

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dwayne Umbarger at 1:35 p.m. on January 26, 2004 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Senator Janis Lee (excused)

Committee staff present:
Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research
Kathie Sparks, Legislative Research
Debra Hollon, Legislative Research
Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Judy Steinlicht, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB)
Dr. Connie Briggs, Director Reading & Recovery Program
Brian Young, Reading Recovery Research for Jones Institute

Others attending:
See Attached List

Senator Umbarger informed the Committee that an unauthorized bill (**SB 345**), concerning school districts; transfers of territory by petition, was read into the Senate and referred to the Senate Education Committee. A duplicate bill has now been sent to the House.

Bill Introduction

Mark Tallman, KASB, requested introduction of two bills. The first bill recommends a minimum number of hours in formal education or training for school board members. KASB believes that board members work hard to stay informed on all aspects of their responsibilities, but believes that educational governance in Kansas can be improved by requiring that all board members receive regular training on those subjects. The second bill concerns school district consolidations which would specifically authorize boards to hold joint meetings and take action on consolidation agreements within the territory of any of the affected school districts. (Attachment 1) Motion by Senator Teichman to introduce both bills, seconded by Senator Vratil. Motion carried.

Briefing - Jones Institute for Educational Excellence

Dr. Connie Briggs, Director, Reading & Recovery Program at the Jones Institute at Emporia University, explained to the Committee that the program is an early literacy intervention program targeted at the lowest 20% of first grade students. The program provides one-to-one help for first grade students that are having the most difficulty in learning to read and write. The goal of the program is to dramatically reduce the number of first grade students who are having difficulty learning to read and write and to reduce the cost of these learners to educational systems.

The program was started in Kansas in 1993. Nationally one in five schools that serve first graders have this program available with excellent results. Dr. Briggs advised that Kansas has eight teacher training sites that serve 161 teachers in 69 school districts throughout Kansas. There are 25 teachers currently in training.

At the request of the Legislative Education Planning Committee (LEPC), Dr. Briggs and her graduate research assistant, Brian Young, conducted a "Sustained Effects Longitudinal Study" on Reading Recovery in Kansas. Studies in eight states showed that the majority of Reading Recovery students continued to perform within the average range of performance when compared to their peers in subsequent years. The purpose of this study was to document results in Kansas.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE at 1:35 p.m. on January 26, 2004 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

Brian Young, assistant research assistant, completed the study and published the results. Data was collected to determine the students that went through the program and were still attending school as fourth graders. Students were tested and it was determined that the reading recovery students were doing nearly as well or better than a comparison group of students.

Dr. Briggs informed the Committee that 1,210 students were served last year in Kansas and 62% successfully completed the program and only 1% of those were referred to Special Education due to reading difficulties. Of those completing 12-20 weeks of the program, 78% reached average reading levels. None of those students were referred to Special Education. Some of those that did not complete the program moved or it was too close to the end of the year to complete the program. Dr. Briggs believes the potential savings are enormous given the high cost of Special Education services. Special Education services are three times as high as that of an average pupil. Dr. Briggs would like to see every first grade student in Kansas have the opportunity to participate in the Reading Recovery before being referred to Special Education. (Attachment 2)

During discussion Dr. Briggs confirmed that the cost per an average pupil in Kansas is \$6,758 and that the cost of Special Education is three times as much. A child diverted from Special Education by the Reading Recovery Program would be a savings of nearly \$13,516 for each year that the child would have received special education services. Dr. Briggs feels sure that if more funding were available, they would have the teachers to meet the demand to put more children in the program. Senator Teichman advised the Committee of the wonderful results in her school district.

Senator Oleen thanked Dr. Briggs for coming to share the results of the program with the Committee and requested that information be provided on what the Legislature support has been in the last year or two and what the Governor is recommending. Senator Downey wanted to know if figures were available to show the amount of money saved on special education in a school with the reading recovery program vs. a school without the program. Dr. Briggs advised that studies were done in Michigan and Massachusetts which show that school districts save about \$5,000 a year per student. Studies in Kansas schools have not been completed.

A motion was made to approve the minutes for January 20 and January 21 by Senator Schodorf. Seconded by Senator Teichman . Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2004.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE - 1-26-04

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Bill Brady	SFFF
Denise Ayl	U.S.D. 500
TERRY FORSYTH	KNEA
BILL LAND	KNEA
Pat Stratton	BUNEA
Kala Musick	KNEA - Shawnee Mission
MARLEEN WATTS	KNEA - SHAWNEE MISSION
TERRY HOLDREW	KS Farm Bureau
TERRI WEST	Jones Institute (ESU)
Connie Briggs	Jones Institute - ESU
Brian Young	Jones Institute - Emporia State Univ.
JOHN DOUGHERTY	ESU
Bob Vancouver	USD 229 and JCCC
Stuart Little	Shawnee Mission #512
Mark Deatti	KNEA



TO: Members of the Senate Committee on Education
FROM: Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director for Advocacy
DATE: January 20, 2004

RE: Request for Bill Introductions

There are two bills that KASB will ask to be introduced at this time. Both are priority issues adopted by the KASB Board of Directors.

