

## **KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**September 8, 1998**

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Gilmore called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 1998, in the Board Room of the State Board of Education Building, 120 SE 10th Avenue in Topeka, Kansas.

#### **ROLL CALL**

All members were present:

Steve Abrams	Mildred McMillon
Mary Douglass Brown	Wanda Morrison
Kevin Gilmore	I.B. "Sonny" Rundell
Linda Holloway	Mandy Specht
Scott Hill	Bill Wagon

Mrs. McMillon introduced Mrs. Janet Waugh, Board member-elect from District 1.

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chairman Gilmore asked that the consent agenda be moved to 1:30 p.m., before the panel discussion. Dr. Wagon asked that item 10 f., minutes of the Quality Performance Accreditation Advisory Council, be pulled from the consent agenda. Dr. Abrams asked that items 10 p., a contract for a videotape of Kansas Project Partnership activities, q., contract for leadership institutes for Kansas administrators, and w., requests from thirteen districts to hold bond elections, be pulled. Mr. Hill asked that items 10 b., appointment to an unclassified special project position, and o., information on the Learn and Serve America program grant competition, be pulled. Mrs. Holloway asked that item 10 k., regarding an Ed-Flex waiver be pulled. Mrs. Brown asked to pull items 10 n., concerning the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program, and s., a request to enter into a contract for a research study on student achievement in districts implementing standards-based reform. There being no further changes, Mrs. McMillon, with a second by Mrs. Brown, moved approval of the agenda as amended. The motion carried.

#### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Chairman Gilmore asked that the record of the vote on the motion to change the name of the social studies standards on August 12, 1998, be changed to 7-2, which would reflect his absence from the meeting that day. There being no further changes, Mr. Hill moved that the minutes for the August meeting be approved as corrected. Mrs. Specht seconded the motion and the motion carried.

## **RECOGNITIONS**

### **1997-1998 Blue Ribbon Schools**

**Deputy Commissioner Dennis introduced principals from the two Kansas schools which had been designated as 1997-1998 National Blue Ribbon Schools by the U.S. Department of Education.**

#### **Shawnee Mission South High School, USD 512**

Dr. C.H. "Corky" Jacobs, Principal of Shawnee Mission South High School, described the school's experience with the Blue Ribbon School application process and criteria used in the selection. He also noted that benefits experienced by the school from having undertaken the process included improved communication and awareness among the staff about activities outside of their individual departments and the positive community support the school had received.

#### **Olathe East High School, USD 233**

Dr. Karl Krawitz, Principal of Olathe East High School, briefly shared the school's experience with the process. Dr. Krawitz also shared what he believes are the four reasons the school was selected to receive the Blue Ribbon designation: 1) the school met or exceeded the standard of excellence in academic rigor and achievement; 2) an innovative, creative, comprehensive, student-oriented school improvement plan; 3) the active involvement of the community and parents in all aspects of the school; and 4) the school's commitment to a program of Service Learning.

Board questions followed and Chairman Gilmore congratulated the schools for their achievement.

## **CITIZENS' OPEN FORUM**

Chairman Gilmore opened the Citizens' Open Forum at 10:39 a.m. Because no one was present to address the Board, Chairman Gilmore declared the forum closed.

## **PRESENTATION**

### **Legislative Post Audit Report on Customized Training**

Mr. Joe Lawhon, Legislative Post Audit Division, reviewed the Post Audit report on community colleges' customized employee training courses (Business and Industry Service Program). Mr. Lawhon reported that the auditors surveyed all 19 community colleges to obtain financial information about customized training courses provided to businesses. They found that Dodge City Community College had generated 79% of the customized training credit hours provided by community colleges to business in 1997. They also found that at least 82% of the customized training credits hours provided by community colleges were provided at no direct cost to the requesting company and in some cases involved payback arrangements that resulted in the businesses receiving more back as reimbursement for rent and instructors' fees than the businesses had paid in tuition. Mr. Lawhon reported that, though these arrangements were not prohibited by state law, it was questionable whether they were reasonable or appropriate.

Additionally, Mr. Lawhon stated that many of the courses were little more than normal on-the-job training, taught by company employees to other company employees on company premises. He noted that officials of some of the participating businesses indicated they would continue to provide the training even if community colleges weren't involved. He indicated it was also questionable whether the Department should have allowed some of the courses to receive credit hours, though by doing so, community colleges were able to receive credit hour state aid for those courses. Mr. Lawhon reported that community colleges received nearly \$2.1 million in state aid for customized training credit hours, with Dodge City Community College receiving \$1.6 million of that aid, almost half of the state aid the community college received. If that aid were redistributed, 16 of the remaining 18 community colleges would have received more of the credit hour aid, ranging from \$15,000 to \$450,000. Mr. Lawhon reviewed recommendations contained in the report to ensure that: the Business and Industry Service program was operated as the legislature intended; the programs were being operated appropriately; that the approval process for customized training courses was efficient, consistent and well-documented; and that community colleges complied with the Department's requirements relating to hiring teacher for customized training classes.

Dr. Joe Birmingham, Assistant Commissioner for Lifelong Learning, described the Department response to the Legislative Post Audit report. He indicated that the issues fell into two categories. First were those that would require external action - public policy and legislative issues, such as whether it was appropriate for state credit hour and out-district aid to support customized training for business and industry, effectively at no cost. The other was a category of issues that could be addressed internally in the Department. One of the external questions for consideration, he suggested, was what authority the State Board had to limit community college boards. He noted that boards of community colleges have the authority to enter into contracts and to set tuition and fees, two areas of concern in the report. Dr. Birmingham stated legislative clarification would be required to address the issue. He stated further that the State Board only has authority to approve courses offered by community colleges and to determine whether funds received were used for approved courses. Dr. Birmingham stated the Department would revise and develop internal procedures to assure a more effective and efficient approval and monitoring process and would also seek to recommend legislative remedies for those issues over which the Department had no authority, or for which statutory clarification was needed. He indicated recommendations would be sent to the Board by October.

Board discussion and questions followed over the extent of Board authority and how the Department had responded to the issue when it was brought to the attention of Department staff and the legislature during the 1998 legislative session.

