

## MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jean Schodorf at 1:35 p.m. on January 23, 2007, in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

Committee members absent:

Committee staff present: Sharon Wenger, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Michele Alishahi, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Ashley Holm, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes  
Shirley Higgins, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Katrin Osterhaus, Legislative Division of Post Audit  
Mark Desetti, Kansas National Education Association  
Sue Gamble, Legislative Liaison, State Board of Education  
Dr. Roxanne Kelly, Director of Academic Services, Kansas Board of Regents  
Dale Dennis, Interim Commissioner of Education  
Diane Lindeman, Director of Financial Aid, Kansas Board of Regents

Senator Chris Steineger requested the introduction of a bill which would set standards for beverages that are sold in schools in an attempt to get high sugar soft drinks products out of the schools.

Senator Steineger moved to introduce the bill, seconded by Senator Teichman. The motion carried.

Senator Steineger requested the introduction of a bill which would set nutrition standards for schools in an attempt to get more fresh fruits and vegetables into the diet standards for school lunches.

Senator Steineger moved to introduce the bill, seconded by Senator Vratil. The motion carried.

Katrin Osterhaus, Legislative Division of Post Audit, presented an overview of the Legislative Division of Post Audit report entitled: "K-12 Education: Reviewing Issues Related to Developing and Retaining Teachers and School Principals". A copy of the report can be obtained from the office of the Legislative Division of Post Audit at the following address: 800 SW Jackson Street, Suite 1200, Topeka, KS 66612.

Ms. Osterhaus summarized the Division of Post Audit's findings regarding the following questions: (1) To what extent does Kansas have a teacher shortage and why, (2) How do Kansas teacher salaries compare with other states, and what does the research literature show about the relationship between salary levels and student outcomes, and (3) What are the best practices for attracting, developing, and retaining high-quality teachers and school principals in different types of school districts. In summary, the answer to the questions are as follows: Question One – The pending growth in retirement is likely to exacerbate the current teacher shortage, especially in those regions of the state that already are struggling to fill positions with qualified teachers. Question Two – Kansas teacher salaries still rank in the bottom half of all states. However, because there is no clear evidence linking teacher salaries to student achievement, across-the-board salary increases are unlikely to be an efficient means of improving performance. Question Three – School districts that are located in high-poverty and rural areas often have difficulties finding teachers. Research shows that teachers prefer to teach close to where they grew up, prompting "grow-your-own" teacher programs. Some districts have used "grow-your-own" programs to attract administrators as well.

**SB 22 – Teacher education matching grant program**

**SB 23 – Teacher service scholarship program**

Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes Office, noted that **SB 22** and **SB 23** were related and were introduced at the request of the State Board of Regents through the Legislative Educational Planning Committee (LEPC).

## CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Education Committee at 1:35 p.m. on January 23, 2007, in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

She explained that **SB 22** would establish a new teacher education competitive grant program, which would be administered by the State Board of Regents. It would be a two-for-one match (two dollars by the state, one dollar by the institution) for the purpose of establishing or expanding a teacher education program at the institution. The State Board would establish the standards and guidelines for reviewing, evaluating, and approving the applications for the grants. The institutions then would be required to submit reports as required by the State Board. The program would be subject to appropriation. Ms. Kiernan explained that the intent of **SB 23** was to consolidate the four teacher service scholarships into one. She noted that the amount shown on page 2, line 43 should be amended to read \$2,500 instead of \$2,000 as printed. She explained that the language in Section 3 was modified to broaden what students must do to comply under all four acts. She noted that the language needed some technical amendments.

