.

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mrs. Martin, that the agenda be approved as presented. The motion carried.

BOARD REPORTS

Chairman

Chairman Abrams handed out copies of an invitation to the 85th National Council for the Social Studies

Annual Conference to be held in Kansas City, Missouri, November 17-20.

Legislative Coordinator

Mr. Willard reviewed issues that had been discussed in recent meetings of the Legislative Educational Planning Committee and the 2010 Commission.

Board Attorney

Mr. Biles reported that he had testified before the 2010 Commission about the State Board's self-executing powers. He also handed out copies of a presentation on school finance that he had made at the NASBE annual meeting. Mr. Biles updated the Board on a session at the NASBE meeting he had attended on NCLB. Mrs. Morris asked Mr. Biles for more information on a Florida data collection ?return on investment? model that he mentioned in his update. Mr. Biles also reported on his activity related to personnel issues at the special schools. Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the Board accept Mr. Biles' report and pay his fees for services and expenses for October as presented. ??The motion carried.

Report on the NASBE Annual Meeting

Mr. Bacon, having recently attended the NASBE annual meeting as the Board's voting delegate, provided an update on action taken on a by-law change and policy positions at the meeting. Mr. Willard, who also attended the meeting, reported on a presentation by the founder of the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP). He suggested that it might be a good model for a new Kansas charter school.

Page 2

MINUTES

November 9, 2005

Other Board Member Reports

Mrs. Martin passed around a copy of a book, *The Bible and Its Influence*, which had been written for use in the public school classroom. She also reported that in visits to schools in her district the concern had been raised about next year's assessment results not being available to schools until October or December. Dr. Posny reported that she had met with Dr. Poggio of the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation about trying to get preliminary results to schools in June. She mentioned that the Wichita school district would be a problem. Dr. Posny added that she would present more information to the Board about the subject in her December assessment update. Among other meetings Mrs. Martin mentioned she had attended, were a USA meeting in Manhattan and a Foundations of Education Conference in Topeka. She noted that each presented different viewpoints on financing education.

Mr. Willard asked about resistance that staff might be encountering regarding the KIDS database. Dr. Posny indicated that the process would be most intensive for districts in this, its first year, because of the need to enter information on all students, whereas next year just new students will have to be added to the system. She reported that it would prove to be beneficial to districts in the long run because prior to implementation of the system the same data might have to be submitted for a student multiple times, depending on different programs that required the reporting of student information.

Requests for Future Agenda Items

Mrs. Morris asked for a presentation on the new QPA regulations, including the 11 quality criteria.? She was interested in knowing when Kansas Board of Regents requirements had an impact on a school?s status.? In response to comments in the Open Forum, Mrs. Rupe asked for an update on special education funding and IEPs for children with autism.? Dr. Wagnon asked for a discussion on using a student growth model instead of AYP.? Chairman Abrams reported that it had already been scheduled for an upcoming meeting.

LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

Deputy Commissioner Dennis briefly reported on the results of November 3rd meeting of the Consensus Estimating Group. ?Revised estimates for FY 2006, he reported, increased by \$221 million, 4.5% above previous estimates.? He handed out a copy of the State General Fund memo from the Legislative Research Department, which also contained estimates for FY 2007.

Discussion of 2006 Legislative Proposals

Several items had been sent to Board members prior to the meeting.? Commissioner Corkins reviewed an overview by the National Governors Association on choice options in education.? He also reviewed information from various studies, concluding that choice programs have the potential to improve the quality of public schools in many ways and address several education goals.? Also included in the materials provided for the Board?s review were two bills introduced in recent sessions of the? Kansas Legislature, SB 169 (2005), Special Needs Scholarship for Special Needs Students, and HB 2906 (2004), Opportunity Scholarship Program for At-Risk Students.? Summaries of the legislation, including the estimated cost for creating the programs were also included and Commissioner Corkins reviewed them.? Deputy Commissioner Posny had provided information on charters schools in the Board?s materials and gave a PowerPoint presentation on charter schools.? Also included in the Board?s materials was information on a Texas incentive program for early high school graduation.

