

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jean Schodorf at 2:00 p.m. on March 10, 2010, in Room 152-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Senator Tim Owens- excused
Senator John Vratil- excused

Committee staff present:

Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Martha Dorsey, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Sharon Wenger, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Dorothy Gerhardt, Committee Assistant

Conferees appearing before the Committee:

Senator Mark Taddiken,
Karen Godfrey, Kansas National Education Association
Sue Storm, Kansas State Board of Education (written only)
Tom Krebs, Kansas Association of School Boards
Dale Dennis, Deputy Commissioner, Kansas State Department of Education

Others attending:

See attached list.

Hearing on SB 557 - Professional employees of schools; renewal of licenses; professional development

Theresa Kiernan, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, provided a brief summary of the proposed legislation. As introduced at the request of Senator Taddiken, the bill would provide that any professional employee of a school which meets AYP shall be deemed to have earned the number of professional development points which are necessary for the renewal of the employee's license.

Senator Mark Taddiken (Attachment 1) spoke before the committee stating the concept behind SB 557 was proposed by a government teacher in a public school. He stated it is intended to be permissive and temporary and an attempt to bring some financial relief in this challenging environment. He stated he realized there were concerns with the bill but that it was proposed as an example of options which could assist schools in these financially difficult times and would expire June 30, 2013.

Karen Godfrey, KNEA (Attachment 2), representing the Kansas National Education Association, spoke in opposition to the bill stating it is the constitutional responsibility of the State Board of Education and its practitioner advisory groups to grant license renewal. Sue Storm, Kansas State Board of Education (Attachment 3) provided written testimony in opposition to the proposed legislation.

Tom Krebs, Kansas Association of School Boards (Attachment 4) presented neutral testimony on the bill saying they appreciated the concept in offering districts flexibility in resource and personnel allocation but were also unsure of the effects. They feel more study is needed.

There being no other conferees, the hearing was closed.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 11, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned at 02:30 p.m.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: March 10, 2010

NAME	REPRESENTING
Dione Gjerstad	USD 259
Karen Lindgren	KNEA
TERRY FOLSETH	KNEA
DAVID HEIT	AIA KANSAS
TRUDY ARON	AIA KANSAS
Dan McLaughlin	Ks. Fire Marshal
Brenda McNorton	Ks. Fire Marshal
Seymour Mark Toddson	District 21
John Faust	USD 411
Mary Rosfeld	USD 411
Janet Lane	USD 411
Patricia Ahlstrom	USD 411
Dallas Boese	USD 411
Jennifer Crow	USD 501
ERIK SARTORIUS	City of Overland Park
Tom KRIBS	KASB
Dodie Wellshear	USA / Kansas
BILL BRADY	SFFF
BILL REARDON	USA 500 (KCKs)



TOPEKA

SENATE CHAMBER

Testimony on Senate Bill 557
to the
Senate Education Committee

by Senator Mark Taddiken

March 10, 2010

Madam Chair and Committee members,

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. The concept behind **SB 557** was brought to me by a government teacher in one of our public schools. It is intended to be permissive and temporary to bring a little financial relief in this challenging environment.

Even though our schools are struggling financially, a number of our schools are very successful in educating our children. This is an attempt to reward those schools that are achieving success.

Under **SB 557** a school that has achieved yearly adequate progress as required by the State Board of Education and the federal no child left behind act of 2004 shall be deemed as having earned the number of professional development points necessary for the renewal of a professional license.

This change would allow the local school board to have the option of using the days normally devoted to professional development for contact days with the students. The effect would be to shorten the number of days in the school year and thus save the local district money. A reward for a job well done.

This would be a short term policy option and the provisions of **SB 557** will expire on June 30, 2013.

I leave to the experience and wisdom of your committee to determine the exact qualifications to qualify for this new option.

There may well be concerns regarding this concept that I am unaware of, but I bring it forth as one option to assist schools in these financially difficult times.

I would be happy to stand for questions at the appropriate time.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
CHAIR: AGRICULTURE
MEMBER: NATURAL RESOURCES
UTILITIES
WAYS & MEANS
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND
INSURANCE

MARK W. TADDIKEN
SENATOR, 21ST DISTRICT
CLAY, CLOUD, JEWELL,
MARSHALL, NEMAHA, REPUBLIC, RILEY,
AND WASHINGTON COUNTIES
2614 HACKBERRY RD.
CLIFTON, KS 66937
(785) 926-3325

STATEHOUSE—ROOM 223-E
TOPEKA, KS 66612
(785) 296-7371 FAX 296-6718
mark.taddiken@senate.ks.gov

Senate Education
3-10-10
Attachment 1



Making public schools great for every child

KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 SW 10TH AVENUE / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Karen Godfrey
Senate Education Committee
March 10, 2010
Senate Bill 557


Madame Chair and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you about Senate Bill 557.

We oppose this bill. Licensure is the constitutional responsibility of the State Board of Education and its practitioner advisory groups. These advisory groups provide input on standards, evaluate programs, and make recommendations to the Board after careful analysis and collaboration. They meet on a regular basis to review decisions and the impact on the field and on students. I served for many years on the Standards Board and the Regulations Committee, and I can assure you they take the responsibility very seriously.

