

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES
August 8, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Voth called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. on Tuesday, August 8, 2000, in the Board Room of the State Board of Education Building, 120 SE 10th Avenue in Topeka, Kansas. He introduced new Board member, Bruce Wyatt, who had been appointed to fill Scott Hill's unexpired term in District 6.

ROLL CALL

Members present were:

Steve Abrams	I.B. ?Sonny? Rundell
John Bacon	Harold Voth
Mary Douglass Brown	Bill Wagnon
Val DeFever	Bruce Wyatt
Linda Holloway	

Mrs. Waugh had been in an automobile accident the previous weekend and was unable to attend the meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Voth indicated that the presentation on the Physical Dimensions and Physical Focus programs had been canceled. He asked that the reports on secondary reading and middle school athletic practice during the school day, and action on the recommendations of the Professional Practices Commission and the foreign language curriculum standards be moved to fill that spot on the agenda. He also asked that an executive session for the purpose of discussing matters regarding non-elected personnel be added after the consent agenda at the end of the day. Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever, that the agenda be approved as modified. The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chairman Voth asked for approval of the minutes of the July meeting. Mrs. Brown moved, with a second by Mr. Rundell, that the minutes be approved as submitted. The motion carried.

RECOGNITION OF UNIONTOWN HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORY DAY PARTICIPANTS

Deputy Commissioner Dale Dennis introduced Sabrina Coons, Elizabeth Cambers, Gabrielle Bradbury, and Megan Stewart, National History Day participants from Uniontown High School. He also introduced Norm Conard, the group's faculty advisor. Mr. Conard reported on the National History Day program and the student's participation, including sharing television news reports about the Uniontown National History Day project on Irena Sendler, who, as a young woman in Poland and member of the Polish underground, rescued 2,500 Jewish children from the Warsaw ghetto during World War II. The students shared how they had researched their project and then performed the skit they had written about Irena Sendler and her wartime

activities.? Board questions followed.

Mrs. Brown left the meeting and returned after the break following the Open Forum.

CITIZENS? OPEN FORUM

Chairman Voth opened the citizens? open forum at 10:32 a.m. Those who addressed the Board were Kevin McKeeman, Abilene; Roger Rankin, Longton; and Judy Smith, Shawnee Mission, representing Concerned Women for America of Kansas. ?Chairman Voth declared the open forum closed at 10:46 a.m. and called for a break until 11:00 a.m.

Page 2

MINUTES

August 8, 2000

PROCEDURE FOR PROCESSING CHARTER SCHOOL PETITIONS

Mr. Ken Gentry, Team Leader, Consolidated and Supplemental Programs, presented a proposed procedure for processing charter school petitions under the revised state law passed during the 2000 legislative session.? He noted that two of the existing charter schools were voluntarily relinquishing their charters, leaving the possibility for granting charters to an additional seventeen schools without applying any selective criteria. The proposed selection process, he explained, which would be followed if more than seventeen applications were received would be: 1) based upon criteria provided in the law, staff will determine point values for the criteria and develop a rubric for determining which proposed charter schools appear to possess the greatest potential for successful operation; 2) school districts, service centers and others will be informed of the seventeen openings for charter schools and the methodology that will be utilized to grant petitions if more than seventeen petitions are received; 3) all petitions will be reviewed, upon receipt, to determine if they contain the statutorily-required information and, if not, will be returned for completion or additional information; 4) all completed petitions would be held until a filing deadline of February 1, 2001; 5) if seventeen or less legally-sufficient charter school petitions are received, each would be approved; and 6) if more that seventeen petitions are received the described selection methodology would be employed and the seventeen petitions deemed ?to possess the greatest potential for successful operation? would be granted.? Board questions followed concerning the criteria and the timeline for development of the rubric.? Mr. Gentry explained that the criteria upon which the rubric would be based were the fifteen points found in the law, KSA 72-1906.? He also indicated that staff was in the process of developing the rubric which would be brought back to the Board for review.? Mr. Gentry was also asked about the use of assessments to evaluate charter schools.? Mr. Gentry indicated that charter school students currently take the state assessment, but that in most cases, the results have been reported within the general school population of the parent school for charters that are schools within a school, and that charter schools would be required in the future to provide state assessment data for those students.? He further explained that the triangulation of data from three assessments, including the state assessment, as required under QPA, was not required of charter schools, which would only report state assessment scores and evaluation criteria determined by the charter schools, themselves.? Mr. Rundell moved, with a second by Dr. Abrams, that the proposed charter school petition criteria and procedures be adopted.? The motion carried.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM STATE ASSESSMENT STUDY SESSION

Dr. Freden discussed with the Board and answered questions regarding the fourteen staff recommen-dations

received at the July meeting relating to state standards, their implementation and assessments.? At the conclusion of the discussion, Dr. Wagnon moved, with a second by Mr. Rundell, that the Board adopt for implementation all the proposed recommendations.? Dr. Abrams asked to divide the question so that more information and discussion could be had on the recommendation that the Board seek state funding, estimated at \$575,000, for materials and costs associated with training trainers to provide professional development activities for districts targeted toward instruction of indicators to be assessed.? Dr. Wagnon stated he would support dividing the question, but that training recommendations should be supported because it was important to provide assistance to districts in keeping up with new developments instituted by the Board.? The training of trainers recommendation failed on a vote of 5-4, with Dr. Abrams, Mrs. Brown, Mr. Bacon and Mrs. Holloway voting ?no?..? Adoption for implementation of the balance of the recommendations passed on a vote of 9-0.? Those recommendations were as follows:

