

**Teaching in Kansas Commission**  
**Subcommittee Work**  
**August 21, 2008**

**Teacher Preparation Subcommittee**

***Professional Development School*** (Margo, Tom, Judy, Tes)

Prior to the next meeting, this group will clarify what kinds of PDS we currently have in Kansas institutions:

- How are PDS sites selected

- Number of candidates/interns at each PDS site – differentiate between elementary/secondary

- What do PDS look like at the elementary/secondary levels (e.g., full year, part year, etc.)

- Are there formal agreements between the university/PDS schools/districts?

- What kind of training/support is provided for P-12 teachers who serve as cooperating teachers/mentor teachers?

- Review the NCATE PDS standards and incorporate additional questions as appropriate.

- Tom will send the questionnaire to the PDS coalition.

- Margo will research other PDS models nationally.

The subcommittee needs to think of funding sources if a recommendation is developed for a standard related to PDS.

***Business/Scholarships/Funding Resources*** (Norma, Matt, Clarence, Heather)

This subcommittee is crafting recommendations related to the following:

- Create a scholarship website at KSDE and KBOR

- Dedicate a staff position to update the websites

- Develop a strategy to encourage local school districts to work with their foundations to create scholarships for students/staff who want to pursue teacher education

- ‘connect’ with the image and promotion subcommittee

- Need to look at additional funding/revenue sources (e.g., casino, etc.)

***Mid-Career Teacher Prep*** (Mary Ann, Gary, Michelle, Gary M., Debbie)

This group surveyed the Council of Education Deans – they will now obtain similar information from the independent colleges/universities.

This group also brainstormed how delivery of courses can be provided using varied methods (e.g., online, intensive weekend, etc.)

Identified the need for a single website where information about current mid-career programs can be listed (needs to be user friendly and provide information about how to obtain additional information)

This group also discussed how middle and high schools could provide instruction to multiple sites using virtual instruction by licensed teachers.

***Technology*** (Gary M., Heather)

This group reviewed the ISTE and NETS standards.

They are developing recommendation that infrastructure (line item funding similar to transportation, food service, etc.) needs to exist in P-12 to support technology.

***State/Federal Regulations*** (Clarence, Gary M., Judy, Norma, Sarah)

This group brainstormed elements of IDEA (collaboration, MTSS, FERPA, general education role with special education, importance of following IEPs), Perkins (general education role in collaboration with vocational education), NCLB (AYP, disaggregation of data with subgroups, alignment of curriculum with standards, formative assessment, FERPA, highly qualified status, differentiating instruction), and QPA (gains formula, QPA vs. NCLB, school improvement process, template, results based staff development plans, role of mentors, assessment literacy – familiarity with terminology, FERPA) that beginning teachers may need to know. The next step is to survey P-12 administrators/teachers to determine what beginning teachers need to know from the district perspective related to each of these regulations.

***Assessment*** (Michelle, Tes, Mary Ann, Tom)

Mary Ann had reviewed the current licensure standards (professional and discipline) to see how assessment is currently addressed in the standards – approximately 1/3 of the individual licensure standards have one or more

indicators related to assessment; professional standards 8 and 9 both have elements that focus on assessment.

The group brainstormed components that beginning teachers may need to be able to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions for: formative and summative, how to collect and interpret assessment data, how to use assessment data to drive instruction for every learner (related to ncate definition for diversity), tiered methods/models for instructional delivery (MTSS, RTI, etc) – what these models are, how to gather data about students from these varied systems, how to consistently use data from these systems to inform instruction, and how to engage p-12 students as learning partners through sharing individual performance/assessment data with them.

The group will review the Olathe assessment materials and organize the content into specific knowledge, skills, dispositions. These will be developed into specific recommendations to be included within standards – either professional standards 8 and 9 or individual content standards.

Mary Ann will review the 21<sup>st</sup> Century standards to see if there are assessment elements that should be added to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions focusing on assessment. Once the list of KSD are identified the group will survey institutions to see which of these are currently being addresses.

Mary Ann will review the PLT to see if there is any focus on assessment.

### ***Pay for Student Teachers*** (Clarence, Heather, Debbie, Matt Jeri)

This group brainstormed some philosophical elements related to pay for student teachers: pay might be a marketing tool to attract individuals to the profession; could be a recruitment tool for districts; could improve the quality of training; could help districts meet specific needs (e.g., math, science urban, etc.).

