

MINUTES/ACTIONS

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Also Meeting As
STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Berrien Intermediate School District
Conference Rooms C and D
711 Saint Joseph Avenue
Berrien Springs, Michigan

April 13, 2000
10:00 a.m.

Present: Mr. Arthur E. Ellis, Chairman
Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore, President
Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, Vice President
Dr. Herbert S. Moyer, Secretary
Mrs. Sharon L. Gire, NASBE Delegate
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire
Mr. Michael David Warren, Jr.
Mrs. Eileen L. Weiser
Mr. Scott Jenkins, representing Governor John Engler

Absent: Mrs. Sharon A. Wise, Treasurer

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Ellis called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

- A. Report of the Superintendent - Annual Report on the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification - added to agenda
- B. Report of the Superintendent - Goals 2000 Cycle 10 - added to agenda
- C. Discussion and Action Regarding Superintendent of Public Instruction Selection Process - added to agenda
- D. Approval of Changes for the Home Economics Endorsement - removed from agenda
- E. Approval of Eligibility Criteria for the Title I School Improvement Funds - removed from consent agenda and placed under discussion items

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

III. AGENDA MATERIALS

- A. Presentation on Plan for Expanded Technical Assistance and Intervention for Low Performing Schools - Revised Memorandum dated April 13, 2000, from Arthur E. Ellis to the Board
- B. Revised Section 3.4 - Related to Approval of Standards for the Preparation of English Teachers
- C. Revised Sections 2.5 through 2.8, K-8 Mathematics and 7-12 Mathematics - Related to Approval of Standards for the Preparation of Mathematics Teachers
- D. Revised Sections 4.0 through 5.3 - Related to Approval of Standards for the Preparation of Physical Education Teachers
- E. Revised Sections 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, and 3.10 - Related to Approval of Changes for the Home Economics Endorsement

IV. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED TO THE BOARD

- A. Memorandum dated April 13, 2000, from Arthur E. Ellis to the Board regarding Report on Out-of-State Travel Costs

V. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, introduced the members of the Board and guests attending the meeting.

Mrs. Hamilton said it is an honor to be able to hold the Board meeting in Berrien County, and thanked Mr. Jerry Reimann, Superintendent, Berrien Intermediate School District, and Ms. Joan Rodell, Administrative Assistant, for their help in making the necessary arrangements for the meeting.

VI. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES AND RECEIPT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS/MINUTES

Mrs. Beardmore said the motion listed for Item A of the Comments by State Board of Education Members, Blue Ribbon Schools, page 36 of the March 16, 2000 State Board of Education minutes inaccurately states, "...where all elementary school buildings within..." She said the word "elementary" should be removed, so the motion states, "...where all school buildings within..."

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary for the State Board of Education, said Mr. Warren recommended a word change on Page 8, fifth paragraph, "...and attending meetings, and not just to fill an adequacy ADVOCACY role."

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the minutes/actions of April 13, 2000, as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

VII. PRESENTATION ON PLAN FOR EXPANDED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INTERVENTION FOR LOW PERFORMING SCHOOLS

Mr. Ellis said providing technical assistance to persistently low performing schools has been an important issue for many years. He said in an effort to assist schools, a new program titled "Partnership for Success," is being proposed which seeks additional funding and authority to assure that the task of effective intervention can be accomplished.

Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Superintendent for Education Services; and Ms. Sue Carnell, Director, Office of School Excellence, provided information, a slide presentation, and responded to questions from the Board regarding the plan for expanded technical assistance and intervention for low performing schools.

Dr. Williamson said the current school excellence process utilized by the Department has been engaged for some time, and is based on a number of documents adopted by the Board over the years. He said the Board directed staff at a previous meeting to determine how the process works. He said the thrust behind the program is to assist schools, and therefore, improve student performance which is in line with the Board's commitment as stated in the Action Plan and Strategic Initiatives adopted at the September 18, 1997 and April 14, 1999 meetings respectively.

Dr. Williamson said he believes that goal can be accomplished through a systematic effort which begins with the standards and benchmarks. He said the standards function as a guide for local school districts to enable them to design a curriculum which will fulfill the needs of their community. He said the standards are then supported by benchmarks and clarifying materials.

Dr. Williamson said school improvement plans are also an essential component of the school excellence process. He said the Department has been striving to provide better guidance to schools which may be developing or improving those plans, but it has been noted that many existing plans are “surprisingly good.” He said some building principals have requested Departmental assistance in consolidating plan requirements of the school improvement process, North Central Accreditation, and federal programs such as Title I. He said staff are working on bringing all these plans together based on data developed through self assessment at the local level and focused on improving pupil performance. He said staff development is primarily focused on supporting the school improvement plan, based on the need to improve student performance and focused on strengthening professional practice. He said there are several resources invested in strengthening practice. He said Michigan has conducted assessments longer than any other state with the first and primary function of providing information about the system, and that assessment must be based on the standards and benchmarks.

Dr. Williamson said staff have for many years collected data pertaining to student achievement. He said the basis of the accreditation/accountability process is utilizing that information to guide improvement by targeting resources for assistance. He said the accountability system helps benchmark progress over time.

Dr. Williamson said a major component of the focused assistance and intervention is ongoing and broad training for schools which need more than just the clarifying resources available to strengthen practice. He said some of schools have been assigned coaches who go into the same school on a number of occasions to work with staff and faculty to align curriculum with standards and help develop the steps necessary for improvement.

Dr. Williamson said staff view this as an opportunity to build school excellence. He said he was pleased to read U.S. Secretary of Education, Richard Riley’s comment regarding the state of education: that states must not be deterred from insisting that schools be held accountable for results, and of making progress each year to reach the standards. He said Michigan cannot wait for the perfect test before holding schools accountable, and must act now to give schools the help they need.

Ms. Carnell said a state level accountability program can make a significant improvement in student performance, but must include several key components. She said staff knows that in most successful schools there is an alignment with assessment instruments which have incorporated writing and other test taking skills into the regular curriculum, and have a focus on high quality professional development activity.