- 1) in order to assure the field about the consistency and long-term character of the assessment program, the Board should ask the legislature for a five-year review of standards and a seven-year assessment program to assure comparability of data over time, as well as funding to support the periodic reviews of standards;
- 2) the State Board should continue to request legislative funding for parent reports of state assessment results;
- 3) the Board should encourage each professional development council to include student performance as a high priority when individual development plans are developed and approved;

Page 3

MINUTES

August 8, 2000

- 4) staff should be responsible for providing schools with at least one curriculum support document for each subject area to aid in the teaching of the standards, benchmarks, and indicators to be assessed; and for providing models and templates for local curricular alignment, selection of curricular materials, curriculum scope and sequence, alignment of indicators to traditional course sequences, and results-based staff development plans;
- 5) the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE) and department staff should conduct an annual fall conference for district testing coordinators to help disseminate consistent information and to gain a better understanding of how schools can best be served in the area of assessments;
- 6) the State Board should ask CETE to conduct a study of the current state of student motivation related to performance on the state assessment, including what interventions might increase the level of student motivation;
- 7) course-taking data from high school students in at least mathematics, science, and social studies should be collected as part of the state assessments, with the board?s review of the results to include consideration of grade-placement of assessments;
- 8) the Board should reconsider the issue of statewide performance assessments and possibly reinstate statewide performance assessments of limited scope;
- 9) the State Board should require and take the action necessary to assure that schools incorporate the indicators targeted for assessment into their local curriculum;
- 10) efforts should be renewed to establish graduation standards and review graduation requirements, including requirements in mathematics and science;

- 11) the Board should adopt a statement encouraging schools to relate their Quality Performance Accreditation school improvement target for mathematics to mathematics content, not to the generalized ? problem-solving? which has been allowed in the past;
- 12) the Board should strongly consider attaching a specific and significant weight to results on the state assessments as a part of the local school accreditation process and consider directing the Quality Performance Accreditation Study Committee to include the issue in their deliberations; and
- 13) the Board should consider whether there should be any additional requirements for schools where a majority of students score in the *unsatisfactory* and/or *basic* levels of performance and support department staff in providing intensive assistance for schools whose results fall in these categories, in keeping with draft recommendations related to an early warning system for schools.

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:20 p.m. and returned at 1:30 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING ON AMENDMENTS TO INSERVICE EDUCATION REGULATIONS

Chairman Voth opened the public hearing on proposed amendments to inservice education regulations K.A.R. 91-1-146a and 91-1-146e at 1:30 p.m.? No one asked to address the Board with comments, though Chairman Voth indicated that the Board had received written testimony from the Kansas National Education Association in support of the proposed changes.? He declared the public hearing closed at 1:31 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING ON AMENDMENTS TO INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM APPROVAL REGULATIONS

Chairman Voth opened the public hearing on proposed amendments to institutional accreditation and program approval regulations K.A.R. 91-1-68a, 91-1-68b, 91-1-68c, 91-1-68d, and 91-1-68e and revocation of 91-1-70b at 1:32 p.m.? No one asked to address the Board with comments, though Chairman Voth indicated that the Board had received written testimony from the Kansas National Education Association in support of the proposed changes.? He declared the public hearing closed at 1:33 p.m.

Page 4

MINUTES

August 8, 2000

SURVEY OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ON SECONDARY READING

Dr. Sharon Freden, Assistant Commissioner, Learning Services, reviewed the results of a survey of middle and high school principals conducted by the Research and Planning team in April to obtain information about the prevalence and type of secondary reading programs in Kansas public schools.? She indicated that because the response rate was only fifty percent, caution should be used in interpreting the findings, but that much information had been received that could be used to direct further inquiry.? The survey included questions about the prevalence and type of reading programs in Kansas schools at the grade levels surveyed; what reading classes were required; how placement in reading classes for students having difficulty with reading was determined and what type of intervention strategies were used for those students; the average length of reading classes; the amount of staff development in reading for teachers of reading; and how much staff development was available in the reading model chosen by the school.? Dr. Freden indicated the following recommendations resulted from the survey:

1. encourage all secondary schools to provide special reading programs for struggling readers;

2. as part of the QPA process, place more emphasis on the level of effectiveness of reading strategies and interventions at the secondary level;
3. provide schools with information regarding effective secondary reading models;
4. find ways to showcase exemplary reading programs so that schools can learn from the experience of others schools; and
5. provide more professional development opportunities to teachers in the area of secondary reading and suggestions to accomplish this goal, including sponsoring secondary reading conferences; providing training and materials on how to use reading strategies in all subject areas; providing training so that reading in the content areas is aligned with state standards; encouraging more reading courses in teacher preparation programs; and include a reading preparation standard in the new standards developed for the new teacher licensure system.