### **1998 Superintendents Leadership Institute**

Dr. Mary Devin, Superintendent of Geary County USD 475, and Dr. John Heim, Superintendent of Emporia USD 253, were present to report on their experiences with the 1998 Kansas Superintendent Leadership Institute provided by the United School Administrators (USA) under a contract with the Department. Dr. Devin reviewed the Institute agenda for the four sessions scheduled between March and September for the 1998 class of thirty. The two- and three-day sessions worked on developing and improving skills for team building, team effectiveness, leading change and conflict management. Dr. Devin reported that benefits of the program included a deeper understanding of leadership skills; a better understanding of personal strengths and areas for growth; tools to improve the effectiveness of local leadership teams; and the opportunity to learn through the interaction with other leaders who participated in the program. Dr. Heim reported that his Board was cognizant of the need for continuous learning and had recognized the benefits leadership training would provide to the whole district organization. He also shared some of the personal goals he had established as a result of his participation in the Institute. Dr. Heim also noted the shrinking pool of candidates for administrative positions in the state and the large number of superintendents new to the position this year. Board questions and discussion followed. Brilla Scott, USA Executive Director, was also present to answer questions about the program. Discussion included how participants were selected; how the program consultants were chosen; the cost of the program; and how the program might be modified to address the needs of building administrators when the program is offered to them next year. Dr. Abrams asked for a summary of program critiques prepared by the participants. It was also requested that low-performing school districts be targeted in the future. At 12:18 p.m. the Board recessed for lunch until 1:30 p.m.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Hill indicated his question regarding consent item 10 b. had been answered. In response to Mr. Hill's question regarding 1998 Learn and Serve grants, Mr. Gentry, Consolidated and Supplemental Programs, explained that the Department had been assigned to administer the federal funds available under the National and Community Service and Trust Act of 1993. Dr. Freden responded to Dr. Wagon's questions regarding the QPA Advisory Council's recommendation, contained in 10 f., that the requirement for local performance assessments in core curriculum areas be delayed one year. She indicated the Department would still require the assessment this year and would continue to provide districts with performance items for continuing the assessments. Dr. Freden also indicated new performance items would be available in November, as well as items used in other states. Mrs. Holloway had a question about an Ed-Flex waiver for a schoolwide program, item 10 k., and was told the program would provide the opportunity for all students in the school to benefit from Title I funding and that no additional funds would be required. Mrs. Brown had a question about item 10 n., grant awards for Safe and Drug Free Schools. She was told that all states had federal funds allocated for the program, for which state plans were submitted, and that some of those dollars were earmarked for competitive grants to schools. Mrs. Brown was told that funding for the contract in item 10 s., regarding a

study of student achievement in schools with a high percent of poverty and significant increases in state reading assessment scores had been made available to Kansas because the U.S. Department of Education was aware that Kansas had data available to identify possible schools for the study. Dr. Tompkins also indicated that a prior study which looked at strategies of high-performing schools had been of QPA pilot schools only. Dr. Abrams asked that item 10 p., a contract for a videotape of Kansas Project Partnership activities, be voted on separately. He indicated his other questions had been answered. Mrs. Specht moved, with a second by Mrs. McMillon, that the consent agenda, with the exception of item 10 p., be approved as presented. The motion carried.

In the consent agenda, the State Board:

- Received the monthly personnel report.
- Confirmed the unclassified special project appointment of Gail Matthews as a Office Specialist under the Kansas Commission on National and Community Services and Learn and Serve Grant, effective August 10, 1998 at an hourly rate of \$11.79.
- Confirmed the appointment of Carol Dermyer as Acting Team Leader, Student Support Services, effective August 10, 1998 at a bi-weekly salary of \$2,685.31.
- Approved school construction plans for Shawnee Mission, USD 512; Cure' of Ars Catholic School, Leawood, Newton, USD 373; Salina, USD 305; Wichita, USD 259; Emporia, USD 253; MidAmerican Nazarene University, Olathe; Olathe, USD 233; Nemaha Valley Schools, USD 442; McPherson College, McPherson; Mulvane, USD 263; Dexter, USD 471; Osage City, USD 420; and Haysville, USD 261.
- Received minutes from the April 20, 1998 meeting of the Quality Performance Accreditation Advisory Council.
- Approved Cycle I accredited status for Salina Catholic Diocese: St. John Elementary, Hanover; Wichita Catholic Diocese: St. Joseph Elementary, McPherson; USD 500 Kansas City: Noble Prentis Elementary and William A. White Elementary; USD 454 Burlingame Public Schools: Schuyler Elementary; USD 330 Wabaunsee East: Dover Elementary, Eskridge Elementary, Mission Valley High School, and Harveyville Elementary; USD 335 North Jackson: Jackson Heights High School and Jackson Heights Elementary; USD 501 Topeka Public Schools: Shaner Elementary, Randolph Elementary and Whitson Elementary; USD 305 Salina: Salina South Middle School; USD 306 Southeast of Saline: Southeast Saline Elementary; USD 435 Abilene: Kennedy Elementary; USD 308 Hutchinson Public Schools: Morgan Elementary; USD 373 Newton: Lincoln Elementary, Northridge Elementary and Sunset Elementary; USD 259 Wichita: Pleasant Valley Middle School; USD 505 Chetopa: Chetopa High School; USD 264 Clearwater: Clearwater High School; and USD 394 Rose Hill Public Schools: Rose Hill Middle School.

