

MINUTES

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ladislaus B. Dombrowski Board Room
John A. Hannah Building
608 West Allegan
Lansing, Michigan

November 13, 2007
9:30 a.m.

Present: Mr. Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman
Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, President
Mr. John C. Austin, Vice President
Mrs. Carolyn L. Curtin, Secretary
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire, Treasurer
Mrs. Nancy Danhof, NASBE Delegate
Mrs. Elizabeth W. Bauer
Ms. Casandra E. Ulbrich
Mrs. Sue Carnell, representing Governor Jennifer M. Granholm,
ex officio

Absent: Mr. Reginald M. Turner

Also Present: Mrs. June Teisan, 2007-2008 Michigan Teacher of the Year

REGULAR MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Flanagan called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

II. AGENDA FOLDER ITEMS

A. 2007-2008 Title III – English Language Acquisition Program
(Preliminary) – Initial

B. 2007-2008 Title III – Immigrant Grant Program – Initial

III. INFORMATIONAL FOLDER ITEM

A. Special Education Advisory Committee Quick Notes and Reporting
Formats

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

A. Approval of the Criteria for 2007-08 Title I, Part A Pilot ISD
Partnership Grant – added to agenda

- B. 2007-2008 Title III – English Language Acquisition Program (Preliminary) – Initial – added to agenda
- C. 2007-2008 Title III – Immigrant Grant Program – Initial – added to agenda
- D. Presentation on Proposed Revisions to the Education YES! Policy on School Accreditation – removed from agenda

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Danhof, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent: Turner**

The motion carried.

V. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS, DEPARTMENT STAFF, AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, State Board Executive, introduced members of the State Board of Education, Department of Education staff, and guests attending the meeting.

VI. POINT OF THE DAY

Mr. Martin Ackley, Director, Office of Communications, presented the Point of the Day regarding the integration of mathematics, science, and technology. Mr. Ackley attempted to use video conferencing to contact Ms. Dee Benjamin, Director, Dickinson-Iron-Menominee Math Science Technology Center, but due to technical difficulties he was unable to resume the connection he had established earlier in the day. Mr. Ackley shared examples of science embracing technology.

Mr. Bruce Umpstead, Director of Educational Technology, said Mr. Flanagan received the State Policy Maker Award for his leadership in education policy and for re-inventing Michigan's schools through effective uses of technology. He said the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) presented the award to Mr. Flanagan during its annual Education Forum.

Mr. Flanagan said he shares the award with State Board of Education members, and Department of Education staff; and he thanks them for their tireless efforts. He said the high school graduation requirements, that include an online learning requirement, were developed through the Board's bipartisan leadership.

VII. RECESS

The Board recessed the Regular Meeting at 9:51 a.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING

VIII. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Flanagan called the Committee of the Whole Meeting to order at 9:52 a.m.

IX. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Presentation of Next Steps Toward Improving Teacher Preparation in Michigan Including Charges to Professional Standards Commission for Teachers

The following individuals presented:

- Sally Vaughn, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer
- MaryAlice Galloway, Assistant to the Chief Academic Officer
- Flora Jenkins, Director, Office of Professional Preparation Services
- Susanne Chandler, Dean, School of Education and Human Services, University of Michigan – Flint
- Karen Adams, Dean, College of Education and Human Services, Central Michigan University
- Sharon Elliott, Associate Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, College of Education, Wayne State University

The focus of the new teacher preparation system is to reorient the accountability relationship between Michigan's teacher preparation institutions and the State Board of Education/Michigan Department of Education from compliance to outcomes. The material included a description of the areas of accountability and authority for the Board and the Superintendent and the next steps needed to move forward with the plan.

Four of the eight elements of the plan were discussed (1) research collaborative, (2) national accreditation by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), (3) comprehensive coherent standards (Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation), and (4) new pathways to teaching.

The other four elements that will be discussed at future meetings are (1) increased rigor in prerequisites for program entry and student teaching, (2) three-tiered teacher licensure, (3) streamline endorsements, and (4) Michigan-specific priority (integration of technology).

A PowerPoint presentation, "Improving Teacher Preparation in Michigan" was used to guide the presentation.

"Michigan Deans Council Response to Board Agenda Items for 11/13/07" was distributed by Dean Adams.

"NCATE and the States" and "TEAC – Teacher Education Accreditation Council" were distributed by Ms. Galloway.