Because there was such a low response rate to the survey, Commissioner Tompkins suggested the issues could be included in the information requested for the school report cards.? The Board discussion that followed focused on the need for student reading proficiency to be the responsibility of all teachers across all curricular areas and that professional development in reading strategies should also be available to all teachers.? Additionally, Board members expressed concern and discussed the low percentage of schools that had a required course in reading at the secondary level for students having difficulty in reading.? The question was raised about whether the emphasis on reading proficiency in the primary grades would eliminate reading problems at the secondary level.? The general consensus was that reading problems would never be eliminated because of the many and diverse factors that could contribute to a student?s difficulties.

STUDY OF MIDDLE SCHOOL ATHLETIC PRACTICE DURING THE SCHOOL DAY

Dr. Freden reviewed the survey on middle school athletic practice during the school day, which had been requested by the Board after the revised Quality Performance Regulations allowing such practice had been in place for a year.? She indicated that the Planning and Research Team had surveyed 258 of the smallest school districts in the state in order to determine the impact on student achievement when allowing schools to use part of the school day for athletic practice.? Dr. Freden indicated that seventy percent of the surveys had been returned. ?The Planning and Research Team also gathered state assessment data for schools which had been granted waivers for school day athletic practice? for the year prior to the waiver being granted, during the year of the waiver, and the year following the waiver.? She reported that analysis of the data showed no significant change in mean student scores during the year of the waiver compared to the year prior to and the year after the waiver.? Though forty percent of superintendents surveyed were against school day athletic practice, the majority were somewhat or totally in favor of it, indicating the decision was based on resources available in the district or because it had a positive impact on students and families by allowing them more time together.? Because there appeared to be no major impact for school day athletic practice, Dr. Freden stated that no recommendations were being made to the Board to alter the regulation.

Page 5

MINUTES

August 8, 2000

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Kevin Ireland, staff attorney, was present to answer questions regarding the findings and recommendations of the Professional Practices Commission to the Board for action.? Mr. Rundell moved, with a second by Dr. Abrams, that the State Board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of the Professional Practices Commission in case No. 00-FC-06 and approve the recommendations of the Commission.? The motion

carried.

MODEL FOREIGN LANGUAGE CURRICULUM STANDARDS

Dr. Freden introduced Jenny Banks, member of the foreign language curriculum standards writing team, who was present to answer any questions from the Board regarding the standards.? There being none, Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever, that the model foreign language standards be approved. ?The motion carried.

CONDITIONAL ACCREDITATION OF TWO SCHOOLS

Dr. Steve Adams, Team Leader, School Improvement and Accreditation, presented the rationale behind the NCA/QPA onsite visiting accreditation team?s recommendation that St. John Military Middle School and St. John Military High School be conditionally accredited.? He indicated that tests scores were declining or flat except for a slight increase in the middle school scores.? He also reported that the high school had been using ACT scores as one of its three assessment measures, but because only 17% of the students take the ACT, it is not a valid measure.? Dr. Adams noted that the schools had undergone changes in administrative leadership twice in the last two years and that the new administrator has assured the Department the schools will do whatever necessary to successfully address the deficiencies cited in their onsite visit reports.? Dr. Adams stated the Department will help them all it can to help themselves.? Mr. Rundell moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever, that the Board approve conditional accreditation status for St. John Military Middle School and St. John Military High School.? The motion carried.

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

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FY 2002 BUDGET

Deputy Commissioner Dale Dennis and Mr. Ron Nitcher, Team Leader, Agency Budgeting and Program Accounting, were present to assist the Board as it continued to develop it?s FY 2002 budget request.? Dr. Wagnon stated that the budget the Board tentatively approved at it?s July meeting made good sense because of the opportunity it provided to present its program priorities to accomplish school improvement.? Mrs. DeFever moved, with a second by Mr. Rundell, that the Board adopt the budget items that had been tentatively approved in July and then consider additional proposals to address areas not covered.? In the discussion that followed, Mr. Wyatt expressed his concern that special education funding, if added to the base, would leave some schools underfunded and others overfunded because it was not tied to the actual number of students in special education.? He asked if it was possible to fund special education as a weighting factor added for each student identified.? Mr. Dennis described problems associated with the current funding method, including potential over-identification of special education students and the difficulty of separating special education costs from those of regular education when more and more special education students are integrated into the regular classroom.? Additionally, Mr. Dennis indicated that funding in the formula allowed more local control because local option budgets were based on the amount approved as general state aid.? Additional positive factors discussed by the Board included the fact that school staffing would be for the benefit of all students; there would be fewer audit exceptions; and it would encourage mainstreaming special education students.? In response to a question from Mrs. Holloway, Mr. Dennis indicated that districts would still have the flexibility to have separate classrooms for special education students as needed.

Additional Budget Items

Teacher Recruitment Incentives

Mr. Dennis introduced additional issues for the Board to consider adding to it?s budget request or legislative

package.? The first issue was for funding teacher recruitment incentives to provide scholarships for selected students enrolled in or planning to enroll in a teacher education program in a Kansas college

Page 6

MINUTES

August 8, 2000

or university.? Additionally, students would have to provide one year of teaching service for each year of funding in Kansas in the hard-to-fill areas of study for which they were selected, as defined annually by the Department of Education.? This would be accomplished by encouraging the State Board of Regents to add an additional \$500,000 to their FY 2002 budget request to increase the amount available in the Kansas Teacher Scholarship Program.? Board discussion followed.? Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that the Commissioner and the Board Chairman write a letter to the Kansas Board of Regents encouraging it to increase its budget request for the Kansas Teacher Scholarship Program by \$500,000.? The motion carried.

