

MINUTES

LEGISLATIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

November 22-23, 2004
Room 514-S—Statehouse

Members Present

Representative Kathe Decker, Chair
Senator Dwayne Umbarger, Vice Chair
Senator Lana Oleen
Senator Mark Taddiken
Senator John Vratil
Representative Barbara Ballard
Representative Tom Holland
Representative Bill Mason
Representative Eber Phelps
Representative Larry Powell

Members Absent

Senator Christine Downey
Senator Bob Lyon
Representative Carol Edward Beggs

Legislative Committee Staff

Carolyn Rampey, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Mary Galligan, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Deb Hollon, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Kathie Sparks, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Art Griggs, Office of the Revisor of Statutes

State Department of Education Staff

Dale Dennis, Deputy Commissioner

Conferees

Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director/Advocacy, Kansas Association of School Boards
Deborah Haltom, Director of Special Education Services, USD 512 (Shawnee Mission)
Greg Buster, Butler County School Board Council Special Education Cooperative
Neil Guthrie, Division Director of Special Education/Support Services, USD 259 (Wichita)

Sue McKenna, Assistant Director, Children and Family Services, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Duane Goossen, Director of the Division of the Budget and Secretary of Administration
Adam Obley, Special Assistant to the Governor
Reginald L. Robinson, President and Chief Executive Officer, Kansas Board of Regents

November 22, 2004

Special Education

The staff presented a memorandum entitled "Special Education Funding Proposal and Missouri Example," which described special education funding in Kansas, a proposal to fund special education half on the resource (teaching unit) base and half on the census base, and special education funding in Missouri ([Attachment 1](#)).

Senator Vratil, who had made the suggestion that the Committee consider the resource based-census based funding method, explained that one component of his proposal is to fund 100 percent of special education excess costs. He said that the census based component addresses the concern that 100 percent excess cost funding could lead to over identification of special education students because there would be no incentive for districts to add more special education students to the count, since additional special education students would not generate additional funding.

Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards, told the Committee that his association supports 100 percent funding for excess costs, but is concerned about census based funding because it is not sensitive to special education enrollment differences among districts ([Attachment 2](#)). He said that if the Legislature considers a funding change, his organization would support a weighting system with varying weights for different levels of services that must be provided.

When asked if school districts might be prone to over identify special education students under a weighting system, Mr. Tallman said he believes oversight by the federal government and the State Department of Education makes it difficult for a school district to identify students as needing special education services unless they actually are eligible. Furthermore, he said that parental involvement mitigates against districts labeling children as needing special education services unless those services can be justified. Mr. Tallman said he believes the Legislature would question any noticeable change in enrollment or funding patterns that would signify over identification of students.

Senator Umbarger observed that he believes there are more special education students in poorer school districts.

Deborah Haltom, Director of Special Education Services at Shawnee Mission, spoke in favor of the proposed funding change ([Attachment 3](#)). She believes the current funding system is inequitable and subject to manipulation in the sense that districts can lower their salaries and hire more teachers in order to generate more teacher-unit state aid. She also said the current system is not predictable and districts often receive less at the end of the year than they originally included in their budgets. She told the Committee that tying part of the funding to a district's full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment would provide a more equitable and stable base for special education funding. She asked the Committee to continue to fund transportation and catastrophic aid first in any formula and concluded by saying that no formula works unless it is adequately funded.

In response to questions, Ms. Haltom said the Shawnee Mission school district currently is reimbursed for about 42 percent of its special education funding through the categorical aid formula and speculated that, under the proposal, funding for special education would increase. She said in her school district, disabled students account for about 12 percent of the student body and gifted students for about 5 percent. She said her district has not received catastrophic aid because it has not had a student whose services cost enough to qualify the district for the aid.

Greg Buster, Butler County Special Education Cooperative, reviewed the several most common methods of special education funding, including pupil weights, census based, and resource based ([Attachment 4](#)). Mr. Buster identified both positive and negative features of both the current funding method in Kansas and the proposed change. Positive aspects of resource based funding include the fact that funding is provided for low incidence needs and there is not an incentive to over identify special education students. A drawback, according to Mr. Buster, is that the method is cumbersome to administer because of the need to verify employment records and the need for records to be audited.

