

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by SENATOR JOSEPH C. HARDER at
Chairperson

1:30 ~~xxx~~/p.m. on TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1984 in room 254-E of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Senator Bogina, excused

Committee staff present:

Mr. Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Ms. Avis Swartzman, Legislative Revisor's Office
Mrs. Millie Randell, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

SB 793 - Community colleges and municipal universities, determination of credit hours at completion of term, distribution dates for state aid (Education)

Opponents:

Dr. W. Merle Hill, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Community Colleges
Mr. Robert Hartsook, Vice President, Washburn University

SCR 1641 - Concurrent resolution urging the State Board of Education and State Board of Regents to cooperatively insure effective instructional leadership in schools; Re Proposal No. 18 (Spec. Comm. on Education)

Proponents:

Dr. Jerry Schreiner, Executive Director, United School Administrators
Dr. William Curtis, Asst. Executive Director, Kansas Association of School Boards

SCR 1624 - A concurrent resolution urging that the salaries of Kansas teachers be raised at least to the national average (Rehorn et al.)

Proponents:

Mr. Craig Grant, Director of Political Action, K-NEA
Dr. William Curtis, Asst. Executive Director, Kansas Association of School Boards

SCR 1667 - SCR urging the state department of education to reduce amounts retained for administration of federal block grants (Parrish)

Proponents:

Mr. Craig Grant, Director of Political Action, K-NEA
Dr. William Curtis, Asst. Executive Director, Kansas Association of School Boards

(SCR 1647 - On behalf of the Kansas State Nurses Association, the secretary distributed to Committee members written testimony in support of SCR 1647 which was heard by the Committee at the last meeting. Attachment 7)

After Chairman Joseph C. Harder called the meeting to order, he called upon Mr. John Koepke, Executive Director of the Kansas Association of School Boards, who had made a request to have the floor preceding the first conferee. Mr. Koepke, along with Mr. Craig Grant of K-NEA, and Dr. Jerry Schreiner, Executive Director of United School Administrators, then presented Chairman Joseph C. Harder the "Friends of Education Award" for 1984. Although the presentation ceremony for recipients of this award had been held previously, the plaques had not arrived in time for the presentation. The Chairman graciously accepted his award.

The Chairman then called upon Senator Charlie Angell who explained the background and purpose of SB 793. During Senator Angell's explanation, he stated that the bill was based on a ten percent dropout rate.

Dr. W. Merle Hill of the Kansas Association of Community Colleges testified against SB 793, and his testimony is found in Attachment 1. Not only did Dr. Hill urge the Committee to recommend the bill adversely, but he also thought the bill was premature without further study and recommended that

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
 room 254-E Statehouse, at 1:30 ~~am~~/p.m. on TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1984

it be comprehensively studied by an interim committee. He said that he also was concerned as to what effect the passage of the bill would have on the independent colleges.

Mr. Robert Hartsook of Washburn University testified as an opponent of SB 793, and his testimony is found in Attachment 2. Mr. Hartsook supported Dr. Hill's recommendation that the bill be studied by an interim committee.

Ms. Barbara Hinton of the State Post Audit Department was present to respond to questions that might be posed by the Committee regarding SB 793.

The Chairman announced that the hearing on SB 793 was concluded.

SCR 1641 - Dr. Jerry Schreiner of U.S.A. was then called upon to testify as a proponent of SCR 1641. Dr. Schreiner stressed the importance of evaluation of both administrators and teachers so as to help insure effective instructional leadership in the schools. Dr. Schreiner maintained that certain goals can be reached and certain criteria can be accepted in the evaluation process but said that time and training are needed. Dr. Schreiner noted the many changes and problems which confront schools today and which schools are expected to solve while receiving much criticism for their efforts. Dr. Schreiner said that U.S.A. supports SCR 1641 and will continue its work to improve the administration of the school system. Dr. Schreiner distributed informational sheets defining TASK to the Committee, Attachment 3, and then gave the Committee secretary Attachments 4, 5, and 6 for perusal by Committee members. These attachments help identify and explain some of the professional development programs that have been provided by the U.S.A.

Dr. William Curtis of KASB said he is testifying in support of SCR 1641, because it speaks to evaluation. Dr. Curtis prompted the Committee to take a good, hard look at the courses on school administration taught by institutions of higher learning.

Dr. William Curtis testified that KASB supports SCR 1624 and SCR 1667, both of which are on today's agenda.