Mark Desetti, Kansas National Education Association, testified in support of **SB 22** and **SB 23**. He noted that, if **SB 23** is passed, **SB 22** will be absolutely necessary. He pointed out that **SB 23** would provide scholarships for a prospective teacher, for a current teacher seeking an additional endorsement, and for a licensed teacher who is pursuing an advanced degree. He noted that **SB 23** would likely create a demand, and **SB 22** would help teacher training programs meet that demand. (Attachment 1)

Sue Gamble, Legislative Liaison, State Board of Education, testified in support of **SB 22** and **SB 23**. She emphasized that the expansion of teacher education programs as provided in **SB 22** was crucial because 24 percent of Kansas teachers will be eligible to retire in the next five years, and 34 percent of the teachers are over 50 years of age. She noted that the Board was supportive of the expansion of students eligible for scholarships as provided in **SB 23** and also supported Section 3 of the bill which provides criteria that must be included as part of the agreement with the student. (Attachment 2)

Dr. Roxanne Kelly, Director of Academic Services, Kansas Board of Regents, testified in support of **SB 22**. She discussed the looming teacher shortage, teachers who are teaching out-of-field, and the pattern of teachers moving out of high-poverty areas and out of state. To address the teaching shortage in the state, The Board of Regents developed a two-pronged approach: (1) creation of a \$2.75 million pool of funding for a competitive grant program whereby public postsecondary institutions would bring forward proposals specifically targeted at increasing the supply of teachers, especially in areas with shortages and (2) consolidation and simplification of the existing teacher scholarship programs and the addition of \$1.0 million in new funding in order to increase the funding to \$2.0 million (**SB 23**). She went on to say that the grants as established under **SB 22** would be made available to the public universities and would focus on hard-to-fill teaching disciplines and underserved areas in the state. (Attachment 3)

Dale Dennis, Interim Commissioner of Education, emphasized that the teacher shortage is much more serious now than it has been in the past. He informed the Committee that North Carolina needs several thousand teachers next year, and representatives from North Carolina will be coming to Kansas to recruit teachers. He noted that representatives from Texas already have come to Kansas and offered a bonus and extra benefits to Kansas teachers and students who will graduate in the spring.

Diane Lindeman, Director of Student Financial Assistance, Kansas Board of Regents, testified in support of **SB 23**. She noted that the Board currently administers four statutorily authorized teacher scholarship programs, and each of the programs has a different amount of funding and different service obligations. The Board supports **SB 23** because it would streamline all four programs into one efficient program. Further, administrative authority would provide flexibility to award scholarships consistent with market demand, and rules and regulations authority would allow the Board to adjust scholarship targets to meet the state's current and future teacher needs. She noted that the Governor's 2008 budget recommendations included \$1,962,859 for the four teacher scholarship programs. However, the Division of Budget's fiscal note indicates that the effect of **SB 23** would be to eliminate expenditures for the three scholarships (\$636,115) because they are being repealed. The Board's intent is that the existing funding for the three programs be merged into the new program for a total of \$1,962,859 in teacher scholarships. (Attachment 4) For the Committee's information, Ms. Lindeman distributed copies of a chart which compared current teacher scholarship programs with the proposed new program in **SB 23**. (Attachment 5)

There being no others wishing to testify, the combined hearing on **SB 22** and **SB 23** was closed.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Education Committee at 1:35 p.m. on January 23, 2007, in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

Senator Schodorf opened committee discussion on a previously heard bill, **SB 69** concerning cost of living and declining enrollment weightings. She reminded the Committee that conferees urged the Committee to take action on the bill as soon as possible. Senator Lee suggested that the bill be amended to include a mill levy. Due to lack of sufficient time to take action on the bill, Senator Schodorf continued the discussion to the January 25 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 24, 2007.

**SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
GUEST LIST**

DATE: January 23, 2007

NAME	REPRESENTING
<i>Andy Dutton</i>	<i>DAT</i>
<i>Scott Frank</i>	<i>LEG. POST AUDIT</i>
<i>Kahn CSTKs</i>	<i>' '</i>
<i>Bill Reardon</i>	<i>USD 500</i>
<i>Mark Doseethi</i>	<i>KNEA</i>
<i>Bob Masters</i>	<i>KBOR</i>
<i>Meissa Miller</i>	<i>KBOR</i>
<i>Kip Peterson</i>	<i>KBOR</i>
<i>Diane Gjerstad</i>	<i>Wichita Public Schools</i>
<i>Doug Penner</i>	<i>KICA</i>
<i>Bill Brady</i>	<i>SFFF</i>
<i>Mike Recht</i>	<i>Garbo Braden</i>
<i>Mark Tallman</i>	<i>KASD</i>
<i>John Dougherty</i>	<i>ESU</i>
<i>Debra Frideaux</i>	<i>FHSU</i>
<i>Diane Duff</i>	<i>KBOR</i>
<i>Roxanne Kelly</i>	<i>KBOR</i>
<i>Diane Lindeman</i>	<i>KBOR</i>
<i>Sheila Fraker</i>	<i>KACCT</i>

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
GUEST LIST

DATE: 1-22-07

NAME	REPRESENTING
<i>Junie Rose</i>	KACCT
HOWARD SMITH	PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY
<i>Dodie Wellshear</i>	USA
<i>Sharon Zaellner</i>	De So to USD 232



Mark Desetti, Testimony  
Senate Education Committee  
January 22, 2006

Senate Bill 22  
Senate Bill 23

Madame Chair, members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to share our thoughts on Senate Bills 22 and 23. I would like to address these two bills together because I think they go hand in hand.

Should you pass Senate Bill 23, I think Senate Bill 22 will be absolutely necessary.

Senate Bill 23 is similar to Senate Bill 566 last year.

In fact, every year we see a variety of bills creating scholarships for persons pursuing degrees in education. Most of the bills are limited to special education but there has been some talk on occasion of adding ESL or bilingual education, math and science, or other perceived shortage areas.

We do have teacher shortages in Kansas – both endorsement shortages and regional shortages. This bill also supports efforts in both areas. It is a unique approach and worthy of your consideration.

Specifically the bill would provide scholarships for three kinds of people. One is the prospective teacher. The second is a current teacher seeking an additional endorsement. The third is a licensed teacher who is pursuing an advanced degree. I would classify the latter two as both a “grow your own” and a “meet your needs” approach.

Supporting licensed teachers pursuing advanced degrees and additional endorsements is an idea we don't see too much. It is one that could help school districts meet some pretty specialized needs. Under No Child Left Behind – and the Kansas licensing system – teachers must hold both a teaching license and an endorsement in the field in which they are teaching. Sometimes, and particularly in small schools, this is difficult to ensure. As an example, a teacher with a biology endorsement may also be called upon to teach chemistry. This teacher would have college training in chemistry but not meet the requirements for endorsement or the standards of NCLB. This scholarship could encourage these teachers to return for the necessary coursework to gain endorsement in chemistry. We could apply this scholarship to teachers seeking ESL endorsements, additional foreign languages, or any number of shortage areas.

The problems that we had with SB 566 last year were mostly related to the size of the scholarship and the length of time to which the recipient must commit. Both of these issues have been effectively dealt with under SB 23 through the concept of a kind of IEP – an agreement between the Board of Regents and the scholarship recipient. Each agreement can reflect the needs of the individual. They can be full time or part time students with the agreement specifying time commitments and obligations.

*Senate Education Committee  
1-23-07*

We also appreciate the ability to postpone completion and obligation under a wide variety of circumstances and the fact that, should the recipient not find a job in the area for which he/she trained after a good faith effort to find one, he/she would be released from the obligation.

We would ask that you also consider what would happen to the scholarship recipient who is caught in a reduction in force? If, for example, a scholarship recipient in a declining enrollment school district is laid off after three years of teaching, what obligation does the recipient have to repay the state? While some may have the ability to pick up and move, others may not. This may be covered under exception 9 in section 4 but we believe it ought to be spelled out specifically. We are also concerned about the impact of other circumstances beyond the teacher's control. We saw what happened in our economic downturn a few years ago when many teaching positions were cut. What obligation would a scholarship recipient have under such circumstances? We can't imagine requiring an unemployed teacher being asked to pay the state back.