Mr. Buster said the census based method would have fewer reporting and auditing requirements and would give districts more local flexibility, but would not adequately provide for situations in which a district has a small number of students who need intensive special education services nor would it take into account the fact that there is a great range in the proportion of special education students to total district enrollment. (According to Mr. Buster, the range is from 6 percent to 29 percent.) A primary concern to Mr. Buster is the fact that, in some districts, the number of special education students is increasing but overall enrollments are declining. (Examples used by Mr. Buster were districts that comprise the North Central Kansas Special Education Cooperative and the McPherson County Special Education Cooperative.) Mr. Buster said census based funding would impact these districts adversely because part of their special education funding would be based on a declining student enrollment but the number of students needing services would be increasing.

Mr. Buster acknowledged that funding excess costs at the 100 percent level would help all districts, but he said the long-range implications of census based funding are troubling to him. Senator Oleen commented that "over identification" is, in fact, difficult to do because most parents do not want their children in special education programs unless they are convinced that special education services are necessary. She maintained that expressing concerns about over identification is a delaying tactic used to rationalize a failure to provide more funding.

Neil Guthrie, Division Director of Special Education and Support Services for the Wichita school district, spoke in support of 100 percent funding of excess costs, but expressed concern about changing to a census based component ([Attachment 5](#)). Mr. Guthrie explained that the current resource based system is sensitive to school districts like Wichita, which has a large number of students with special needs. He said a number of factors contribute to large numbers of special education students in certain districts, including high incidences of poverty, the availability of medical facilities and other services in urban centers, a large number of private schools whose students need special education services, and the availability in an area of specialized school facilities. According to Mr. Guthrie, census based funding is not sensitive to high needs districts and likely would over fund some districts and under fund others.

Mr. Guthrie elaborated on his point about the relationship between poverty and incidence of special education students by saying that, in general, as poverty increases, so does the number of special needs students. However, past a certain point, if most of the students in a regular classroom need additional services because they are from low-income families, the need for special education services may decline because needed services are being provided in the regular classroom. Mr. Guthrie said he believes poverty is the main reason why special education enrollments are increasing.

Written testimony submitted by Dr. Ronald Sarnacki, Director of Special Education at the Cowley County Special Services Cooperative, is included as Attachment 6. Dr. Sarnacki's position is that the current funding system works well and that census based funding would fail to account for variations among school districts with regard to numbers of special education students and would penalize those districts with high special education incidence rates.

Children in Foster Care

Sue McKenna, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS), met with the Committee to respond to questions generated at a prior meeting about special education children in foster care placement. (Ms. McKenna's presentation is Attachment 7.) Ms. McKenna told the Committee that the standards for selecting a foster parent for a special education child are not different from those for any other child. All foster parents must meet requirements established by the Department of Health and Environment in order to be licensed. In addition, they must complete 30 hours of parenting training or an alternative called "Deciding Together" before a foster child can be placed with them. During this process, a social worker and a current resource parent assess the prospective foster parents, including a screening to identify parents who have the skills to deal with special needs children.

In response to a question about whether consideration is given to the school district's ability to deal with a special education child who is placed in foster care, Ms. McKenna said SRS assumes that all school districts are able to deal with special education children in their district. (Senator Vratil challenged that assumption.) She said the highest consideration is given to maintaining connections with the child's birth family. According to Ms. McKenna, the current practice of the Department is to place children in their home counties or contiguous counties. (In FY 2004, 54 percent of all foster care children were placed in their home counties.) However, on July 1, 2005, a new system is being implemented which will seek to place children with families so that they can attend their home schools. The purpose of the change is so that children can continue to have contact with their families and home communities. Implementation of the change will depend on the Department's ability to locate and recruit individuals in each child's home school area who are willing to serve as foster parents.

Ms. McKenna said there is no specific information about whether foster care parents release their child to the care of others when school ends. (The implication of the question is that some individuals depend upon foster care children for income, but give them up when school ends and the child becomes more dependent on them for care.) She said that if such a pattern is observed, it is unlikely that more children would be placed with those foster parents. Ms. McKenna said that changes in a child's placement usually take place at a normal break in the school routine and it is possible that more children do change locations when school ends. The reason, however, would not necessarily be because the foster parent does not want to remain responsible for the child.

Ms. McKenna said the Department does not have data to respond to a question about a correlation between high unemployment and the number of foster families in a school district. She said that individuals who become foster care parents because of the money usually are screened out during the orientation and training period.