- Approved requests for waiver of state QPA regulation from: USD 103 Cheylin to allow Carol A. Partch to teach English to special education and at-risk students; USD 232, DeSoto High School, to allow David Theis to teach three hours of high school physical science; USD 251, Northern Heights High School, to allow Greg French to teach weightlifting at the secondary level; USD 333, Concordia Jr.-Sr. High School, to allow Natalie Vogt to serve as a media center specialist; USD 386 Madison Virgil to allow David A. Sielert to teach secondary foreign language, 8<sup>th</sup> grade English, and creative writing/technical writing for 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade students; USD 418 McPherson to allow Scott Bonnett to teach high school debate/forensics; Kansas State School for the Blind to allow it to not include the state assessment results in reading or mathematics in the School Profile until appropriate assessments are developed; McPherson County Special Education Cooperative to allow Kimberly Reazin to teach learning disabled students at the middle school level; Sedgwick County Area Educational Services Interlocal Cooperative to allow Joyce L. Kaufman to teach special education students at the secondary level; Southeast Kansas Special Education Cooperative to allow Judy K. Taylor to be a K-8 special education teacher, Karen Williamson to teach adaptive physical education and Cynthia Garner to teach special education students at the middle school level; Tri-County Special Education Independence to allow Dorothy Jean Sullivan to teach learning disabled special education students at the elementary level, Emily B. Foreman Brumley to teach K-9 learning disabled students, Lea Bender and Bobbi Tripp to serve as speech therapists, and Averal Barmann to serve as a special education teacher in the area of early childhood; Twin Lakes Educational Cooperative to allow Judy Dreeszen to serve as a K-8 gifted facilitator; USD 269 to allow Judy Blecha to teach 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade English; Leavenworth County Special Education Cooperative to allow Michael Browne and Beth Noland to teach learning disabled students at the secondary level and Martin McPherson to teach learning disabled students.
- Approved with stipulations requests for waiver of state QPA regulation from: USD 469 Lansing to allow Don R. Allen to teach high school physical science; and USD 500 White Church to allow Ms. Devin Brown to teach in a K-1 full inclusion class.
- Approved request for waiver of state regulations for special education from USD 230 Spring Hill.
- Received the annual report of the State Advisory Council for Special Education for FY 1998.
- Approved request from USD 261 Haysville for an Ed-Flex waiver from Title I regulations to conduct a schoolwide improvement program.
- Approved the inservice education plans for USD 231 Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch, USD 265 Goddard, USD 313 Buhler, USD 331 Kingman, USD 335 North Jackson, USD 406 Wathena, and USD 450 Shawnee Heights.
- Approved Structured Mentoring grants for USD 202 Turner; USD 230 Spring Hill; USD 248 Girard; USD 253 Emporia; USD 257 Iola; USD 259 Wichita; USD 261 Haysville, USD 305

Salina; USD 337 Royal Valley; USD 341 Oskaloosa; USD 383 Manhattan; USD 475 Morris County; USD 465 Winfield; USD 501 Topeka; and the South Central Kansas Educational Service Center.

- Approved FY 1999 Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities program grants for USD 500 Kansas City, ESC 609 Southeast Kansas Education Service Center, USD 262 Valley Center Schools, USD 233 Olathe, USD 409 Atchison, USD 289 Wellsville, USD 475 Geary County, ESC 629 Smoky Hill Service Center, USD 453 Leavenworth, USD 457 Garden City, ESC 633 Fort Hays Educational Development Center, and USD 259 Wichita.
- Received information on the 1998-1999 Learn and Serve America grant competition.
- Received draft minutes of the July 17-18, 1998 meeting of the Kansas Assessment Technical Advisory Council.
- Approved recommendations from the Certification Review Committee for cases 1620, 1631, 1635, 1637-1651, 1653 and 1655-1657,
- Certificates of Approval under the Kansas Proprietary School Act were issued to Universal Technical Institute, Houston, TX; Johnson County Board of Realtors, Overland Park, KS; Graham School, Inc., Garnett, KS; The Travel Academy, Overland Park, KS; High Tech Institute, Phoenix, AZ; and Grand Island College, Grand Island, NE.
- A 1998 commercial driver training school license under the Driver's Training School License Act was issued to Safety First Services, Liberal, KS.
- Issued orders to USD 202, Turner, Wyandotte County, USD 235 Uniontown, Bourbon County, USD 250, Pittsburg, Crawford County, USD 254, Medicine Lodge, Barber County, USD 265, Goddard, Sedgwick County, USD 307, Ell-Saline, Saline County, USD 343, Perry-Lecompton, Jefferson County, USD 371, Montezuma, Gray County, USD 376, Sterling, Rice County, USD 385, Andover, Butler County, USD 416, Louisburg, Miami County, USD 457, Garden City, Finney County, and USD 486, Elwood, Doniphan County, granting them authority to hold elections on the question of the districts' general bond debt limitation.
- Approved the Nutrition Education and Training Program State Plan for FY 1999.

***Contracts Approved:***

The Superintendent of the Kansas State School for the Blind was authorized to negotiate and enter into contract for speech pathology services with Dr. Donald Robinson during the 1998-1999 school year, in an amount not to exceed \$28,400.

The Commissioner of Education was authorized to negotiate and enter into a contract with:

- the United School Administrators of Kansas to conduct leadership institutes for Kansas superintendents and principals, with the contract amount not to exceed \$60,000; and
- the University of Kansas to conduct a research study on student achievement, with the contract amount not to exceed \$15,091.

## **CONTRACT FOR SUMMARY VIDEOTAPE OF KANSAS PROJECT**

### **PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES**

Mrs. McMillon moved, with a second by Dr. Wagon, that the Commissioner of Education be authorized to negotiate and continue a contract with the Southeast Kansas Education Service Center to produce a final summary videotape on activities for years one through six of Kansas Project Partnership, with the contract amount not to exceed \$8,000. In response to Board questions, Phyllis Kelly, Coordinator, Educate America Act, explained that the videotape, which would be a final summary of the six years of Kansas Project Partnership activities, had been included as an evaluation component in the Kansas state plan as part of its federal grant. Dr. Kelly also indicated that the grant required that educational media and informational materials be included as part of the training and public awareness packages for teachers and administrators and would also be used to disseminate information about the program to other members in a ten-state program consortium of which Kansas was a member. The motion carried on a vote of 6-4.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **School-to-Work Panel**

Mrs. Vickie Kelly, School to Careers Project Manager, gave a brief history of School to Careers activities in Kansas from an initial meeting of state representatives with the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Education in September, 1993 through the final approval June 30, 1998 of the Kansas implementation grant. She noted that during the planning process, of the \$1,026,652 dollars received by the State of Kansas, \$643,400 had been allocated for 31 local planning grants, 10 curriculum development grants and 112 teacher internships. Mrs. Kelly also reported that Kansas would receive \$16.8 million over four years for its implementation grant, \$2.8 million for total first year funding. Of that \$2.8 million, slightly more than \$2 million will be allocated as subgrants to local partnerships. Mrs. Kelly also reviewed the three major focuses of the Kansas School to Careers Implementation application: integration of work-based and school-based activities; integration of academic and technical education; and linkages between secondary and post-secondary education. She noted that the emphasis of the program was to provide Kansas students with career options and opportunities. Mrs. Kelly answered Board questions about the internship grants, the Kansas grant application process, whether student participation is voluntary, and preservice and inservice teacher education.