Finally, since the program is subject to appropriations we would assume that should the scholarship be cut before the candidate has completed the obligations under the agreement, the candidate should be released of the requirement to finish at his/her own expense, the service obligation, and the obligation to repay the partial scholarship amount. We would like to see this spelled out in the bill.

There is a lot of good in SB 23 and it would help schools to meet a variety of needs when it comes to the kinds of personnel requirements they might have. We would hope that if the committee decides to pursue this legislation, you will carefully consider the concerns I've brought to you today.

And if this committee does decide to pursue SB 23, I believe you will find willing takers. To that end, SB 22 becomes very important. Our teacher training institutions might very well want to expand programs to allow more teachers to take advantage of these scholarship opportunities. Such expansion costs money and the grants in SB 22 would provide resources for the expansion of programs. At the same time SB 22 requires a commitment from the university to the program expansion. Senate Bill 23 is likely to create a demand; Senate Bill 22 will help our teacher training programs meet that demand.



## Division of Fiscal and Administrative Services

785-296-3871  
785-296-0459 (fax)

120 SE 10th Avenue • Topeka, KS 66612-1182 • (785) 296-6338 (TTY) • www.ksde.org

January 23, 2007

TO: Senate Education Committee

FROM: State Board of Education

SUBJECT: Senate Bill 22 – Teacher Education Matching Grant Program  
Senate Bill 23 – Teacher Service Scholarship Program

My name is Sue Gamble, Legislative Liaison of the State Board of Education. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee on behalf of the State Board.

The State Board of Education is very concerned about the number of teachers eligible to retire and the number of program completers coming out of our colleges/universities. Based on a recent report provided by the Legislative Division of Post Audit, 24 percent of the Kansas teachers will be eligible to retire in the next five years. In addition, 34 percent of the teachers are over 50 years of age. It is crucial that we try to expand our teacher education programs as provided in 2007 Senate Bill 22 which provides a competitive grant program

We are also very supportive of the expansion of students eligible for scholarships as provided in 2007 Senate Bill 23. This bill is very comprehensive and provides for “qualified students” who: (1) are residents of Kansas; (2) have been accepted for admission to or are enrolled in a course of instruction leading to licensure as a teacher; or (3) are licensed as a teacher and been accepted for admission to, or enrolled in, a course of instruction leading to a graduate degree in the field of education.

The State Board also supports Section 3 of this bill which provides criteria that must be included as part of the agreement with the student. The student must begin teaching in Kansas within six months after a license has been issued and continue teaching for the period of time required by the agreement which is based upon the amount of the scholarship.

*Senate Education Committee  
1-23-07  
Attachment 2*





# KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

1000 SW JACKSON • SUITE 520 • TOPEKA, KS 66612-1368

TELEPHONE – 785-296-3421  
FAX – 785-296-0983  
www.kansasregents.org

**Senate Education Committee  
January 23, 2007**

*Testimony in Support of Senate Bill 22*

**Dr. Roxanne Kelly  
Director of Academic Services**

Good afternoon Chairwoman Schodorf and members of the committee. My name is Roxanne Kelly and I am the Director of Academic Services for the Kansas Board of Regents. My colleague, Diane Lindeman, is the Director of Financial Assistance for the Kansas Board of Regents. We are here on behalf of the Kansas Board of Regents to testify in support of both Senate Bill 22 and Senate Bill 23. Both bills were introduced by the Legislative Educational Planning Committee on January 8, 2007.

## **Looming Teacher Shortage**

In July 2006, the Legislative Division of Post Audit (LPA) reported its findings concerning the Kansas teacher shortage in a document entitled "School Districts Performance Audit Reports, K-12 Education: Reviewing Issues Related to Developing and Retaining Teachers and School Principals." Findings included the fact that the percentage of teachers who are eligible to retire has consistently grown over the past six years. The audit projects that 24% of all teachers in Kansas will be eligible to retire in the next five years. This estimate does not account for early retirement options provided by some districts which could increase the percent of teachers who actually do retire over the next five years.