In discussion following her presentation, Ms. McKenna acknowledged that the team placing a special education child with foster parents probably gives little consideration to school district special education programs and, in all likelihood, is not aware of comparative merits of various programs. She said the priority in placing a child is security and permanence but she expects that greater emphasis will be placed on school programs when the new home-based system is implemented next summer.

With regard to another matter, Ms. McKenna was asked to provide information to the Committee about the policy of SRS to charge school districts a fee of 5 percent of what they receive under the Medicaid reimbursement program for medical services provided by school districts to special education students.

Information on the number of foster care children and at-risk children in each school district was provided by the staff in a memorandum entitled "School District Information on Numbers of Free Lunch Students and Foster Care Placements" (Attachment 8). The information shows that 14 school districts are in the top 20 districts for both numbers of at-risk students (free lunch eligible) and children in foster care. Four districts are in the top 20 districts on the basis of percentages of at-risk and foster care students.

Bill Drafts and Final Report

Student Self Medication. The Committee reviewed a memorandum prepared by the Office of the Revisor of Statutes that pertained to self administration of medication by students (Attachment 9), and reviewed a draft of a bill implementing the Committee's recommendation that current law be amended to generally conform to recently passed federal law and that the sunset in current law be extended from June 30, 2005, to June 30, 2006. *On a motion by Senator Vratil, seconded by Representative Ballard, the Committee voted to amend the draft to reflect its changes.* (A copy of the proposed bill draft, incorporating the Committee's changes, is Attachment 10.)

Special Education. The Committee instructed the staff to expand the special education section of the final report by making mention of rising costs for some special education services, the Committee's concern about over identification of special education students, and an audit by the Legislative Division of Post Audit that found, in general, most special education students are properly classified as needing special services.

Upon a motion by Senator Oleen, seconded by Representative Ballard, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of legislation that would establish 88 percent as the level for funding special education excess costs. The Committee also instructed the staff to include in the report its recommendation that the gifted mandate be continued.

Early Childhood Standards. The Committee instructed the staff to emphasize in the final report the importance of early childhood standards, adequate funding for early childhood programs, and the need to try to develop a more organized approach to providing early childhood services.

November 23, 2004

Governor's Efficiency and Accountability in Schools Initiative

Duane Goossen, Director of the Division of the Budget and Secretary of Administration, reported on the Governor's proposal to make schools more efficient. He said the state will enter into a contract with Standard and Poor's to establish a pilot program to review school district efficiency. The project, paid for by the Kauffman Foundation, will involve the School Evaluation Services division of Standard and Poor's and will establish performance benchmarks and identify management practices used by the most efficiently run districts. According to Mr. Goossen, once the benchmarks have been created and it is possible to identify the characteristics of an efficiently run district, it will be possible to apply these benchmarks to selected school districts on a pilot basis and bring about

improvement. Mr. Goossen described the project as Kansas based and said the report will enable policy makers, school district officials, and the public to see how various school districts compare to the benchmarks.

Mr. Goossen said it is hoped that the benchmarks will be developed in the next few months and that the application of the benchmarks to from three to six selected school districts will be completed by late spring, 2005. (According to Dale Dennis, State Department of Education, about ten school districts have contacted the State Department and asked to be included in the study.)

In discussion following his remarks, Mr. Goossen agreed that some apparent differences among school districts could be due to a lack of uniformity in reporting data. He said the Center for Innovative Leadership involving Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, and Pittsburg State University will complement, not compete with, the Governor's initiative. For example, the Governor's proposal will result in benchmarks that identify efficient school districts that need improvement. Those districts can get the help they need to improve from the Center.

Adam Obley, Special Assistant to the Governor, made the point that the purpose of the study is not to compare Kansas to other states, but to compare Kansas school districts to each other so that those that are more efficient can serve as a model. He said the project will establish "best practices" in Kansas among various groupings of school districts.

Senator Vratil expressed skepticism about the ability of Standard and Poor's to arrive at appropriate benchmarks, given such things as variations in how school districts code certain expenditures. Mr. Goossen acknowledged the concern, although he said problems with variations in how data are reported are something Standard and Poor's encounters in all of its studies and has learned how to address. He concluded by saying that concerns about the data ought not impede an effort to help school districts become more efficient. He also noted that perhaps the Center for Innovative Leadership can assist school districts in the area of more uniform data reporting.

Dale Dennis told the Committee that the Department of Education will have on its Website in December 2004 one-page summaries for each school district, showing expenditures for various operating budget line items. He said the information can be used by local boards and school district administrators to see how their districts compare with others across the state.