After Mrs. Kelly's overview of the Kansas program, eight panelists, four proponents of the

program and four opponents, addressed the Board. First of the proponents to speak was Mr. Fred Bright, Human Resources Development Director, at Cessna in Wichita, KS. Mr. Bright spoke of the need of employers for a quality workforce--not students trained to do specific jobs, but trained how to learn many jobs. Mr. Bright also noted the higher level of basic skills that were required in the workplace today compared to a few years ago. He spoke of the role School-to-Work (STW) can play in providing opportunities that stress core academics and competencies, collaboration with others in a team environment, the relevance of learning from real-work experience, and accountability and consequences.

Ms. Diana DeLuca, Project Manager, Education Commission of the States (ECS), the next panelist, stated that ECS was interested in programs that show promise in improving the learning and success rates of students and noted that STW programs had the potential to contribute to those goals. After reviewing statistics on the high school and college graduation rates, the percentage of entering college freshman enrolled in remedial courses, the positive effects of continuing education on employment and family income, top reasons why students attend college, and preferred elements in a learning environment identified by students, Ms. DeLuca noted several necessary qualities that had been identified by employers. Those included honesty and integrity, proficiency in listening, reading, oral and written communication, responsibility for self and self-management, problem solving ability, and knowing how to learn. Ms. DeLuca posed several challenges the state STW programs needed to address. They included the need to balance STW with other education reforms such as Goals 2000; the need to balance the developmental needs of students with employer needs; the need to gain stakeholder (parents and teachers) support; the need to reach a common understanding about purposes and methods; the need to negotiate a philosophy of evaluation and accountability; the need for major infusions of time; and the need for restructuring of funding when the federal program sunsets.

Mr. Myron Graber, Principal at Abilene High School, described how the school had implemented its STW program. He noted that most schools typically identify students as those who are college bound (20% at Abilene High School), those who are thinking about college but have no concrete goals and enroll in a non- challenging curriculum (60-70%), and those who are at-risk (5-10%). Without lowering expectations for the brightest students, Abilene High School proposed, as part of its school improvement plan to bring those groups closer together. In order to accomplish it, they implemented several changes which included: adjustment of graduation requirements; development of six career pathways; integration of academic and vocational programs; development of competencies for vocational programs; development of program and course level outcomes and assessments; implementation of a block schedule; development of a STW program; staff development and counselor training; and providing every student with an advocate. Mr. Graber reported that every freshman now has a four-year plan of course study and a career portfolio that is added to throughout high school. Benefits already realized included more students taking an increased level of core courses, rising tests scores, and more parent and community involvement. He stressed that the school's goal was to provide students with the skills they need to successfully go on to the next level - whether a job or further education.

Ms. Pam Wiems, the last proponent to speak and Business Education Coordinator, Kansas City Kansas Area Chamber of Commerce, reviewed the history of efforts in the Kansas City area to assess what was needed to prepare students for success in the workplace and the development of

a framework for businesses to work with educators and students. She reported that among other activities, a program, "Reality 101", had been developed as an outgrowth of those efforts. Business volunteers were recruited for the program, to communicate in various ways with students at the middle school level. Ms. Wiems reported that volunteers emphasize the importance of staying in school and the relevance of skills being learned there. Volunteers also stress the importance of communication, critical thinking and dependability. The program has been extended to teachers through opportunities for workshops, workplace tours and teacher internships. Ms. Wiems noted that through the program, students are learning about career choices and opportunities for work in the community. She added that program success was dependent on a community decision and a community commitment.

The Board took a short break at 3:20 p.m. and reconvened at 3:33 p.m.

Mr. Robert Holland, Columnist and Editor of the Op-Ed Page, Richmond Times-Dispatch, was the first of the four opponents of STW to speak. Mr. Holland cited several concerns, the first of which was the issue of the constitutionality of a federal Department of Education and its potential to erode local and state control over public schools. Additionally, he questioned whether elements in the STW Act of 1994 violated a statutory prohibition against the Department of Education injecting itself into the curricula of local schools. Mr. Holland's second concern was about the way STW was adopted at the national level and was implemented at the state level without adequate dialogue with elected policymakers, elected state boards and legislators. He stated that STW asserts a redefinition of education and proposes that the purpose of education is to prepare students to fill a niche in the workforce, rather than to be educated citizens in a free society. Mr. Holland cautioned about the effects on representative government of a collaboration between big business and big government to control the schools in a managed economy. He expressed concern for the potential for STW programs to limit the horizons of young people by steering them into training for employment based on job market projections ten years in the future. He noted the potential for local industries to train more workers than needed in order to keep the cost of labor down. Mr. Holland also suggested that not all jobs of the future are high-skill and high-wage and that opportunities for a well-rounded education would be denied to young people tracked into jobs requiring minimal skills. He cautioned against STW programs that exploit students and use them as unpaid labor in exchange for class credit and work experience of questionable value. Finally, Mr. Holland discussed the assessment and electronic data collection elements of STW and the potential use to which they might be put by businesses as the beginnings of a national employability transcript.

The second opponent to speak was Dr. Gary Wolfram, Member of the Michigan Board of Education and Professor of Political Economics at Hillsdale College. As stated by Mr. Holland, Dr. Wolfram expanded on the issue of STW as an unconstitutional expansion of the federal government's power, referring to specific examples of mandated elements in the STW Act. He further added it is not the government's responsibility to determine how children should be educated, but the primary responsibility of parents. He cautioned that as education becomes thought of as the responsibility of government it becomes a political issue and cited the debate over the primary mission of schools: whether they should provide general knowledge or job training. Dr. Wolfram stated that the political economy of STW encourages a political process that engages special interest input into school curriculum through dialogue with the business

community on what job skills should be taught in schools. Dr. Wolfram discussed the power of market forces to more efficiently allocate resources, than the central planning principles which he sees imbedded in the STW program. He indicated the STW program calls for businessmen and educators to plan a curriculum to teach specific skills for specific industries and counsel children in finding a career path no later than the 7<sup>th</sup> grade. Dr. Wolfram suggested the dollars invested in STW efforts could be better spent in providing a strong foundation in basic educational skills. He noted that states are tempted to claim their share of federal dollars in programs such as STW, but they don't come without a cost.

