

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES**

May 1, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

A special meeting of the State Board of Education had been called by Chairman Abrams. Chairman Abrams opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room at the Kansas State Department of Education, 120 SE 10th St., in Topeka. The purpose of the special meeting was to meet in executive session with the State Board's attorney concerning litigation involving the State Board.

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 Mrs. Martin, that the Board recess into Executive Session, at 3:31 p.m. for a period of one hour for consultation with the Board attorney so that the attorney-client privilege could be preserved, and that the open meeting of the Board resume in the Board Room at 4:31 p.m.? The motion carried.? The open meeting resumed at 4:31 p.m.? Mrs. Morris moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that after a nine minute break, the Executive Session be extended for thirty minutes and that the open meeting resume in the Board Room at 5:10 p.m.? The motion carried.? The open meeting resumed at 5:10 p.m. Mrs. Rupe moved, with a second by Mr. Willard,? that the Executive Session be extended for fifteen minutes and that the open meeting resume in the Board Room at 5:25 p.m.? The motion carried.? The open meeting resumed at 5:25 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Van Meter moved, with a second by Mrs. Morris, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried. Chairman Abrams adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.?

_____ ???

Steve Abrams, Chairman?? Penny Plamann, Secretary

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES**

April 12, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Abrams called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 12, 2005, in the Justice Theatre of Shears Technology Center at Hutchinson Community College, 1300 North Plum Hutchinson, 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 was unable to attend the meeting.

The Board stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.? Chairman Abrams

Chairman Abrams introduced Dr. Edward Berger, President of Hutchinson Community College and expressed the Boards thanks for being allowed to hold its meeting at the school.? Dr. Berger made brief welcoming remarks and spoke about the importance of educational partnerships between higher education and other postsecondary institutions.? He also introduced members of the Community College staff who were present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Abrams noted that Board members had received corrected copies of the list of recommended 2004 Enhancing Education Through Technology Competitive grantees.? He also noted that an additional item should be added to the consent agenda, acceptance of a voluntary surrender of a teacher?s license as item? 14 l.? Chairman Abrams reported that the white papers schedule for the Wednesday agenda would be postponed until May.? Dr. Wagnon asked that item 14 f., approval of local inservice plans, be pulled from the consent agenda.? There being no further changes, Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mrs. Rupe, that the agenda be approved as amended.? The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chairman Abrams asked if there were any changes or amendments to the March minutes.? Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mrs. Morris, that the minutes be approved as submitted.? The motion carried.

COMMISSIONER?S REPORT

Commissioner Tompkins asked Kathy Toelkes, Director of Communications and Recognitions Programs, to distribute pamphlets outlining the Board?s goals and objectives.? He indicated that Board members might like to

use them when making presentations or meeting with constituents.

Page 2

MINUTES

April 12, 2005

Commissioner Tompkins also reported on a meeting with Margaret Spelling, the new U.S. Secretary of Education. He pointed out that the model used by Kansas to assess special education students was being used by the U.S. Department of Education as a modification of one of the assessment requirements of NCLB. It would raise the number of special education students a state could identify for alternate assessments from 1% to 3%. He also discussed other modifications which would allow more flexibility for states, noting that more information about them would be available in the next few months.

Dr. Tompkins asked for the Board member input on the dates he had suggested for two study sessions and which topics they would like for each session. Board members agreed to the dates proposed, Friday, June 24 and Friday, September 23, beginning at 10:00 a.m. and ending by 4:00 p.m. each day. It was also agreed that the sessions would be held in Topeka. Board members asked that the list of topics and priorities assigned to each at the retreat in February be reviewed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman who would determine what topics to include in each study session. Mrs. Morris noted that her request for a study session on faith-based initiatives had been left off the list. The Board also indicated it would be helpful for staff to provide them with information on the issues prior to the each study session. Mr. Willard suggested that presentations by interested stakeholders on what's working and what's not might be helpful in the Board's study of some of the topics.

PRESENTATION KANSAS GIFTED EDUCATION

Assistant Commissioner Posny provided the Board with an update on gifted education in Kansas in response to a Board request to address several issues raised at the March meeting by Kathy Jones, President of the Kansas Association of Gifted, Talented and Creative. Dr. Posny pointed out that the National Standards for Gifted Education have been embedded in the Kansas guidelines, *Effective Practices for Gifted Education in Kansas*. She also shared data on achievement and dropout rates of students identified as gifted, as well as information on Kansas caseloads for gifted teachers.

CITIZENS' OPEN FORUM

Chairman Abrams declared the Citizens' Open Forum open at 10:30 a.m. Those addressing the Board were: Janelle Lucas, representing USD 373 Vocational Education, Newton; Don Thomas, representing USD 308 Vocational Education, Hutchinson; Chad Issinghoff, Tim Crater, and James Ruhlmann, all from Hutchinson. Chairman Abrams declared the open forum closed at 10:51 a.m.

The Board took a break from 10:51 until 11:00 a.m.

PRESENTATION BY HOST DISTRICT, USD 308, HUTCHINSON

Chairman Abrams introduced Wynona Winn, Superintendent of the Hutchinson school district. Dr. Winn welcomed the Board and introduced a video about the district and the Hutchinson community which had been done by Hutchinson High School broadcast journalism students. Some of the issues covered in the video were the KOALATY Kids program being used in the elementary schools; the focused volunteer program that had been initiated to help students with reading; after school programs for struggling students; and the tremendous gains that have been made in high poverty schools in the district on the state reading and math assessments. Dr. Winn also discussed the district's determination to achieve the national Malcomb Baldrige Award for performance

excellence.? She indicated that the district was moving forward in addressing the Baldrige criteria in the district and is now part of the North Central pilot of the program.? At the conclusion of the video, Dr. Winn answered questions.? Mr. Willard complimented Dr. Winn, saying that what is demonstrated in the Hutchinson school district is the result of good leadership.

Page 3
MINUTES
April 12, 2005

Because the meeting was running ahead of schedule, it was decided to move ahead and address several items on the agenda for the afternoon.

APPROVAL OF MODEL DANCE STANDARDS

Dr. Posny asked that the Board act to approve the model dance standards which it had received in March.? Mrs. Morris moved, with a second by Mrs. Rupe, that the model curriculum standards for dance be approved as presented.? Mrs. Gamble asked if there was some way to incorporate into the title the emphasis on movement and the use of the standards to enhance other curricular areas.? Mrs. Martin moved, with a second by Mrs. Van Meter, that the motion be amended by the addition of a request that the writing committee modify the title to reflect the focus on creative movement contained in the standards.? The motion to amend carried.? The amended motion carried 9-0.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the State Board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of the Professional Practices Commission and approve the recommendations of the Commission in cases 05-FC-01, 05-FC-03, 05-O-04, 05-FC-05, 05-BR-06, 05-BR-07 and 05-BR-08.? The motion carried.