SCR 1624 - The Chairman then called upon Senator Tom Rehorn who briefly confirmed his continued support for the resolution which he co-authored and which urges that salaries of Kansas teachers be raised at least to the national average.

Mr. Craig Grant of K-NEA testified that he endorses SCR 1624.

SCR 1667 - The Chairman then called upon Senator Parrish to speak on behalf of her resolution. Senator Parrish explained that the State Department of Education can retain for administration purposes up to twenty percent of the block grant money it receives from the Federal Government for distribution to U.S.D.'s. She said that she would like to see less than twenty percent retained for administrative costs and that this difference be given to the U.S.D.'s. She added that she would also like for the state to reimburse the State Department of Education for the additional money it would forward to the U.S.D.'s.

Mr. Craig Grant of K-NEA testified in support of SCR 1667 and added that he, too, is in favor of having the State Department of Education reduce the amount of money it retains for administration of block grant funds. He said that he, also, would like to see that the State Department of Education is reimbursed by the State for the additional funds it would give to the U.S.D.'s from the block grant funds.

The Chairman announced that the hearing on SCR 1667 was concluded.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
room 254-E, Statehouse, at 1:30 ~~a.m.~~p.m. on TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1984.

When the Chairman asked the Committee's pleasure regarding SCR 1647, Senator Winter moved, and Senator Parrish seconded the motion to recommend the resolution favorably for passage. The motion carried.

When the Chairman called for action on HB 2879, Senator Winter moved, and Senator McCray seconded the motion to recommend the bill favorably for passage. The motion did not carry. Following discussion, the decision was made to hold the bill in Committee and recommend it to an interim committee for study.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 254-E DATE: Tuesday, March 27, 1984

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Steve Janke	Holton Ks.	
Harriette Janke	Hollon, Ks	
Bill Curtis	Topeka	KASB
Alan Foster	Topeka	Leg. Post Audit
Barb Hinton	Lawrence	Legislative Post-Audit
Al Bramble	Lawrence	AAFP
John F. Myers	Hutchinson	Budget
Synda Cory	Topeka	WW Intern for Sen Angell
Paul Hubbs	Washburn	Washburn
Gen Rager	Paula	S O C
Eileen Gombrowski	Topeka	Ks. Action for Children
Ed Walkourn	Topeka	Washburn
M. Hawer	"	Capital-Journal
Ruth Weimer	"	AAUP

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: 254-E DATE: Tuesday, March 27, 1984

GUEST LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Jacque Dakes	Gates Center	KASB
Jay Schreiner	Topeka	USA
Alu Kozka	Topeka	KASB
Nancy Halberg	Topeka	K-NEA
Mehle Hill	"	KACC
Sam Ireland	"	Bd of Regents
Betty Jones	Shawnee	Eagle Forum
Stan Lind	K.C.Ks.	KACC
Ray Fernandez	Topeka	NEA
Ken Seoby	Sabetha	
Alu Gene Seoby	"	
Sharon Green	Topeka	Sen. Daniels Sec
Bob Wootten	Topeka	
Oran C. Burnett	Topeka	USD 501#



KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Columbian Title Bldg., 820 Quincy • Topeka 66612 • Phone 913-357-5156

W. Merle Hill
Executive Director

To: Senate Education Committee
From: Merle Hill
Date: March 27, 1984
Subj: Senate Bill 793

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to appear before you today in behalf of the 19 Kansas community colleges who are providing quality educational opportunities to more than 42,000 Kansans and, also, to express their concern about the opposition to Senate Bill No. 793.

The community colleges appreciate the proposed increases in credit hour state aid and out-district tuition but are extremely concerned about distribution of funds only on those courses which are completed.

The bill appears to suggest a change in philosophy for support of higher education in Kansas - or, rather, for support of one segment of higher education. The philosophy expressed in the proposed bill is different from that expressed in the mission statement in the Department of Education's State Plan for Community Colleges. On page 2 of the 1983-84 State plan one reads: "The mission of the Kansas community college system shall be to provide equal access to quality, low cost, comprehensive postsecondary educational opportunities for citizens of the state who may benefit from the programs and services of the several institutions." Note that the opportunities are for citizens "who may benefit from the programs" and not merely for those who complete courses.

Kansas has had, essentially, open admissions to its public institutions. The philosophy of this bill seems to support open admissions but to assume responsibility for a student's education only if he remains in school for an entire semester. If a student drops a class or withdraws from school, for whatever reason, the state assumes no responsibility.