Mandatory School Board Training

This bill would require that all school board members receive a minimum number of hours in formal education or training programs each year. The State Board of Education would approve such programs. These could include programs offered by KASB, other education associations, educational service centers, higher education associations and any other individual or group that received State Board approval. These programs could be provided through seminars and other meetings, or by holding programs for individual boards so that no travel is required.

Approximately 15 other states have adopted some kind of board training requirements. A similar bill passed the legislature in the early 1990's, but was vetoed by Governor Finney.

Teachers and administrators are required to receive on-going professional development. The requirements on public schools continue to grow under the No Child Left Behind Act and rising public expectation. While many board members work hard to stay informed on all aspects of their responsibilities, we believe educational governance in Kansas can be improved by requiring that all board members receive regular training on those subjects.

School District Consolidations – Joint Board Meetings

KASB oppose mandatory requirements for school district consolidation, but we support efforts to encourage and remove barriers to voluntary consolidation when local boards believe it is appropriate.

We propose a bill that would specifically authorize boards to hold joint meetings and take action on consolidation agreements within the territory any of the affected school districts. Currently, a school board can only take action at meetings held within its own territory.

We would encourage the committee to discuss this bill within the context of legislation proposed by the Legislative Educational Planning Committee.

Thank you for your consideration of these two issues.

*Senate Education
1-26-04
Attachment 1*

HOUSE BILL No. 2070

By Committee on Education

1-18

AN ACT establishing the Kansas school board development program.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:

Section 1. There is established the Kansas school board development program. As used in this act, the term "school board" means the board of education of a unified school district.

Sec. 2. The state board of education shall adopt rules and regulations for administration of the Kansas school board development program and shall prescribe and adopt standards and procedures for accreditation of sponsors of courses, programs or other school board development activities for school board members.

Sec. 3. (a) Each member of a school board shall earn a minimum of ten credit hours of board development in each year.

(b) Credit hours shall be reported to the state board of education in such form and manner as the state board shall prescribe.

(c) The state board may grant waivers or extensions of time to complete development program requirements because of hardship, disability or other good cause.

Sec. 4. (a) An organization or person desiring accreditation as a sponsor of courses, programs or other school board development activities for board members of this state, may apply for accreditation to the state board. The state board shall accredit a sponsor if the state board is satisfied that the sponsor's program will meet the standards prescribed under section 2, and amendments thereto.

(b) The state board may at any time reevaluate an accredited sponsor. If after such reevaluation, the state board finds there is cause for revocation of the accreditation of a sponsor, the state board, after a hearing held upon 30 days' written notice, may revoke the accreditation of the sponsor. If the state board in its judgment concludes that a course fails to meet the standards for accreditation, it may deny or withdraw approval for the course even though offered by an accredited sponsor.

Sec. 5. A school board member seeking credit for attendance at or participation in an educational activity which was conducted by a non-accredited sponsor or which was otherwise nonaccredited may submit to the state board a request for credit, which request shall include a descrip-

The state board of education may establish reasonable fees to offset the cost of administering the program.

, and the sponsor pays the fee, if any, required by the state board.

1-2

1 on of the activity, dates, subjects, instructors and their qualifications, the
2 number of credit hours requested and any other information required by
3 the state board. Within 90 days after receipt of such request, the state
4 board shall advise the school board member in writing whether devel-
5 opment credit has been granted and if granted the amount of credit
6 allowed.

fee or

7 Sec. 6. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its
8 publication in the statute book.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

December 30, 2003

72-8701
Chapter 72.--SCHOOLS
Article 87.--CONSOLIDATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

OLD STATUTE

72-8701. Agreements to consolidate authorized. In accordance with the provisions of this act the boards of education of any two (2) or more school districts are hereby authorized to enter into agreements to form one consolidated unified school district.

REVISED STATUTE

K.S.A. 72-8701 is hereby amended as follows: In accordance with the provisions of this act the boards of education of any two (2) or more school districts are hereby authorized *to discuss consolidation issues and* enter into agreements to form one consolidated unified school district *in meetings held within the territorial limits of any of the consolidating school districts provided the meeting complies in all other respects with the requirements of all relevant Kansas Statutes.*

History: L. 1969, ch. 336, § 1; L. 1980, ch. 227, § 1; March 6.

Senate Education Committee
January 26, 2004

Dr. Connie Briggs
Director Reading + Recovery Program

Senator Umbarger, Members of the Senate Education Committee ...

Thank you for the opportunity to share some good news with you today about a Program that is making a difference in the lives of Kansas' children.