The Kansas Association of School Boards submitted written testimony concerning the Governor's proposal ([Attachment 11](#)). The Association supports greater efficiency in schools, but is concerned that such a study could place too great an emphasis on "efficiency" and not enough on student achievement. The Association also believes that local boards of education should have the flexibility to make choices about how to spend money in order to achieve the best results and that diversity among districts may make it inappropriate to apply a single standard of efficiency.

Report from the State Board of Regents

Reggie Robinson, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Kansas Board of Regents, presented information on the Board's legislative initiatives and other matters ([Attachment 12](#)). Items addressed by Mr. Robinson are the following.

Deferred Maintenance. The six universities have a backlog of deferred maintenance totaling \$584 million. Mr. Robinson explained that 80 percent of the facilities are at least 20 years old and that major subsystems in the buildings simply have worn out. He said preventing further deferred maintenance will cost \$74 million a year (without factoring in inflation) and that failure to address the situation will cause the backlog to grow to \$800 million by FY 2014. Mr. Robinson told the Committee the Board has no specific proposal at this time, but may have a proposal in several months.

Interest Ownership on University Funds. The Board would like interest earned on various university funds credited to the fund that generated the earnings, not to the State General Fund. The impact on the State General Fund had this proposal been in effect in FY 2004 would have been a reduction in receipts of \$1.9 million. Mr. Robinson explained that crediting interest earnings to university funds could mitigate future tuition increases.

Continuation of Kan-Ed Funding Through the Kansas Universal Service Fund. Funding for Kan-Ed currently is an annual amount of \$10 million from the Kansas Universal Service Fund. That funding source began in FY 2003 and will expire at the end of FY 2005. The Board would like to extend the funding for another three years (until the end of FY 2008).

Repeal Community College Education Contract Language. The Board would like to repeal language in the statutes that prohibits community colleges from entering into out-of-state agreements with institutions in other states. Mr. Robinson described the limitation as “outdated and often ignored” and speculated that the original concern might have been travel distances involved if an institution had a contract with an out-of-state institution. He said technological changes make this limitation unnecessary.

Modifications to the Regents Retirement Plans. The Board would like to amend the statutes relating to mandatory and voluntary retirement plans, as the result of a project involving outside counsel specializing in tax, retirement, and benefits law. According to Mr. Robinson, the main change would be to allow the Board to contract with a bank or approved non-bank trustee or custodian under Section 401(f) of the Internal Revenue Code. Mr. Robinson said the Board would provide specific language concerning its proposed changes.

Modifications to the Regents Phased Retirement Program. The Board would like legislation to update and clarify current law regarding program eligibility and the distribution of benefits.

University of Kansas Alternative Civil Service Proposal. The Board would like authorization to create a new category of unclassified employees called “University Support Staff.” At the discretion of each state university and subject to approval by the Board, currently classified staff would be reassigned to the unclassified category. Mr. Robinson explained that the state job classification system does not give the universities the flexibility to reward good employees based on merit nor does it reflect regional differences in cost-of-living expenses.

Elimination of the \$1 Million Research Foundation Capital Improvement Project Cap. The Board would like the cap removed. The cap was imposed when the 2000 Legislature enacted legislation allowing research foundations of state colleges and universities to initiate and complete capital improvement projects on state-owned projects. Mr. Robinson said the cap could impair the ability of universities to respond to federal research opportunities. (Mr. Robinson’s formal presentation contains a proposed draft to implement this recommendation.)

Property Insurance Initiative. Mr. Robinson addressed a matter that was not contained in his formal presentation, but one which the President of the Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC) discussed with the Board at a recent meeting. Mr. Robinson said Kansas law presently prohibits the state universities from participating in a property insurance initiative sponsored by MHEC. He said the Board intends to pursue the matter and likely will have a specific proposal shortly.

Regents Budget. The Board is requesting full funding under the Higher Education Coordination Act (1999 SB 345). To attain this level of funding, the FY 2006 request includes an increase of \$79.4 million over FY 2005. Other items include \$5 million to fully fund the postsecondary aid program for technical schools and colleges; enhancements for several student assistance

programs; \$110,000 to restore the Regents Honors Academy; funding for MHEC dues; an enhancement for the Regents Distinguished Professors program; additional funding to meet the state match of federal funding for the Adult Basic Education Program; \$227,169 for operating expenses by Fort Hays State University of a Cheyenne Bottoms Education and Visitors Center; and funding for the Board Office, including 6.0 FTE new positions.