Ms. Carnell said change begins with learning which may be characterized as occurring at one of three levels: (1) awareness; (2) understanding; and (3) application. She said current efforts exist to assist schools in working toward improvement at two levels: (1) provide ongoing professional development to strengthen practice; and (2) using professional development as a focused intervention strategy to improve low performing schools. She said although each level serves different purposes, the focus and delivery systems are similar. She said current efforts and initiatives provide professional development to 3,800 school buildings and approximately 1.7 million students in Michigan.

Ms. Carnell said efforts begin with the Michigan Curriculum Framework which provide a guide for standard based performance and has been available since 1996. She said the framework also provides fundamental school improvement resources for principal and instructional staff. She said other resources available on the Department's web site include assessment samples, funding and professional development opportunities, and district level data.

Ms. Carnell said resources available to strengthen practice include: (1) Title I/ Eisenhower Grants for Professional Development; (2) Title IV which supports innovative practices; (3) grants for class size reduction, comprehensive school reform demonstration programs, and state improvement grants to improve performance by students with disabilities; and (4) math and science centers which provide professional development, curriculum support, instructional material, and technical assistance to school districts. She said other state and regional organizations, universities, resource centers, and individuals also provide services to schools which make training available either directly or indirectly through funding targeted for that purpose.

Ms. Carnell said assistance in intervention becomes vital in order for consistently low performing schools to succeed. She said intervention to assist schools suffering from persistently low performance is required by Section 1280 of the Revised School Code of 1976. She said assistance has often been targeted at raising a single test score, and does not focus on fundamental systemic changes. She said it is important to note that even though much effort has been made to reduce the number of unaccredited schools, the result has been simply to raise the scores on one test, and does not mean that Michigan has fewer persistently low performing schools.

Ms. Carnell said the result is that professional development has either been at the awareness or the understanding levels. She said awareness level training alone is insufficient to bring about changes necessary to result in improved achievement. She said although the comprehensive school reform demonstration program offers promising results, efforts on the application level have not been explored. She said practices have, to some degree, been strengthened, but the assistance may not be in the area of focused need.

Ms. Carnell said the current accreditation program has limited the ability of the Department to identify and focus on persistently low achieving schools toward the fundamental changes necessary to improve. She said the “Partnership for Success” moves the issue of intervention in persistently low performing schools to the top of the agenda for the Department. She said the common and salient features of these intervention programs include: (1) commitment to a school improvement plan at the school building that focuses the staff on increased teaching skills and which engages the community and district; (2) the use of data as a means of determining low performing schools, setting school improvement targets, and informing and instructing improvement efforts; (3) delivery of services by an assigned individual or team at the school site to train staff and model effective teaching and learning techniques and strategies; (4) continuous support from the Michigan Department of Education through the activities monitoring school/district progress and providing support, resources and funds needed to implement school improvement that will enhance student performance; and (5) continuous learning which results from ongoing training and coaching of school staff at the application level relevant to school improvement and pupil performance.

Ms. Carnell said Kentucky, North Carolina, and Illinois have similar features which include: (1) commitment to a school improvement plan at the building level; (2) use of data as a means to determine low performing schools; (3) delivery of services by an assigned individual or team; (4) continuous support from a state education agency; and (5) continuous learning.

Ms. Carnell said the intention of the Michigan Partnership for Success includes: (1) recruit, train and support outstanding educators; (2) identify the barriers to learning; (3) work in partnership with a diverse school team including the principal, a teacher, and perhaps a support person on staff, a community person, and a parent; and (4) sustain the intensity and duration of each intervention long enough to achieve lasting positive impact on student achievement.

Ms. Carnell said the partner will serve as an expert resource to the school leadership team, as a catalyst in the change process, and as facilitator of organizational and process development efforts. She said services provided by a partner may include: (1) serve as a resource to the building principal in aligning his/her leadership with the goals expressed in the school improvement plan; (2) assist in developing the ability of the school to gather and use data to inform the decision-making process so building activities remain focused on improving student performance; (3) provide leadership in setting goals and priorities for maximum results; (4) provide training or mentoring to teachers to improve pedagogy; (5) facilitate development of effective and productive community relations by the client school leadership; and (6) develop the ability of school leadership to focus all school resources on improving student achievement.

Ms. Carnell said the Michigan Partnership for Success will: (1) demonstrate increased student achievement; (2) demonstrate improvement in adequate yearly progress; (3) make strides in closing the achievement gap; (4) observe positive, collaborative climate focused on pupil performance; and (5) increase parent satisfaction. She said it will take approximately three to five years to institutionalize the change and to initially improve student achievement. She said some client schools will develop quickly while others will require extended partnerships. She said services will be tailored to the specific needs of each school so not everyone will have the same program.

Ms. Carnell said staffing requirements for this program will be met primarily through contract employees, and it may be possible to fill these positions with individuals who are early retirees from the K-12 system. She said selection and training would take place in the 2000-2001 school year, and intervention would begin in 2001-2002. She said the program would start with ten selected schools, and increase by ten schools each year for three years. She said approximately \$300,000 per building is estimated resulting in a total of \$30 million. She said although this is a large amount, it is imperative to address this issue in Michigan schools.

Ms. Carnell said \$1.5 million has been slated for technical assistance through Section 94. She said staff are aware that it is having some effect, but there still seems to be a focus on identifying schools which are in need of help because the current system does not give the best results. She said typically when technical assistance is given to a school, it is in the area of science.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Dr. Williamson said science has been the focal content area because science scores are usually lower than reading and writing, and the current system is geared toward raising the lowest score. He said staff is now performing intervention at the awareness and coaching levels, but it is not specifically directed to targeted schools.

Mrs. McGuire said the technical assistance part of the presentation is right on target, and what the Board has been working toward for some time.

Mrs. Straus said she is pleased to receive this information, but the fact that staff is requesting \$30 million instead of the \$1.5 million identified in the legislation would indicate that schools in need of help have not received the assistance necessary to succeed. She said she was not aware that the current system focused on raising science scores.