Assistance for Truancy Prevention

The second issue for the Board to consider was how to assist students who take longer to learn and whose potential for truancy leads to failure.? The Board looked at several options for providing additional funding to schools to address this problem.? After Board discussion of the options, Dr. Abrams, with a second by Mr. Rundell, moved that schools be allowed to add students to the count of at-risk students if they have not made satisfactory progress to graduate on schedule during the preceding year (grades 9-12), or if they have had truancy or attendance problems during the preceding year (grades K-12), as provided by state law, at an estimated cost of \$4 million.? After discussing the motion, it carried unanimously.

Incentives for Participation on QPA Visiting Teams

Dr. Abrams suggested that, because of the difficulty the Department had in finding and retaining Quality Performance Accreditation visiting team chairs, the Board look at ways to encourage district and building administration to allow qualified staff to participate.? Mr. Dennis suggested that the funding for incentives could be added to the discretionary grants the Board had approved.? Board members discussed the need for non-monetary incentives as well.? Suggestions included letters of commendation sent to the building or district for its support of participation, and promotion of participation in Department publications and recognition of districts who support it.? Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. Brown, that \$300,000 be added to the Board's request for discretionary grants to provide incentives to districts to allow teacher participation as QPA team chairs.? Additionally, staff was asked to refine the wording of the proposal for providing incentives in order not to overlook options for non-monetary incentives and present it in final form for approval at the September Board meeting.? The motion carried.

Dr. Abrams asked if the staff was developing talking points for the Board to use in communicating its recommendations on school finance and the KSBE budget to the legislature and the School Finance Task Force.? Mr. Dennis indicated staff was working on them and they would be sent to the Board in a Commissioner's Friday letter as soon as they were available.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Rundell moved approval of the consent agenda and Mrs. DeFever seconded the motion.? The motion carried and the consent agenda was approved as presented.

In the consent agenda, the State Board:

- ? Received the monthly personnel report.
- ? Confirmed the special projects appointments of Amanda Jeffrey to Secretary I position under the PAT/AIDS and Human Sexuality grant, effective July 11, 2000, at a biweekly rate of \$644.80; and Martha Gage to the unclassified position of Team Leader, Certification and Teacher Education, effective August 7, 2000, at a biweekly pay rate of \$2,781.69.
- ? Received end-of-year reports from Kansas State School for the Blind and Kansas State School for the Deaf.

Page 7

MINUTES

August 8, 2000

- ? Approved school construction plans for Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch, USD 231; Emporia, USD 253; Haven Public Schools, USD 312; Andover, USD 385; Holcomb, USD 363; Johnson County Community College; Holton, USD 336; Wichita, USD 259; Neodesha, USD 461; El Dorado, USD 490; Spearville, USD 381; Winfield, USD 465; Dodge City, USD 443; Barber County North, USD 254; Shawnee Mission, USD 512; Pratt, USD 382; and Marais De Cygnes Valley, USD 456.
- ? Approved Cycle I accredited status for USD 204: Bonner Springs High School; USD 500: F L Schlagle High School; Kansas City Catholic Diocese: Sts. Peter and Paul Elementary, Immaculata High School, St. Patricks Elementary, Holy Name Elementary, Bishop Miege High School, Cure of Ars Elementary and St. Ann Elementary; USD 229: Blue Valley Northwest High School and Heartland Elementary; USD 348: Baldwin Elementary, Baldwin Jr. High School, Marion Springs and Vinland Elementary; USD 319: Lawrence Gardner High School; Lutheran Schools (Topeka) Zion Lutheran Elementary, St. Paul Lutheran Elementary (Leavenworth) and Immanuel Lutheran Elementary; USD 281: Hill City Elementary and Hill City High School; USD 443: Beeson Elementary and Soule 6th Grade Center; USD 333: Concordia Jr.-Sr. High School; Salina Catholic Diocese: Tipton High School; USD 259 Wichita: Hyde International Studies/Community? Elementary Magnet, Sowers Special Education Center, Northeast Magnet High and Downtown Law and Truesdell Middle School; Wichita Catholic Diocese: Holy Savior Catholic Academy, St. Mary Elementary, School of the Magdalen Elementary, St. Mary Catholic Elementary (Derby), St. Patrick Catholic Elementary (Newton), Holy Name Catholic Elementary (Coffeyville) and St. Andrew Catholic Elementary; USD 285: Cedar Vale Elementary and Cedar Vale High School; USD 465: South Vernon Elementary, Irving Elementary, Lowell Elementary, Whittier Elementary, Winfield Middle School and Winfield High School; and Cycle II accredited status for USD 512: Brookridge Elementary, Indian Woods Middle School and Shawnee Mission South High School; USD 231: Nike Middle School; USD 450: Shawnee Heights Sr. High School; USD 497: Lawrence Central Jr. High School; USD 443: Sunnyside Elementary; USD 457: Kenneth Henderson Middle School; USD 498: Valley Heights Elementary (Blue Rapids), Valley Heights Elementary (Waterville) and Valley Heights Jr./Sr. High School; USD 418: McPherson Middle School and McPherson High School; USD 460: Hesston High School; Wichita Catholic Diocese: St. Mary?s Colgan High School; and USD 404: Riverton Elementary, Riverton Middle School and Riverton High School.
- ? Authorized Department of Education staff to issue a special certificate for school counselor to those

persons who meet the criteria for such a certificate.