Other Matters. Mr. Robinson told the Committee that the Board continues to work to implement legislation concerning technical college governance changes and praised the initiative of the Sedgwick County Commission regarding the Wichita Area Technical College. He said progress is being made to deliver baccalaureate degree completion programs to place-bound students in Western Kansas through the Western Kansas Access US Initiative. He said the Board has received the report and recommendations of the Northwest Research Education Center (NORED) on higher education financing and will begin formal consideration of the report and recommendations at its next meeting. Mr. Robinson told the Committee that, in compliance with legislation requiring that higher education funding be performance based, each institution has negotiated a performance agreement with the Board. New funding in FY 2006 will be based on the degree of compliance with the agreements. The Board is undertaking a review of high school curricula and courses offered that comprise the Regents required curriculum, which qualifies students for admission to the state universities. Also under consideration is a review of concurrent enrollment policies. Recommendations on concurrent enrollment will be considered by the Council of Presidents and forwarded to the Board for its consideration.

In response to a question about the Board's community college funding proposal, Mr. Robinson said that the request for FY 2006 includes funding for the third year of the phase out of out-district tuition, not both the third and fourth years. (The phase out has been delayed because of revenue shortfalls.)

Senator Vratil asked Mr. Robinson to respond to questions about technical college funding, noting that original legislation changing technical college governance also included mill levy authority, but that authority was deleted from the legislation that was enacted. Senator Vratil asked Mr. Robinson whether the Board prefers increased state funding for technical colleges or more local control that would derive from a local property tax base. Mr. Robinson said the Board does not yet have a proposal and that both options might find favor. He said Board consideration of a local levy in the past had not been pursued because of objections by the technical colleges. Mr. Robinson said that, if the state fully funded its 85 percent share of the postsecondary aid formula, consideration of other funding sources might not be necessary.

Senator Oleen observed that Kansas has not kept up with the need for student assistance. She urged the Board of Regents to develop a student assistance proposal and to include in the proposal giving community colleges more access to need based assistance. She expressed dismay that the state universities cannot participate in MHEC's property insurance initiative, the result being that the state has missed an opportunity to save thousands of dollars.

Bill Drafts and Final Report

Interest Ownership on University Funds. *Upon a motion by Senator Oleen, seconded by Senator Vratil, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of legislation intended to implement the request by the Board of Regents that interest earnings on special revenue funds be credited to the funds that generate the earnings.* (Similar legislation was introduced during the 2004 Session in the form of SB 490, which did not pass.) The Revisor was instructed to work with the Regents staff to develop drafting language.

Continuation of Kan-Ed Funding Through the Kansas Universal Service Fund. *Upon a motion by Senator Vratil, seconded by Senator Umbarger, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of legislation intended to implement the request of the Board of Regents that funding for Kan-Ed from the Kansas Universal Service Fund be continued for another three years (until the end of FY 2008).*

Repeal Community College Education Contract Language. *Upon a motion by Representative Decker, seconded by Representative Mason, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of legislation intended to implement the request of the Board of Regents that language be repealed which prohibits community colleges from entering into agreements with out-of-state institutions.*

Modifications to the Regents Retirement Plans and Modifications to the Regents Phased Retirement Program. *Upon a motion by Senator Oleen, seconded by Senator Umbarger, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of legislation intended to implement the request of the Board of Regents that amendments be made to statutes relating to the Regents system retirement plans and the Regents phased retirement program.*

University of Kansas Alternative Civil Service Proposal. *Upon a motion by Representative Ballard, seconded by Senator Vratil, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of legislation intended to implement the request of the Board of Regents that authorization be given to create a new category of unclassified employees called "University Support Staff."*

Elimination of the \$1 million Research Foundation Capital Improvement Project Cap. *Upon a motion by Senator Vratil, seconded by Representative Mason, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of legislation intended to implement the request of the Board of Regents that the \$1 million cap on Research Foundation Capital Improvement projects be removed.* (Under the Committee's recommendation, there would be no cap.)