Page 3

MINUTES

November 9, 2005

Mrs. Gamble was concerned that the Board was departing from its normal practice of first identifying specific problems and then studying various options as it worked to develop policies to address them.? She stated that she didn?t feel that Kansas had the types of problems that would require providing school vouchers or other choice options that were not already in place.? Commissioner Corkins responded that increasing achievement by broadening the choices for students was the goal being addressed.? Mrs. Gamble was concerned that the Board had not even finished addressing best practices.? Chairman Abrams stated that the Board could do both, provide more choice and continue to work on identifying and disseminating best practices.? Mrs. Morris agreed, and stated that offering more choice was representative of a best practice in closing the achievement gap.? Mr. Willard spoke about the large amount of money being pumped into public education to address achievement problems, and noted that it seemed reasonable to consider providing \$3400 to a student to attend a private school to help the student?s performance increase as provided in the one of the legislative bills.

Dr. Wagnon stated he didn?t have a problem with addressing the issues that had been brought to the Board for consideration because each would provide some flexibility to the system and shared the Board?s goal of improving the system.? He added it was also important to be ever vigilant and make the best use of public

funds.? He was concerned, however, about statements the Commissioner had made to the press that appeared to characterize public education in Kansas as a failed system requiring heroic measures to save it.? He suggested that the solution to closing the gap and redesigning schools lay in community building and collaboration where information and strategies are shared.? He suggested that the Board consider the impact on high schools from implementing the reforms from Breaking Ranks, and the First Things First program in the Kansas City schools.? Dr. Wagnon urged the Board to look at schools that are performing well and have initiated successful strategies and building on those before initiating strategies he felt have spun out of failed schools. Mrs. Gamble pointed out, also, that the new QPA regulations had just gone into effect in July and it would be some time before the Board learned the impact of them on schools.

Chairman Abrams agreed that Kansas does not have failing schools, but added that competition can drive innovation and success.? He mentioned the information that had been presented at the Open Forum about students in the Kansas City area whose needs are not being addressed by the system and suggested that it was important to try to reach every student and give them every opportunity to be successful.? Mr. Bacon agreed with the need to create opportunities and noted that if the Board had the data, there would probably be schools the Board should fail.? He indicated that some districts are very resistant to choice, noting a situation in Blue Valley where parents are upset by material on a reading list which they felt was inappropriate.? He noted that if a choice option existed, those parents might pursue it.? Mr. Bacon added that he was not convinced about all the choice options the Board was considering, but felt that the Board should take the time to learn more about them.?

The discussion included the issue raised by the parents of autistic children who had spoken in Open Forum and the costs associated with providing them funding to attend a private school.? Commissioner Corkins answered questions about specific elements in the scholarship bills such as transportation; who would pay the balance of the tuition for students from very low-income families; whether private schools would have to accept all students that apply; and whether private schools accepting scholarship students would have to be accredited.? Also discussed were district open enrollment policies and the some of the limits that were imposed at the local level.? Several questions were raised about the proposal for incentives for early high school graduation.? Noting that the initiative presented came from Texas, Mrs. Waugh asked that in the future when reform initiatives are discussed that information be included on the top ten states in academic performance.

Page 4

MINUTES

November 9, 2005

Mrs. Morris indicated she would like to have a legislative proposal for the Board to consider at the December meeting and suggested that the Board work during the afternoon on developing it.

The Board took a break from 11:25 to 11:33 a.m.? When it reconvened, Mrs. Morris, Mrs. Martin and Dr. Wagnon were absent.? Mrs. Morris and Mrs. Martin arrived shortly after the break, but Dr. Wagnon had left for the day.

The Board also discussed proposed changes to campaign finance limits for Board members and agreed that they would seek a change in the law that would allow them to receive the same amount per election as Senate candidates, \$1,000.? They also agreed that they would seek changes to the ethics laws governing the receipt

of gifts and meals and ask that they, as elected officials, be treated in the same manner as members of the legislature.? The issue of requesting modification to the ethics rules for Department employees was also discussed, but it was decided to see what changes the Ethics Commission might already be proposing.

In the discussion of charter school reform, Mrs. Morris shared with Board members and answered questions about her vision for a statewide entrepreneurial magnet school.

Dr. Abrams mentioned that another issue the Board should consider was program for leadership development.

STATE BOARD TRAVEL

Mrs. Waugh asked to add salary and mileage for a Tonganoxie legislative meeting on November 21st and a USD 500 Board meeting on November 22nd.? Mrs. Rupe asked that salary and mileage be added for her and Chairman Abrams for a Wichita Board meeting on November 14th.? Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mrs. Morris, that the state board travel requests be approved as amended.? The motion carried 9-0 with Dr. Wagnon absent.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Abrams adjourned the meeting at 12:17 p.m.

_____??

Steve Abrams, Chairman?? Penny Plamann,
Secretary