Reading Recovery is an early literacy intervention targeted at the lowest 20% of first grade students. The program provides a short-term one-to-one safety net for students who are having extreme difficulty learning to read and write at a critical time—before the cycle of failure begins.

Teachers are required to select the lowest literacy learners in first grade, regardless of IQ, ethnicity, language ability or disability. **The goal of the program** is to dramatically reduce the number of first grade students who are having difficulty learning to read and write and reduce the cost of these learners to educational systems.

Reading Recovery is based on over 30 years of scientific research on how children acquire reading and writing skills. Since 1985 the program has served over one million children in the United States. Nationally, one in five schools that serve first graders made this program available to their lowest literacy learners with excellent results.

Reading Recovery was first implemented in Kansas in 1993 when one teacher leader was trained in Texas. At that time teacher leaders had to go out of state to be trained. In 1998 Emporia State University was approved as the 23rd Reading Recovery university training center in the U. S. making it possible to train teacher

Senate Education
1-26-04
Attachment 2

leaders in this state. Our program is housed in the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence at Emporia State University.

Currently, eight teacher training sites serve 161 teachers in 69 school districts throughout Kansas. This year thanks to legislative support, twenty-five new Reading Recovery teachers are currently in training.

Last year, at the suggestion of the Legislative Education Planning Committee, my graduate research assistant, Brian Young, and I conducted a Sustained Effects Longitudinal study on Reading Recovery in Kansas. This is the article that you have before you, which was published in the peer-reviewed fall issue of the Journal of Reading Recovery.

Follow-up studies in eight states had shown that the majority of Reading Recovery students continued to perform within the average range of performance when compared with their peers in subsequent years. The purpose of our study was to document the sustainable results of Reading Recovery on the reading performance of Kansas' children.

I'll let Brian tell you about the study.

When the data were statistically analyzed we found that most Kansas Reading Recovery students scored nearly as well or better than the comparison group mean scores for vocabulary, comprehension and total reading scores three years after their initial Reading Recovery instruction. (refer to page 60). May need to explain groups.

We hypothesized that children who went through the Reading Recovery program as first graders in 1998-99 would continue to score as well as a comparison group of students representing the normal distribution of reading and writing abilities on a standardized test administered to them in fourth grade in 2001-2002.

Permission was obtained from the 8 of the 10 school districts who had an implementation of Reading Recovery at that time. *1998-1999.*

Reading Recovery data are collected on every child who enters the program annually and is sent to the National Data Evaluation Center in Columbus Ohio where it is aggregated, disaggregated, and comes back to the state and school district in detailed reports. Using the NDEC records, we were able to identify students in those eight school districts who had completed the Reading Recovery program in 1998-99.

Teacher leaders used school records to determine which students were still attending school in the districts as fourth graders. A random sample was chosen from this pool of students.

We also identified a comparison group of children from the same size schools with similar demographics that did not have a RR implementation in 98-99.

All students were given the standardized Gates-MacGinite reading test, which yielded a vocabulary, comprehension and total reading score for each child.

Keep in mind that these were the lowest literacy learners in their first grade classrooms. Many of these children would have likely ended up in special education classes.

Reading Recovery in Kansas served 1,210 students last year. If you count every child who entered the program even for one day, (This includes those children who moved during the year and those who didn't received a full program due to not having enough time at the end of the school year) 62% successfully completed the program reading and writing within the average of their peers. Of ALL children who received a ~~full~~ Reading Recovery program, only 1% were referred to Special Education due to reading difficulties.

Of all the children who had an opportunity to receive a full Reading Recovery intervention of 12-20 weeks, 78% reached average grade levels in reading. NONE of these students were referred to Special Education for reading.

We would like to see every first grade student in Kansas have the opportunity to receive an early intervention program from a highly qualified Reading Recovery teacher before they are referred for Special Education.

The potential savings are enormous given the high cost of Special Education services. In the 2002-03 academic year, the average pupil expenditure for regular education in Kansas was \$6,758 with the cost of SPED services being three times that number. For each child Reading Recovery diverts from SPED, nearly \$13,516 is saved for **each year** that the child would have required SPED services.

With the Focus on No Child Left Behind I would also like to add that when RR is implemented as an early literacy safety net within the context of a comprehensive school literacy program, it is possible to close the achievement gap not only of the lowest literacy learners in general, but with differences in educational outcomes across children of different races and ethnicities. Data in Kansas for last year showed that all minority students who received a full Reading Recovery program were reading above grade level by the end of the year.

We would be happy to answer any questions that you might have concerning the program.

Thank you for your ~~interest~~ and support.

I am currently conducting research on the cost benefit of Reading Recovery in a couple of school districts in Kansas.

If they ask a question about the number of students RR keeps out of SPED?????

We also looked at the group of students who did not successfully complete the RR program and were referred for further specialist help. These students were still performing significantly lower in vocabulary, comprehension and total reading scores than the fourth grade comparison group.