Board member comments and *staff clarifications* included:

1. NCATE includes Specialty Program Areas (SPAs) and TEAC does not; would institutions flee one accreditation system for another – *whether an institution chooses NCATE or TEAC it is based on a state relationship, and the committee would strongly recommend that SPAs be optional as they once were; the state standards are rigorous and some of the SPAs don't align; NCATE and TEAC require evidence that institutions are meeting rigorous state standards;*
2. if the SPAs are optional are we giving up nationally credible rigor – *other states offer the option of NCATE or TEAC accreditation, and those states are confident they are holding high rigor;*
3. how much does national accreditation cost – *approximately \$10,000 annually; the fee is based on the student body count;*
4. if the state continued to accredit institutions could a fee be charged to cover that cost – *the fee would be extremely high for the entire process; it is appropriate for institutions to pay for a staff person from the Michigan Department of Education to be present during the national accreditation visit to ensure alignment with state standards and rigor;*
5. would national accreditation include formative and summative assessment, and universal education vision and principles – *yes that would be part of the state protocol;*
6. are all endorsements reviewed or is it just a sample – *all endorsements are reviewed;*

7. how is pedagogy assessed – *through site visits to classrooms of student teachers; viewing of student portfolios; discussions with principals, recent graduates, other deans outside the college of education;*
8. how does the state get the information from NCATE and TEAC – *national accreditation body issues report, institution has opportunity to respond, national accreditation body sends a letter to the president of the institution and the Michigan Department of Education also receives a copy; a full report and summary reports are received; there is also an opportunity for public comment posted prior to the visit;*
9. need to move from a checklist to how teachers are prepared to teach effectively and the resulting student achievement outcomes – *in the past state accreditation was viewed by some as the easiest and least expensive route; deans of institutions want national accrediting bodies to have rigorous standards, even if it means some institutions may not meet them;*
10. is national accreditation rigorous – *the state sets the standards and NCATE and TEAC evaluate using state standards;*
11. how are evaluation teams formed – *organizations recommend people, however if appointed they do not represent the organization; there is a week-long training; teams are balanced to include a variety of members; no member of any visiting team knows anyone at the site of the visitation; teams are focused on state standards and what the institution is trying to accomplish by assessing data;*
12. is there a willingness at most institutions to participate in NCATE or TEAC – *more and more private colleges are willing, and larger universities have offered to help smaller colleges with the process; primary concern is cost and size of staff;*
13. is there a written contract – *yes there is a written protocol established with the national accreditation body that the Superintendent of Public Instruction signs;*
14. does the Office of Professional Preparation Services feel comfortable with this arrangement – *yes;*
15. how will outcomes in the classroom be measured – *the state will have data on how students are doing in their classrooms; the Department is working with the Center for Educational*

Performance and Information regarding data and individual student identifiers; institutions are also asking how their actions will improve student achievement and how it will be measured;

16. are actual measures of validity determined by the higher education institutions – *TEAC determines if the institution is using valid and credible measures; NCATE has its own standards, but the measurements at various institutions could be different; everyone is working within the same set of data, so there is not a large variance;*
17. it is encouraging to hear deans of higher education institutions say they want rigor and higher expectations; it is hard work but necessary to prepare teachers and students to achieve in today's business climate;
18. SPAs need to be aligned with high Michigan standards;
19. looking to the future how will national accreditation, teacher preparation, and universal education work toward guaranteeing the goal of achieving higher expectations for learners of all diversities - *change comes from the authority of the bodies higher education institutions work with; this is about what the collaborative body wants; we all want a greater diversity in student bodies and professions;*
20. are potential teachers assessed regarding dispositions for teaching such as creativity, discipline, organization, and ability to work with students – *counseling occurs to assess the dispositions for teaching;*
21. what is the oversight of student teachers – *supervising classroom teacher must be experienced; there is a blend of supervisors from the higher education institution including subject matter specialists; there are also early field experiences other than student teaching; there is close monitoring by a number of people having interactions with the student teacher; and*
22. would like language regarding the State Board of Education setting the standard for review.

There was Board consensus to take action during the Regular Meeting regarding support by the Board on national accreditation of institutions of higher learning.

X. RECESS

The Board recessed the Regular Meeting at 11:32 a.m. and reconvened at 11:45 a.m.