They then reviewed varied programs that currently provide reimbursement during student teaching: residency programs for mid-career individuals – some provide tuition, room, board, housing support, salary/stipend, and debt reduction opportunities. ‘Payback’ is required within the district (X number of years per time supported).

This group believes that current policies need to be changed: e.g., supervisor of record – institutions need to be willing to have other institutions supervise students during student teaching so that current

geographic restrictions related to distance from the institution will no longer exist creating greater opportunity for students to go to rural or geographic locations for student teaching.

Promising models the group explored are Tier 1 (consortium of districts in western Kansas, Topeka, Wichita, etc. with 2 to 3 students in a specified school and a mentor teacher...after completion, the student teacher would be expected to remain in the student teaching location for a specified number of years). A second option is Tier 2: for districts that have fewer numbers of annual new hires – would involve a residency semester or co-teaching – the student teacher receives teacher assistant or paraprofessional salary.

This group also brainstormed funding sources: title 2 funding, matching money from state funding, debt reduction options, scholarships (KBOR is an example).

Prior to the next meeting, the group will explore European models, examine how national accreditation (NCATE for Kansas) might be impacted at the institution level if such models were adopted in Kansas, and will explore pay for student teaching models for 'traditional' aged (18-22) year old individuals who are engaged in semester long student teaching with a mentor/cooperating teacher.

### **Regulations and Data Subcommittee**

Members Present: Tom Petz, Susan Helbert, John Heim, Sam Rabiola, Peggy Harris, Mark Jarboe, Ruth Teichman

Absent: Dick Harlan, Terrel Harrison, Andy Tompkins, Andrew Davis

(Note: the following original members of this subcommittee have been assigned to the teacher leader workgroup, and will continue with that group under the direction of Jeanne Duncan – Lynn Bechtel, Larry Wheelles and Kathy Wagoner)

The subcommittee met as a whole following the general session. The discussion summary and the findings around the three areas of KBOR issues, Legislative issues and Data:

#### **Kansas Board of Regents issues:**

##### **1. 9 credit hour transfer rule**

- Any rule change will impact all programs, not just education

- Program completer issues in accepting candidates with lots of
- More than 9 grad credits is a large portion of any program
- Accessibility to programs is real issue, not the # or credits you can transfer – online programs are addressing the accessibility
- Taking a variety of credits from numerous IHEs is not beneficial – encourage teachers to plan ahead

#### Findings:

- If the board of Regents took off the cap on transfer credits, it would have no or minimal effect on current practice by higher education institutions.
- Accessibility is real issue.

#### 2. Geographic Regions

- Not restricting – look at all the regents programs in Eastern KS
- No one is turning anyone away in graduate programs because they cannot accommodate (some caps on undergrad programs)
- There is a codified petition process that is already working – everyone can and does petition to enter other regions – working in highly populated areas
- Online program delivery is also addressing accessibility issues
- Reminder that any rule covers all programs, not just education
- Do the division lines that establish the regions need to be reviewed for more equitable distribution?
- Politics involved

#### Findings:

- If the petition process already in place is working correctly, this is not an issue.
- Online is addressing accessibility = Encourage promotion of current programs and development of new online programs.
- Need to be cognizant of duplication of effort and the best return on dollars
- If remove this rule, there will be no significant effect on recruitment and retention of teachers

#### 3. Community Colleges

- Lots of discussion around articulation agreements. Gary Alexander from KBOR and Tes Mehring, ESU joined the discussion briefly to help answer questions.
- How to recruit from CC to enter teacher education
- General education credit transfer not generally an issue – however, may just transfer as elective credit rather than program/degree credit
- Early teacher prep coursework at the CC level – one issue is faculty qualifications
- Need for common course codes as postsecondary level

- Articulation agreements not true partnerships – how do you create these?
- Why variability in programs at CCs – is this a myth or reality
- What is the coordinating role of KBOR – can't mandate but can be in on conversation

#### Findings:

- Recommend that KBOR collect data and become central repository on existing agreements
- Recommend that KBOR convene a summit of 4 year institutions, community colleges, KSDE, TKC to address the issues of partnerships (beyond articulation agreements) for teacher preparation in order to increase the number of teachers while maintaining/improving standards.  
Places these discussions in the arena where it belongs!  
All parties will have an understanding of current parameters

#### Legislative Issues:

- Continue to push for the budget at least a year out - Legislature already knows and is dealing with this
- Earlier notification date – won't solve any problems because everyone still using the same date/timeframe.
- Need to improve status of profession = marketing, salaries, funding for teacher preparation, etc. Are these legislative concerns?
- These are funding issues.
- How do you educate the legislators on budget issues

#### Findings:

Suggest to local school districts that they work one-on-one with their legislators on the budget process and how it works so that the legislator can make educated decisions during the legislative budget processes related to educational issues.