CONSENT AGENDA

Dr. Wagnon had asked for discussion of issues related to item 14 f., approval of local inservice plans.? He asked to what extent staff could give assurance that the staff development standards were being used in approval of inservice plans.? Dr. Posny reported that the standards which had been approved by the Board three years ago and the rubric developed from them is being used to approve professional development plans.? Dr. Wagnon asked for more information on professional development, including alignment of individual professional development plans with district improvement goals.? Having no further questions, Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the consent agenda be approved as presented. The motion carried.

In the consent agenda, the State Board:

- ? Received the monthly personnel report.
- ? Confirmed the appointments of Corey Iverson to the position of Senior Administrative Assistant in the Computer Information and Communications Services team, effective February 28, 2005 at an annual salary of \$21,445; Charlotte Bogner to the position of Staff Development Specialist II in the Planning and Research team, effective March 13, 2005 at an annual salary of \$43,472; Amanda Jeffrey to the position of Senior Administrative Assistant in the Office for Community Service, effective March 13, 2005 at an annual salary of \$21,445; Linda Geiger to the position of Education Program Consultant in the School Improvement and Accreditation team, effective March 13, 2005 at an annual salary of \$45,635.
- ? Approved school construction plans for Wichita USD 259 (2); Halstead USD 440; Mulvane USD 263; De

Soto USD 232 (2); Gardner-Edgerton USD 231; Shawnee Mission USD 512; Winfield USD 465; and Hugoton Public Schools USD 210.

? *Adaptive Special Education:* Carol Habluetzel, Blue Valley USD 229;? Aliesha Daniels, Manhattan-Ogden USD 383; Ryan Kellems, Atchison, USD 409; Conrad Marsh, Garden City USD 457; and Jill Springer, Butler County Special Education Cooperative USD 490; *Biology,? Chemistry and? Earth and Space Science:* Leland Francis, Brewster USD 314; *Early Childhood Special Education:* Vickie

Page 4

MINUTES

April 12, 2005

Hammons, Turner USD 202; *Functional Special Education:* Kimberly Eversmeyer, Derby USD 260; and Kinzie Gibson, Geary County USD 475; *Gifted:* Julie Riphahn, Topeka USD 501; *Interrelated Special Education:* James Janzen and William Ledford, McPherson USD 418; Patricia Ashley-Hiscock, Lawrence USD 497; Summer Ford, Ardeen Webster, Debra Berg, Jesse Drew, and Joy Dee Jacquart, High Plains Educational Cooperative D0 611; and Gera Cochren,? Doniphan County Educational Cooperative D0 616; and *Library Media Specialist:* Catherine Wilcox, Arkansas City USD 470; and Lori Mansell, Liberal USD 480.?? Request from Stephanie Goodwin, USD 105, Stacy Roop, USD 209, Lorrie Munsell, USD 214, Elizabeth Duggins and Duff Watson, USD 273, Angela Stanfield, USD 383, Mike Hulse, USD 400, Emily Gibson, USD 418, Summer Younie, USD 438, Jennifer Windholz, USD 489, Jane Robson, USD 501, and Elizabeth Donahue, D0 618, were denied.

? Approved accredited status for USD 233 Sunnyside Elementary School and Chisholm Trail Junior High; USD 312 Partridge Elementary; USD 440 Halstead Middle School; USD 453 Howard Wilson Elementary School; USD 475 Washington Elementary School and Lincoln Elementary School; USD 498 Valley Heights Elementary and Valley Heights Jr/Sr High; and USD 512 Sunflower Elementary School.

? Approved the inservice plans from USD 214 Ulysses; USD 314 Brewster; USD 443 Dodge City and the Kansas School for the Deaf.

? Issued an FY 2005 license to Stop-N-Go Driving School, Wellsville, from March 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005.

? Approved charter school status for USD 383 Theodore Roosevelt Charter School and USD 349 Stafford Economic Development Center Charter School.

? Approved requests from USD 206, USD 261, USD 382, and USD 417 to hold elections on the question of issuing bonds in excess of the districts? general bond debt limitation.

? Approved the Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant Awards for the 2005-2006 school year - ***Student Technology Leadership Grants*** - USD 259 Wichita: Brooks Technology and Arts Magnet and Truesdell Middle School, \$40,000; and \$20,000 each for USD 255 South Barber: South Barber Middle School; USD 311 Pretty Prairie: Pretty Prairie Middle School; USD 351 Macksville: Macksville Elementary School; USD 382 Pratt: Liberty Middle School; USD 434 Santa Fe Trail: Scranton Attendance Center; USD 444 Little River: Little River Junior High; USD 484 Fredonia: Fredonia Middle School; and USD 506 Labette County School: Mound Valley Grade School. ***Technology Rich Classrooms Grants*** ? in the amount of \$150,000 each for USD 218 Elkhart: Elkhart Elementary School; USD 240 Twin Valley: Tescott Elementary School; USD

259 Wichita: Irving Elementary School; USD 309?Nickerson South Hutchinson: Nickerson Elementary and Stafford Elementary School, USD 349; USD? 373 Newton: State Creek Elementary School and Walton Elementary School; USD 413 Chanute: Hutton Elementary and St Patrick Catholic Elementary School; USD 452 Stanton County: Stanton County Elementary; USD 489 Hays Public Schools: Washington Elementary; USD 508 Baxter Springs: Central Elementary School; and 609-Southeast Kansas:? Education Service Center: Erie Elementary School, USD 101; ***Technology Rich Classrooms?Continuation Grants ?*** in the amount of \$40,000 for USD? 264 Clearwater: Clearwater Elementary West and Argonia Elementary, USD 359; USD? 314 Colby Public Schools: Colby Elementary and Golden Plains Elementary, USD 316; USD 361 Anthony? Harper: Anthony Elementary and Windom Elementary, USD 444; USD 373 Newton: Sunset Elementary and

Page 5

MINUTES

April 12, 2005

Northridge Elementary; USD 376? Sterling: Sterling Grade School and Pretty Prairie Middle School, USD 311; USD 406 Wathena: Wathena Elementary and Elwood Elementary, USD 486; USD 457 Garden City: Garfield Elementary and Charles O. Stones Intermediate Center; 609 Southeast Kansas Educational Service Center: Lincoln Elementary, USD 484, and Elk Valley Elementary, USD 283; 609 Southeast Kansas Educational Service Center: Garnett Elementary, USD 365, and Pleasanton Elementary, USD 344; and 626 Southwest Plains Regional Service Center: Scott City Lower Elementary, USD 466, and Hickok Elementary, USD 214.

? Accepted the surrender and revoked the teacher?s license issued to Mr. Brian L. Burris as a consequence of his conduct in Furnishing Alcoholic Liquor or Cereal Malt Beverage to a Minor.

