Approved	June	26,1992	
		Date	

MINUTES OF THE SENATE	COMMITTEE ON	J	EDUCA	TIC	N	•
The meeting was called to order	by	SENATOR	JOSEPH Chairpers		HARDER	at
1:30 &X./p.m. on	Tuesday, March	17	, 19_	92 _{in}	room <u>123-S</u>	of the Capitol.
All members were present except	:					

Committee staff present:

Mr. Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department

Ms. Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes

Mr. Dale Dennis, Assistant Commissioner of Education

Mrs. Millie Randell, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

HB 3092 - School Board Development Program

Mr. John Koepke, Executive Director, Kansas Association of School Boards

Ms. Jacque Oakes, Schools for Quality Education

Ms. Connie Hubbell, Legislative Coordinator, State Board of Education

Mr. Craig Grant, Director of Political Action, Kansas-National Education Association

After calling the meeting to order, Chairman Joseph C. Harder explained that <u>HB 3092</u>, which establishes the Kansas School Board Development Program, was referred recently to the Education Committee. He noted the importance of attending to all bills as soon as possible in anticipation of the Committee's work on the school finance bill. He then recognized Mr. John Koepke, Executive Director, Kansas Association of School Boards.

Mr. Koepke explained that his organization had requested introduction of $\underline{\text{HB}}$ 3092 based on action taken by the KASB Delegate Assembly in December, 1991. Delegate Assembly action, he said, reversed his organization's position of opposition to mandatory board development. He noted that $\underline{\text{HB}}$ 3092 is an important part of school reform and represents a significant commitment on the part of the Kansas school board members to educational improvement. (Attachment 1)

Ms. Jacque Oakes, representing Schools for Quality Education, stated that although many board members already have been attending seminars to become better trained, $\underline{\text{HB}}$ 3092 would hasten the attendance of those people who have not committed themselves to development activities. (Attachment 2)

Legislative Coordinator of the State Board of Education Ms. Connie Hubbell explained that $\underline{\text{HB}}$ 3092 would require local school board members to earn a minimum of ten credit hours of board development each year. She said that the hours would be reported to the State Board of Education to ensure compliance. (Attachment 3)

Mr. Craig Grant, Director of Political Action, Kansas-National Education Association, stated support for $\underline{\text{HB 3092}}$. He said that although he believes a majority of school board members now take advantage of the quality workshops that currently are available, $\underline{\text{HB 3092}}$ would provide an incentive for the minority who do not attend such workshops to do so. He noted that everyone in the education field needs to keep abreast on matters which concern them.

One Committee member expressed concern regarding constitutionality of removing an elected official (school board member) from office if the required training had not been completed.

Ms. Swartzman, revisor, replying to the concern, suggested that the requirement for ten hours of training could be amended into the Recall Statute, and neglect of such training could be considered malfeasance in

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

room 123-S Statehouse, at 1:30 x 2.70./p.m. on Tuesday, March 17 , 19 92

office. She questioned, however, the constitutionality of removing a board member from office for not having attended a meeting.

Following a call for additional conferees, the Chair announced that the hearing on $\frac{HB}{3092}$ is concluded and that the bill will be taken under advisement.

SB 747 - Teachers, nonrenewal or termination of contracts, professional improvement policies.

The Chair reverted Committee attention to \underline{SB} 747, relating to due process, which, he said, was on the agenda today for Committee discussion and possible action. He recognized Senator Kerr, sponsor of \underline{SB} 747.

Senator Kerr informed members that he had two amendments he would like to propose in order to make <u>SB 747</u> more acceptable to those persons who were not yet convinced of its workability. He called Committee attention to page 2, line ll, and explained that his first amendment would allow portability of a "career teacher" status from one school district to another. Senator Kerr moved to amend <u>SB 747</u> by inserting, following the word "employed." on page 2, line ll, the words: "Any board may waive the requirements for the granting of tenure and grant a teacher career status at any time a teacher had previously achieved the status of career teacher in another school district, area vocational-technical school, or community college in the state." Senator Montgomery seconded the motion.

Senator Kerr explained that another school district could offer career status to a teacher who already has achieved such status. When the Chair called for the question, he ruled that the amendment was adopted.

Senator Kerr explained that his second proposal to amend $\underline{SB~747}$ is for the purpose of decreasing the total elapsed time to achieve career status from six years to possibly five years total for persons wishing to do so.