#### DATA:

Much initial discussion occurred. The following are highlights.

- Concerns on misuse of data – taken out of context
- Who is the audience for data - how to translate data into useful information to multiple audiences
- How to present data – tiered/layered system?
- Categories of data:
  - Licensure: # issued/endorsement areas; KS versus out-of-state; types; traditional versus alternative route; renewals; IHE where completed. Where to find a program; which programs are online
  - Demographic: age, employed versus just maintaining a license; why educators leave (retention), degree info.
  - Salary: what figures should be used? Base vs. all benefits? Average?

KNEA salary report.

Vacancy information: should include district, # of assignments vacant, assignments filled by off-level licensed teachers, assignments filled by subs

SPED: waivers/provisionals and how affect retention; how many not using SPED license

Retention data very important – district exit/entry survey info not being reported back to KSDE

IHE data: pipeline data, programs offered, alternative routes

- How to convince districts to report accurate data
- KanTELL survey – how to use and frame working conditions data

Dissemination of data:

- Think of an iceberg – tip is what everyone needs. Make it easily available on KSDE website – general statistical data
- Rest of the data = matter of accessibility. Provide summary reports with links to full reports.
- What other format should be used. Cost is a concern

Teacher preparation data related to recruitment/retention:

- Cost of becoming a teacher
- Debt average of someone coming out of program
- Regents versus private costs
- Cost vs. salary at beginning of career
- How long does it take to complete a program
- What implications for debt relief like old NDSL loans

Other issues:

- What about data collected but not used – track how often accessed
- Is there data on high school student career choices

Did not reach a point for findings

Work to be completed prior to next meeting:

Review the KEEB ([www.kansasteachingjobs.com](http://www.kansasteachingjobs.com))

Review the KanTell website ([www.kantell.org](http://www.kantell.org))

### **Image/Promotion Sub-Committee:**

1. We will have three 30 second commercials that focus on mid-career access. The concept given to us by BLAM! is outstanding. The premise of these commercials is a central character who goes throughout his normal day and continually hears/sees the phrase "and Jim, you should teach."

For example, Jim – hurrying out the door, gets in his car and leaves for work. He turns on the radio and we hear the end of the weather forecast . . . "the high today 85. And

Jim, you should teach." Jim naturally shakes it off, but these reminders continue throughout the day (seeing the message on billboards, fortune cookies, sticky notes on his computer, etc). The end of the commercial features the Change Lives. Teach! campaign logo and website link.

2. We will have four 30 second commercials that focus on middle-school kids and the 18-23 folks (two commercials each). The BLAM! concept is equally powerful. The focus is on a real-life classroom teacher, and we see him/her in the classroom environment. The voice-over (either professionally or from the teacher) shows elegant text on the screen that quantifies the impact of a teacher. For example: 24 years, 72,000 homework assignments, 5,500 parent conferences, 3,210 college graduates, 50 doctors, 20 scientists, 10 valedictorians, 1 goal: Change Lives. Teach! The end of the commercial features the Change Lives. Teach! campaign logo and website link.

3. We will have an eight minute video to be used throughout the state in career fairs, universities, and similar forums. The eight minute video will purposely divide the content into sections that could be pulled out and show independent of the rest of the video (a la DVD sub-chapters). This video will highlight the Grow Your Own programs, the mentoring programs, and celebrating the success of Kansas public schools. Each video will be designed to stand alone.

4. Please know that some of these are subject to change in terms of length or number of commercials, but the basic framework will not change. Specifically, some of the commercials might be limited to 15 seconds.

Ok, that covers what the final products will probably look like. Let's talk about how we make that happen! I think it would be easier to ask each of you to take the next steps in the portion you volunteered to tackle when we last met. In some cases, the next step is logical. For others who didn't have a homework assignment, I'm asking you to tackle something new. Please know that these assignments are intended to directly impact the campaign!