XI. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

A. Presentation of Next Steps Toward Improving Teacher Preparation in Michigan Including Charges to Professional Standards Commission for Teachers (continued)

Board member comments and *staff clarifications* continued:

23. an enhanced Professional Standards Commission for Teachers will provide thoughtful and helpful input; do the PSCT and staff have the capacity to do this amount of work – *people from the field could be added on an ad hoc basis for subcommittees;*
24. charge to the PSCT needs to be enlarged;
25. why abolish Michigan Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification (MARTC) standards – *this has not been used since 1994; MARTC was too cumbersome for districts; Section 1233b of the Michigan School Code allows a school district to employ certain non-certificated individuals under certain conditions; if MARTC standards are abolished there are other options;*
26. need a list of current PSCT members – *it will be provided;*
27. with a small, dedicated, and overburdened staff, how is support going to be provided to the PSCT for this project that will take approximately one year; can we bring in “surrogate” staff – *REL (Regional Educational Laboratories) Midwest, Learning Point Associates, university interns, and perhaps contracted work will be used;*
28. REL Midwest is focusing on teacher preparation and working with several other states; and
29. need the information from the Research Collaborative to inform decision making – *timeline may need to be altered.*

XII. RECESS

The Board recessed the Regular Meeting at 12:12 p.m. and reconvened the Committee of the Whole at 1:07 p.m.

Mrs. Teisan left the meeting at 12:12 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING

XIII. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

B. Presentation of the Revised Science Grade Level Content Expectations

The following individuals presented:

- Sally Vaughn, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer
- Ms. Betty Underwood, Interim Director, Office of School Improvement
- Mr. Larry Casler, Genesee Intermediate School District
- Ms. Liz Niehaus, Niehaus and Associates, Inc.

The Draft K-7 Content Expectations for Science represents a thorough consideration of input from a variety of stakeholders. Comments and suggestions have been incorporated by the work group and the internal review team.

A PowerPoint presentation, "Science K-7 Content Expectations" was shown.

Board member comments and *staff clarifications* included:

1. did the document change after public review – *there were some changes made as a result of reviewer comments;*
2. why are the science content expectations kindergarten through grade seven – *it is a carryover from the Michigan Curriculum Framework; high school is grade eight through grade twelve;*
3. did the national reviewer comment on preparation for high school – *the reviewer said the K-7 grade level content expectations flowed nicely into the high school grade level content expectations;*
4. did any members of the Legislature comment – *Legislators were notified and no comments received were designated as being provided by a Legislator, however, they could have commented on the website without designation as a Legislator; and*
5. why aren't the grade level content expectations kindergarten through grade eight for consistency with the other content areas – *material is assessed in grade eight, so kindergarten through grade seven is a natural break; we will revisit the consistency issue.*

The Expectations for Science will be on the December State Board of Education agenda for approval.

- C. Presentation on Proposed Revisions to the Education YES! Policy on School Accreditation

This item has been removed from the agenda.

XIV. RECESS

The Board recessed the Committee of the Whole at 1:42 p.m. to reconvene the Regular Meeting.

REGULAR MEETING

XV. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES

- A. Approval of Minutes of Special Meeting of October 1, 2007

Mrs. Bauer moved, seconded by Mrs. Danhof, that the State Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of October 1, 2007.

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent During Vote: Austin
Absent: Turner**

The motion carried.

- B. Approval of Minutes of Committee of the Whole and Regular Meeting of October 9, 2007

Mrs. Danhof moved, seconded by Ms. Ulbrich, that the State Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Committee of the Whole and Regular Meeting of October 9, 2007.

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent During Vote: Austin
Absent: Turner**

The motion carried.

XVI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

- A. Mr. David Borth, Big Rapids, Michigan. Mr. Borth, representing the Network of Michigan Educators, provided verbal and written information on the annual conference.

- B. Ms. Catherine Tilles, Brighton, Michigan. Ms. Tilles provided verbal and written information on charter school accountability and Supplemental Educational Service Providers.

- C. Mrs. Mary T. Wood, Warren, Michigan. Mrs. Wood presented verbal and written information on public school academies.
- D. Mr. George Wurtzel, Lansing, Michigan. Mr. Wurtzel, representing Opportunities Unlimited for the Blind, provided verbal and written information on Camp Tuhsmeheeta.
- E. Ms. Jodie Lee Klaassen (Heap/Fenn) Drewniak, Dearborn, Michigan. Ms. Drewniak provided verbal comments on safe schools.
- F. Ms. Sandee Koski, Pinckney, Michigan. Ms. Koski, representing Michigan's Developmental Disabilities Council, provided verbal and written information on standards for teacher preparation.
- G. Ms. Rose Bonacci, Farmington Hills, Michigan. Ms. Bonacci provided verbal comments on No Child Left Behind and Highly Qualified Teachers.