? Approved renewal of Visiting Scholar Certificates for Dr. Dixie McReynolds to teach science, grades 7-12, for the 2000-2001 school year at Accelerated Schools of Overland Park; David Eichler to teach behavior disorders, grades 7-12, at the Southeast Kansas Education Service Center; Colleen Brooks to teach Japanese over the Distance Network, grades 7-12, at the Southeast Kansas Education Service Center;? Susie Beck to teach home economics, grades 7-12, at Prairie View High School; Richard Harrison to teach behavior disorders, grades 7-12, at the Southeast Kansas Education Service Center; and Todd Wilkinson to teach music, grades 7-12, at Sumner Academy.

? Approved the award of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration grants for FY 2001, using Title I funds for: Success for All - USD 283, Elk Valley Elementary, \$55,000; USD 101, St. Paul Elementary, \$55,000; USD 202, Oak Grove Elementary, \$84,054, and Turner Elementary, \$68,867; and Lightspan Achieve Now - USD 259, Clark Elementary, \$73,638; using Funds for Improvement of Education: Talent Development High School ? USD 501, Highland Park High School, \$76,500; Core Knowledge ? USD 259, Funston Elementary, \$65,800; and Pathways to Success ? USD 501, French Middle School, \$67,655.

? Approved Structured Mentoring grants for USD 253 Emporia, \$132,700; USD 259 Wichita , \$89,472; USD 261 Haysville, \$72,238; USD 293 Quinter, \$11,000; USD 341 Oskaloosa, \$43,000; USD 365 Garnett, \$5,650; USD 489 Hays, \$37,900; USD 500 Kansas City, \$62,253 but not to exceed \$105,100; and #609 Southeast Kansas Education Service Center, \$45,787.

Page 8

MINUTES

August 8, 2000

? Approved FY 2000-2001 Educate America Act Year Two-Seven Local Reform grants in the amount of \$7,000 for Fowler USD 225, Wabaunsee East USD 330, Royal Valley USD 337-Mayetta, Sublette USD 374, Marion USD 408, Nemaha Valley USD 442-Seneca, Pawnee Heights USD 496-Rozel, Satanta USD 507, Smoky Hill Education Service Center (2), Ft. Hays Education Development Center, and Prairie Hills Interlocal 635-Mullinville; and for Blue Valley USD 229-Overland Park, \$66,440; Olathe USD 233, \$80,768; Wichita USD 259, \$190,124; Shawnee Heights USD 450, \$13,660; Geary County USD 475, \$26,012; El Dorado USD 490, \$8,896; and Smoky Hill Education Service Center 629, \$20,372; and approved Preservice Professional Development Partnership grants in the amount of \$25,000 for Olathe USD 233, Ness City USD 303, Great Bend USD 428, Neodesha USD 461, Geary County USD 475, El Dorado USD 490, Kansas City USD 500, and Central Kansas Education Service Center 628; and for Derby USD 260, \$20,265.

? Received a summary of 1999-2000 Kansas Educate America Act State Panel Work.

? Approved a request from USD 268 Cheney for a waiver of the education requirement for a Parents as Teacher parent educator, Mrs. Debbie Henson.

? Approved School Violence Prevention continuation grants for East Central Cooperative, \$60,000; Fort Hays, \$42,000; Garden City, \$65,000; North Central Kansas Service Center, \$75,000; Ottawa, \$40,000, Topeka, \$103,000; Wichita, \$103,000; and a planning grant for Kansas City, \$12,000.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Voth called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, August 9, 2000, in the Board Room of the State Board of Education Building, 120 SE 10th Avenue in Topeka, Kansas.

ROLL CALL

Members present were:

Steve Abrams	I.B. ?Sonny? Rundell
John Bacon	Harold Voth
Mary Douglass Brown	Bill Wagnon
Val DeFever	Bruce Wyatt
Linda Holloway	

Mrs. Waugh was not present.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Voth asked that the day be extended and an executive session for the purpose of discussing matters regarding non-elected personnel be added after a lunch break.? Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. Holloway, that the agenda be approved as modified.? The motion carried.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW EMPLOYEES

Mr. Lanny Gaston, Director of Personnel, introduced new Kansas Department of Education staff: Lisa Akard, Education Program Consultant, School Improvement and Accreditation; Karen Campbell, School Food Service Consultant, Nutrition Services; Amanda Jeffrey, Secretary I, Consolidated and Supplemental Programs; Linda Loder, Information Resource Specialist III, Computer Information and Communication Services; Christina A. Madden, Office Assistant IV, Computer Information and Communication Services; Emily Ryan, Secretary I, Consolidated and Supplemental Programs; Randy Stout, Grant Writer, Planning and Research; and Sherry A. Triggs, Education Program Consultant, School Improvement and Accreditation.? Attending a team retreat and unable to be present was Shelby Fenoglio, Assistant Education Program Consultant, Consolidated and Supplemental Programs.

ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO INSERVICE EDUCATION REGULATIONS

Mr. Rundell moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever, that the State Board of Education adopt amendments to inservice education regulations K.A.R. 91-1-146a and 91-1-146e. On a roll call vote, the motion carried 9-0 as follows:

Dr. Steve Abrams????????? ?Yes?	Mr. I.B. Rundell????????????????? ?Yes?
Mr. John Bacon????????????? ?Yes	Mr. Harold Voth????????????????? ?Yes?
Mrs. Mary Brown????????? ?Yes?	Dr. Bill Wagnon????????????????? ?Yes?
Mrs. Val DeFever????????? ?Yes?	Mrs. Janet Waugh??????????????? not present
Mrs. Linda Holloway????? ?Yes?	Mr. Bruce Wyatt????????????????? ?Yes?

August 9, 2000

ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM APPROVAL REGULATIONS

Mr. Rundell moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever, that the State Board of Education adopt amendments to institutional accreditation and program approval regulations K.A.R. 91-1-68a, 91-1-68b, 91-1-68c, 91-1-68d, and 91-1-68e and revocation of 91-1-70b.? ?On a roll call vote, the motion carried 9-0 as follows:

Dr. Steve Abrams????????? ?Yes?	Mr. I.B. Rundell????????????????? ?Yes?
Mr. John Bacon????????????? ?Yes	Mr. Harold Voth????????????????? ?Yes?
Mrs. Mary Brown????????? ?Yes?	Dr. Bill Wagnon????????????????? ?Yes?
Mrs. Val DeFever????????? ?Yes?	Mrs. Janet Waugh????????????????? not present
Mrs. Linda Holloway????? ?Yes?	Mr. Bruce Wyatt????????????????? ?Yes?

REPORT ON STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES STUDY AND SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON EARLY CHILDHOOD

Dr. Sharon Freden introduced Judy Pfannenstiel, Research Training and Associates (RTA), to report on the results of the Staff Development Practices Study and the Summary of Research on Early Childhood. RTA had been selected by the Department as the contractor for the two studies and Dr. Pfannenstiel had been the principal investigator.?? Dr. Pfannenstiel described the selection process for the study sample and noted that there had been an 83 percent overall response rate from those teachers and principals asked to participate.? She also indicated that data from the national study of the Eisenhower grants supporting professional development had been used as a source for comparing data from the Kansas schools.

Professional Development Practices Study

Dr., Pfannenstiel reviewed responses received from teachers and principals on professional development practices.? Issues covered in the survey included:.? types of professional development in which teachers are participating; kinds of support for professional development available from schools and districts; the focus and intensity of professional development; beliefs and attitudes about professional development; and level of participation in on-the-job practice of new skills or strategies.? Dr. Pfannenstiel reported on the funding levels and sources of funding for professional development, with state appropriations being the largest single source for schools.? Roadblocks to professional developed were the lack of substitute teachers; lack of funds in elementary schools for stipends, consultants and follow-up training; and for only twenty percent of schools, lack of district support.? Dr. Pfannenstiel also reported on the principal recommendations arising from the report which are as follows:?

- 1) Develop strategies to allow teachers more time for professional development, including the availability of substitute teachers; increasing teachers? duty days to be spent on professional development; and providing time for teachers for planning and learning new strategies.
- 2) Increase funding for professional development support, i.e. stipends, consultants, and follow-up training.
- 3) Involve teachers in planning so they have input into the content and quality of professional development activities.? Also encourage districts to obtain teacher evaluations of district-sponsored professional development so that those activities are more meaningful to teachers and students.
- 4) Provide all teachers with greater opportunities for on-the-job practice, follow-up training, coaching, mentoring and other opportunities for extended, in-depth learning.
- 5) Expand opportunities for elementary teachers to participate in professional development on science

content areas; and for middle and secondary teachers to participate in professional development in content areas they teach.

6) Provide for opportunities for teachers to learn strategies to help them understand and effectively work with children with disabilities, students from diverse cultural backgrounds, and children with limited English proficiency or where English is a second language.

7) Provide incentives and meaningful professional development opportunities for teachers who frequently use traditional teaching practices and have a lower participation rate in all forms of professional development.

Page 3

MINUTES

August 9, 2000

Additionally, Dr. Pfannenstiel reported that because professional development had a strong influence on teaching practices and reflects research on effective practices, questions about teaching practices used were built into the survey.? Recommendations from the survey on teaching practices were:

- 1) Offer more professional development opportunities on inquiry-based strategies and on integrating technology as a teaching and learning tool.
- 2) Provide teachers with performance-based assessment examples that encompass a broad range of curricular standards.
- 3) Encourage teachers to instruct students in assessing their own and peer?s work in order for students to develop self-evaluation skills.
- 4) Provide professional development support and resources for all teachers, especially at the middle/secondary level, to increase the time spent engaging in purposeful writing and other literacy activities.

Brief Board discussion followed.

Summary of Research on Early Childhood Learning

Dr. Pfannenstiel reported that a literature review had been conducted in order to identify best practices and programs in the area of early childhood, focusing on programs for three to eight-year old children.? Lessons from that review indicated that education was becoming more focused on improving the quality and challenges of learning opportunities for all children.? Additionally, Dr. Pfannenstiel reported that the focus was also on schools? readiness to serve a wide range of students who might vary dramatically in cognitive and academic achievement. Efforts were increasingly directed at leveling the playing field by ensuring readiness for all children, she noted.? Participation in the Parents as Teachers program followed by preschool attendance ensured that children are ready for school attendance, regardless of economic or minority status.