1. John – we need to contact each of the districts that offered money and give them the opportunity to recommend one or two teachers for Concept #2 (see above). I need to create a form and have it approved by Pam. Once it is approved, would you mind forwarding it to those who offered money? I think this message is better if it comes from you because it immediately validates the contribution you asked them to make. Hopefully it's as easy as copying and pasting the same email to all respondents. I'm also going to give you a head's up that the turn-around returned directly to me to save you time. The names/locations/times of the interviews are due to Gizmo by August 29th.

2. Angela and Denver – would the two of you agree to work together to create a list of about 15-20 statewide accomplishments for public education? This piece will be directly injected into the celebration piece of the 8 minute video. I'm thinking that this list would not focus on specific districts, but rather the total sum of accomplishments (i.e. the number of blue ribbon schools). The deadline for this is September 1st.

3. Jaime – would you mind investigating the Augusta, KS district mentoring program? I'm hearing excellent things about it, and I'm hoping you'll be ok with making a few phone calls and compiling an overview of the program. Also, would you be willing to travel to Augusta if we selected it as a filming location? You'd work with Gizmo to set some dates that work for you, and I would work with your beforehand to let you know what the supervision would require. The deadline for this is September 1st.

4. Denise – would you mind continuing your work with national GYO programs and preparing a well-crafted, short paragraph about national trends that could be directly inserted into the GYO portion of the 8 minute video? Will September 1st work for you?

5. Martha – you did great work with contacting those businesses. Would you be available to travel to Dodge City for the on-site filming that will occur as part of the campaign? This would probably take a couple of hours (hopefully not more). You would be able to work with Gizmo to set a date that works for everyone.

6. Eva – I think you might be able to help us with something that I can't quite figure out. It is important that we highlight the role of IHE's in the recruitment/retention process, but I'm struggling to see how we can use them in the existing campaign. Would you mind reviewing the details of the campaign and suggesting some key strategies for implementing IHE's?

7. Jeri and Josh – we will continue several behind-the-scenes details including working with Dodge City and Wichita to prepare GYO/mentoring pieces, gathering proposed logo designs, working with KNEA and KSDE to research additional mentoring programs, and working with Gizmo to put it all together.

### **Salary and Benefits Sub Committee:**

**Members Present:** A.J. D'Angelo, Deborah Perbeck, Blake West, Gary Sechrist, Sandra Ames, Greg Mann, Howard Shuler, Duane Dorhorst, and Alan Cunningham

**Members Absent:** Susan Arnold, Annette Saucedo

The Salary and Benefits subcommittee met as a committee-of-the-whole at 9:30 AM, following the general session. Each of the three (3) work groups within the subcommittee reported on their findings and recommendations, to date.

Following are the topics presented and discussed during the subcommittee meeting:

#### **Retirement Work Group**

1. Encourage the Kansas Legislature to fully fund the Kansas Public Employees Retirement System (KPERS).
2. Evaluate a graduated percentage increase in KPERS contributions for those currently in the system up to the level required for new members (6%) beginning in July 2009, with commensurate increases in benefits.
3. Evaluate the proposal to gradually increase current contributions to 6% as a way to provide COLA's for current members upon retirement.
4. Evaluate the effects of increasing the formula multiplier from 1.75% to 2.00%, to more closely match the mean % of other states.
5. Encourage the Kansas Legislature to accelerate (over fund) KPERS funding by the State in order to compensate for underfunding it in the past.
6. Evaluate the option of reduced retirement benefits immediately upon accumulating 85 points for those persons desiring to keep working in the same district and continue to contribute to KPERS. (Example: 25% benefit with 85 pts, 30% with 86 pts. 35% with 87pts., etc...) This would require recalculation of benefits upon full retirement.
7. As an alternative to No. 6 above, increase the formula multiplier for years taught beyond 85 points.
8. Recommend that every KPERS-eligible position continue to contribute to KPERS, regardless of retirement status.
9. The number and variety of retirement options available at retirement are OK.