XVII. RECESS

The Board recessed the Regular Meeting at 2:15 p.m. and reconvened the Committee of the Whole.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING

XVIII. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

- D. Presentation on the Statewide System of Support for High Priority Schools

The following individuals presented:

- Sally Vaughn, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer
- Ms. Betty Underwood, Interim Director, Office of School Improvement
- Mr. Linda Hecker, No Child Left Behind Consultant, Office of School Improvement

The Office of School Improvement has expanded the support to high priority schools through partnerships with intermediate school districts, Michigan State University, Advanced Ed/North Central Association, Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators, the School Improvement Facilitators network and the Michigan Association of State and Federal Program Specialists. These partnerships will develop a capacity for the Department and intermediate school districts to assist districts with school improvement efforts and will increase focus on academic achievement for students in schools identified for

improvement. The statewide system of support includes mentors, leadership coaches, and a fellowship of high priority school principals, academic program audits, and resources to support improved instruction in reading and mathematics.

A PowerPoint presentation, "Statewide System of Support for High Priority Schools" was shown.

Board member comments and *staff clarifications* included:

1. are Supplemental Educational Service Providers communicating effectively with school personnel – *SES Providers should be working with the schools to enhance what is being done through mentors and coaches; this is the first year, and tightened requirements will improve quality;*
2. if communication between the principal and staff is not effective what happens – *the process consultation model would be used by coaches to improve communication by sharing strategies;*
3. very impressed with coaches training; participants said it was among the best trainings they had attended;
4. Michigan is one of three states that have been highlighted for what is being done with high priority schools; Michigan has four or five years of experience of evaluation, because we started the process prior to the No Child Left Behind Act; many other states did not begin until it was required by the No Child Left Behind Act;
5. mentor helps schools in phase 3 and phase 4 determine focus of funding; would it be helpful to provide mentors with best practices such as an example of a school that was in a similar situation and what they did to get positive results – *yes;*
6. are people encouraged to change their practice through mentors and coaches – *yes the job of the mentor is to help the school analyze data and make a plan; professional learning communities and helpful books are among the suggestions given; and*
7. *U.S. News and World Report, November 12, 2007, contains an article on the No Child Left Behind Act and Wyoming (Michigan) Public Schools' strategies for successful improvement of the school district.*

XIX. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee of the Whole Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m. to reconvene the Regular Meeting.

REGULAR MEETING

XX. REPORTS BY STATE BOARD MEMBERS REGARDING NASBE STUDY GROUPS AND ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Mrs. Danhof said she was a member of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Study Group on Models of Success: Policies and Strategies for Reconstitution and Schools in Need of Improvement, and she requested that she provide her report following the discussion on High Priority Schools since the two are closely linked.

Mrs. Danhof said findings of the Study Group determined training is essential for coaches and the entire school must have "buy in" and ownership. She said principals must believe in what they are doing, have the resources needed and the authority to follow through. She said flexibility is necessary.

Mrs. Danhof said there is not sufficient federal funding for states to provide capacity to mentor, tutor, monitor, and provide oversight for local districts.

Mrs. Danhof said there needs to be a credential for principals with a proven track record of successful leadership in the improvement of high priority schools.

Additional NASBE Study Group reports were presented later in the meeting.

XXI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

A. NASBE Policy Symposium on Healthy Eating

Mrs. Straus said she attended the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Policy Symposium on Healthy Eating on October 10-11, 2007. She said she was a member of the Michigan team with Kyle Guerrant, Supervisor, Coordinated School Health and Safety Programs Unit; and Paul Yettaw, Food Service Director, Lakeview Schools in Battle Creek. Mrs. Straus said travel costs were paid as part of a Centers for Disease Control grant to NASBE on health and wellness policies. She said there were excellent presentations on school policies to foster healthy eating, policy issues on school meals and meeting the needs of low income students, and nutrition standards for foods at schools.

Mrs. Straus said there was time for the team to plan, and hear innovative ideas from other states, and Mr. Guerrant will be making a presentation to the State Board at a future meeting. She said representatives from other states were very interested in the policies the Michigan State Board of Education has adopted.