Information gathered for the early childhood survey conducted by RTA included the percent of Kansas schools offering pre-kindergarten and special education programs for three and four-year olds, as well as the percent offering before and after-school care for pre-school and elementary students; the number of children in Head Start, the At-Risk four-year old program; Title I pre-kindergarten, Early Childhood Special Education, Even Start and Migrant Even Start; average enrollment in pre-kindergarten programs and the eligibility criteria used; funding and staffing of pre-school/pre-kindergarten programs, including training of personnel and professional and staff development; the number of schools with Parents as Teachers programs; information on the number of schools with pre-kindergarten programs which also offer all-day kindergarten;

pre-kindergarten program models used; and enrollment percentages for the special needs children and gifted students in pre-school through grade three.

Ms. Pfannenstiel reported that possible policy recommendations resulting from the survey included:?

1. provide increased access to publicly funded preschool programs in Kansas;
2. assist schools in developing appropriate high quality curriculum/programs for the early childhood age group; and
3. provide on-going and high-quality professional development in the area of early childhood/child development for teachers and paraprofessionals.

Commissioner Tompkins requested the number of pre-K students served in schools and Dr. Pfannenstiel indicated she would add that figure to the report.? To a question about whether the findings in the report could help justify the Board?s commitment to pre-K funding, Dr. Pfannenstiel responded that the report could prove useful for that purpose.

Page 4

MINUTES

August 9, 2000

PROPOSED TIMELINE FOR EDUCATOR LICENSURE REGULATIONS

Dr. Martha Gage, Team Leader, Certification and Teacher Education, reviewed a proposed timeline for implementation of the newly adopted educator licensure regulations.? She indicated that the timeline which covered the period July, 2000 through July, 2001, included the development of the regulations and guidelines for implementing the mentoring program for new teachers, as requested by the legislature, and teacher preparation institution testing information required on the state report card by the federal government.? Development of teaching standards would begin with a Regulations Committee review of the K-12 standards they had developed several years ago, and, Dr. Gage reported, the Policy and Procedures Committee would begin work on the transition plan for institutions.? Additionally, the Professional Standards Board would begin work on the assessment model.? In the Board discussion that followed, Dr. Gage was asked by Dr. Wagnon to carefully review the composition of endorsement standards writing committees to ensure appropriate representation from higher education for each discipline.? He also indicated it would be important to encourage the teacher preparation unit heads to develop a close working relationship with arts and science departments in the implementation of the new standards and accreditation regulations.? Mrs. Brown expressed the importance of keeping committees at manageable numbers.? Mr. Bacon asked that the Board be provided with the lists of members of the endorsement standards writing committees.

The Board took a short break at 10:20 a.m. and returned at 10:30 a.m.

STUDY SESSION ON KANSAS COMMISSION ON TEACHING AND AMERICA'S FUTURE (KCTAF) RECOMMENDATIONS

Commissioner Tompkins, with Dr. Martha Gage, began the review of the recommendations received in July from the Kansas Commission on Teaching and America?s Future.? He reviewed the status of those recommendations which were in progress or had already been accomplished and asked for direction from the Board about whether the others were a Board priority. Recommendations about which Board members had

comments follow.

Goal I. *Get Serious about Standards for Both Students and Teachers?*

I.1. Support and Strengthen student achievement in Kansas.

I.1.1. Continue to review and refine curriculum standards for students and use those standards as a foundation for reform ? Dr. Tompkins reported this recommendation as accomplished with the development of revised curriculum standards.? It was noted that it was also an ongoing effort as standards reviews took place under statutory requirements.? Dr. Wagon stated that much needed to be done in order to use the standards as a foundation for school reform and needs to be noted as a high priority for improvement.? Mr. Rundell asked that it be continued as a priority.

I.1.2. Continue Quality Performance Accreditation and maintain focus and continuous improvement ?

Reported as accomplished, it was recommended that it also be recorded as in progress, because of the study committee currently beginning review of the process, and should be noted as a high board priority.

I.2. Establish a well-functioning Kansas system for setting, revising and enforcing standards for teacher preparation and licensure to give the profession a strong voice and role in improving the quality of practice.

I.2.1. Establish an independent professional standards board to set standards and to govern the Kansas education profession with an authority and conscience not vulnerable to changing political priorities -?? In the discussion that followed, concern was expressed about how a profession governed by an independent board would be held accountable for the taxpayer money that was its primary source of funding; what the experience was in states with independent boards; and who would have ultimately have control over teacher education and teaching standards.? Mr. Bacon suggested that a licensing board formed by the teacher organization might have more credibility.? Mr. Scott Brown, responding on behalf of KCTAF, indicated that details on how the board would be organized and structured had not been studied.

Page 5

MINUTES

August 9, 2000

He also explained that the recommendation came from the desire to see teaching as a true profession with autonomy for developing and maintaining standards, not to strip authority from one group and give it to another. It was the consensus of the Board that more information be gathered from states with independent boards, for Board deliberation on the recommendation.

I.3. Establish standards for Kansas teacher preparation programs and Kansas teacher licensing that are linked to Kansas student learning goals and that predict good performance in the classroom.