MHEC Property Insurance Program. *Upon a motion by Representative Decker, seconded by Senator Umbarger, the Committee voted to instruct the staff to work with the Regents Board staff to develop legislation to be introduced by the Committee which would make it possible for the state universities to participate in the property insurance program sponsored by MHEC.*

Technical School and College Funding. Representative Decker discussed her interest in providing workforce training opportunities for Kansas residents and told the Committee she had donated campaign funds of her late husband, Steve Lloyd, to set up scholarships for students attending technical schools and colleges. *She seconded a motion, made by Senator Vratil, that the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Ways and Means Committee be informed of the Committee's support of full funding of the state's 85 percent share of the postsecondary state aid program. The motion carried.* The Committees should be informed that, if the state pays its share of the formula, other sources of revenue for technical schools and colleges, such as a local property tax, may not be necessary. The message of the Committee is to be included in the final report and also in a letter from the chair to the chairs of the appropriate committees. The Committee wishes to be informed of action taken by the Appropriations and Ways and Means committees so that it can consider other options, including the introduction of legislation, if full funding of the postsecondary tuition aid program is not recommended.

Student Financial Aid Programs. *Upon a motion by Senator Oleen, seconded by Representative Ballard, the Committee voted to include in its final report and to include in a letter to the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Ways and Means Committee the points made by Mr. Robinson in his prepared testimony concerning student financial assistance programs.* The points concern the budget request of the Regents for the Comprehensive Grant program, the Medical

Student Loan program, the Osteopathic Scholarship program, the Ethnic Minority Scholarship, the Teacher Scholarship, the Nursing Scholarship, and the optometry seat purchase agreement.

Community College Out-District Tuition Phase Out and Board Office Funding. By consensus, the Committee agreed to endorse, in its report and in letters to the appropriate committees, funding necessary to implement the third year of the community college out-district tuition phase out and the necessity to adequately fund operations of the Board Office, including the addition of more staff.

Committee Letters. Letters to be written by the chair on behalf of the Committee to the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Ways and Means Committee are the following:

- A letter concerning full implementation of the Higher Education Coordination Act (1999 SB 345) and Board Office needs;
- A letter concerning full funding for the technical school and college postsecondary tuition state aid program; and
- A letter advocating adequate funding for student assistance programs.

The Committee instructed the staff to include in the final report acknowledgment of the various items reported on by Mr. Robinson in his presentation and to note that the matter of deferred maintenance of state-owned higher education facilities is under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on State Building Construction.

Student Self-Medication. *Upon a motion by Senator Vratil, seconded by Senator Umbarger, the Committee voted to further amend the draft relating to student self-medication by adding language to clarify that school policies would apply to students “at any place where a student is subject to the jurisdiction or supervision of the school district or its officers, employees or agents.”*

Upon a motion by Senator Vratil, seconded by Senator Umbarger, the Committee voted to recommend the introduction of a bill on student self-medication, with the Committee’s changes.

Governor’s Teaching Excellence Scholarships and Awards (National Board Certification). *Upon a motion by Senator Oleen, seconded by Senator Umbarger, the Committee voted to amend a draft concerning the Governor’s Teaching Excellence Scholarships and Awards program. (A copy of the final version of the draft is Attachment 13.)* The Governor’s Teaching Excellence Scholarships and Awards program provides stipends to teachers who are in the process of attaining National Board certification and requires school districts to pay bonuses to teachers who are National Board certified. The programs to prepare teachers for initial certification and renewal are offered by the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence at Emporia State University.

The Committee’s recommendations include making the scholarship portion of the program statutory, instead of a proviso in appropriations bills; increasing the scholarship from \$1,000 to \$1,150 in recognition of an increase in tuition for the initial certification program (from \$2,300 to \$2,500); authorizing a scholarship of \$500 for teachers who are in the process of renewing their National Board certification (total tuition cost for the recertification program is \$1,150); and providing that \$1,000 bonuses will be paid to eligible teachers who have renewed their National Board certification, not just to those in the first ten years of initial certification.

Upon a motion by Senator Umbarger, seconded by Representative Holland, the Committee recommended that the draft relating to National Board certification be introduced, as amended.

Committee Report

A final copy of the Committee report will be mailed to the Committee for its approval.

Minutes

Upon a motion by Representative Phelps, seconded by Senator Taddiken, the minutes of the October meeting were approved, as revised. The revision concerns a change on page 3 and inserts the word "setting," which was omitted at the end of a sentence. The complete sentence should read: "Least restrictive environment' means the determination of how services will be provided that child within the inclusive *setting*."

The meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by Carolyn Rampey

Approved by Committee on:

December 25, 2004

(date)