B. NASBE Annual Conference

Mrs. Straus said immediately following the Policy Symposium on Healthy Eating she attended the NASBE Annual Conference with Mrs. McGuire who was elected to the NASBE Nominating Committee. She said they both participated in interesting sessions, and study group reports were released.

Mrs. Straus said a conference highlight was a visit to the Philadelphia School of the Future, a public high school designed under the guidance of Microsoft with community participation. She said the curriculum is designed around interdisciplinary projects that engage students in the learning process. She said the intent is to make the program replicable.

C. Special Education Students Transition to College

Mrs. Straus said she attended Think College: Postsecondary Education for Students with Intellectual Disabilities on November 5, 2007 at the University of Michigan, Dearborn Campus. She said the symposium was sponsored by the Developmental Disabilities Institute, and Mr. Flanagan delivered well-received comments about educating all students noting that the system is disabled not the students. She said there were also presentations from students, and people from other states.

D. Milken Award Presentations

Mrs. Straus said she, Mrs. Bauer, and Ms. Ulbrich attended the National Milken Award Presentations. She said Mr. David Robinson, a computer-aided drafting program teacher at Randolph Career and Technical High School in Detroit Public Schools; and Mr. Brian Langley, a chemistry and physics teacher at Novi High School in Novi Community Schools; each received a \$25,000 cash award during surprise notifications on October 18, 2007.

E. Exchange City

Mrs. Straus said she visited Exchange City in Taylor on October 30, where students are the citizens and assume the roles of owners and operators of businesses including manufacturing and services. She said they use a hands-on classroom curriculum that applies

and integrates math, language arts, social studies, civics, and economics and technology. She said the students elect a mayor and judge and run their own town. She said they operate businesses, apply for loans, create products and sell them, receive paychecks and work to pay off their loans. She said teachers and adult volunteers participate in training prior to the visit, and there is follow up.

F. Public School Academy Committee

Mrs. Straus said the Board's Public School Academy Committee met on November 8, 2007, to discuss the Report on Public School Academies. She said she, Mr. Austin, Mrs. Curtin, and Mrs. McGuire, met with Department staff.

XXII. REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT

Reports

G. Human Resources Report

H. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers

Grants

I. 2007-2008 Title I Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children in State Agency Institutions – Initial

J. 2007-2008 Reading First – Continuation

K. 2007-2008 Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting – Amendment

L. 2007-2008 Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology – Amendment (CFDA No. 84.318X)

M. 2007-2008 McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act Grant – Continuation

N. 2007-2008 Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs – Amendment

O. 2007-2008 Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs – Amendment

P. 2007-2008 Mandated Activities Project, Preschool Outcomes Measurement Grant – Continuation

Q. 2007-2008 Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology – Amendment (CFDA No. 83.318)

AA. 2007-2008 Title III – English Language Acquisition Program (Preliminary) – Initial

BB. 2007-2008 Title III – Immigrant Grant Program – Initial

Mr. Flanagan provided an oral report on:

A. Connor Creek Academy East in Warren

Mr. Flanagan explained that the Department of Education and the Department of Labor and Economic Growth have a memorandum of understanding for school site plan approval. He updated the Board on the status of the site plan approval of Connor Creek Academy East in Warren.

B. Highly Qualified Teachers at Michigan School for the Deaf

Mr. Flanagan asked Dr. Jacquelyn Thompson, Director, Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services, to comment on the issue of Highly Qualified Teachers at the Michigan School for the Deaf, as mentioned during the Public Participation portion of the meeting.

Dr. Thompson said she does not have the actual Highly Qualified status of every teacher at her fingertips, but she will get the information. She said there are nine long-term substitute teachers, and there are barriers to filling the positions permanently. She said teachers need to be proficient in American Sign Language, endorsed as a teacher of the hearing impaired, and Highly Qualified in their content area. She said the pool of potential candidates is very small, and civil service salary rates are not competitive with public school districts. She said there have also been delays with regard to technology at the Michigan School for the Deaf.

Mr. Flanagan said this will be a topic of future discussion with more data being provided to the Board.

XXIII. TEACHER OF THE YEAR REPORT

The Teacher of the Year Report stands as written.

XXIV. APPROVAL OF CHARGES TO PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION FOR TEACHERS (PSCT)

This item was discussed during the Committee of the Whole Meeting.