Mr. Paul Bielawski, Supervisor, School Restructuring and Accountability, said students perform in a variety of ways in different content areas which are commonly reading, science, and mathematics. He said some schools are low in one, two or all three of the content areas. He said within that group, there are schools which have made progress, while others have not. He said a number of schools throughout the

state have fewer than 25% of their students scoring proficient in science at both the 5th and 8th grade levels. He said many schools have difficulty moving their science programs to a scientific literacy program which involves society's idea of the context of science. He said professional resources are being utilized in many cases to assist schools low in one or two areas category, but more effort must be made toward schools low in all three content areas category.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Ms. Carnell said Achieve, Inc. provided an Academic Standards and Assessments Benchmarking Evaluation in December 1998, but the Achievement Group holds a contract with the state to provide technical assistance to low performing schools. She said staff is not implying that those intervention programs have been wasted, but that the proposed program will add to what is already in place to better focus resources to schools which are specifically low in performance.

Mrs. Straus said the Department has limited human and financial resources, and wondered how they would be utilized in the new program. In response, Ms. Carnell said for every eight to ten consultants operating at the local school district level, one staff person would be hired to coordinate their efforts. She said there would be criteria which would assure that consultants would not only have the appropriate background, but also have good team leadership skills and be a competent facilitator.

Dr. Moyer thanked staff for their presentation and said he likes the concept of Partnerships for Success. He said the Board is pleased to learn of the advocacy of \$30 million which will go toward assisting schools that are not doing well, but urged staff to not demean the efforts made in the past.

Ms. Carnell said staff will continue to utilize the previous efforts involving the \$1.5 million targeted assistance as well as the approximately \$250,000 from the Office of School Excellence to work with the next level of schools which have needs.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board has received various reports from the Achieve Group and the Coalition for Essential Schools who have made it clear that it is imperative to assist low achieving schools as much as possible. She said professional development has moved away from just awareness, and the one day workshop where teachers are inundated with information and expected to incorporate the information received into everything they do from then on. She said a number of efforts have been made, but never the necessary state level of commitment, either monetarily, and with staff availability in the Department. She said many schools are pointing to Kentucky, North Carolina, and Illinois which are successful in identifying the level of achievement necessary for success, and actually place their resources where they can accomplish that goal. The Board learned through the Michigan Statewide Systemic Initiative (MSSI) that simply teaching people new terminology did not implement change in the classroom or help improve student achievement.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board has tried to convince people to stop focusing on test scores, and concentrate on student learning. She said if Michigan wants to make the necessary changes, it is vitally important to place resources where they will be able to accomplish that goal. She said she is surprised that alignment with the standards and benchmarks was not the first point of the six areas identified by Ms. Carnell.

Ms. Carnell said she realizes that is a concern of the Board, and therefore, felt it imperative to point out in her opening statement that schools should be concerned with building curriculum based on state standards.

Mr. Warren thanked staff for an excellent presentation, and said in the context of the millions of dollars which have been spent since public education has been around, this may be the best money Michigan could spend. He said he thinks that this is exactly the kind of leadership role the Board provides in connection with policy making authority, and that it actually has a moral obligation to help the students in low performing schools.

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mrs. Weiser, that the State Board of Education resolve, that pursuant to the State Board of Education's leadership, general supervisory, planning and coordinating authority over public education, the State Board of Education hereby adopts as its policy that expanded technical assistance and intervention for low performing schools be provided in the memorandum described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated April 13, 2000 regarding the presentation in "Plan for Expanded Technical Assistance and Intervention for Low Performing Schools."

Mr. Warren said the original recommendation states that the Board approve a program for expanded technical assistance and intervention, but he thinks the Board's role is to establish policy which becomes converted in a program.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Mr. Jenkins said the cost for the Standard and Poor's process may change depending on how many other states join into the process, but right now the contract is for \$2 million.

Mrs. Gire said she appreciates the approach used by staff regarding this issue, but expressed concern that only 150 schools have been targeted. She recognized that this is an expensive project, but thinks the Board must begin discussion regarding investment if they are serious about school improvement. She said student learning is the most important factor, and it is essential to place people in the schools who will be able to assist in all aspects including parental involvement, discipline, content, and teaching methods so that the school will no longer be considered low performing.

Mrs. Gire asked Mr. Jenkins if he believes the current administration will support this proposal. In response, Mr. Jenkins said if the Department and the State Board of Education were limited to one role, it would be to intervene in the lowest performing schools. He said it is treating schools as teachers are expected to treat students, intervene, find the problem, find a solution, and fix the system. He said aside from the budgetary restraints which he cannot speak to, he would be glad to move this proposal to the Governor for recommendation beyond budgetary restraints. He said he thinks it is a great ability to identify even a limited number of schools, and hopefully, be able to show substantial improvement in three years.

Mrs. Gire said based on discussion held at the March 16, 2000 Board meeting, she felt that there were more than 150 low achieving schools. She said she is pleased with the possibility of a long term approach and that the proposal requires three to five years to institutionalize a change that is meaningful. She said the Legislature tends to move too quickly on implementing new programs before waiting to see if previous programs will be successful instead of putting in the investment of time as well as resources that are necessary at an institutional level.

Mrs. Weiser said there are other private systemic curriculum and whole school reform programs under way throughout the state right now that are very effective, so this is an effort by the Department to add to that slowly and comprehensively with the right number of schools. She said if it is successful, the Department will be a provider in the future years and will know how to do it very successfully.

Dr. Moyer said he appreciates Mr. Warren's well worded resolution, however, he has some reservations about it at this time. He said the Board has received a memorandum from the Public Education Advocates which addressed their concerns regarding this issue. He said many times constituents, the educational community and others have not collaborated on issues even though they are anxious to be part of the process. He said to move forward with this proposal on a quasi unilateral approach will result in the loss of that support. He said he would be more willing to approve the staff recommendation because of the information received in the presentation.

Dr. Williamson said information presented to the Board today is merely conceptual. He said historically, the Board has not had a policy of engaging in direct intervention. He said efforts to assist schools have always been through staff development or coaching, and therefore, it is a policy step forward to implement direct intervention.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks Mr. Warren's motion emphasizes the distinction between the policy position vis a vis recommending that the Board approve the Partnership for Success program. She said she thinks the revised wording addresses somewhat Dr. Moyer's concern regarding public input and utilizing educational organizations to the extent that this is the direction and policy to change from awareness of the understanding level to actually changing.