This problem is not unique to Kansas. In a March 2006 report published by the U.S. Department of Education, the states of Missouri, Oklahoma and Nebraska all report teacher shortages in areas similar to those in Kansas – math, science and special education. The National Education Association (NEA) calls the turnover "historic" and estimates that more than 2 million new teachers will be needed to fill the gap in the next decade. California alone projects over 100,000 new teachers will be needed within the next ten years. The demand for teachers nationwide only compounds the problems in our state.

The LPA found approximately 6% of teaching positions are either unfilled or filled by a teacher who is teaching out-of-field. Of the nearly 34,000 teaching positions across Kansas only 154 remain unfilled while over 1,800 are filled by teachers who are teaching "out-of-field." "Out-of-field" is defined as those teachers who have not earned the required endorsement or credential for their assigned grade level or content area or do not have a valid teaching license.

*Senate Education Committee  
1-23-07  
Attachment 3*

The Colleges of Education at the state universities, in conjunction with the Kansas State Department of Education, have made modest gains in helping to address filling vacancies noted in the report. As the audit notes there are very few unfilled teaching positions, however, a larger number of teachers are teaching in areas outside their area of expertise. Math and science are two areas commonly pointed to as experiencing this problem. In addition, the audit revealed that there was a high incidence of special education teachers choosing to move into regular education classrooms leaving a shortfall in the area of special education.

The audit also uncovered a pattern of movement out of high-poverty areas into more suburban settings as well as from less-populated settings in the west to more-populated settings in the eastern parts of Kansas and out of the state. Four of the state universities reported that 16% of teachers prepared in Kansas leave the state.

### **KBOR Proposal Responds to Critical State Issue**

In response to specific recommendations in the LPA report, the Board engaged its staff and the College of Education Deans to develop a two-pronged approach. The proposal is similar to that used to begin to address the nursing shortage last year.

- I. Create a \$2.75 million pool of funding administered by Board for a competitive grant program whereby public postsecondary institutions would bring forward proposals, specifically targeted at increasing the supply of teachers, especially in geographic and subject areas with shortages. The grants would be matched on the basis of \$2 from the teacher education grant program for \$1 from the institution receiving the grant. This proposal is before you in the form of Senate Bill 22.
- II. Consolidate, streamline and simplify the existing teacher scholarship programs into a new Comprehensive Teacher Scholarship Program and add \$1.0 million in new funding in order to increase the funding to \$2.0 million. This proposal is before you in the form of Senate Bill 23.

The Governor's budget recommends \$2 million dollars to address both these issues, \$1 million for teacher scholarships, and \$1 million for the competitive grant program.

### **Competitive Grant Program**

Teacher education programs in the state universities are at capacity. Most Colleges of Education report there are waiting lists for the programs as well. The universities want to produce adequate numbers of highly qualified teachers to serve Kansas students. In order to expand the pool of qualified applicants for all teaching positions additional funding is needed for:

- Additional qualified faculty to teach and supervise teacher candidates. Teacher education is labor intensive, particularly during the field experience and student teaching phases of the process. It is essential that there are adequate numbers of qualified faculty to ensure the teacher candidates receive the best training and experiences possible.

- Expansion of innovative approaches to teacher education that are currently being used across the state. In 2004, Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University and Pittsburg State University, were given additional funding to provide alternative avenues for teacher education. One of the approaches was to develop partnerships with community colleges and, in some instances, included developing satellite locations at colleges. Over 150 teacher candidates have participated, or are participating in, these alternative avenues for teacher education. Replicating these types of partnerships with community colleges in a more rural setting may help to address the issue of migration to the more populated areas of the state.
- Expansion of the teacher education opportunities that currently exist including new teacher training, offering courses and programs for those teachers who are teaching outside of their area of endorsement, as well as expanding the pipeline to fill the openings anticipated over the next five years as a result of retirements.

Specifically, the Board supports Senate Bill 22 which establishes the teacher education competitive grant program. These grants would be made available to the public universities and would focus on hard-to-fill teaching disciplines and underserved areas in the state.