In effect, the bill is saying to community colleges that they should continue to have open admissions, that the student should pay his tuition and the local taxpayer should pay his taxes. If the student remains enrolled for an entire semester, the state will continue to provide state credit-hour aid, even a little more than it now provides; but, if for any reason the student drops out of school, the state assumes no fiscal responsibility.

Students drop from courses in community colleges for the same reasons they drop from courses of instruction at the regents' universities and private institutions, yet the bill seems to be directed only at community colleges and Washburn. The bill appears to suggest that there is a particular problem with drops and withdrawals at these institutions.

Students drop courses or withdraw from them for many reasons, most of them legitimate and almost all of them beyond the control of the colleges. We believe any college or university should be reimbursed for providing five or more weeks of instruction, counseling, grading of papers, etc., for a duly enrolled student. They should be reimbursed for the student:

- o who is pregnant and, upon her physician's advice, withdraws from a class or from school.
- o who is a part-time student and a full-time worker, at Wolf Creek, for example, and has his work schedule changed and must withdraw from a class.
- o who, in spite of a counselor's advice, insists on enrolling in classes beyond her capacity, then finds out she erred and drops several classes to keep from flunking them.
- o who is interested only in automotive mechanics and could care less about the liberal arts courses that are required for graduation.
- o who simply decides to change his major field of study, as more than 75% of all college students do at least once.
- o who didn't learn to read during the back-to-hieroglyphics or Look-Jane-Look period of teaching, was passed along in school for maturational purposes, was graduated from high school and now needs education for survival but cannot handle a full schedule of classes.

These are all legitimate drops or withdrawals, and they occur nearly every day in colleges and universities throughout the country.

One of America's eminent scholar historians, Henry Steele Commager, calls the community colleges "the most significant contribution to education in this century." Perhaps they are so significant because, in many cases, they are attempting to solve the problems that should be solved in elementary and high schools. They have become everyman's college, the college of fewer out-of-pocket dollars, the I've-always-wanted-to-try-this college, the I'm-not-ready-for-the-big-university college and, yes, even the last-chance college.

The bright, talented high school pupil who breezes through with no difficulty is ordinarily not the student who drops a lot of courses in college, although even he sometimes encounters difficulties. It is the pupils of lesser abilities who are sometimes overwhelmed when they become college students, and it appears undemocratic to say to them that they have only one chance to have the state assist them in their attempts to become better functioning members of society, to become employed and pay their share of governmental support services and to seek the social mobility that has distinguished our society from others.

The community colleges serve many high-risk students, and serving high-risk students is a risky business. We should not expect the same persistence rates from this group that we would hope to achieve from those who do not enter college with a variety of academic deficiencies accumulated over 12 or more years.

In addition, students attending community colleges are, on average, older than students attending other institutions of higher education. The average age of students attending Kansas community colleges is 30 years, approximately 10 years older than the average of students attending baccalaureate programs. Older students' attrition rates reflect a lower tolerance for institutional barriers and the frustrations of raising a family, maintaining a job and attending college at the same time.

We believe the state should not deny its educational responsibility to these students, and educational responsibility carries with it financial responsibility.

We do not believe SB 793 is in the best interests of the citizens of Kansas, the more than 42,000 students currently enrolled in the community colleges and the hundreds of thousands who will enroll in the future. We respectfully request that you report Senate Bill 793 unfavorably.

TESTIMONY BY WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

BEFORE THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

CONCERNING SENATE BILL 793

INTRODUCTION:

Senate Bill 793 has been introduced to change the student enrollment reporting date for "duly enrolled credit hours" for purposes of state aid and out-district tuition payments for the public community colleges and Washburn University. The bill recommends that rather than the end of the fifth week of the spring and fall semesters, the completion of the duration of the regular semester be used for purposes of determining "duly enrolled credit-hours" for state aid and out-district payments.

RESPONSE TO THIS PROPOSAL:

COST CONSIDERATIONS:

A higher education institution incurs costs for teaching students on the day the classes start. These are real costs of educating a student and ones that must be borne by the institution. Such costs of education obviously need to be funded from the various sources of funding available to each institution. To declare the end of the semester that a substantial share of funding, for class time already taught, may no longer be available, amounts to a setback to the funding of an institution, especially since costs have already been incurred. The community colleges and Washburn University already suffer from a loss of funding for costs incurred during the first four or five weeks of classes.