Mr. Warren said the policy issue which his resolution puts forth gives a direction and guidance for the Department, the Superintendent, and those who have policy making authority. He said the Board has no legal requirement to collaborate with educational organizations to fulfill its constitutional authority. He said Board members are elected representatives of the people of Michigan, with leadership and general supervisory power over public education. He said there is a statute regarding accreditation.

Mr. Warren said this is an independent policy of the State Board of Education based, in part on the criteria used in the accreditation process. He said cooperative partners are necessary for the success of the program, which is typically schools. He said that cooperation will not happen until a policy is in place that explains the process. He said participation is not a mandate nor a requirement.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Ms. Carnell said if the Board adopts this policy, staff will proceed in developing details on how to acquire the skilled people who will become coaches in low performing schools.

Mrs. Straus said an individual school cannot do this without the support and encouragement of their local school district administration.

Ms. Carnell agreed that staff have found if a district does not buy into the intense assistance of a school building, it will not bring about the change needed for success.

Mrs. McGuire suggested tabling Mr. Warren's motion because the Board has not had an opportunity to discuss intervention.

Mr. Warren said the motion relates specifically to the Partnership for Success, and does not address intervention. He said the memorandum is titled, "Plan for Expanded Technical Assistance and Intervention for Low Performing Schools," and therefore, Mrs. McGuire may be confusing intervention and accreditation.

Mrs. McGuire said she understands, but the Board must still identify how intervention will occur. She said she also believes that intervention and accreditation go together.

Ms. Carnell said after the Board grants its approval to seek the funding, staff plans on approaching educational associations and universities for their input on how this program could work. She said she stated in a meeting on April 7, 2000, with educational agencies and organizations that this is a partnership and staff will seek input from low achieving schools as well as from the public and view this as a collaborative venture.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Ms. Carnell said the meeting revealed that organizations wanted to know about intervention, and she did not sense disapproval of the plan to move forward in assisting for low performing schools.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board has discussed many times utilizing outstanding educators such as the Teacher of the Year, and Milken Educator Award winners as well as other identified excellent teachers. She suggested that staff consider recruiting this group of educators when considering who to hire as coaches for low performing schools.

Mrs. Beardmore said she hopes that this level of effort continues because as experience and successes are identified, there may be other schools which will want to take advantage of this approach.

The following individuals offered comments regarding this item.

- A. Ms. Linda Holt, Trustee, Berrien County Intermediate School District, 2401 Ridgewood Drive, Stevensville, Michigan 49127
- B. Mr. Mathew M. McCusker, President-elect, Michigan Association of School Boards, 1001 Centennial Way, Lansing, Michigan 48917.
- C. Ms. Linda Myers, Michigan Education Association, 1216 Kendale Boulevard, East Lansing, Michigan 48826.
- D. Mr. Donald Olendorf, Public Education Advocates, 70 ½ South Paw Paw Street, Lawrence, Michigan 49064.

Mrs. Straus offered a friendly amendment to the motion in placing the title "Presentation on Plan for Expanded Technical Assistance and Intervention for Low Performing Schools" in quotation marks, and said it may be more appropriate to simply adopt the policy as opposed to making the motion in the form of a resolution.

Mr. Warren accepted the friendly amendment, but feels that the resolution format is appropriate to the motion.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

VIII.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 11:40 a.m. and reconvened at 11:50 a.m.

IX. PRESENTATION ON IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR ACCOUNTABILITY
BASED ACCREDITATION

Mr. Ellis said that in May 1999, the State Board of Education approved a framework for a new system of performance-based accreditation for Michigan schools. He said Department staff have worked with education groups to develop details of the system.

Ms. Sue Carnell, Director, Office of School Excellence; Mr. Paul Bielawski, Supervisor, School Restructuring and Accountability; and Dr. Lindy Buch, Supervisor, Curriculum, Birth-Grade 12, provided information and a slide presentation, and responded to questions from the Board.

Ms. Carnell said school reform is part of almost every state's accountability system, and often contains high standards which are invariably coupled with the necessity of assessing student achievement to determine if they are meeting higher standards as well as holding principals, teachers and schools accountable.

Ms. Carnell said reasons for establishing standards include: (1) lack of accountability for students and schools - studies on the relationship between school finance and test scores have shown a systematic link between spending and improved achievement; (2) poor student achievement in comparison with national and international assessments; and (3) inequity of the educational system and the quality of education offered to students. She said too often there are differences between schools in both funding and academic resources and sometimes even with those in the same district.

Ms. Carnell said students need to be able to read, write, and do math to be successful in school and life. She said statistics indicate that without these skills, three out of four will go on welfare, and approximately 65% will end up in criminal institutions. She said staff believe that state standards, as well as testing and accountability will focus efforts and influence choices regarding professional development, curriculum, instruction, and targeted interventions. She said this system will help schools review their capacity to accomplish goals while assisting teachers and administrators in using student achievement data, and improving classroom instruction. She said it will help schools look at student achievement indicators and connect them back to what they are doing or not doing. She said in the end, standards must be translated into classroom practices before they can improve student performance and achievement.

Ms. Carnell said the new accountability based accreditation system is designed to determine where school buildings fall when measured against the State Board of Education adopted standards. She said input received from educational agencies, organizations, and

directors from the Department of Education revealed concerns about the process and the content of this report. She said they are willing to work through their concerns and have agreed that a partnership will assist the challenge of improving education for all students.

Ms. Carnell said the first of the two content areas identified through this input focuses on whether schools are meeting the state standards. She said the second content area identified was how to report to the general public the progress of school systems and reveal a clearer picture of schools. She said staff have tried to tie in a method by which local and intermediate school districts can use this system for school improvement efforts.

Dr. Buch said in the past, people could reach an agreement on what students needed to learn and be able to do to be considered successful in school and life, and how to assess that knowledge. She said the proposed system focuses on high standards based on the Michigan Standards and Benchmarks. She said in terms of accountability for high student performance and achievement, she thinks staff have defined the factors in a way that makes sense. She said those five factors are:

(1) Assessment of All Students; (2) High Academic Achievement; (3) Improvement in Student Performance; (4) Achievement for All Students; and (5) School Improvement Results.