The Board also supports SB 23, which you will soon be hearing more about, which creates the Comprehensive Teacher Scholarship Program.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.



# KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

1000 SW JACKSON • SUITE 520 • TOPEKA, KS 66612-1368

TELEPHONE – 785-296-3421  
FAX – 785-296-0983  
www.kansasregents.org

Senate Education Committee  
January 23, 2007

*Testimony in Support of Senate Bill 23*

**Diane Lindeman**  
**Director of Student Financial Assistance**

Good afternoon Chairwoman Schodorf and Members of the Committee. My name is Diane Lindeman and I am the Director of Student Financial Assistance for the Kansas Board of Regents. I am here this afternoon to testify in support of Senate Bill 23 which consolidates and streamlines the Board's existing teacher scholarship programs. This bill was introduced by the Legislative Educational Planning Committee on January 8, 2007.

Currently the Kansas Board of Regents administers the following four statutorily authorized teacher scholarship programs:

- **The Kansas Teacher Service Scholarship** – for undergraduate students planning to teach in hard-to-fill or underserved geographic areas.
- **The Math & Science Teacher Service Scholarship** – for undergraduate students planning to teach in the fields of math or science.
- **The Special Education Teacher Service Scholarship** – for current teachers working on additional coursework and licensure and full endorsement in special education.
- **The Teacher Education Scholarship** – for current teachers who are pursuing a master's degree in education or school district employees with associate's degrees who are pursuing a bachelor's degree in education.

The accompanying chart provides you with a quick overview of the current programs and the proposed streamlined scholarship program. As you will see, each of these programs has different amounts of funding and different service obligations. The Board of Regents supports Senate Bill 23 as it would streamline all four programs into one efficient program. Working with the Kansas State Department of Education, and utilizing rules & regulations authority, the Board would prioritize and target funding to respond to the needs of the K-12 system. Funding would be allocated to specifically address:

- Shortages in specific fields, i.e. math, science and special education;
- Shortages in specific geographic areas, i.e. high poverty and rural districts;
- Helping out-of-field teachers to get correct licensure and endorsements; and
- Increase teacher retention by helping teachers pursue advanced degrees in their fields.

Administrative authority would provide flexibility to award scholarships consistent with market demand, and rules and regulations authority would allow the Board of Regents to adjust the

*Senate Education Committee  
1-23-07  
Attachment 4*

scholarship targets to meet the state's current and future teacher needs. Furthermore, consolidation would reduce confusion among teacher scholarship applicants and reduce administrative burden for Board staff to administer four similar, yet very different, scholarship programs.

Senate Bill 23 would provide financial assistance to Kansas residents who are:

- Enrolled in a course of instruction leading to licensure as a teacher;
- Licensed teachers enrolled in a course of instruction leading to endorsement in a field of education other than one in which they are currently endorsed, if that field is a designated shortage area; and
- Licensed teachers enrolled in a course of instruction leading to a master's degree in a field of education designated as a shortage area.

Applicants would be reviewed on the basis of having demonstrated scholastic ability as determined by ACT or SAT score, cumulative grade point average, academic references, and any other indicator of scholastic ability which the Board of Regents determines to be demonstrative of potential successful completion of coursework leading to licensure as a teacher.

The amount of the award would be specified in the student agreement and would be dependent upon whether the student was enrolled in part-time or full-time coursework. During academic year 2007-08, the amount awarded shall not exceed \$2,500 each semester or its equivalent. (Revisor's staff indicate that an error was made in the bill drafting and a technical amendment will be needed to make the award amount \$2,500.) For academic year 2008-09 and each year hereafter, the maximum amount that may be awarded shall be increased by an amount equal to the percentage increase in the consumer price index during the preceding fiscal year as certified to the Executive Officer of the Board of Regents by the Director of the Budget on August 15 of each year.

Once the student has obtained the necessary licensure and endorsement, they agree to commence teaching in a hard-to-fill discipline or underserved geographic area on a full-time basis in Kansas in an accredited public or private elementary or secondary school for a period of not less than the length of the course of instruction for which the scholarship was awarded. The student may teach part-time for a period of time that is equivalent to full-time as determined by the Board of Regents. Students who fail to fulfill their service obligation will be required to repay the amount of the scholarship received plus interest.