The requirements for the renewal of a license were not set casually. The requirements affirm the importance of continuing education and professional development, the cornerstone of professional license renewals. Attorneys, physicians, veterinarians, and many other professions depend on continuing education as a way to keep practitioners engaged in the profession and up to date on new ideas. Why would the teaching profession be any different? We surely expect more of our students than passing tests in a few curriculum areas. We want them to have a wide range of knowledge and skills, including problem solving and critical thinking. If that is the expectation for the students, then teachers also need to continue to develop their own knowledge and skill to serve the students. I know that education has changed enormously since I went through teacher preparation, and I have benefited tremendously from professional development every year that I have been in the classroom.

Another concern is the potential adverse effect on schools that struggle to achieve adequate yearly progress. We need good teachers in those schools, and we need them to know that they are appreciated and supported in every way possible. This bill doesn't communicate that.

We respectfully ask this committee to reject this bill. Licensure and the renewal of licenses are tasks constitutionally assigned to the State Board of Education, and we do not believe it is appropriate for legislature to substitute its judgment for that of the profession or the Board.



Kansas State Board of Education

Kansas State Education Building
120 S.E. 10th Ave.
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

(785) 296-3203
FAX (785) 291-3791
www.ksde.org

Janet Waugh <i>District 1</i>	Sue Storm <i>District 2</i>	John W. Bacon <i>District 3</i>	Carolyn L. Wims-Campbell <i>District 4</i>	Sally Cauble <i>District 5</i>
Kathy Martin <i>District 6</i>	Kenneth Willard <i>District 7</i>	Walt Chappell <i>District 8</i>	Jana Shaver <i>District 9</i>	David Dennis <i>District 10</i>

March 10, 2010

TO: Senate Education Committee

FROM: State Board of Education

SUBJECT: Senate Bill 557

My name is Sue Storm, Legislative Coordinator of the State Board of Education. Due to the monthly State Board of Education meeting, I am not able to express our concerns about Senate Bill 557 in person.

The State Board of Education issues teacher licenses based upon individual professional development requirements which may include college coursework, local professional development programs, etc. We believe it is very important that teachers are kept up to date on the latest teaching strategies and other related curricular matters. Senate Bill 557 raises several questions.

Would a license be issued if a teacher taught in a school that met AYP two out of five years?

How would the bill be interpreted if a school met AYP for three years and a teacher transferred to a high-poverty school that did not meet AYP for the past two years?

There could also be some changes in the federal No Child Left Behind law as a result of reauthorization which is not known at this time.

As a former legislator, I always understood that teacher licensure was the responsibility of the State Board of Education.

The State Board of Education requests that you do not recommend Senate Bill 557 favorable for passage.

h:FN-TEST:Test--557

KANSAS
ASSOCIATION



OF
SCHOOL
BOARDS

1420 SW Arrowhead Road • Topeka, Kansas 66604-4024
785-273-3600

Testimony before the
Senate Education Committee
on
SB 557

by
Tom Krebs, Governmental Relations Specialist
Kansas Association of School Boards

March 10, 2010

Madame Chairman, Members of the Committee:

We stand neutral on this bill due to the fact that we have one policy in place that can be construed as support of this bill conceptually. However, we also have a number of concerns with it.

One of our licensure policies reads, "KASB supports a licensure system for teachers and administrators based on the demonstration of outcomes, including subject matter and communications skills assessment." KASB training has long acknowledged instructionally "it takes a village to raise a child." Much evidence exists that school improvements are most successful when there's a collaborative climate in a building. Meeting ESEA/QPA standards have to be regarded as some measure of "demonstration of outcomes."

However, other KASB policies are more on point as far as opposing the bill. Another licensure policy reads, "KASB supports an initial, conditional license for the first three years of service. License renewal should be based on performance, professional development and college-based programs." Our members see the value of a performance component but have not seen fit to decouple it from other activities, specifically professional development. In fact another policy reads, "KASB supports full funding of the state formula for approved professional development plans in school districts." Our members have long-supported the full-funding effort because they appreciate the positive role professional development plays in improving student achievement, particularly when it also helps close the achievement gap.

Senate Education
3-10-10
Attachment 4

We appreciate the intent of offering districts flexibility in resource and personnel allocation. However, this bill appears to generate many questions that would require a great deal of study to determine answers.

- What if the negotiated agreement paid for professional development hours, would they have to be paid even if no professional development was done.
- Would districts have to totally revamp their professional development councils?
- Would KSDE have the ability to monitor all the differences in district choice to implement, or not implement, revised requirements?
- How would districts with a number of buildings plan for professional development activities when some buildings may have requirements others don't?
- Would making AYP one year be counted as one-fifth of the professional development requirements for a license that is good for five years? Or something different?
- Would it take all grades and all tests to award the points or something shy of that.
- Would it be just math and reading or all the assessments students take?
- Would the assurance standard to provide formal training for teachers regarding the state assessments and curriculum standards be affected?

Again, we see some merit in the concept behind the bill but are unsure of the effects such a bill might have on instruction, budgets and personnel management.

Thank you for your consideration.