Mrs. Diane Fessler, Member of the Ohio Board of Education handed out two documents, "Report on the Work Toward National Standards, Assessments and Certificates", based on activity in Ohio, and a Kansas-specific document, "School to Work: It's the Law". Both documents were authored by her. Ms. Fessler stated that STW redefines education as preparation for work and has as its goal the reinvention of government. She stated that the public policy question regarding STW was "why do schools exist". Mrs. Fessler expressed concern about the STW integration between the workplace and the school curriculum; the early introduction of career awareness activities in a child's schooling; computerized career portfolios beginning in the sixth grade, and the completion of a preliminary six-year individualized career plan by eighth grade students and their parents--citing elements contained in the South Central Kansas STW grant application. Further elements of concern were the selection at the end of ninth grade of a career major or cluster and a mandatory career education course taken in high school. Ms. Fessler expressed concern about mandatory elements of the federal law. She noted that the decision for a state to apply for funding was voluntary, but once funding had begun, it would be mandatory for all students in a state to participate. Ms. Fessler also expressed concern about implementation costs of STW and the need for the use of other funding to sustain the program. She indicated that STW would require states to incorporate work-based learning, school-based learning and connecting activities and discussed several of the components which she felt policymakers should question. She cautioned that skill certificates and Certificates of Initial Mastery would be required before a student became eligible for work, more job-training or more schooling. Ms. Fessler noted that funds could go directly from the federal government to local business and education partnerships, bypassing local school boards and other elected officials at the state and local level. Ms. Fessler reiterated what the two earlier opponents had stated about the lack of public debate over STW and a philosophy which would regulate and restrict children's future access to employment and education.

The final presenter of the afternoon was State Senator Laurie Bleeker. Senator Bleeker stated that the underlying premise of STW was that policymakers must do what labor and business want in order to address the rapidly changing needs of the workplace and that education must be restructured for the training and retraining of the workforce. She questioned whether the emphasis on the need for centralized planning for workforce training and labor market needs was based on sound data. Senator Bleeker described a national survey she had initiated of 400 large, medium and small businesses, undertaken in the Spring of 1998 to find out how business owners and managers perceived their employees and their training needs. The answers to many of the questions asked indicated that business owners and managers felt that the skills needed by entry-level employees were basic writing, oral and math skills and that job-specific skills were most easily improved after hiring. She reported that when asked what the primary role of a K-12

education should be, 65% responded it was to provide a broad, academic foundation. She noted that there appeared to be a knowledge gap among business owners about what STW was, that they didn't like many of the components, but like the concept as a whole. She stated there was a lack of understanding of the concept of integrated and applied academics. Senator Bleeker cited problems in the State of Oregon with STW pilot schools and declining test scores. She also reported on the subjective measures used by Oregon on their certificates of mastery and reported that under the federal STW plan students would not be able to continue their education or get a job without successfully achieving one. Senator Bleeker also expressed concern about the lack of a public policy debate over STW and stated that the elected State Board has the authority and responsibility for educational policy and is accountable to students for the policy decisions it makes. She further stated that, historically, the purpose of education was to provide a broad-based liberal arts education to prepare the next generation for change.

The Board took a break at 4:45 p.m. and returned at 4:55 p.m.

The presenters returned after the break for a question and answer session with the Board. Issues included in the discussion were the funding mechanisms that allowed grants to bypass elected officials and what kind of authority the Board had for oversight of the Kansas STW grant; compliance with mandatory elements in the federal law; how communities and school districts view and involve themselves in the program; prior Board involvement in initiatives for workforce development; and where the Board focus in establishing education policy should be.

Mr. Rundell left at 5:15 p.m. and Mrs. McMillon left at 5:35 p.m. because of prior commitments.

## **RECESS**

There being no further business for the day, Chairman Gilmore recessed the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

---

Kevin Gilmore, Chairman

---

Penny Plamann, Secretary

## **KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**September 9, 1998**

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Gilmore called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, September 9, 1998, 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	Mildred McMillon
Mary Douglass Brown	Wanda Morrison
Kevin Gilmore	I.B. "Sonny" Rundell
Linda Holloway	Mandy Specht
	Bill Wagnon

Mr. Hill was not present, but arrived at 9:03, shortly after the meeting started.

## **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Chairman Rundell asked for a motion to amend the agenda in order to add an executive session to discuss a legal matter after item 10, approval of Board travel. Mrs. Brown, moved, with a second by Dr. Abrams, that the agenda be so amended. The motion carried.

## **LEGISLATIVE MATTERS**

Deputy Commissioner Dale Dennis handed out copies of the 1998-1999 Kansas Educational Directory and the Kansas Superintendents Directory to Board members. He also commended Bob Gast, Team Leader, Recognition Programs, Graphic Arts and Printing, for the fine work his staff had done on producing the directories.

### **Kansas State School for the Blind Proposed FY 2000 Budget**

Mr. Daugherty reviewed his proposed FY 2000 budget. He indicated a reduced resource budget at a state funding level of \$4,176,649 could only be accomplished through a \$257,639 reduction of services and programs for students with blindness and multiple disabilities. As reported last month, it would include the elimination of three teachers, three dormitory teachers and the reduction of physical and occupational therapy services. To maintain services at their current FY 1999 level would require state funding of \$4,434,288. He noted his enhancement level budget represented a 3% salary increase, or \$47,074, to address the teacher salary equity adjustment recommended by the Division of Personnel Services. Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. Morrison, that the proposed FY 2000 budget for the Kansas State School for the Blind be approved as presented. The motion carried.

## **Kansas State School For The Deaf Proposed FY 2000 Budget**

Mr. Johnson indicated his proposed FY 2000 budget request and \$957,00 in requested capital improvements was the same as he had presented to the Board in August. His budget at a current services level would reduce staff shrinkage. A reduced services budget would increase shrinkage to 7.7%. Enhancement programs would decrease personnel shrinkage, continue the professional salary equity plan and expand the early childhood program. Total state general fund required for FY 2000 to maintain current services would be \$7,179,752, with an additional \$377,011 to implement the enhancement package, or a reduction of \$344,713 for a reduced services budget. Mrs. McMillon moved, with a second by Mrs. Morrison, that the proposed FY 2000 budget for Kansas State School for the Deaf be approved as presented. The motion carried.