Mr. Bielawski said the Assessment of All Students would require a minimum threshold of all students within a school district to participate in the assessment program in order to have some credibility in public reporting, and to utilize their assessment information for internal improvement. He said schools will be required to report on a minimum of 80% of their students during the first year of implementation. He said included in that percentage will be students for whom an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) supports the use of an alternate assessment. He said staff in the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services have been working on alternate assessments and capacity building and training in the field on that issue. He said also considered a part of that will be those students for whom English is not the primary language and who have been in a U.S. school for less than two years. He said clearly a student who has a greater proficiency in another language should not be expected to sit through a test they do not understand. He said staff are still determining a reasonable time frame for English proficiency acquisition, but would like to move aggressively on that within the next 2-3 years.

Mr. Bielawski said the High Academic Achievement entails content areas to be considered in this system which will vary based on the continued development and sophistication of the MEAP tests. He said it will begin with reading, mathematics, and science, with social studies added in the near future. He said staff will collaborate with MEAP staff to determine some reasonable expectations of the proposed program, and how it is related to efforts focused on targeted assistance for low achieving schools.

Mr. Bielawski said staff is optimistic regarding high schools meeting the 80% goal for students taking the MEAP test, because many students who did not participate in 11th

grade are returning as 12th graders to take the test. He said the Department does not have data yet on how many schools will meet that 80%, but have developed cohort database which would indicate the number of students in the Class of 2000 who took the test in 1998 as 11th graders, and in 1997 as 10th graders. He said the idea is to keep the scores together and use the student's best effort so they receive the benefit of the doubt.

Dr. Buch said whenever a system of this type is established, it is essentially putting labels on schools and categorizing them, otherwise it would be possible to simply publish raw data in newspapers and let people figure for themselves what it all means. She said part of the Department's responsibility is to determine the categories for the new accreditation program, and indicate their relationship to technical assistance efforts. She said they are as follows:

- (1) Exemplary Performance - 75% or more of the students meet or exceed state standards in all content areas (satisfactory or proficient). The content areas will change from time to time as the assessments change. Not all of the tests use the terms "meets or exceeds," but they are moving toward that. Conceptually, exemplary performance is when most of the students meet or exceed Michigan's high standards
- (2) High Performance - The school does not exhibit exemplary performance, but 50% or more of the students meet or exceed state standards in all content areas (satisfactory or proficient). The lowest score will drive the category of achievement so a school with two content areas where 75% of the students meet or exceed state standards, and one in the 50% range, would be considered at the High Performance Level.
- (3) Moderate Performance - The school does not exhibit high performance, but 25% or more of the students meet or exceed state standards in all content areas (satisfactory or proficient).
- (4) Low Performance - fewer than 25% of the students meet or exceed state standards (satisfactory or proficient) in one content area.

Mr. Bielawski said Improvement in Student Performance includes the Adequate Yearly Progress which will be calculated according to the procedure approved by the State Board of Education for Title I schools. He said for any content area where 75% or more of the students meet or exceed state standards or score in the highest classification for that content area, the Adequate Yearly Progress will not need to be calculated, because there is not much room for improvement.

Mr. Bielawski said Achievement for All Students ensures that schools are held accountable for the performance of all students. He said schools are required to disaggregate their achievement data, and analyze achievement gaps in their school improvement plans. He said staff is proposing the collection of data on gender and/or racial ethnic groups on the MEAP, so if a substantial gap is detected, schools will be held accountable to rectify that discrepancy. He said calculation will entail a similar formula to the Title I Annual Yearly Progress. He said MEAP staff have advised that there be a minimum threshold of ten students in a particular category before the calculation can be meaningful.

Mr. Bielawski said the School Improvement Results is a format for a self-assessment review and rating of the building-level School Improvement Plan which will identify strengths and weaknesses. He said each school will be required to submit this report on their School Improvement Plan to their intermediate school district so they may provide assistance if needed, and utilize the data in their improvement planning, professional development, and technical assistance. He said staff believe that it is reasonable to ask schools to identify and explain their strengths and weaknesses, and what plans are in place for improvement.

Dr. Buch said the four accreditation levels are as follows:

- (1) Summary Accredited Schools - in order to be a summary accredited school, a school would have to meet the participation target and have exemplary achievement. In the other three factors, the school would have to meet all of them, except that improvement in achievement would not be applicable since they are at the exemplary level. If the school had identified achievement gaps among groups, the targets for improvement in those gaps would have to be met in the majority of the identified gaps. A school can have a large number of identified gaps because of the number of content areas multiplied by gender, or by ethnic groups, so it would be hard to target all of them at once. Staff request that schools review their targets and meet them for the majority of the identified gaps. The intermediate school district would have to report for a summary accredited school that they complied with the school improvement standard support.
- (2) Schools Accredited with Recognition - the participation target would be met, have exemplary or high achievement, and meet two of the three, or all three of the accountability factors.
- (3) Accredited Schools - schools would meet the participation requirement, and have high achievement in two of the factors or moderate achievement in all three accountability factors.

- (4) Unaccredited Schools - schools are considered unaccredited if they do not meet the participation target and/or have low performance and/or the required number of accountability factors are not met for the higher level of accreditation.

Dr. Buch said one of the problems with the current system is that schools could reach a certain level, but it did not reflect any changes in the school that might require some assistance or targeting, or address needed areas for improvement in School Improvement Plan. She said the current plan also makes it seem that the next level was almost impossible to attain. She said staff realize that the Department is not going to have the resources to assist schools considered below the summary level under the new plan, but it does allow involvement with the district and the intermediate school district in a more systematic way. She said it also helps staff to prioritize technical assistance to unaccredited schools, and that is where the tie in with the Plan for Expanded Technical Assistance and Intervention for Low Performing Schools lies. She said the Office of Field Services will be able to provide some assistance through some grant programs, and assist in focusing priority and eligibility for the schools that need help the most.

Ms. Carnell said staff anticipate releasing the new accreditation system, and its status to school districts soon. She said the Department will release the accreditation status based on participation, as well as the Implementation of the Self-Assessment of School Improvement at the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year. She said it is expected that the entire system will be released in 2001-2002 making it operational, and adding on additional MEAP content areas as data become available.