Contracts Approved

Authorized the Commissioner of Education to continue a contract with Families Together, Inc. for coordination and operation of a family-school partnership training network, with the contract amount not to exceed \$58,000 for the 3 year period.

At 11:50 a.m. the Board recessed for lunch at Lincoln Elementary.? After lunch they visited the school library where students were available to demonstrate and explain some of the learning strategies being used at the school.? Board members were also invited to drop in on classrooms.? The Board meeting resumed at Hutchinson Community College at 1:30 p.m.

QUALIFYING SCORES ON CONTENT TESTS FOR LICENSURE

Dr. Martha Gage, Director of Teacher Education and Licensure asked for the State Board to approve the qualifying scores for the educator licensure assessments, pointing out that the Department will continue to look at the data from the assessments and request modifications as needed.? Asked about the status of an assessment for art, Dr. Gage reported that it had not been validated the first time and that the Educational Testing Services will come to Kansas in June to work with a different mix of art educators to validate it.? Mrs. Gamble moved, with a second by Mrs. Martin that the State Board accept the Praxis II qualifying scores for licensure testing as recommended by the Professional Standards Board.? The motion carried.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL INTEGRATION

Dr. Posny reported that KSDE staff has checked with other states regarding statewide initiatives on vocational and technical integration. In a PowerPoint presentation she reviewed what had been learned from the eight states that had responded. Common to all the programs are that they: align the academic curriculum to curricular standards;

align the technical curriculum to high quality industry standards; integrate some academic and technical content and teach it in context; have their academic curriculum (e.g., math and science) taught by academic teachers and their technical curriculum taught by technical education teachers; provide greater depth in vocational curriculum than generally found in comprehensive high schools; emphasize employability skills; have state-of-the-art equipment and facilities; provide professional development; link schools, vocational training, higher education and business and industry; use regional technical centers; partner with business and industry; have multiple feeder schools; are based in large population cities; enroll students in grades 10-12 or 9-12 and involve special needs students.? Dr. Posny provided details about three of the programs. The Tennessee High School and University Construction Industry Partnership could lead to multiple career opportunities upon graduation from high school or could lead to a construction management program at the university level.? Also discussed were the Career Center in St. Louis, the first charter construction high school in the country which opened in 2001; and the Oklahoma Design and Construction Academy which will open in the 2005-2006 school year.? Dr. Posny

Page 6

MINUTES

April 12, 2005

reported that there were six pre-engineering programs in Kansas ? four that are part of Project Lead the Way in Winfield, Arkansas City and two in Wichita; and two locally designed programs, one in Shawnee Mission and one in Olathe.?? Dr. Posny said that if the State Board wanted to provide an incentive for a few districts to pursue an integrated approach, staff suggested that they: identify two or three high schools; limit the program to seniors; provide some incentive funds; use KSDE staff to work with each school; ensure administration and faculty are invested; have each district summarize the outcomes achieved; and review the experience of the pilot projects as a basis for making future policy decisions.

Elements of several existing programs in Kansas were discussed, as were several issues which were viewed as obstacles to implementing a statewide program. It was pointed out that there was probably the need to develop multiple models because of different needs across the state.? The importance of defining the essential academic standards and skills necessary to graduate was mentioned and Dr. Posny reported on her work with the new Transition Council and said that defining the standards should be one of the first issues it addresses. Developing programs which provide for team collaboration between technical instructors and core curriculum instructors was suggested as a way to ensure that the technical curriculum is 1) aligned with state and district academic standards; and 2) is reinforced in the academic classes. Problems associated with developing programs in rural areas were discussed, including getting enough teachers who meet the ?highly qualified? criteria of NCLB for rural programs.? Partnering with area districts was one of the solutions suggested for rural areas.? Dr. Tompkins indicated he would summarize and review what the Board had indicated it wants to see in an integrative vocational program and develop a framework to solicit interest for pilot programs in four or five high schools.? He reported that planning grants in the amount of \$10,000 to \$12,000 could be made from Carl D. Perkins funds for statewide initiatives.

The Board took a break from 2:40 to 2:47 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

Review of Education Legislation

Deputy Commissioner Dennis handed out a summary and reviewed the status of 2005 education legislation. He also handed out and reviewed information on the Conference Committee report on school finance legislation contained in HB 2247.? The proposal would give a \$145.2 million in additional state funding for schools. Mr.

Dennis reported that the Conference Committee has agreed to eliminate correlation weighting, lower low enrollment weighting, and raise the base state aid per pupil (BSAPP) to \$4,107.? That change would result in no changes in expenditures for school districts, but the legislature did add \$115 to BSAPP, bringing the total to \$4,222.? The also agreed to increase at-risk weighting from .10 to .145; increase bilingual education weighting from .20 to .395; and increase special education funding to 85% of excess cost in 2005-06, 88% in 2006-07, and 91% in 2007-08.? They also agreed to a reduction in the federal impact aid deduction in computing local effort from 75% to 70%.? Among the other provisions in the Conference Committee report, local boards would be authorized to increase their local option budget from 25% to 27 % in 2005-06 and would not be subject to protest petition, and 29% in 2006-07, and 30% in 2007-08, subject to a resolution and protest petition.? The increases above 25% would not be eligible for state aid. Other provisions also agreed to included: a Skills for Success grant program that would provide funding for reading and mathematics for grades K-3; the criteria that an out-of-state student must meet to be enrolled; a provision that would require all foreign exchange students enrolled in a school district on September 20th to be enrolled and attending at least one semester in order to be counted in the school district?s enrollment; an extraordinary declining enrollment weighting, which is defined as a school district that has declined during the preceding three school years at an average rate of at least 15% or by at least 150 pupils and has adopted

Page 7

MINUTES

April 12, 2005

the 27% local option budget for 2005-06, 29% for 2006-07, and 30% for 2007-08;? a new cost of living weighting for the purpose of enhancing salaries for any school district that has an average cost of housing that exceeds 125% of the statewide average and has a 27% local option budget in 2005-06, a 29% LOB in 2006-07, and a 30% LOB in 2007-08;? increased state aid beginning in 2007-08 based upon the consumer price index, applicable through 2009-2010; and computation of state aid for bond and interest and local option budgets based upon the assessed valuation per pupil excluding valuation that is a part of any new tax increment financing projects.? The Conference Committee report also included a provision that would require a school district that had a declining enrollment for the three preceding school years at an average rate of at least 5% or at least 50 pupils per year to secure permission from the State Joint Building Committee before issuing bonds, constructing a building, and receiving bond and interest state aid. The State Joint Building Committee would make recommendations to the State Board of Education who would make the final decision.

?