## **Kansas Department of Education *Proposed FY 2000 Budget***

Mr. Dennis handed out an FY 2000 budget summary sheet reflecting Board action taken at the August, 1998 meeting. He noted that that detailed program-by-program information had been provided to the Board with their agenda materials. Board discussion followed and Mr. Dennis answered questions and provided clarification. In response to questions from Dr. Wagon and Mrs. McMillon, he indicated that the base state aid per pupil (BSAPP) included funding for four-year old at-risk programs and that though the BSAPP had risen over five years from \$3,600 to \$3,720, with a proposed increase to \$3,795, it had not kept up with the consumer price index. Dr. Abrams asked where School-to-Work funding was found in the budget the Board was being asked to approve. Mr. Dennis replied that program was funded with federal flow-through funds and was reflected in the Department's budget document that would be submitted to the Governor and that the budget the Board had been working on was for those activities funded from the state general fund. In response to a question from Mrs. Holloway regarding evaluation of the early childhood program, Commissioner Tompkins indicated he would provide Board members with the research design and a summary of what schools have been asked to do for the at-risk four-year-old program. He also indicated he would provide Board members with a portfolio on research into the benefits of early childhood education.

Mr. Hill moved, with a second by Mr. Rundell, that the State Board approve the FY 2000 budget as presented. Mr. Gilmore asked if the School-to-Work program was in the budget the Board was being asked to approve. Mr. Dennis indicated that as flow-through funds, Board approval was not required, but the program would be included in the approved budget document submitted to the Governor. Dr. Abrams, with a second by Mrs. Brown, proposed an amendment to the motion that School-to-Work funds be removed from the budget. Asked if the removal of the funds would affect FY 1999 activity, Mr. Dennis said it would not. A vote on the motion to amend failed on a vote of 5-5. The vote on the original motion failed on a vote of 5-5. Mrs. Morrison and Mr. Rundell asked that the vote on the original motion be clarified. Voting "yes" were Mr. Hill, Mrs. McMillon, Mrs. Morrison, Mr. Rundell and Mrs. Specht. Voting "no" were Dr. Abrams, Mrs. Brown, Mrs. Holloway, Chairman Gilmore and Dr. Wagon.

Mr. Hill moved that the FY 2000 budget be approved as presented with the exception of the

School-to-Work funding. Discussion followed. Dr. Wagnon indicated that the School-to-Work program deserved the Board's support and that his "no" vote on the original motion was because the budget did not provide adequate per pupil support. Mr. Hill's motion failed on a vote of 5-5 with Mr. Hill, Dr. Abrams, Mrs. Brown, Mrs. Holloway, and Chairman Gilmore voting "yes"; Mrs. McMillon, Mrs. Morrison, Mr. Rundell, Mrs. Specht and Dr. Wagnon voting "no".

### **1999 Legislative Education Issues and Legislative Brochure**

Mr. Dennis reviewed two proposals for inclusion in the Board's 1999 legislative package and responded to questions. Regarding revision to the definition of credit hour used by community colleges, Mr. Dennis explained that the proposal would bring the community college credit hour in line with the definition used by State Board of Regents institutions and most other institutions of higher education. He further explained that the proposal had been a non-controversial component of the plan proposed last legislative session by the Special Committee on Higher Education. He indicated that, currently, community colleges use a definition that one credit hour equals one hour of instruction per week or an equivalent thereof, while higher education institutions use a definition equal to one hour per week for fifteen weeks. A recommendation from the Kansas Association of Community Colleges suggested that the definition should include the basic unit of collegiate level of instruction as determined by the State Board, thereby giving the State Board the responsibility for defining a credit hour. Discussion followed. Mr. Hill stated the proposal should be included in the Board's legislative package. The Board discussed options to lower the state transportation mileage limitation in light of safety issues for children walking to school in unsafe districts, where districts don't have sidewalks or where student have to cross busy streets and highways. Dr. Abrams stated interest in a new funding formula with transportation included. It was recommended that the Board include in its legislative package a request to the Legislature to study the school finance statute to include a new funding formula for transportation and special education. It was requested that the Board be provided with special education funding options for its review as well. Mr. Dennis was also asked to include the Board's proposal on funding a statewide technology infrastructure in the legislative brochure.

### ***State General Fund***

Deputy Director Dale Dennis noted that state general fund receipts for July and August were down and that estimates for FY 1999 were in line with adjusted projections made in May, 1998. Mr. Dennis also advised Board members of an upcoming legislative interim committee meeting on special education to include catastrophic state aid and funding based on census data. A discussion of special education funding followed.

On a related budget matter, Mrs. McMillon asked that the Board to be provided with information about the cost in staff time and reimbursed expenses for the School-to-Work panel and to which budget line item the expenses would be charged.

The Board took a short break from 10:05 a.m. until 10:20 a.m.

### **STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT ISSUES**

## **Relationship of Curricular Standards, Benchmarks and Indicators to Assessments**

Dr. Freden introduced Matt Gandal, Director of Standards and Assessments for Achieve, Inc., and Dr. John Poggio, University of Kansas Center for Education Testing and Evaluation, to discuss how states which do not dictate a curriculum can find an appropriate balance between and among state curriculum standards, state benchmarks, state indicators, local curriculum and state assessments. Mr. Gandal noted that two issues faced by states which do not dictate a curriculum are 1) how to provide adequate specificity in the benchmarks and indicators for academic standards without dictating a curriculum; and 2) maintaining rigor in standards so that they compare favorably with other states and countries with expectations that are high enough, but are also reasonable. An additional issue to be addressed is that there is an adequate balance between content and skills. Mr. Gandal reported he had examined the revised Kansas communication arts and mathematics standards and compared them to earlier versions. He stated his belief that the new standards showed much improvement, were easier to read, specific enough for teachers to know what to expect, showed a better balance between content and skill, and provided an appropriate level of guidance with a focus on what needs to be taught-not how to teach it. He also applauded the inclusion of supplemental grade by grade material. Additionally, he noted that the Kansas standards are broad enough without covering too much curriculum.

Mr. Gandal discussed three issues which were important in considering the level of specificity and guidance provided for teachers, districts and parents. In describing the issue of equity, Mr. Gandal noted that when standards are too broad, expectations about what needs to be taught are often different between richer and poorer districts. He stated standards need to be specific enough at certain grade levels so that expectations will be met. Mr. Gandal noted that a related issue is mobility and that one-fifth of students move every year and that one-third of those at the poverty level move every year. States should develop a common core of academic expectations and consistency in their standards. Thirdly, fairness is another issue and one tied to accountability. If standards are not clear enough, the high stakes for assessments set up teachers and schools. Mr. Gandal expressed the hope that the Kansas science and social studies standards would be subjected to the same rigorous review as the communication arts and mathematics standards. The science standards needed more content and the social studies standards needed to be clearer about the core academic expectations. He also suggested that states need to review their assessments, as well, and examine how well they align with their standards. He noted that Kansas was lucky to have its testing contractor within the state and available to work closely with the Department.