X. RECESS

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:30 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

XI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- A. Ms. Joni Marie Williams, 509 Davis Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007. Ms. Williams offered comments regarding alleged neglect of her 11 year old special education son by Kalamazoo Public Schools' educationally impaired program.
- B. Ms. Melissa Prestine, 2090 Pokagon Highway, Niles, Michigan 49120. Ms. Prestine offered comments regarding the importance of early music education and what can be done to keep music in Michigan schools.
- C. Ms. Linda Myers, Michigan Educational Association, 1216 Kendale Boulevard, East Lansing, Michigan 48826. Ms. Myers offered comments regarding the proposed accreditation plan.
- D. Mr. Mathew M. McCusker, President-elect, Michigan Association of School

Boards, 1001 Centennial Way, Lansing, Michigan 48917. Mr. McCusker offered comments regarding the implementation plan for accountability based accreditation.

- E. Mr. Donald Olendorf, Public Education Advocates, 790 ½ South Paw Paw Street, Lawrence, Michigan 49064. Mr. Olendorf offered comments regarding the accountability based accreditation.

XII. PRESENTATION ON IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR ACCOUNTABILITY BASED ACCREDITATION (continued)

Mrs. Gire thanked staff for their information and presentation, and said she thinks the “Presentation on Plan for Expanded Technical Assistance and Intervention for Low Performing Schools” answered many questions the Board had regarding the beginnings of an intervention program. She said the Board does not want to set students and schools up for failure, and so must ensure that resources are available to promote success. She said it is imperative to develop a plan to build support in local school districts for the accountability based accreditation process so it does not suffer the same fate as the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) High School test. She said it would benefit all Michigan students if the entire educational community bought into this program as stakeholders to improve student success. She said professional development clearly gets addressed with the approach that was laid out earlier, and some commitments from several sources were made that may make it work.

Mrs. Gire expressed concern regarding the use of the MEAP test, and said she feels that a broader base would be better. She said discussions with staff have revealed that even though it will be difficult, there must be a way to include some other factors. She said parental involvement, school readiness, and school reading programs are factors that could be integrated in this process.

Mrs. Gire said it seems that there are already some accreditation policies in place, and it does not make sense to simply disregard them. She said it may be possible to add to them. She said one of her concerns is that staff are discussing some new labels which is always fraught with potential for back lash and problems. She asked why it is not possible to keep the existing labels, and if the Board wants to increase the number of schools receiving intervention, simply access the interim accreditation level and separate it into more than one category.

Mrs. Gire asked if staff had an idea of the approximate number of school buildings being placed in the new matrix. In response, Mr. Bielawski said he must qualify the numbers in that they came out of the 1999 MEAP tests which are still in the process of being updated. He said the 2000 4th, 5th, 7th, and 8th grade MEAP tests have already been given, and the High School MEAP test is underway. He said there are approximately 180 schools that are low in two or more content areas. He said 900 schools are low in one content area.

Mrs. Gire said that is a quantitative factor to work with. She said as policy makers, the Board must look at both the policy and politics of an issue, and she has many concerns regarding headlines that state 200 or more schools fail accreditation.

Mr. Bielawski said the old system essentially was designed to identify the worst of the worst, and schools got out of unaccredited status if they could get one score above 50%. He said it also treated reading as two separate tests, story and informational. He said it did not have an emphasis on achievement in all content areas, and there has been very little policy voice stating that achievement in all content areas is important.

Mrs. Gire agreed that all content areas are essential, but the Board must also look at more than scores. She said the headlines read that over half of the students end up in the “Not Yet Novice” category, and was defined as a failure even if that were not true. She said staff has only defined the matrices for the top two categories for the proposed labels, but she feels that most students will end up in the third category and will, once again, be deemed as failures. She said there are a lot of nuances that could have a serious effect on students.

Dr. Buch said Mrs. Gire has raised several issues, one of which is multiple measures. She said staff were looking at this accountability based accreditation system to measure whether or not schools are meeting or exceeding state standards, but if other methods of testing were added to the equation, it would not give an accurate picture of whether schools were meeting those standards. She said for this purpose the multiple measures of parental involvement would not be a factor in many equations. She said if the Board wanted to look at an accountability system that gave a clearer picture of the achievement and progress schools are making, the multiple measures of parental involvement as well as other factors would need to be included and implemented.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Dr. Buch said the proposed accountability system does not focus on how well students do on the MEAP tests, but if schools are meeting state standards. She said part of the confusion is that legislation requires a building based accreditation system, which raises the question of who is accountable for student learning, the district or the community. She said are school districts responsible for parental involvement and school readiness, or is that a larger issue that must be addressed by the community?

Mrs. Gire said staff presented information to the Board regarding graduation, attendance, and drop out rates at the May 1999 meeting, and discussed a broader system. Dr. Buch said some statistics are only applicable to the elementary or high school levels so staff thought they could be counted at the building level through the school improvement plan. She said the problem is that because of inconsistencies between plans, the same data are not collected at each school.

Mrs. Gire said there is a problem with school building accountability, and asked if, for example, a 4th grade student has been in five schools since Kindergarten, can a particular school building be held accountable for that child's performance on the MEAP test. She said there is a reference to working with, involving or collaborating with the whole community, but she thinks there are many different perceptions of what was meant when that was discussed at the May 1999, meeting. She said she envisioned that citizens from the community would be a part of the development process.

Mrs. Gire said the Goals 2000 project has been funded in different parts of the state to align the curriculum framework and standards. She asked how staff will merge that system with the proposed accountability process.

Ms. Carnell said the four initiatives of the Goals 2000 project are to clarify the benchmarks and make them more teacher friendly for instruction.

Mr. Ellis said this issue pertains to the financial setting of school districts which staff can provide to the Board if it wishes.

Ms. Carnell said the new system gives a clearer picture than the old accountability system as to the needs of the building and whether they are meeting state standards which will enable the Department to target technical assistance to schools with the most need. She said for schools which are low in just two levels, staff could work with the \$1.5 million for technical assistance. She said another type of professional development could be utilized for schools low in only one level.