Additional provisions in the report included the creation of a 2010 Committee to study school finance, with the Legislative Division of Post Audit directed to conduct a professional cost study analysis and add a school district audit team to conduct annual performance audits of selected school districts.? Carryover balances in vocational education, bilingual, and at-risk funds would be allowed; at-risk fund for all programs included in the school district at-risk plan and a capital outlay would be created. Capital outlay mill levy was limited to eight mills.? It would also provide that every accredited school in Kansas would teach the subjects and areas of instruction mandated in statute as of January 1, 2005 and the bill would specify that every high school must teach the subjects necessary to meet the State Board of Education?s graduation requirements and would outline the goals for areas of instruction.

Mr. Dennis also reviewed other funding recommendations, including an increase for the four-year-old at-risk program; an increase for Parents as Teachers; resumption of funding for the Mentor Teacher Program; funding to train scorers and score performance assessments for new teachers; an increase in the employer

Chairman Abrams reported that he had asked Board of Regents Chair Dick Bond and Co-Chair Bill Docking to meet with Dr. Wagon and himself, but they had declined.

Commissioner Tompkins asked for approval of the Action Plan for the Board's 2005-2006 Goals and Objectives. Mrs. Martin moved, with a second by Dr. Wagon, that the Action Plan be approved. The motion carried.

Chairman Abrams asked Personnel Director Lanny Gaston to give an update on the recruitment process for a new commissioner. Board members were given several items that the Policy Committee had Mr. Gaston prepare, including a list of screening committee members appointed to date; a candidate rating scale to be used by the screening committee; a suggested process for the Board to use in screening semi-finalists and finalists; a suggested interview process; suggested questions for the Board to use when conducting the interviews; and a suggested reference check process. Mr. Gaston reported on activity to date and answered questions. It was clarified that even though the screening committee was meeting on May 9th, applications received after that date could be considered by the Board. Mr. Willard, Policy Committee Chairman, also answered questions and elaborated on the process. Mrs. Morris noted that her questions that had been e-mailed to Mr. Gaston were not included with the interview questions. Mr. Gaston indicated that the list would be updated, as would the screening committee list when all nominations had been received. A discussion followed about making the applications available to screening committee members prior to their meeting. It was the consensus of the Board that in order to maintain the confidentiality of the applicants, that the committee would receive the applications the day of their meeting and work through them that day.

Page 2

MINUTES

April 13, 2005

Chairman Abrams was asked to clarify several things regarding the Board subcommittee's science hearings. Concern was expressed about the number of individuals that might be making presentations for the minority view. Mrs. Gamble indicated she thought there had been consensus to have seven to ten people to represent each side and asked if that was still the plan of the subcommittee. Dr. Abrams reported that the subcommittee had not yet reached a decision, but would be considering it at its next meeting. Mrs. Rupe said that given the fiscal note, she hoped that the subcommittee would try to limit the number of presenters. Mrs. Gamble said it appeared that the authority for the hearings had been delegated to Mr. Calvert and that he was in control of the process. She asked what role he was playing. Chairman Abrams responded that Mr. Calvert had been given the task of arranging witnesses for the minority side, but was not in control of the process. Mrs. Gamble asked to whom she should direct her concerns if she felt that Mr. Calvert had taken over control. Chairman Abrams said that as Chairman, those concerns should be shared with him. Dr. Wagon asked that the subcommittee on the science hearings keep Board members informed as plans for the hearing progress. Mrs. Waugh asked if there would be a limit on the budget for the hearings and Dr. Abram indicated that the budget would be fixed though an amount had not yet been established. He assured Board members that the Board would not be paying for foreign travel for any of the presenters. Mrs. Gamble asked, noting that the subcommittee had decided to structure the presentations for the hearings around a statement by Senator Santorum on the No Child Left Behind Act, if the subcommittee would make public the fact that Senator Santorum's statement was not part of the Act. She said it should be read carefully and made clear that it had no authority on the federal or state governments. Chairman Abrams explained that it was understood that the statement came from the subcommittee report which was adopted by the Senate by a wide margin and was not a part of the law, but the subcommittee had liked the language of the Santorum amendment for the purposes of the hearings. Mrs. Martin pointed out that she would have liked to have some members on the subcommittee with opposing views, but since they had chosen not to

participate, the subcommittee has done what it thought best for the process.? Mrs. Waugh stated she had not participated on the subcommittee because she wasn't elected to be a science expert.

Legislative Coordinator

Mr. Willard stated he had no report, adding that he felt the legislature was making a good faith effort to respond to the Supreme Court's decision.

Board Attorney's Report

Mr. Biles stated that he would continue his discussion with the Board on the school finance case in executive session.? He reported that with the ruling from the Shawnee County District Attorney, that the open meeting question regarding the Board had been resolved.?? Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mr. Willard, that the Board pay Mr. Biles' fees for services and expenses for March as presented.? The motion carried.

Other Board Member Reports

Mr. Willard reported on the recent NASBE Board of Directors meeting he had attended.? He reported that NASBE has been studying governance and the danger state boards of education are in.? NASBE would be taking a more visible role in promoting state board and become involved in Council of Chief State School Officers and other organizations.? He also reported that NASBE had extended the term of the New Member representative on the Board of Directors to a two-year term and stressed the importance of attendance at the new member institute.? He noted that there was a move to involve NASBE members more in regular communications with Congress.? Mr. Willard also reported on a visit he had made to the new Zenda Charter School.

Page 3

MINUTES

April 13, 2005

Dr. Wagnon reported on attending a meeting of the ECS Steering Committee.? He reported that the Governor of Arkansas is the Chair and has established an Art in Education initiative, about which he spoke very eloquently.? Dr. Wagnon shared some of the components of the programs, noting that participation improves grades and career goals for the students who participate in an after school program in Hope, Arkansas.? The improvement results from the discipline and commitment required in the arts program.? Dr. Wagnon stated it would be good to have a similar program in Kansas.

Mrs. Waugh reported that she was on the Kansas Volunteer Commission and passed out copies of its 2004 annual report.

Mrs. Rupe attended a McRel Advisory Policy Committee meeting which focused on envisioning schools for the future.? She said the work centered around planning for different scenarios, such as funding and the amount of government intervention.? Policy papers based on the scenarios will be developed and made available to states in order to prepare them for possibilities that lie ahead.

Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items.