#### **Benefits Work Group**

1. Health Insurance is the priority. Access to state-wide benefit pool/program is critical.
2. Minimum of full single insurance coverage provided for all teachers.
3. As an alternative, a commensurate premium amount should be provided for each qualifying employee.
4. Evaluate state or district-provided disability insurance as an option to the budgeted expenses for school districts to "cash out" unused sick leave days and other benefit days (i.e. personal leave, etc.) This would allow teachers to accumulate leave up to the point that the KPERS disability would begin.
5. Communicate and expand loan forgiveness programs and opportunities at the entry level as a benefit for new teachers.
6. Research district payment or reimbursement of tuition expenses for required recertification and/or added endorsements.

7. Evaluate current district-sponsored early retirement programs in light of current teacher shortages.
8. Consider 403B's or similar programs for transferable personal retirement options for teachers, as well as for benefits offered by school districts.

### **Salary Work Group**

1. Goal: Kansas starting and average teacher salaries should be at or above the national median salaries. (See KSDE/Dale Dennis' information on what it would take to attain this goal.)
2. There was a lot of discussion regarding the concept of adding a "third dimension" or "scaffolding" to the traditional teacher salary schedule. This would continue to recognize longevity/years of service (steps) and educational attainment/professional growth (columns). In addition, the third dimension would include contributions/service to the profession.
3. Further discussion on this concept identified the need to distinguish between temporary or transitory "service" activities such as supervising a student teacher, and those that are on-going. No resolution in this item, yet.
4. This led to the broader discussion of teacher leadership. "Leadership" really defines the concept of professional contribution/service introduced in Item 2 above.
5. Get information on the Teacher Advancement Program from the Milliken Foundation.
6. There are different emphases for teacher leadership, including mentoring, technology, content area expertise, adult learning, group facilitation, PLC facilitation, and many others.
7. National Board is developing (or has developed) standards for Teacher Leadership.

Blake West and Howard Shuler will direct the group's discussion at the next meeting due to schedule conflicts with co-chairs Duane Dorhorst and Alan Cunningham.

The goal of the September 11 meeting is to clarify three to five (3-5) priorities in each of the three work group areas, and provide supporting details for each.

### **Working Conditions:**

Members present: Peg Dunlap, Marti Crow, Ingrid Seitz, Michelle Penner, Jarius Jones, Bart Goering, Marvin Estes, Jim Lentz, Carla Sullivan, Sarah Thomas, Melinda Stanley, Julie Ford.

Members absent: Susan Scherling, Brad King, Tom Vernon, Cindy Garwick.

The working conditions subcommittee met as a full committee throughout the day. The subcommittee work centered on mentoring, professional development, NCLB and revisiting leadership at the next meeting.

### **Mentoring-**

1. Several USD models for mentoring were shared and discussed. Members discussed the advantages/challenges concerning each model.
2. The Mentoring Program standards and criteria were reviewed for possible edits.
3. 72-1401 – 72-1412 was reviewed as it is related to mentor teacher programs.
4. Recommend mentoring is supported by KSDE with purposeful selection of both mentor and mentee.
5. Discussion centered on Standard II #2, Mentor teachers must be on site. Standard III #1, mentor teacher has completed at least three consecutive school years of employment in the school district.
6. Several mentoring programs were discussed.(Julie will investigate the Milken TAP program)

### **Professional Development-**

1. The Standards Assessment Inventory results were shared.
2. KSDE supported PD was discussed.
3. Write a survey to send out on the listservs to determine what PD themes are being used and the cost to USD's.
4. iTunes was discussed as a future opportunity
5. The legislative post audit report retention strategy report was read and discussed.
6. Several plans used by the USD's represented were discussed.
7. The consensus was that PD is under funded by the state.
8. A recommendation was made to arrange a conversation with legislators to discuss future funding. It was suggested via the discussion that USD's need to contact local legislators as to the under funding.
9. USD's would like KSDE supported PD.

### **House Concurrent Resolution No. 5016-**

1. Discussion concerning NCLB and the desire to express the concerns felt in the USD's as it relates to NCLB.
2. It was suggested that concerns are written to be considered to attach to 5016.
3. A small group will form within the subcommittee to write the suggestions.

### **Leadership-**

1. Articles from McRel were shared to frame the recommendations for effective leadership.
2. Subcommittee members are to read the articles prior to the 9/11 meeting and come prepared to discuss.
3. Larry Wheelles was invited to join the discussion.

The meeting concluded with all members receiving an assignment.