Mr. Jenkins said at the end of the day, what really counts is student learning and achievement. He said the proposed accreditation system is the first step in identifying problems that schools are experiencing, and if the state does not take this action, momentum will not be gained and the Legislature may intervene. He said until problems are identified, some legislators will be glad to craft their own responses. He thanked staff for coming forward with their convictions and for working through many problems and concerns.

Mrs. Straus said she appreciates the efforts made by staff in bringing this information to the Board, but is particularly concerned regarding the number of schools which will require intensive technical assistance. She said she thinks the Board needs to be very careful in these definitions and how problems are addressed.

Mrs. Straus said one of her long time concerns has been who is responsible for the building accountability system. She said schools must do a better job, but they cannot do it alone. She said schools, communities, and county and state agencies must work together to ensure success. She said most people tend to only be concerned with the MEAP scores instead of how students and schools are doing. She said they do not know that the MEAP is based on academic content or curriculum. She said the Board has let it get out of

control, and the media has reported the data irresponsibly.

Dr. Buch said it is a challenge, and Section 1280 of the Revised School Code of 1976 states that the Department should develop an accreditation system for school buildings, which is what staff has tried to accomplish. She said a more comprehensive accountability system would require an additional policy of the Board. She said she thinks staff are confused because they want to work with accountability, but is caught by the building accreditation law. She said staff is getting some clearer thinking about what it is that it needs to do.

Mrs. Beardmore said after attending the meeting on April 7, 2000, of Department staff and representatives from interested education groups in the field, she prepared a memorandum to the State Board of Education. She said it was made abundantly clear that people are frustrated, did not feel they had been adequately represented, and wanted more input. She said when comparing what the Board had adopted at the May 1999, meeting with where the issue is now, they actually have heard and responded to much more than they may have realized. She said if accreditation's purpose is on a building by building basis to learn to what extent students have moved toward or have reached the state standards, and if that is the definition, then the MEAP is the defining device. She said as it has been pointed out frequently, in the School Code there is a requirement that the Board develop a system of accreditation that establishes exactly how students have or are reaching the state standards.

Mrs. Beardmore said at the May 1999, meeting the Board received information regarding accountability and its definition. She said the Board stated that it has pushed for that since the Blueprint for Action was adopted in 1984, and encouraged that accreditation be part of PA 25 in 1990. She said when the conversation shifted from accreditation to accountability, the Board stated that it did not want to lose accreditation, and since then it has been called accreditation/accountability. She suggested that the Board separate these two terms, and said that the proposed accreditation process is complying with the law. She said the amount of participation, the level of achievement and improvement, closing the gap, and developing and utilizing a school improvement plan building by building is absolutely appropriate. She encouraged the Board to adopt this process when it is presented for approval.

Mrs. Beardmore said accountability is not mandated by law, and therefore, the Board could establish accountability activities and determine what should be included. She said as stated in her memorandum to the Board, that would entail more than what people are doing with achievement, and require broader criteria which would involve the entire community. She said it is the responsibility of the community and state to ensure that all children are successful in acquiring the knowledge and skills defined in the Curriculum Standards, Benchmarks and Framework. She said the Board has established curriculum standards in other areas which are not part of the MEAP tests, for example, the importance of music was discussed during the public participation earlier in the meeting.

She said many questions have been raised such as: (1) what services do public and private agencies provide; (2) how are funding and services provided and coordinated between state departments; (3) are parents and community members included in the decision making on education matters, and are they welcome to volunteer; (4) are parenting and budgeting skill training available for adults who need them; and (5) where is the community commitment to schools. She said she strongly believes that schools cannot do it alone, but the community must be involved. She said it is unfair to blame schools if children do not perform well in school because of attendance problems, language barriers, or if they move frequently. She said there are many factors which could prevent children from doing well. She said she would like the Board to separate accreditation from accountability, and accept the information presented in this item as accreditation.

Dr. Moyer said even though Mr. Jenkins mentioned that this is a good first step, he feels that the Board has been working on this issue for the past four or five years and has identified schools in need of assistance through the process.

Mr. Ellis said even though the law mandates an accreditation system, the Department holds no liability with non compliance because the Legislature has continually changed the law, which prevents the collection of three years of information. He said the Board has a unique opportunity to begin anew with the proposed system, and should take advantage of the situation.

Mr. Weiser said even though the Department is viewing this as a diagnostic tool, it is neither a judgment nor a death sentence, and some people have focused on all of the negative aspects of what is a very positive process. She said Mrs. Gire is correct about gathering all the educational people in the state and trying to make it work. She said the problem for the Board is that it is the body charged with the constitutional responsibility for K-12 education, and it must maintain an educational integrity. She said the Board is trying to acknowledge and publicize that problems exist so that people can do better, and the MEAP tests are the best measure for accreditation. She said she thinks there are other measures for accountability and it helps people understand by separating them. She said she is anxious to make sure that accreditation is on track because schools cannot start finding out how they rate unless the Board is willing to give them a fair and accurate judgment.

Mr. Warren commended staff for developing this process and said he realizes that it was a long process. He said a review of the Board agendas over the last couple of years reveals that there have been no less than six agenda items from May 1998 until now dealing with the accreditation process. He said this is an open Board, there has been much opportunity for people to give their input, and the team has made significant changes based on that. He said he thinks the Board should acknowledge that and applaud them for being diligent and moving forward with the assistance they have had. He agreed with Mrs. Beardmore in that there is a distinction between accountability and accreditation, and as a policy making Board, the State Board of Education has a constitutionally charged responsibility.

Mr. Warren said Section 380.1280 of the Revised School Code of 1976, subsection 5 states that “The standards for accreditation or summary accreditation under this section shall include pupil performance on Michigan education assessment program (MEAP) tests and the percentage of pupils achieving state endorsement under section 1279 as criteria, but shall not be based solely on pupil performance on MEAP tests or on the percentage of pupils achieving state endorsement under section 1279. The standards shall also include multiple year change in pupil performance on MEAP tests and multiple year change in the percentage of pupils achieving...” He said the Board has no option but to abide by the law and rely on the MEAP tests. He said that is what has been done in the past, but maybe the Legislature should be approached regarding the elimination of the accreditation process, or the MEAP tests as the critical determinate. He said he does not support that action, but believes that the Board should abide by the law as it exists and try to do the best it can.