SCIENCE STANDARDS

Dr. Steve Case, and Ms. Carol Williamson, Co-Chairs of the committee to revise the Kansas science standards,

reviewed the revision process and discussed changes in Draft 2 of the revised standards which had been sent to the Board. They indicated that, though curriculum and instruction are local decisions, the committee had discussed the extent of guidance in the standards and more had been added in the instructional examples and teacher notes.? In order to address State Board concerns, the committee had met in January to vote on the eighteen items at issue in the minority report, delaying the public hearings until February.? They reported that approximately 1200 people had attended the hearings, with 184 speaking.? Dr. Case said he was very proud of the public hearings.? There was a civil discourse and people spoke clearly and passionately.? He said he was not sure much was learned from the hearings about the standards document, because the focus of the discourse was on one issue.? Input considered in the revisions contained in Draft 2 included comments from the review by 170 educators in the field; a review by WestEd to determine if there was sufficient specificity in the indicators for test development; the minority report from Draft 1 and related votes resulting in changes in Draft 1; responses from scientists to the Draft 1 minority report; e-mail input to the Kansas State Board of Education, and other committee recommendations.? Dr. Case reported that the committee would like to continue with the electronic review process because it had worked well in gathering input.? It was noted that despite some of the differences between members of the committee, they worked well together and Draft 2 was approved by consensus with the exception of two votes.? One was on a change in the grade spans used in the standards grades 5-7 and 8-12.? The other vote was on the grade 8-12 Standard 3, Benchmark 3, the understanding of evolution at the high school level.? It was pointed out that the consensus on Draft 2 was achieved with the understanding that instead of bringing items from the minority report to a vote again by the whole committee, some of the committee members would be submitting a Draft 2 minority report.

Changes included formatting and rewording for vertical alignment of standards and benchmarks across grades, consistency and specificity; the addition of more teacher notes; and a glossary added at the end of the document as recommended by the Board, with glossary words also defined in teacher notes.?? Part of the Glossary was targeted to grades K-4, because it was thought to be important that K-4 teachers were

Page 4
MINUTES
April 13, 2005

using a common vocabulary.? It was noted that a grade-by-grade version will be developed with the help of curriculum directors across the state after the standards are approved and will be included as an appendix.

Mrs. Gamble asked if the K-4 vocabulary and concepts shouldn't be integrated into the K-4 general curriculum.? Dr. Case responded that this was a local curriculum decision. Ms. Williamson added that it would be suggested in the implementation guidelines and communicated to teachers and curriculum directors at workshops on the standards. Dr. Wagon asked why there were reservations about changing to the 8-12 grade span.? It was explained that while in most schools grade 8 is not grouped with 9-12, it made sense to have the grade spans consistent with the grades assessed: grades 5, 7, and high school.

Mrs. Morris asked about the Board Subcommittee Science hearings and why there were no names from the writing committee to represent the majority.? Dr. Case indicated he had removed himself from the hearing process and that it was his feeling and that of the majority of the committee that their position stands as the document that has been presented to the Board in Draft 2.? He noted that it was a document that represented the consensus view of the writing committee, with each member voting for their own reasons.? Because of that, no one member would want to speak for what other members chose to do.? Mrs. Williamson added that the additional information being sought in the subcommittee hearings was political in nature and that the writing committee was not a political

body.? She suggested that perhaps it would be better for someone to speak to the subcommittee about the legal ramifications of adopting the minority report.

Dr. Wagnon asked how the high school standards were linked to the state assessment.? Ms Williamson explained that in high school it would be an end-of-course assessment, given at a time when students have had the material.? Dr. Posny added that because high school science curriculum is scheduled differently in every district, students would be able to take the assessment when they could be the most successful.? Discussion followed about how concepts that might be peripherally addressed in the life science test, for example, would be taught without the student actually having had the physical science courses.? Ms. Williamson pointed out that three benchmarks are part of all science disciplines. Dr. Case noted that those items on the assessments would deal with conceptual knowledge, not memorization.

Mrs. Gamble returned to the discussion of the subcommittee hearing process.? She agreed that Dr. Case had participated in the revisions process as he had been asked to do, and pointed out that other noted mainline scientists had chosen not to participate in the subcommittee hearing process.? She added that many scientists have responded to the minority report in writing, pointing out its inaccuracies and misuse of information and their responses have been ignored.? She further stated that ideas in the minority report had been responded to many times over the years and that she saw no purpose in holding further hearings.? Dr. Case suggested that those who wrote the minority report were confusing science with science education by stating that science was corrupted by philosophical naturalism. He noted that science education does not deal with philosophy.? Dr. Wagnon asked Dr. Case to explain the parameters that were used in the development of the section of the introduction to the standards that dealt with the nature of science.? Dr. Case responded that he was uncomfortable with the use of the word "natural" because of the way it was being used to market the controversy and would have much preferred that "matter and energy" had been used instead because they are the only things science has the tools to explore.? He stated that science does not intersect with philosophical naturalism, which was outside the realm of science, though perhaps some scientists might espouse such a belief.? He added that it would be inappropriate for a science educator to do so and communicate it to his students.? He also noted that the writing committee

Page 5

MINUTES

April 13, 2005

members believed philosophy and religion should be discussed, in a philosophy class, not the science classroom. Ms. Williamson reported that the writing committee had used the language of the scientific community to define science. Dr Wagnon expressed his gratitude to the writing committee noting that the standards were thorough, well-grounded and articulated very clearly why the committee had done what it had done in the standards.? He asked that the Co-Chairs convey his comments to the rest of the writing committee.

Regarding teaching science with tolerance and respect, Mrs. Gamble asked how one would know if something were being taught dogmatically.? Dr. Case said that one would have to look for examples where someone had crossed the line into a personal belief system.? He continued by saying that science deals with uncertainty, with statistics and confidence indicators.? If someone were to teach that something was fixed and unchanging that would be to teach dogmatically.? Dr. Case indicated that scientists are limited to matter and energy and how it is applied.? Mrs. Gamble asked if the new frontiers in science yet to be explored included the supernatural.? Discussion followed with Mrs. Gamble, Dr. Case and Ms. Williamson about the definition of a scientific theory.? Mrs. Williamson said that a scientific theory becomes valid when it has been tested and reviewed and there is agreement that it is the best explanation.? Dr. Case added that a theory explains and predicts and the more it

explains, the more central it becomes to a scientific theory.

Dr. Abrams complimented the writing committee on the standards and indicated he only had issues with three or four pages of the document. He pointed out that at grades 3-4, Standard 6, Benchmark 2, Indicator 1, the student was asked to define pollution. Dr. Abrams questioned what an acceptable definition of pollution would be since what could be defined as pollution in one set of circumstance, might not be considered pollution in another circumstance. Ms. Williamson said that an addition to the teacher notes about developing an operational definition of pollution might clarify the issue. She noted that it should be added to the standard for grades 8-12, as well. Dr. Abrams suggested that there might be a better instructional example than passing around a ball of string to demonstrate the interactions and energy flow of organisms in a food web at grades 5-7, Standards 3, Benchmark 4, Indicator 2, perhaps by actually growing some plants with bugs or parasites on them. Chairman Abrams asked Dr. Case for additional information to support the statement in grades 8-12 Standard 2B, Benchmark 2, Indicator 3 a., "Entropy is a state function that describes a system. In some cases, it can be thought of as a measure of disorder." He said he didn't remember "in some cases" included as it relates to being a measure of disorder. He also asked for information to back up grades 8-12 Standard 4, Benchmark 3, Indicator 4, "The student understands the sun, earth, and other objects in the solar system formed from a nebular cloud of dust and gas", stating he didn't understand it was that definitive. Dr. Case related the work being done at the University of Kansas with the Hubbell telescope, and indicated he would get more information for Dr. Abrams on it.