Additionally, he stated that it was important for assessments to measure across a range of difficulty. He also cautioned that a balance needs to be maintained between the state and district roles in assessment and noted the burden on districts for tests to address standards. Lastly, regarding assessments, Mr. Gandal noted that though tests can have some very good multiple choice questions, there are certain limitations to their usefulness as a measure of expectations.

Dr. Poggio discussed the need for focus and specificity in standards to assist educators in providing instruction that meets the intent of the outcomes expected. He noted that when indicators are too vague instructional effort can become less relevant to education goals. He cited

several benefits of more specificity in indicators which included: 1) to help define and establish the curriculum to be taught; 2) to guide decisions regarding instructional approaches, teaching materials and learning activities; 3) to provide an effective means for communicating to parents and students the schools' immediate targets and expectations; 4) to assist professional development among educators; 5) to help shape a more accurate understanding of expectations; 6) to assist course planning and advising; 7) to provide a means for educators to formally review their instructional and curricular sequence; and 8) to identify the specific skills that will be tested. Of these benefits, he noted that least important was the assessment itself. Dr. Poggio also cautioned that too much specificity risked interfering with effective teaching practice and the development of complex thinking, as instruction becomes more focused on trivial outcomes and instruction is broken down into unrelated pieces.

Dr. Poggio reviewed two procedures to test whether a manageable number of educational outcomes are stated with sufficient specificity within a curriculum standard and recommended that Kansas standards be reviewed with consideration to these criteria and revisions be made as necessary. Additionally, he recommended that those outcomes be classified into three categories: those to be tested each time the assessment is given; those that will be eligible on a sampling basis to be included on the assessment; and those not likely to appear on an assessment, but that should be monitored by the local school. Dr. Poggio also stated that the standards for mathematics and communication arts were where they should be regarding specificity to provide adequate instructional guidance.

The Board discussed the issues presented by Mr. Gandal and Dr. Poggio and asked several questions, including what evaluation criteria were used by the different organizations that provide critiques of state standards and the use of performance elements on other states' assessments.

### **Reconsideration of the Decision on the 1998-1999 Writing Assessment**

Dr. Freden presented the difficulties created for some of the state's school districts by the Board decision to implement a more standardized writing assessment during the current academic year. Three options were presented for Board consideration. Mr. Rundell, with a second by Dr. Wagnon, moved approval of the third option, which would delay the implementation of a more standardized writing assessment until 1999-2000. The state would continue to use the current writing assessment at grades 5, 8 and 10 in 1998-1999. Implementation of the new reading and writing assessments at grades 5, 8 and 11 and the new mathematics assessment at grades 4, 7 and 10 would occur during the 1999-2000 academic year. Implementation of the new science and social studies assessments, as well as for reading, mathematics and grade 5 writing would occur during the 2000-2001 academic year. Discussion followed and included the potential problems some districts might encounter if the more standardized writing assessment were implemented this year. Mr. Phil Rhea of the Wichita School District was present and answered questions about their testing program. Of particular concern was the legal defensibility of the prompts used on the assessment. Other districts' concerns included staff development time needed for the potential testing of additional writing modes, scheduling grading time, possible increased scoring costs, and spring break conflicts. Many districts had developed their calendars in January of 1998 based on earlier information provided on the assessment schedule and have found they are unable to adjust

to the changes required by the narrowed time frame for the assessment. Dr. Freden also indicated there was a need for additional time for fine tuning the assessment rubrics. The motion carried on a vote of 9-1.

## **Revised Music Standards**

Dr. Freden introduced Dr. Jana Fallin, Chair of the Music Standards Writing Committee, who was present to answer any Board questions about revisions made to the proposed music standards in response to Board comments at the July meeting. In response to a question from Mrs. McMillon about why Music Educators National Conference (MENC) were not included, Dr. Fallin indicated that their use was denied because MENC sells them, but that they are readily available and reasonably priced. Dr. Abrams moved that the proposed Kansas Music Standards be approved. Mr. Hill seconded the motion and the motion carried.

The Board took a break at 10:15 a.m. and returned at 10:25 a.m.

## **VISITING SCHOLAR CERTIFICATES**

Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mr. Hill, that the Board deny requests for visiting scholar certificates from the Southeast Kansas Education Service Center for David Eichler and from Bishop Carroll High School in Wichita for Pamela Wheatcroft, as recommended by Department staff. The motion carried.

Mr. Ken Bungert, Team Leader, Certification and Teacher Education, briefly reviewed for the Board the history of the situation in USD 497, Lawrence, requiring the use of visiting scholars in its program for autistic students. He noted that in Board action last month, visiting scholar certificates had been issued to four individuals, contingent upon enrollment in the Fall of 1998 in coursework that would lead to certification. Because of personal difficulties, USD 497 had asked the Board to reconsider the provision requiring Fall enrollment and extend it to the Spring of 1999 for two of the individuals. Mrs. Specht moved, with a second by Mrs. McMillon, that the Board approve visiting scholar certificates for Craig Parlato and Adriana Gonzalez-Lopez to teach autistic students in USD 497 during the 1998-1998 school year with the stipulation that they be enrolled in the Spring of 1999 in coursework that will lead to certification. In Board discussion that followed, Mrs. Holloway noted that the situation highlighted to need for the development of alternate pathways to certification. Dr. Tompkins stated he was working on a plan to bring to the Board and hoped to be able to provide them with information at the October meeting. The motion carried on a vote of 9-1.

## **NASBE ISSUES**

**Chairman Gilmore reported that several items are scheduled to be voted on at the annual meeting of the National State Boards of Education (NASBE) meeting, October 15, 1998. Mr. Rundell will be attending as the Kansas State Board of Education delegate and Mr. Gilmore asked that the Board vote on those items in order to provide some**

## **direction to Mr. Rundell regarding the wishes of the Board.**

### **Proposed Changes to NASBE Bylaws**

The NASBE Bylaws Committee recommended that Article IV, Members, of the bylaws be changed to expand the membership categories to allow former state board members, associate, affiliate and honorary members to chair and/or serve as voting members of committees, study groups or task forces if they have been appointed to such committees, but shall not be voting members of the Association. Mr. Gilmore explained that this change was being recommended to bring continuity to terms on committees. Mrs. McMillon moved, with a second by Mrs. Brown, that the Board approve the proposed change to Article IV of the NASBE bylaws. The motion carried.