Senator Kerr called Committee attention to the bottom of page 6, New Sec. 10, line 41 and moved to insert on line 42, following the word "teacher" and preceding the word "who", the following words: "or any probationary teacher who has completed two consecutive contracts and has been offered a third contract".

Senator Kerr explained that this amendment would make it possible for a teacher to start his/her teacher improvement plan at that point rather than waiting until they have achieved continuing status. Senator Montgomery seconded the motion.

When the Chair called for the question, he announced that the amendment was adopted.

Senator Kerr moved that SB 747, as amended, be recommended favorably for passage. Senator Montgomery seconded the motion.

Senator Parrish made a substitute motion that SB 747, as amended, be recommended for study by an interim committee. The motion was seconded by Senator Karr.

Responding to a question, Senator Kerr replied that a number of states are making changes to their tenure and/or due process system. Some, he said, are seeking to eliminate it. Senator Kerr cited Toledo as an example of a school district which has used teacher improvement plans to achieve better quality teaching and to resolve differences that exist between expectations of administration and of the teachers themselves. He said the Toledo plan was used as a guide in drafting SB 747 and has been used as a guide by maybe 15 other school districts throughout the United States.

Committee expressed some concerns regarding how the the provisions of $\frac{SB}{747}$ would affect current teachers. Page $\frac{2}{3}$

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE	COMMITTEE ON	EDUCATION	······································
room <u>123-S</u> , Statehouse, at <u>1:</u>	30 <u>xxx</u> /p.m. on	Tuesday, March 17	, 19_92

When the Chair called for the substitute motion to refer SB 747, as amended, to an interim committee for study, he ruled, following a call for a division, that the motion had carried.

Senator Frahm moved, and Senator Webb seconded the motion to approve minutes of the Committee meeting of Wednesday, March 4, and the minutes were approved.

The Chair announced that the Committee will convene at 1 p.m. next Monday, March 23; Tuesday, March 24; and Wednesday, March 25. He announced that the agenda for Monday, March 23 will be a staff briefing and Committee discussion on $\underline{\text{HB } 2892}$, relating to the school district finance and quality performance act; Tuesday's hearing will be for proponents of $\underline{\text{HB } 2892}$; and Wednesday's hearing will be for opponents of $\underline{\text{HB } 2892}$. He informed members that because $\underline{\text{HB } 2892}$ has been doubly referred to both the Assessment and Taxation and Education Committees, the Tax Committee will be having hearings for proponents and opponents of $\underline{\text{HB } 2892}$ on the same days as the Education Committee.

Following a call for additional business, the Chair adjourned the meeting.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME:	1:30 p.m.	PLACE:	123-S	DATE: Tuesday,	March 17, 1992

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDDFCC	OPGANT ZATTON
NAME Angle Religion	ADDRESS Vancia ataa Va	Page for Senator Lee
Angela Rahjes	Kensington, Ks	Page for Sonator lee
amber tolansky Courtney Bohm	Selleville, RA	Page for Senator Lee
Deborah Smith	Lawrence	Sen Steineger's Intern
Gandy Kelly	Topeka	KASB-4
Wound apt	Tapelia	4.5.00
JACque Dates	Topeka	SQF
Conne Higelell		S+Bd flo
merle fice	Topeka	Kacc
Robin Nichols	Wichela	USD 259
Peg Dunlap	Topela	KNEA
Deb miller	Dinight	Monis Co Leadership
Jim Alley	Topzka	PetzMcaile Assi
GERAD HENDERSO,		USAJKS
Brilla Scott	Topeka	USA
Craig Grant	Topotra	HNEA
Han (Me	Topeka	KNEA
Um. Yodier	The -	D. Keen
Small I floor	Dwight	Leadership Morris Co.
Karen Lee	Durght	Leadership Morris Co.
Brenda C Ricolet	Luight	Leader skip Morris Co.
Jarry Mulyan	Dwight	Leadurhip Moris Co.
	Haven Kunsas	Closella Kansas
Tenn Februariah	Now ton KS	Close Up KS
197	1	

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME:	1:30 p.m.	PLACE:	123-S	DATE:	Tuesday,	March	17,	1992
			GUEST LIST					