The Board took a break from 11:25 to 11:30 a.m.

Mrs. Gamble thanked the writing committee for its tolerance and ability to listen to and treat all sides evenhandedly.

Mr. Greg Lassey, a member of the science writing committee, reported that he would be speaking to the Board on behalf of the eight committee members who have proposed changes to Draft 2 of the standards, and hoped to explain briefly their proposals. He prefaced his remarks by stating that it had been said

Page 6
MINUTES
April 13, 2005

many times that there is no controversy over evolution and that those in the minority are trying to achieve by their proposals, the inclusion of creationism or intelligent design into the science standards. He stressed that at the present time, their proposals do not seek to incorporate intelligent design into the standards. He pointed out that the cover letters to both Draft 1 and Draft 2 of the Minority Report, stated that they were suggesting "that teachers be allowed to address scientific alternatives at their own discretion if they sense that it is appropriate for a given class." He added that their proposals seek to have students critically analyze evolution. He said it was their opinion that students should understand both sides of the scientific controversy about evolution and should be provided with an opportunity for a neutral and unbiased discussion. In respect to the accusation that the minority was seeking to put religion into the standards, he stated that the opposite was true. They were trying to take the current one out. He explained that a naturalistic bias in the proposed standards had created a religious problem, because it only favored one side of the controversy and, thus, unavoidably impacts religion.

Mr. Lassey stated that the heart of the controversy was about the addition of the word "informed" to the mission statement in the standards. It was the opinion of the minority that evolution and origins should not be presented

to students dogmatically in a way that supports a philosophical presupposition that has a major impact on religious belief?. Student should be informed of that bias.? Mr. Lassey also addressed the bias that the minority was attempting to correct in its proposal regarding the definition of science.? He stated that the current definition had the effect of preventing critical analysis of evolution and origins and that an objective definition of science was needed to do good science and remove the religious problem.? Mr. Lassey also explained the minority position that students learn the critical distinction between historical and experimental? science.? He pointed out that historical sciences such as evolutionary biology, paleontology and aspects of geology and anthropology deal with causes of events that were not observed, cannot be observed in the laboratory and occurred in a remote past where evidence was sparse and incomplete. He said that finding evidence supporting an historical theory does not prove the truth of the theory unless the evidence also rules out other competing theories.? He noted that the distinction was critical to the debate over origins because origins is an historical science.?

Mr. Lassey went on to explain the focus in the minority report on the evolution benchmark. He stated that very few people understand its core claims, its limitations, and the problems that it has not solved??. He stated that students need to be introduced to the scientific controversies about evolution so they can make decisions about which parts of the theory are well-supportable and which are not??. Finally, Mr. Lassey discussed the recommended changes in Standard 7, the Nature of Science.? He explained that science is a tool that should be used to help people make informed decisions and lead people to think in a particular way.? He stated that because scientific knowledge impacts not only government and environment, but also ethics, morals and religion? it can become a religion in its own right??. He stated the need for science to be conducted objectively, particularly in the area of origins science, where mainstream science now only allows one answer ? that all of nature are merely physical objects that derive only from matter, energy and the forces of nature, all purely by chance?. He stated that there was much evidence that contradicts that and science should follow the evidence regardless of its philosophical or religious implications.

Mr. Lassey invited Mr. John Calvert to briefly speak about the need for the public hearings. Mr. Calvert explained how the minority would present its case at the hearings and shared with the Board information about the number of presenters for the minority and their areas of expertise.? He noted that the hearings were necessary because of the complexity of the issues that involved science education, religion, philosophy and law.? He pointed out that members of the standards writing committee had not been

Page 7

MINUTES

April 13, 2005

equipped to deal with the kind of complexity involved.? He also stated that the committee had been polarized from the outset with leadership of the majority represented by executives of Kansas Citizens for Science, and the minority being led by a managing director of IDnet, Bill Harris.? He reported that Dr. Harris had unsuccessfully tried to engage the leadership in focused discussions of the key issues.? Mr. Calvert related other unsuccessful efforts made by the minority to have their proposals discussed and voted on.? He said the process had discouraged a candid discussion of the issues.

Mr. Calvert stated that having focused hearings on the issues with experts was a good solution and would allow the Board to make an informed decision about how to conduct a religiously charged discussion with children??. Mr. Calvert spoke to an argument that had been made that the hearings were rigged and stated that the only manipulation of the process that he was aware of was a boycott of the hearings by the majority.? He said that he didn't believe the controversy would go away until the Board critically analyzes the problems in a focused

inquiry open to the public? and expressed his belief that the hearings would be the best vehicle to accomplish that.

Mrs. Rupe, addressing Mr. Calvert, spoke to him about the number of people participating in the hearings, noting that he indicated there would be 24 representing the minority and yet the costs would be nominal.? She said that it was first discussed that 7-10 people would appear on both sides.? Because the funds for the hearing were coming from the cash-strapped Department of Education, she indicated her desire that Mr. Calvert be concerned about the costs.? She also said she was mystified and troubled by the apparent opposition to science. She noted that those representing the minority spoke as if there were only two sides, calling the minority side science and claiming it is not religion.? She added that the theories of origins learned in one?s church are unique to each person and that she did not believe what she was taught in biology class was taught as religion.? She related this to Mr. Lassey, Mrs. Martin and herself, who all had children who were physicians and pointed out that the science they had learned had not drawn them away from their faith.? Mr. Calvert stated that philosophical naturalism supports atheism and that the methodological naturalism taught in the standards was worse, as the presenters at the hearings would show.? Mrs. Rupe stated that was not taking place in Kansas science in the schools.? Mr. Calvert disagreed because the other side of the controversy is not allowed.

Dr. Wagon stated that he had several questions about the minority report.? He asked how the process described by the writing committee for dealing with disagreements in content was applied to other proposals for changes in the draft and why the minority report rated special treatment.? Mr. Calvert reported that several proposals by Dr. Harris and his colleagues had been adopted, such as the statement about teaching with tolerance and respect. He said that the previous standards adopted in 2001, which directed a student to discuss the issue of design, because it was outside the realm of science, with appropriate sources outside the science classroom, caused the state to promote philosophical naturalism. The writing committee, when it understood this, he said, eliminated that provision from teaching with tolerance and respect. He said the standard now says personal biases in understanding science should be understood. Mr. Calvert added that he thought there should be an understanding of any bias, including institutional bias. He noted that the vote on that change was 14-3 with 6 abstentions.? He also noted that there was not unanimity in the vote on the definition of science where there were 10 for, 12 against, 1 abstention.? He pointed out that a number of the proposals made by members of the minority have been embraced.? Dr. Wagon asked about the proposals in the minority report that had not been accepted.? Mr. Calvert said that the minority report reflects the proposals not embraced by the committee as a whole or by consensus and were substantive issues he thought should be considered by the Board and that the recommendation of the minority are to do something different than the writing committee recommends.