### **Proposed Changes and Action on 1998 Resolutions**

Chairman Gilmore asked if members had problems with any of the proposals for new or amended resolutions to be voted on at the NASBE meeting in October. If so, they would be pulled out and voted on separately and the remainder would be voted on as a block. Mrs. Holloway asked that resolution 1. H., Student Involvement in State Governance of Education, be pulled. Chairman Gilmore pulled out resolution 5.C., Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenthood. Dr. Abrams asked that resolution 9.C., Federal Assistance for School Construction, be pulled. Mrs. Brown was provided with clarification on resolution 2.D., Reading Curriculum and Instruction, and Mrs. Morrison commended the language of the resolution on Character Education to the Board and suggested it might be used as a model if the Kansas Board elected to take a similar position. Mrs. Morrison moved that the Board approve the proposed resolutions and amendments with the exception of 1. H., 5.C., and 9.C. Mrs. Specht seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Dr. Abrams moved that the Board oppose resolution 1.H., Student Involvement in State Governance of Education. Linda Holloway seconded the motion. Discussion followed. The motion carried on a vote of 6-4.

Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Wanda Morrison, that the Board oppose the changes to resolution 5.C., Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenthood. The motion carried.

Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mr. Holloway, that the Board oppose resolution 9.C., Federal Assistance for School Construction. The motion carried on a vote of 6-4.

### **NOVEMBER 1998 BOARD MEETING DATE**

Chairman Gilmore stated it had been Board practice in the past to not meet on general election day. He indicated that because Tuesday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>, was the date of the general election, he wanted to provide the opportunity if anyone wanted to change the dates of the meeting. Mr. Hill moved, with a second by Mrs. Brown, that the Board November meeting dates be moved from November 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, to November 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>. After discussion, the motion failed on a vote of 0-10.

## **CHANGE IN PUBLIC HEARING DATE FOR PROPOSED REVISED REGULATIONS FOR DRIVER AND SAFETY EDUCATION COURSES**

Mr. Dan Biles, Board Attorney, reported that because of the date that had been published in the *Kansas Register*, the Board would need to take action to change the date of the hearing. The time would remain the same. Dr. Abrams moved, with a second by Mrs. Holloway, that the public hearing date for proposed revised regulations for driver and safety education courses be moved from November 3 to November 4, 1998. The motion carried.

## **REPORTS**

### **Board Attorney**

Mr. Biles reviewed his written report of recent activity with Board members. Mr. Biles noted that Kansas Supreme Court staff had expressed some interest in the appeal of the Board's decision to deny the Dodge City school district permission to withdraw from its special education cooperative. Mr. Biles stated that oral arguments in the case had been scheduled for September 14, 1998. He also provided a brief update of other pending issues. Mrs. Morrison moved, with a second by Mrs. Specht, that Mr. Biles' fees for services and expenses for August be paid as presented. The motion carried.

### **Legislative Coordinator**

Mr. Scott Hill noted upcoming interim legislative committee meetings of interest to Board members. The Special Committee on Economic Development would be meeting in September with a report due in October on the customized training issues. He also encouraged Board members to attend upcoming hearings on special education funding.

### **Commissioner**

Commissioner Tompkins noted that meeting details for the October Board meeting in Leavenworth were attached to his report. Dr. Tompkins reported that a meeting of the Joint Advisory Committee on Governance had been tentatively scheduled for November 5<sup>th</sup> and that the meeting will be used to begin the long range planning process for the Committee for improving coordination of postsecondary education. Commissioner Tompkins noted that three of the four Board members on the Committee would no longer be on the Board after January. He requested direction from the Board on whether to reschedule the meeting after the first of the year, go ahead with the meeting as scheduled, or appoint new members now in order to have continuity over the course of the next few meetings. Mrs. Morrison moved, with a second by Mrs. Holloway, that the meeting be rescheduled for after the first of the year. The motion carried. On a related matter, Dr. Wagnon noted that the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education would be meeting and that it would be appropriate for the State Board to be represented and make a presentation on appropriate changes needed in higher education coordination. Dr. Tompkins agreed that the Department would develop some possible recommendations to present to the Governor's Task

Force and send them to Board members to review before the October meeting. Dr. Tompkins also reviewed additional items in his written report.

## **Other Board Reports**

Dr. Wagon reminded members of his tour of KNI and the Youth Center at Topeka scheduled for September 10<sup>th</sup> and again invited Board members to accompany him. Chairman Gilmore asked about the status of the situation in USD 501 regarding tampering on state assessments. Dr. Tompkins indicated that it was the responsibility of the local district to take appropriate action against those involved. Chairman Gilmore asked if this type of problem could affect the accreditation status of the school. It was agreed that Dr. Freden would provide some information to the Board on the matter.

## **APPROVAL OF BOARD TRAVEL**

Members reviewed the composite travel request. Mrs. McMillon asked to add salary for an ECS Steering Committee meeting to be held October 11-15, 1998. Mrs. Holloway asked to add salary and related expenses for the Joint Committee on Economic Development meeting and the Joint Budget Committee meeting, September 22 and 23. Mrs. Morrison moved, with a second by Mr. Hill, that the travel requests be approved as amended. The motion carried.

## **KANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUDGET**

Mr. Hill moved that the Board approve the Kansas Department of Education budget as presented, with the provision that a letter be drafted to Governor Graves asking him to reassign the School-to-Work program to another Department. Mrs. Brown seconded the motion. After discussion, the motion carried on a vote of 6-4. "Yes" votes were Abrams, Brown, Gilmore, Hill, Holloway and Specht.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mrs. Holloway moved, with a second by Dr. Abrams, that the Board recess into Executive Session for period of twenty minutes for the purpose of consultation with the Board attorney and to preserve the attorney-client privilege and that the open meeting of the Board resume at 1:40 p.m. The motion carried. At 1:40 p.m. Mrs. Morrison moved, with a second by Mrs. Holloway, that the Executive Session be extended an additional ten minutes. The motion carried.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

At 1:50 p.m. the open meeting resumed. There being no further business, Chairman Gilmore adjourned the meeting.

---

**Kevin Gilmore, Chairman**

---

**Penny Plamann, Secretary**