Senate Bill 793 in essence, is proposing that this existing problem be compounded by extending the possible reduction of funding at the end of the semester.

This is analogous to students being allowed a full refund of tuition because they drop out of school and do not complete their work, even though costs have been incurred to teach those students while they were enrolled and educational services were rendered. This bill is essentially stating that if a student doesn't complete a full semester of work, no state funding would be available to cover the costs of teaching that student. Applied to its extremity, why should funding be available from student tuition payments if the course work is not completed. Obviously, the rationale for not refunding student tuition is that a service was rendered for a certain period of time and the cost for delivering this service must be paid.

A second analogy would involve the state regents' institutions. State appropriations are made to the state regents' institutions, in part, on the basis of their anticipated enrollments as counted on the 20th day of classes. The question is, should the state regents' institutions be required to immediately forego state appropriation funding for those students who drop out of school by the 20th day of class or the end of the semester. The state has long recognized at the state regents' institutions that they do in fact incur costs for educating students at the level estimated in their budget, and therefore, funding continues to be available to these institutions throughout the budget year. Current state procedures provide for a two-year adjustment period for any decline in enrollments for the state regents' institutions as opposed to an immediate reduction in state appropriation, should enrollments decline. Therefore, Senate Bill 793 would in essence impose double standards for public higher

education -- one for the state regents' institutions and one for the community colleges and Washburn University. Should Senate Bill 793 be favorably considered, it would seem fair and equitable to have a similar procedure apply to the state regents' institutions rather than have a double standard for public higher education.

OPEN ADMISSIONS INCONSISTENCY:

A second factor that should be considered in connection with Senate Bill 793 is the State of Kansas policy of open admissions in all public higher education. On the one hand, the state is declaring that educational opportunities are and should be available to all Kansans who are graduates of a high school in Kansas and who want the opportunity to attend a public college or university in Kansas. On the other hand, this bill would penalize only selected institutions who accept students with a lower chance of being successful in their educational endeavors. A system of selective admission criteria, while denying the open admission opportunity, would reduce dramatically the number of students who would drop out. Penalizing institutions by first requiring institutions to incur the costs to teach students with a lower chance of being successful in their educational endeavors, and then saying that we will not help fund the costs of educating these students, is inconsistent with the state policy of requiring open admissions.

UNIFORM REPORTING:

For years, efforts have been made in Kansas to develop systematic student enrollment reporting dates for all of public higher education. Considerable progress has been made over the years and the state essentially has established a uniform student enrollment reporting system for all of public higher education. Presently, the 20th day of classes (4

weeks) is used for the official count of student enrollments and credit-hours in the state regents' institutions, the independent institution, and the community colleges. The fifth week of classes is used for Washburn University.

For these official enrollment dates to be changed, would amount to a reversal of the previous efforts to have fairly uniform enrollment reporting dates. The public colleges and universities in Kansas use the current reporting dates not only for the state, but also for federal reporting purposes, which include the annual HEGIS (Higher Educational General Information Survey) report and student financial aid reports for federal aid distribution. There are numerous other national reporting bodies on enrollments which would also be affected by any change in determining student enrollments and student credit-hours. Essentially, the state would wind up with two different reporting systems: one for the state regents' institutions (unless they are included in the change), the community colleges, and one for Washburn University. It would become increasingly difficult to make meaningful comparisons under such a system of reporting.

In addition, all historical data from previous years would have to be adjusted in order to reflect comparable information with the proposed change in reporting dates. So, from a reporting standpoint, it would certainly not be to the advantage of the State of Kansas to establish new dates which would be inconsistent within the state, inconsistent with historical reports, and inconsistent with institutions in other states.

CASH FLOW:

Another factor associated with Senate Bill 793 is the further deterioration of cash flow that would be created. Each institution already has a tight cash flow situation. By

delaying the date of official reporting to the end of the semester, the cash flow problem would be extended by at least six to ten weeks, again compounding problems of institutional management.

SUMMARY:

For the reasons cited above, Senate Bill 793 should be defeated. However, if it is voted in, it should be amended to include the same reporting dates for the state regents' institutions and independent colleges.