	GUEST LIST	
NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Mark Splitter	Bahler, Ks	CloseUp-Ks
LON BRUNER	TopeKA	KSHR
Agn Sparke	Council Prove	Seadership Mr. Co.
Judeen Bachusa	Cuncil Gure	Leadershy Morris Co
Hom Pluly:	Oxago City Ks.	USD #410
V V		



5401 S. W. 7th Avenue Topeka, Kansas 66606 913-273-3600

Testimony on H.B. 3092 before the Senate Committee on Education

by

John W. Koepke, Executive Director Kansas Association of School Boards

March 17, 1992

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we appreciate the opportunity to appear before you on behalf of the member boards of education of the Kansas Association of School Boards in support of House Bill No. 3092. This bill was introduced at our request based on an action taken by our Delegate Assembly in December of 1991. That action by our Delegate Assembly reversed our previous position of opposition to mandatory board development.

Our stance on this issue underwent close scrutiny as a part of a thorough review of all of our positions in light of the development of a comprehensive school reform and school finance program which is called the Quest for Quality. In endorsing a new system of school accreditation based on outcomes, our members became convinced that a successful implementation of that concept required an informed and committed board of education. We felt it inconsistent to drop our opposition to mandatory inservice for school employees without also recognizing the importance of inservice for school board members.

EDUC 3/17/92 A1-1 When we began to explore a model to develop legislation to implement this concept, we were disappointed to find that similar legislation in the eight other states where mandatory training exists was not very comprehensive. We therefore utilized a model for this legislation based on the continuing legal education requirement for attorneys. We believe it will provide the basis for a meaningful inservice requirement for school board members. It will be our intent if this measure is enacted to ask that the implementing regulations provide for removal from office as the ultimate sanction for those who fail to meet the requirements of this act.

KASB has long supported and fostered the notion of school board development through an extensive program of workshops, seminars and on-site consulting services. Development activities are also available to school boards from a long list of other potential sponsors under this measure. For most school board members in Kansas, enactment of this measure will not change their past practice. Their existing program of personal development will more than satisfy the requirements of this act.

House Bill 3092 represents a significant commitment on the part of Kansas school board members to educational improvement. We would urge your favorable support for this measure and I would attempt to answer any questions about our position.



Schools for Quality Education

Bluemont Hall Menhattan, KS 88506 (913) 532-5886

March 17, 1992

TO: SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

SUBJECT: HB 3092 -- EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR

LOCAL BOARDS

FROM: SCHOOLS FOR QUALITY EDUCATION -- Jacque Oakes

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Jacque Oakes representing Schools for Quality Education, an organization of 96 small schools.

We are extremely pleased with HB 3092, and we appear as a proponent of the school board development program.

According to figures from the Kansas Association of School Boards, 50% of 2,111 board members in 1989-1990 attended a variety of seminars on many different subjects and 83% of 2,041 board members attended in 1990-1991.

We believe that many board members have already been attending seminars to become better trained and that this bill will certainly hasten the attendance of those people who have not committed themselves to development activities.

Thank you for your time and positive consideration of HB 3092.

"Rural is Quality"

EDUC 3/17/92

42

mansas State Board of Education

120 S.E. 10th Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

March 17, 1992

TO:

Senate Education Committee

FROM:

State Board of Education

SUBJECT:

1992 House Bill 3092

My name is Connie Hubbell, Legislative Coordinator of the State Board of Education. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee on behalf of the State Board.

House Bill 3092 establishes the Kansas School Board Development Program. Under this bill local school board members would be required to earn a minimum of ten credit hours of board development each year. These hours would be reported to the State Board of Education to ensure compliance with the law.

In those cases where the requirement creates a hardship, the State Board of Education may grant a waiver or extension of time to complete the requirements.

Any organization which desires to sponsor a course or program of board development activity must apply for accreditation to the State Board of Education.

A local school board member may seek credit for attendance or participation in an educational activity that was not accredited and submit it to the State Board of Education for approval to count the activity toward the development credits.

The State Board of Education has been and continues to be a strong supporter of inservice training and retraining of school employees. We believe this is also applicable to local board of education members due to the rapidly changing educational community. The more knowledgeable local board members are of the challenges before them and potential solutions, the better opportunity students have to succeed in school.

The State Board of Education recommends the Committee report House Bill 3092 favorably for passage.

Dale M. Dennis
Deputy/Assistant Commissioner
Division of Fiscal Services and Quality Control
(913) 296-3871

EDU C 3/17/92