Senate Bill 23 states that funding for the Teacher Service Scholarship program would be determined by appropriations. The Governor's 2008 budget recommendations include \$1,962,859 for the four teacher scholarship programs. The Division of the Budget's fiscal note indicates that the fiscal effect of SB 23 would be to eliminate expenditures for the three scholarships (\$636,115) because they are being repealed. The Board's intent is for the existing funding, for the three existing programs, to be merged into the new program for a total of \$1,962,859 for teacher scholarships.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would be happy to answer any questions that you members may have.

**Comparison of Current Teacher Scholarship Programs  
with Proposed 2007 New Program Legislation (SB 23)**

Program	Eligibility Requirements	Service Obligation	Amount of Award
<b>Kansas Teacher Service Scholarship</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must be a Kansas resident</li> <li>2. Awarded to undergraduate students</li> <li>3. Award based on academic merit</li> <li>4. Licensed teacher not eligible</li> <li>5. Must be enrolled full-time (min. 12 hrs each semester)</li> <li>6. Must plan to teach in either a hard-to-fill discipline or underserved geographic area</li> </ol>	1 year for each year of scholarship	\$5,000; may be renewed
<b>Math &amp; Science Teacher Scholarship</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must be a Kansas resident</li> <li>2. Awarded to undergraduate students</li> <li>3. Award based on academic merit</li> <li>4. Licensed teachers not eligible</li> <li>5. Preference given to students with at least 60 hrs. of coursework completed</li> <li>6. Must be enrolled full-time (min. 12 hrs. each semester)</li> <li>7. Must plan to teach math or science in KS</li> </ol>	2 years for each year of scholarship	\$5,000; may be renewed
<b>Special Education Teacher Scholarship</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must be a Kansas resident</li> <li>2. Must be currently licensed as a teacher</li> <li>3. Award based on academic merit</li> <li>4. Must be enrolled in course of instruction leading to licensure &amp; full endorsement as a special education teacher</li> <li>5. May be enrolled part-time or full-time</li> </ol>	Must teach for no less than 3 years if employed full-time; 6 years if employed part-time	Dependent upon number of hours enrolled-up to \$3,000 per semester; May be renewed
<b>Teacher Education Scholarship</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must be a Kansas resident</li> <li>2. Must be currently licensed as a teacher, hold a bachelor's degree &amp; been employed in a school district for at least 4 yrs. OR hold an associate's degree &amp; been employed in a school district for at least 4 yrs.</li> <li>3. Award based on academic merit</li> <li>4. May be enrolled part-time or full-time</li> </ol>	Must teach 1 year for every 15 credit hours of assistance received.	Dependent upon number of hours enrolled up to \$3,000 per semester; May be renewed
<b>NEW TEACHER SERVICE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Must be a Kansas resident</b></li> <li>2. <b>Depending upon area of teaching (i.e. discipline, geographic area, degree program, etc.) - can be awarded both to undergraduate students &amp; currently licensed teachers seeking licensure &amp; full endorsement in a field such as special education.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Award based on academic merit</b></li> <li>4. <b>May be enrolled part-time or full-time</b></li> </ol>	<b>Must teach one year for each year of scholarship; prorated if recipient has been enrolled or employed on a part-time basis.</b>	<b>Dependent upon number of hours enrolled up to \$6,000 annually; May be renewed</b>

The proposed Comprehensive Teacher Service Scholarship Program would keep existing programs intact, but would allow more flexibility in expending the funding to areas of the most need (i.e. shortages in specific fields; shortages in specific geographic areas/rural/urban; or areas in which teachers are outside their area of expertise teaching out-of-field.) The service obligation would be streamlined so that all of the programs would have the same service requirement allowing easier administrative management of the program.

Senate Education Committee  
 1-23-07  
 Attachment 5

Diane Lindeman