Page 8

MINUTES

April 13, 2005

Dr. Wagon asked why the Santorum amendment, which was a footnote in a government document and not part of law, had become a coordinating mechanism for the minority report.? Mr. Calvert didn?t agree that it was a coordinating mechanism.? He did point out that the U.S. Congress embraced the advice in other parts of NCLB that is applicable to the standards ? that they be secular, neutral and non-ideological. He added that dogma is doctrine that only allows one perspective and can be avoided by showing both sides of the controversy and that controversy must be dealt with when it exists. Dr. Wagon said he was troubled with the notion of both sides. He noted that the language of the Santorum footnote stated that students should be helped to understand the full spectrum of scientific views that exist. He asked what that meant ? should students study alchemy as a companion to chemistry, or astrology as a companion to astronomy. He asked Mr. Calvert if there were any boundaries that should inform the nature of science education.? Mr. Calvert said reason should be used in any interpretation of a document and that ?full range? should be subject to reason. The minority proposals, he said, do not give a full

range. He stated that there is no scientific consensus about evolution data and there isn't the curriculum to provide a full range. The minority report is a pragmatic first step in getting to a reasonable range of information, he stated, but the question "what is the origin of life?" goes into religion.

Dr. Wagon asked Mr. Lassey if he felt his proposals had not received fair consideration by the committee.? Mr. Lassey agreed that the issues were heard and voted down, but the minority felt they needed to advise the Board of important issues it should consider. Dr. Wagon asked Mr. Lassey what the scientific alternative were that teachers should be able to discuss and if there were any barriers to which scientific alternatives. Mr. Lassey shared from his own experience that from time to time, students ask about alternatives and that he tries to address them.? He added that that the naturalistic point of view is all that is being taught in biology.

Dr. Wagon asked Mr. Lassey what his view was about the proper definition of science and the role of philosophical naturalism in explaining these ideas.? Mr. Lassey responded that the minority?s definition opens up science, not stops it, by hearing all sides and not denigrating some other point of view.? He pointed out that alchemy and astrology are in some textbooks as ideas that didn?t make it.? Dr. Wagon asked if there was any investigative process that was complete. Mr. Lassey responded that when it was stated earlier that matter and energy are the only things that can be explored, the biological information system, state of consciousness, etc. were not addressed.? Dr. Wagon asked if those moved beyond science, to which Mr. Lassey said he believed one needed to follow where the evidence leads.

Mrs. Gamble asked Mr. Lassey several questions about whether Mr. Lassey believed evolution was a theistic concept.? Mr. Lassey said that it if one makes a leap of faith to believe some if its suppositions, based on a particular faith that certain things are true, it turns evolution into a religion of its own.?? Mrs. Gamble pointed out that she accepted things in the study of science and had faith in her religion, with no conflict between the two. She state she struggled with having to choose between science as the study of the natural world and her religion which is of the supernatural world and comes through revelation.? She said to her there was a clear delineation between the two. Mr. Lassey noted that design theory is science that tries to detect design and does not go into religion, something which is misunderstood, particularly by the press.? Mrs. Gamble said she had never seen this type of inquiry be successful in science classes and perhaps it would best be moved to humanities. She said that the Board meeting was an inappropriate place to aruge the issue, as were the hearings and asked what Mr. Lassey would do if a student came to him with Wiccan, Hindu, Native American or other views about origins.? He indicated he tried to be sensitive to students? belief systems. Adding that a teacher does not have to teach science from the naturalistic

Page 9

MINUTES

April 13, 2005

view only - experiments speak for themselves.? Mrs. Gamble questioned whether science teachers are equipped to handle all of those questions.

Mrs. Martin thanked the committee as a whole and the minority group for their courageous and informative stand on the whole issue of allowing critical analysis of the issues. She added that she didn?t think the Board could solve which side was correct, but it knows there is public and scientific disagreement on the issues. She noted that the only thing a science teacher needs is to listen and have a? sensitivity to students? beliefs.?? Mrs. Rupe suggested that perhaps university courses for pre-science teachers should provide classes to address some of the issues.? She pointed out that students need an understanding of science. She added she didn?t think biology teachers are

belittling children for their faith. If the ID movement could prove God, she noted, it would be wonderful, but she stated that she didn't need proof of God as it was part of her belief system. Mrs. Rupe stated that she knew that the three subcommittee members wanted to get to the heart of the issue, but because none of the Board members were scientists, she didn't believe it would happen, noting that getting to the bottom of the issue could only come through science. The questions should be resolved in the science community and not before state and local boards of education.

Mrs. Morris expressed her appreciation for the minority members and Mr. Calvert, stating it was not an issue of religion for her. The conversation between the Board members and the members of the science writing committee, majority and minority views, was the type of give and take that the hearings are for, not in a Board meeting. In illustrating the confusion that some children confront with when presented with scientific ideas about origins that conflicted with those taught in a religious setting, she shared her memories of sitting in a public classroom and being told about evolution, an idea that put into questions what her parents and her Sunday school had taught her. She mentioned that some children do not have a belief that is strong enough to reconcile the two. Because of those children, she stated she believed that a critical analysis of the theory is a crucial part of education. She stated her perplexity that in the information age there would be opposition to presenting students with information.

In response to an earlier comment of Mrs. Gamble's where she stated she was uncomfortable with Mr. Calvert responding to questions when he was not part of the process and had strong objections to his participation, Mrs. Morris said that if it was necessary to make a motion that the Board was willing to hear from Mr. Calvert as a representative of the minority group, she would make it. Mrs. Morris moved, with a second by Mrs. Martin, that the Board welcomed the knowledge and expertise of Mr. Calvert to speak on behalf of the minority if they so choose. The motion failed on a vote of 4-3-2, with Mrs. Gamble, Mrs. Rupe, and Mrs. Waugh voting "no", and Mr. Willard and Dr. Wagon abstaining. Mr. Willard indicated he had abstained because he did not think the motion was necessary because anyone can speak to the Board at anytime.

Mr. Willard asked if there had been any efforts by any member of the writing committee to discourage people from participating in the subcommittee hearings. Dr. Posny indicated, that though she had not attended all of the meetings, she was not aware of any.