Dr. John L. Green, Jr.
President, Washburn University

February 24, 1984

Community Education Programs

- *Task* is defined as a major function responsibility related to the assistant principalship.
- *Competency* refers to the ability to perform certain skills related to the specific task.
- *Indicators* are the specifics by which evidence is gained for the determination of competency mastery. The indicators listed are by no means all-inclusive, but are suggestions to begin measurement.

TASK

- 1.0 Philosophy, Goal Setting, and Policy Implementation
- Competency:
1.1 Ability to comprehend and implement policy and goals consistent with district philosophy.
- Indicators:
1.1.1 Develops goal statements consistent with district philosophy.
1.1.2 Demonstrates a knowledge of district philosophy (verbally or in writing).
- Competency:
1.2 Ability to employ procedures for establishing organizational goals.
- Indicators:
1.2.1 Establishes a representative community council.
1.2.2 Seeks and uses input from council, faculty members, and students.
- Competency:
1.3 Ability to serve as liaison between school and board of education, district offices, community education director, community.
- Indicator:
1.3.1 Spends time establishing communication.
-

TASK

- 2.0 Program Development
- Competency:
2.1 Ability to supervise assessment of program needs with the help of the community.
- Indicators:
2.1.1 Meets periodically with council to discuss directives and needs of program.
2.1.2 Works with community council in establishing a needs assessment within the community.
- Competency:
2.2 Ability to supervise planning of instructional and curricular programs.
- Indicators:
2.2.1 Communicates; encourages other agencies to help provide programs.
2.2.2 Periodically holds meetings with director.
2.2.3 Reviews and monitors progress.
- Competency:
2.3 Ability to supervise program implementation.
-

TASK

- 3.0 Program Management
- Competency:
3.1 Ability to apply problem identification and analysis procedures.
- Indicator:
3.1.1 Uses group problem-solving techniques (brainstorming sessions).
- Competency:
3.2 Ability to supervise planning and scheduling in accordance with available facilities and equipment.
- Indicators:
3.2.1 Delegates to director responsibility to implement.
3.2.2 Establishes guidelines on procedures and facilities and is aware of constraints.
3.2.3 Establishes procedures to request facilities.

TASK

4.0 Developing Climate

Competency:

4.1 Ability to assess climate of faculty and community toward community education.

Indicator:

4.1.1 Surveys community, staff, suggestions, complaints, turnouts, etc.

Competency:

4.2 Ability to clarify roles and responsibilities.

Indicator:

4.2.1 Develops job descriptions.

Competency:

4.3 Ability to generate and maintain a supportive attitude with staff and community.

Indicator:

4.3.1 Participates in activities that are part of the community education program.

Competency:

4.4 Ability to work through conflict situations.

Indicator:

4.4.1 Uses community council to bring people together.

TASK

5.0 Personnel Management

Competency:

5.1 Ability to recruit and select competent community education director.

Indicators:

5.1.1 Develops a job description of community education director.

5.1.2 Advertises.

5.1.3 Interviews.

5.1.4 Uses committee and council.

Competency:

5.2 Ability to supervise community education director.

Indicators:

5.2.1 Holds evaluation conferences periodically.

5.2.2 Develops evaluation procedures.

Competency:

5.3 Ability to evaluate competence of community education director.

Indicator:

5.3.1 Follows through with use of evaluation procedures.

TASK

6.0 Financial Management

Competency:

6.1 Ability to plan all phases of community education program consistent with laws that relate to financing community education.

Indicators:

6.1.1 Knows laws.

6.1.2 Develops adequate budget.

6.1.3 Involves coordinator in preparation of total school budget.

- Competency:
6.2 Ability to organize program with community education staff in harmony with financial resources available.
- Competency:
6.3 Ability to supervise and manage financial affairs relating to district and agency funds.
-

TASK

- 7.0 Community Relations
- Competency:
7.1 Ability to identify and utilize community resources that affect successful operation of the community education program.
- Indicator:
7.1.1 Gets out into the community to make contacts and learn what resources are available.
- Competency:
7.2 Ability to plan and establish a public program relating to community education.
- Indicators:
7.2.1 Makes personal contact with media.
7.2.2 Involves district community relations department.
- Competency:
7.3 Ability to assist in developing and maintaining a productive community education council.
- Indicators:
7.3.1 Principal is present often.
7.3.2 Obtains good cross-section on community council.
-

TASK

- 8.0 Program Evaluation
- Competency:
8.1 Ability to employ professional research techniques.
- Indicator:
8.1.1 Uses district research personnel.
- Competency:
8.2 Ability to interpret research data.
- Indicators:
8.2.1 Writes articles, speaks, etc.
8.2.2 Shares with community council and community.
- Competency:
8.3 Ability to evaluate the community education program in relation to education program goals.
- Competency
8.4 Ability to utilize evaluative data to modify the community education program.
-
-

To: Associated Press
Kansas State Capital Office

THE ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE PROGRAM IN KANSAS SCHOOLS

Kansas educators did not wait for the major reports such as that of the President's Commission on Excellence or the Carnegie Report in order to begin to attack some of the weaknesses in our educational system.