Mr. Austin moved, seconded by Mrs. Curtin that the State Board of Education (1) approve the creation of the Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation to replace multiple standards that inform teacher preparation, and charge the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers to develop and recommend to the Board a comprehensive conceptual alignment of current proposed standards; and (2) abolish the 1993 Michigan Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification (MARTC) standards and charge the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers (PSCT) to develop and recommend to the Board standards for new alternative pathways to teacher certification, as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated November 6, 2007.

There was consensus to allow staff to think creatively to extend the capacity of the PSCT including REL Midwest, to assist in the development of the Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation.

Mrs. McGuire expressed concern that the Board has not had sufficient conversation to provide input regarding the development of the Framework prior to a final product.

Mr. Austin said as the Board's liaison to the PSCT, he can provide updates on what the process looks like, and how it guarantees the opportunity for the Board to provide input and feedback.

Mrs. Bauer said this is a multi-step process. She said the first part is the coherent organization of all existing standards so that it can be assessed, and after that new standards can and will be developed.

Mrs. Curtin said this topic may warrant a one-half day workshop. There was Board consensus to consider a workshop.

Dr. Jenkins said the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers are still under development and will be presented for the Board's approval in April, 2008. She said this document should provide a good basis for the framework.

Mrs. Straus said she is concerned that cultural awareness and diversity have not yet been addressed.

Ms. Galloway said the standards for new alternative pathways describe the process. There was Board consensus to revise the motion to read "process standards for new alternative pathways to teacher certification."

Based on the Board discussion, the motion was modified as follows:

Mr. Austin moved, seconded by Mrs. Curtin that the State Board of Education:

- (1) approve the creation of the Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation to replace multiple standards that inform teacher preparation, and charge the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers (PSCT) to develop and recommend to the Board a comprehensive conceptual alignment of current proposed standards, allowing the PSCT to be expanded to include other individuals to assist in developing the Framework;**
- (2) schedule a State Board of Education workshop in order to give the Board an opportunity for preliminary review and input into the Framework, if needed; and**
- (3) abolish the 1993 Michigan Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification (MARTC) standards and charge the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers to develop and recommend to the Board process standards for new alternative pathways to teacher certification, as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated November 6, 2007.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent: Turner**

The motion carried.

Mr. Austin moved, seconded by Mrs. Danhof that the The State Board of Education (SBE) support the plan of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to require national accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) for continued approval of teacher preparation institutions. The MDE agreements with NCATE and TEAC will include review protocols based on SBE approved standards. National accreditation of the individual specialty (endorsement) programs within the teacher preparation unit will be optional for the institutions. All teacher preparation programs and specialty (endorsement) programs within the unit must attain initial approval by the State Board of Education based on Board approved Standards and Requirements for Initial Approval.

Mrs. Bauer said the agreement is between the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and the accrediting body which is NCATE or TEAC. She said the college or university chooses one of the two accrediting bodies, and they have to be accredited within that contractual framework between the MDE and NCATE or TEAC.

Mrs. Danhof said the motion reads "National accreditation of the individual specialty (endorsement) programs within the teacher preparation unit will be optional for the institutions." She said she questions whether this is true for NCATE. Dr. Jenkins said she will get further clarification regarding this matter.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent: Turner

The motion carried.

XXV. APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE MICHIGAN STATE PLAN FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION – JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008

Ms. Patty Cantu, Director, Office of Career and Technical Preparation, presented Approval of the Amendment to the Michigan State Plan for Career and Technical Education – July 1, 2007 Through June 30, 2008.

Ms. Cantu said each state receiving federal funds under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 must develop a State Plan for Career and Technical Education. She said Michigan has developed a one-year transition plan for July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. She said the plan addresses the key areas of planning, coordination, and collaboration; program administration; provision of services to special populations; accountability and evaluation; technical preparation programs; and financial requirements. Ms. Cantu said this amendment designates the Superintendent of Public Instruction as the authority under State law to hold, receive, and disburse the federal funds made available under the Plan. She said this had previously been approved by the State Administrative Board, when the Office of Career and Technical Preparation was part of the Department of Labor and Economic Growth.

Mrs. Bauer moved, seconded by Mrs. Danhof, that the State Board of Education (1) approve the Amendment to the Michigan State Plan for Career and Technical Education – July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008, as attached to the October 29, 2007, memorandum from the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and (2) authorize the Superintendent to submit the Plan to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

Ms. Cantu said she will return to the Board in a couple of months to present the "Michigan State Plan for Career and Technical Education, 2008-2013." She said the draft of the five year plan is on the website for review.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent: Turner

The motion carried.