Mr. Willard asked Mr. Calvert how would science or Kansas standards would be damaged by the Kansas definition of science reflecting what is used by other states, as suggested by the Minority Report, and why it might be necessary for the Kansas definition to be more restrictive. Dr. Abrams noted that because of the failure of the Board to approve the motion to allow Mr. Calvert to speak, he would not be able to give any further responses for the minority at the meeting.

Page 10

MINUTES

April 13, 2005

Dr. Case answered that he understood that the minority wanted to expand the definition of science. The change suggested, he reported, reflected to some degree the definition used in Ohio, where Mr. Calvert had a great deal of influence on that committee. He added that the issue is what happens in science education, if science is accurately defined or if the definition is expanded to include the supernatural to be an alternate causal explanation. Dr. Case stated that the addition would be a disservice to students. Mr. Willard questioned whether the addition of the word "informed" to the definition would be understood as including the supernatural. Dr. Case responded that the addition lacked clarity because what the student was to be informed about was not included. He pointed out that origin science was not a science, not at the universities, nor in the standards. The Kansas standards do not

speak to the origin of life, he added.

Mr. Willard asked Dr. Case if he knew of any efforts by anyone on the writing committee to discourage people from participating in the hearings.? Dr. Case repeated that he had removed himself from the process.? He added that he had not been a member of Kansas Citizens for Science for several years as Dr. Calvert had stated in his opening remarks.? Asked by Mr. Willard if he would support a boycott by the science community of the upcoming hearings, Dr. Case answered that he was uncomfortable with the word boycott, but there had been a request that people respect the committee?s work and not participate. He added that he would have to say he would support such a boycott.

Mr. Willard expressed his appreciation for all the work that had been done on the science standards, but indicated that the votes taken within the science committee were unimportant except to inform the Board about the level of discomfort they had experienced with what had been presented. Mr. Willard noted that the only vote that would count would be the one the Board would take on the standards. For the benefit of the Board, hearing the basis of the discomfort of the science community, as well as its level of comfort, would be helpful, adding that a boycott wouldn?t help dissolve the divisiveness, nor assist the Board in making its decision.? Dr. Case responded that the science community was not known for its uniformity of view and there would be no way to enforce a boycott, yet people were still agreeing not to participate. He said he felt the surprisingly uniform response from the scientific community indicated there was not a controversy within it concerning evolutionary theory.? Mr. Willard added that it was impossible for alternative theories to get a peer review if they come from outside the mainstream and that the boycott of the hearings indicated to him there was a reason for it.

The Board took a break from 1:01 to 1:09 p.m.

Dr. Wagon responded to Mr. Willard?s questions about why there would be a boycott. He indicated that there were four Board members who did not support the motion for the subcommittee hearings because they had confidence in the writing committee process and felt was already complete.

Dr. Wagon, addressing Mr. Lassey, stated concern about a statement in the minority report that would add the following to the section on Patterns of Cumulative Change:??although science proposed theories to explain changes, the actual causes of many changes are currently unknown (e.g. the origin of the universe, the origin of fundamental laws, the origin of life and the genetic code, the origin of major body plans during the Cambrian explosion, etc.)?? Dr. Wagon asked if it wasn?t the point of a scientific theory to give ideas of how things probably developed, rather than a final sense.? He noted that to imply that the science standards tried to answer all the fundamental questions of life was a mischaracterization. He added that the standards were saying that this is all that is known.? He asked Mr. Lassey if he believed science had explained all the fundamental questions of life. Mr. Lassey said it was implied, which

Page 11
MINUTES
April 13, 2005

reflected the bias that needed to be changed and why students needed be informed that science does not have all the answers.

Mrs. Waugh asked why the minority, or all scientists that support alternative theories, have not gone to the science community to have their ideas peer reviewed, noting that if they had done so the issue wouldn?t be before boards

of education.?? Mr. Lassey explained that it was not a question of not taking alternatives to the science community, it was the fact that the science community is not accepting alternatives because their biases and presuppositions.? He noted that when the evidence amounts to a critical mass, it will be accepted.?? Mrs. Waugh asked how, if board of education are used as the route to get alternate theories accepted, how teachers will learn about them to teach them.? Mr. Lassey suggested that perhaps teachers should have a class or two about other traditions before going into the classroom, noting that 99% of science dealt with everything else. Asked if should be a part of teacher preparation programs, Mr. Lassey suggested at least a survey course so that teachers would know what they might experience in their classes, adding that occasionally when asked by students what he believed, he tells them.? He stated it wouldn't be something that he would mention without being asked first because that would be proselytizing. Mrs. Waugh asked if he would allow students to discuss Wiccan beliefs and if he thought the minority committee would support Kansas mandating a comparative religions class where the different theories of origins could be explored.? Mr. Lassey was not opposed to classes being offered, but stated he wouldn't go so far as to require it, as some religious traditions don't want their children exposed to any other religions. Mrs. Waugh asked it that was true, why was it he thought religious views should be discussed in science class.

Mr. Lassey, again, stated that one religious view was already being presented ? philosophical naturalism. To Mrs. Waugh's statement that evolution is not a religion according to scientists, Mr. Lassey asked why they were they afraid of opposing ideas.? Mrs. Waugh pointed out that she had received many e-mails from ministers asking the Board to support the science committee because they don't see it as it as a religion, they see it as science. Mr. Lassey said many of the ministers he has spoken with don't have an understanding of the issue and once it is explained that the only explanations allowed are naturalistic explanations, and thus a religion, they have a better understanding.

Mrs. Waugh asked if it was now the time to have an external review of the standards, presenting both the committee document and the Minority report.? Chairman Abrams indicated he would like to wait until the Board had approved a document.? Asked for clarification, Chairman Abrams responded that it would be his preference to wait until after the science hearing and the Board had in hand the document it intends to adopt before presenting it for review.? Mrs. Waugh noted that to know which one the Board intended to adopt would require a vote, but Dr. Abrams said it wouldn't be a final vote.

Mr. Willard asked if the vote on allowing Mr. Calvert to speak precluded him or anyone else the minority group wanted to represent them from speaking.? Chairman Abrams indicated that would only be for the current meeting.

Referring to Standard 3, Benchmark 3, Indicator 1, Additional Specificity, to which the minority had added several statements, Dr. Wagon asked Mr. Lassey why 1 a. ?Biological evolution postulates an unpredictable and unguided natural process that has no discernable direction of goal,? It also assumes that life arose from an unguided process? was added.? He also asked Dr. Case why it didn't belong there.? Mr. Lassey said they are just saying what evolution postulates; it is information not generally given to

Page 9
MINUTES
April 13, 2005

students; and not generally allowed for debate. Dr. Case responded that ?unguided? is not a term used in science. Additionally, he said, ?postulates? is not a term used as it relates to a scientific theory. Science doesn't speak to whether something is guided or unguided; it speaks to matter and energy. Dr. Case noted that is was an inaccurate