In the fall of 1981, the United School Administrators of Kansas organization discovered a highly acclaimed program designed to deal with problems in school discipline. Over the past several years the Gallup poll on education had named school discipline as the number one problem in schools. Therefore this program became an important part of USA's professional development program not only for administrators but teachers as well.

The program is contained in a book written by psychologist Lee Canter whose consultants provide training for educators through workshops. The program is called "Assertive Discipline" and is based upon hundreds of observations made by Canter and his wife Marlene who is a teacher. They set out to determine what successful teachers do to maintain good discipline and wrote the program based upon those observations. Teachers training rarely includes methods of dealing with disciplinary problems. Such skills must be acquired either on the job from experience or from staff development programs provided by the school district they serve.

USA's first programs in Kansas were in the form of five "drive-in" workshops which attracted nearly 1,000 teachers and administrators. After sampling the program individual districts began scheduling the workshop in their schools for the entire staff or a major portion of it. Some of the smaller districts combined their staff in order to have a consultant come to their district. The consultants were in such great demand that a minimum of 100 participants was generally required in order to schedule a workshop.

To date, approximately 8,000 Kansas teachers and administrators have participated in the program. This represents a substantial investment and commitment on the part of school districts to improve the teaching atmosphere and to eliminate the distractions in a class which take away time from teaching. The program is designed to address not only classroom problems, but also those which occur in cafeterias, hallways, buses and on playgrounds. Bus drivers have accepted the program as enthusiastically as have teachers and administrators.

The program helps teachers determine the conditions and student behavior which must be present in the classroom in order for good teaching to occur. Rules must then be clearly stated to both students and parents with the approval of the principal. The teacher then must develop ways to reinforce and reward good behavior and must consistently provide negative consequences for unacceptable behavior. The consequences depend upon the rule broken and the frequency. They can vary from loss of privileges to phone calls or conferences with parents, to short-term in-school suspension. On rare occasions, in those cases in which the school does not get cooperation from parents, students might be taken home, if they are too disruptive, or taken to the place of the parent's employment.

Districts using the program have been surveyed and the evaluations have been overwhelmingly favorable. Canter consultants have served hundreds of thousands of teachers throughout the U.S. and Canada and because parents expressed interest in the program, he has written a similar book on "Assertive Discipline for Parents."

The list below includes most of the districts in Kansas which have provided the workshop for either their entire staff, a major portion or at least all staff members in a school building:

Arkansas City	Garden City	Lindsborg	Perry
Belle Plaine	Garnett	Little River	Pleasanton
Belleville	Goddard	Leavenworth	Phillipsburg
Bucklin	Goessel	Liberal	Pike Valley-Scandia
Buhler	Greensburg	Logan	Prairie View
Caney	Haven	Macksville	Pretty Prairie
Canton-Galva	Haviland	Marysville	Rose Hill
Central Heights	Hill City	Maize	Salina
Chanute	Hillsboro	Marion	Shawnee Mission
Cherryvale	Holcomb	McPherson	Smith Center
Cimarron	Hoxie	Meade	Southeast of Saline
Coffeyville	Hugoton	Moundridge	Spearville
Dodge City	Hutchinson	Mullinville	Topeka
El Dorado	Inman	Nickerson	Ulysses
Eudora	Jefferson West	Osage City	Victoria
Fort Scott	Lawrence	Peabody-Burns	Wakeeney

Several school districts sent their teachers and administrators to two or more workshops and therefore have their entire staff trained in the program so the list is longer than the above.