XXVI. STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Ms. Lisa Hansknecht, Legislative Director, presented State Legislative Update.

Ms. Hansknecht said Senate Bill 482 is on the Senate floor, and it requires that social studies be included in the Michigan Merit Examination as a requirement for the Michigan Promise scholarship program.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. McGuire, that the State Board of Education (1) take a position of support on Senate Bill 482 requiring that students participate in the Michigan Merit Examination social studies test to be eligible for the Michigan Promise Scholarship and to pass the area of social studies to qualify for early payments as entering freshmen and sophomores under the scholarship program; and (2) take a position of non-support of Senate Bills 805, 806, 809, 810, and 811 regarding the elimination of social studies from the Michigan Merit Examination, and Michigan Educational Assessment Program.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent: Turner

The motion carried.

Ms. Hansknecht said there are several other Senate Bills regarding testing provisions in an effort to reduce costs. She said Senate Bill 812 would amend the Revised School Code eliminating end of course exams for the Michigan Merit Curriculum. Mr. Flanagan said he has been told this is due to funding, rather than philosophical differences.

Board members said they would be interested in speaking during legislative hearings.

XXVII. REPORTS BY STATE BOARD MEMBERS REGARDING NASBE STUDY GROUPS AND ANNUAL CONFERENCE (continued)

Mrs. McGuire said she was a member of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Study Group on Language and Learning. She said the Study Group met from January through June, 2007, and the final recommendation was that all new citizens learn English but not to the extent that their native heritage, culture and language are erased. She said they are to be welcomed into the English-speaking family. She said the report is titled "Language and Learning in Public Education: English Proficiency and Language Preservation."

Mrs. Curtin said she is a member of the Governmental Affairs Committee that discussed the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act and its reauthorization. She said reauthorization has been delayed.

Mrs. Danhof presented on the NASBE Study Group on Models of Success: Turn Around Policies and Strategies for Low Performing Schools earlier in the meeting.

No action was required.

XXVIII. CONSENT AGENDA

Criteria

- V. Approval of Criteria for the Special Education and Early Intervention Services State Personnel Development Grant Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004)
- Z. Approval of the Criteria for 2007-08 Title I, Part A Pilot ISD Partnership Grant

Approval

- W. Approval of SBE Travel Report – July 1 – September 30, 2007

Resolution

- X. Adoption of Resolution Regarding Inclusive Schools Week
- Y. Adoption of Resolution Regarding National Child and Adult Care Food Program Week

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Danhof, that the State Board of Education approve the Superintendent's recommendations for the consent agenda, as follows:

- V. approve Criteria for the Special Education and Early Intervention Services State Personnel Development Grant Under the IDEA (2004), as identified in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 24, 2007;
- Z. approve the Criteria for the 2007-08 Title I, Part A Pilot ISD Partnership Grant, as identified in Attachment A, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated October 29, 2007;
- W. approve the July 1 – September 30, 2007 report of State Board of Education expenses, dated October 29, 2007;
- X. adopt the resolution regarding Inclusive Schools Week, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated October 29, 2007; and
- Y. adopt the resolution regarding the National Child and Adult Care Food Program Week, March 16-22, 2008, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated October 29, 2007.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich
Absent: Turner

The motion carried.

The resolution regarding Inclusive Schools Week is attached as Exhibit A.

The resolution regarding the National Child and Adult Care Food Program Week, March 16-22, 2008, is attached as Exhibit B.

XXIX. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

There were no additional comments offered by State Board of Education members.

XXX. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Future agenda topics mentioned during the meeting include:

- A. State Board of Education Meeting at Michigan School for the Deaf
- B. Clarification from the Attorney General's Office regarding Public School Academies moving from one city another
- C. Highly Qualified Teachers at Michigan School for the Deaf
- D. Camp Tuhsmeheeta Report from George Wurtzel, Opportunities Unlimited for the Blind

Mr. Flanagan asked Board members to contact a member of the Executive Committee comprised of Mrs. Straus, Mr. Austin, and Mrs. Curtin with suggestions for agenda topics.

XXXI. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. December 11, 2007
- B. January 8, 2008
- C. February 12, 2008
- D. March 11, 2008

XXXII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn L. Curtin
Secretary