I.3.2. Require accreditation of all teacher education preparation programs in Kansas by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to ensure consistent quality and I.3.3. Issue initial licenses only to candidates who complete programs in NCATE-accredited institutions ? Dr. Tompkins indicated that being accredited by NCATE was currently up to each institution, though all the Kansas Regents institutions were required to have it.? The desirability of having common standards for all teaching institutions in the state, as well as common standards across the country was noted, as was the fact that most institutions see NCATE accreditation as desirable.? After further discussion about NCATE, the Commissioner stated additional information would be brought to the Board in September to assist in further discussion about NCATE and TEAC, the Teacher Education Accreditation Council, a newly organized organization which

would assist institutions in setting and assessing standards particular to their own institution.

Goal II. ?Reinvent Teacher Preparation and Professional Development?

II.1. Design and implement teacher education programs through school-university collaborations that tightly integrate coursework and clinical experiences.

II.1.2. Establish statewide standards for Kansas preK-12 clinical schools ? Reported as a recommendation already in progress, Mrs. DeFever noted it would raise the level of professionalism for all teachers in the field and that standards were necessary because professional development schools varied greatly in the state.

II.4. Use Kansas teacher, student and professional development standards as the basis for design, approval and investment in professional development programs.

II.4.1. Develop statewide standards for high-quality professional development, II.4.2. Require systems of staff development for teachers using measures of student achievement, accomplished teaching, and Quality Performance Standards, and II.4.3. Enact state policies and incentives that encourage school districts and teachers to invest in high-quality staff and professional development ? Board members, Mr. Brown, and staff discussed the differences in staff development and professional development.? Dr. Freden stated definitions for inservice training, staff development and professional development were being developed and would be brought to the September Board meeting for further discussion.

Commissioner Tompkins indicated that discussion of additional KCTAF recommendations, as well as issues which Board members wished to revisit for clarification, would continue at the September meeting.

APPOINTMENT OF NASBE MEETING DELEGATE AND ALTERNATE DELEGATE

Chairman Voth indicated that the Board would need to appoint a delegate and an alternate at the National Association of State Boards of Education Annual meeting in St. Louis, October 12- 14, 2000.? After discussion of which Board members would be attending the NASBE meeting because of NASBE committee activity, Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mr. Rundell, that Mrs. DeFever represent the Board as its official delegate and Mr. Rundell as the alternate.? The motion carried.

BOARD REPORTS

Board Attorney

Mr. Biles reviewed his recent activity on behalf of the Board and gave a brief update on the status of the school finance lawsuit.? Dr. Rundell moved, with a second by Mr. Bacon, that Mr. Biles? fees for services and expenses for July be paid as presented.? The motion carried.

Page 6

MINUTES

August 9, 2000

Legislative Coordinator

Mrs. DeFever gave an update on the Governor?s Task Force on School Finance, reporting on presentations on declining enrollment and the QPA process and history, and a discussion of why school finance won?t work if determined by the money available instead of the money needed.

Board Chairman

Chairman Voth reported that the October Board meeting would be held in Yoder, Kansas.?

Additional Budget Proposal and Action

Dr. Steve Adams was present and handed out two options for the Board to consider regarding the recommendation considered the previous day on providing funding for materials and costs associated with training trainers to provide professional development activities which were targeted toward instruction of indicators to be assessed.? Dr. Adams indicated that Option A represented funding for materials and costs associated with training trainers to provide professional development activities based on a three-year review and a five-year revision cycle for state curriculum standards, with an estimated cost of \$420,000 for FY 2002.? Option B, he reported, represented funding for those activities based on a five-year review and seven-year revision cycle for state curriculum standards, with an estimated cost of \$345,000 for FY 2002.

Board discussion followed to clarify some of the details of the proposals.? Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. Brown, that the Board adopt Option B and that \$345,000 be added to the Board?s budget request for the training program.? The motion carried.

Commissioner

Commissioner Tompkins briefly reviewed his written report, noting it contained information regarding leadership development initiatives and educator recruitment and retention issues.

Board Member Reports

Mrs. DeFever reported on the Social Studies Academy she had attended in Topeka July 28th?

Mrs. Holloway passed out a summary of a portion of a 1999 *Scientific American* article on scientists and religion which reported on the results of a 1998 anonymous survey done of National Academy of Science members regarding their belief in supernatural theism, or God.? Mrs. Holloway said the article stated that 90% of scientists surveyed did not believe in supernatural theism, or God, and that 95% of the biologists showed the same disbelief.

Future Agenda Items

John Bacon asked that the Policy Committee review and address how ad hoc and standing committees in the Department are formed.? Dr. Abrams asked for a presentation on Reading Recovery.?

APPROVAL OF BOARD TRAVEL

Mr. Bacon moved, with a second by Mrs. Brown, that the travel requests be approved as submitted.? The motion carried.

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:00 noon and returned at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. Holloway, that the Board recess into executive session for a period of one and one-half hours for the purpose of discussing personnel matters affecting non-elected personnel, so that the privacy, confidentiality and other rights of such personnel would not be violated, and that the open meeting should resume at 2:00 p.m.? The motion carried.? The open meeting resumed at 2:00 p.m. Dr.

Wagnon moved, with a second by Mrs. DeFever, that the Board recess into executive