United School Administrators is an association made up of eight associations of school administrators. Those groups are: superintendents, elementary principals, secondary principals, curriculum directors, business officials, school public relations officials, special education administrators, and vocational-technical school administrators. The association headquarters is in Topeka.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Offered in 1982-83

(as of December 1, 1982)

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ATTENDANCE</u>
Systematic Teacher Evaluation	Esch & Everitt	Wichita	49
District-Wide Needs Assessment	McKenney	Newton	11
		Goddard	5
		Richmond	4
		Garden City	13
		Topeka	10
	Wakeeney	10	
Changing Teacher Attitudes	Homlish	Topeka	10
Use of Computers In Instruction	Bauer	Topeka	26
		Wichita	25
		Garden City	17
Use of Computers in Management	Ackelson	Wichita	16
The Role of the Administrator in Creating Positive School Climate	Mitchell	Wichita	22
Changing Family Patterns	Homlish	Salina	25
Improving Teacher Performance	Manatt	Salina	44
Assertive Discipline (Drive-ins)	Geddes	Salina	97
		Great Bend	76
Motivating Students	Coleman	Salina	to be determined 18

SCHEDULED:

Administrator Evaluation Based Upon District Goals	Ritchie	Convention	<u>45</u>
--	---------	------------	-----------

YET TO SCHEDULE:

Staff Selection and Interviews			<u>CANCELLED</u>
--------------------------------	--	--	------------------

Curriculum Development			<u>137</u>
------------------------	--	--	------------

Improving Communications in the School/Classroom

Atch. 5

SCHEDULED LATER DURING



1981-1982 Professional Development Programs Schedule
of the United School Administrators of Kansas

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Locations *</u>
<u>August</u>		
10	Corrective Discipline for the Professional Staff	Dodge City
11	Corrective Discipline for the Professional Staff	Topeka
12	Corrective Discipline for the Professional Staff	Chanute
<u>September</u>		
15	Improving School-Community P.R.	Parsons
16	Improving School-Community P.R.	Salina
22	Evaluation of Classified Employees	Hays
29	Evaluation of Classified Employees	Salina
<u>October</u>		
1	Evaluation of Classified Employees	Topeka
6	Clinical Supervision of Instructional Staff	Salina
7	Clinical Supervision of Instructional Staff	K.C. area
13	Blueprint for Curriculum Development	Hays
13	Improving Students' Self-Image	Topeka
14	Positive Student Discipline	Hays
15	Conflict Management for Educational Leaders	Salina
20	School Climate for Learning & Teaching	Wichita
21	School Climate for Learning & Teaching	Hays
22	School Climate for Learning & Teaching	K.C. area
27	Positive Student Discipline	Salina
28	Blueprint for Curriculum Development	Salina
28	Improving Students' Self-Image	Wichita
29	Conflict Management for Educational Leaders	Topeka
<u>November</u>		
3	Evaluating & Improving Teacher Performance	Salina
4	Evaluating & Improving Teacher Performance	Topeka
10	Blueprint for Curriculum Development	Topeka
18	Positive Student Discipline	Topeka
19	Improving Students' Self-Image	Hays

December

1	Stress Management & Burn-Out	Hays
2	Stress Management & Burn-Out	Wichita
3	Stress Management & Burn-Out	Topeka
8	Implementing a Staff Development Program	Salina
9	Implementing a Staff Development Program	Topeka

January

12	Staff Selection, Employment Policies, and Interview Techniques (Tentative)	Hays
13	Staff Selection, Employment Policies, and Interview Techniques (Tentative)	Topeka
27	Effective Staff Leadership	Wichita

February

16	Developing and Administering Attendance Policies (Tentative)	Salina
16	Affecting Teacher Attitudes	K.C. area
17	Developing and Administering Attendance Policies (Tentative)	Topeka
17	Affecting Teacher Attitudes	Hays

March

9	The School & the Changing Family	Wichita
11	The School & the Changing Family	Topeka

* Locations subject to change. Possible sites other than those listed include Colby, Dodge City, Manhattan, Hutchinson, Parsons, or Emporia.

LPR Center

KSNA

the voice of Nursing in Kansas

To: Members of the Senate Education Committee

From: Lynelle King, R.N., M.S., Executive Director

Date: March 27, 1984

Subject: KSNA Support for HCR 1647 "Encouraging Life Development Programs"

KSNA supports HCR 1647 because of the association's interest in seeing that children are prepared for the various stages of life development. This should lead to improved mental health.

KSNA also notes with approval the resolution's language which provides that the decision to provide education for life development in local schools must be a community decision. This should give each community an opportunity to have such a program or not, according to the wishes of the community.

Attachment 7