Mr. Warren said he thinks the current proposal does comply with existing legislation, and there will be another hearing process where the Board may solicit additional input. He said in the end, the Board must make the decision because it has the constitutionally charged responsibility and represents children in Michigan, not necessarily the special interest groups. He said by doing what it thinks is best for public education in Michigan, the Board may not make some groups happy.

Mr. Warren said he thinks Mrs. Beardmore’s point on accountability is excellent, and he has considered in the past that the Board should move forward with an accountability program which is based on Constitutional authority and input from educational organizations, citizens of Michigan, and hearings and consultation with others. He said hopefully the Board will develop a comprehensive accountability standard which will be consistent with, but independent from and supplemental to, the accreditation program. He said it would be something that would effectuate a fundamental change in public education for the good, somewhat like the Board did for the “Presentation on Plan for Expanded Technical Assistance and Intervention for Low Performing Schools.” He said the Board could expand that and be pro active as a policy making authority to push an agenda to help struggling schools move forward.

Mrs. Gire said if the Board makes a commitment to follow the Revised School Code of 1976, it should follow it to the letter. She said the School Code does refer to the importance of holding statewide public hearings for the purpose of receiving testimony regarding the standards, but it is not a question of whether people are happy or not. She said if schools in Michigan are adamantly opposed to the process and the way it is going, the program will fail. She said the Board has a goal of improving public education and what children learn, but must have the cooperation of schools to succeed. She said staff have not addressed her question regarding more involvement of professionals which she believes is a sticking point. In response, Ms. Carnell said based on discussion today and the meeting of April 7, it is imperative that staff have a cooperative agreement with educational agencies and organizations in order to make this work. She said as mentioned

earlier in the meeting, the cooperation of the entire educational community is essential for the success of this program.

Mrs. Gire asked how staff would achieve that goal. In response, Ms. Carnell said a meeting is scheduled in May which would be the second step in this process. She said much input has already been received from the April 7 meeting, and discussion has been held regarding either developing a task force or continuing with two separate committees. She said that is something that staff will have to work out with educational agencies and organizations, but needs to engage the Board in conversation before that is done.

In response to Dr. Moyer, Mr. Ellis said the "Presentation on Implementation Plan of Accountability Based Accreditation," is a prototype, and the Board must allow staff the time to work within its parameters. He said for example, the Special Education Rules Task Force began development in 1994 and may present its final recommendation to the Board sometime in the future. He said it is the involvement of every constituency in the process that takes so much time. He encouraged the Board to express their opinions, but cautioned them to be aware that the process must be followed.

Ms. Carnell said that process and the resulting time line will depend on whether the Board can reach consensus regarding the presentation. She said if the task at hand is to create an accountability system separate and comprehensive from accreditation, then the time line may be shorter. She said if the task is to create an accountability system that ensures schools are complying with state standards, that will take a little bit longer.

Mr. Ellis suggested that staff update the Board prior to the May 18, 2000 meeting regarding the status of this proposal.

Mrs. Beardmore said the problem with literally following the law, is that there may be parts of it which are obsolete. She said it is realistic to state that the Board can follow the direction of the law, and still separate accreditation and accountability.

Dr. Williamson said in most states accountability is governmental, and accreditation is the reach for excellence. He said it was realized some time ago that in Michigan, the terms accreditation and accountability were used differently than in other states in that they are reversed so staff has struggled with that issue. He said in Michigan accreditation means what is in the law.

Dr. Buch said staff is trying to determine if it is possible to hold public hearings and consultations with the organizations, and return to the Board with feedback by the July meeting.

Mrs. Beardmore said the concerns that have been expressed are about the expansion of other factors that need to be considered in addition to academic achievement and progress. She said the MEAP tests are really the only true measurable way to determine

progress and level of achievement. She said that can be the basis of accreditation by Michigan's definition of terms. She said except for Mrs. Gire's concern about titles and going from three areas to four, she think that the Board could work that out and approve accreditation based on these standards that are here. She said the broader accountability issue will take more time, but the Board has received pertinent information regarding the first step and the upcoming hearings.

Mr. Bielawski said over the last six years or so, Michigan has had a major revolution regarding the requirement of schools to use standardized testing, and schools have tied the federal policies to the state assessments and the state standards. He said as a result, many schools are reluctant to drop those tests, however, others are finding them increasingly irrelevant and so are eliminating them. He said he thinks there will be a problem with going back and asking schools to undertake the mandate and burden of additional expenditures for testing in areas that they already know.

No action was taken on this item.

XIII. RECESS

The Board recessed at 3:05 p.m. and reconvened at 3:30 p.m.

XIV. APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF ENGLISH TEACHERS; APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF MATHEMATICS TEACHERS; APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS; APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF JOURNALISM TEACHERS

Dr. Carolyn Logan, Director, Office of Professional Preparation; Dr. Catherine Smith, Supervisor, Program Preparation and Continuing Education; and Ms. Sue Wittick, Education Consultant, Office of Professional Preparation Services, provided information and responded to questions from the Board regarding the proposed standards for English, mathematics, journalism, and physical education teachers.

Dr. Logan thanked staff in the Office of School Excellence for their assistance with the curriculum portion of these documents. She said the standards presented to the Board for approval reflect the collaboration between the Office of School Excellence and the Office of Professional Preparation.

Ms. Wittick said the standards were developed by referent committees that represent higher education institutions, K-12 teachers, and other stake holding organizations. She said after the standards were developed, they are submitted for review and feedback through mailings and forums to provide an opportunity for additional input. She said the

suggestions and comments received are reviewed by the referent committee and ultimately submitted for adoption by the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers.

Ms. Wittick said the standards for the preparation of English, mathematics, journalism, and physical education teachers presented to the Board for approval are a part of the series of standards which will come before the Board over the coming months.

Ms. Wittick said several changes to these four documents have been suggested. The new language, shown in italics type, is as follows

- (1) Proposal to the Michigan Board of Education for the Preparation of English Teachers:

Section 3.4.1 - "...in a variety of rhetorical contexts, *including the mechanical and technical conventions of standard written and spoken English (e.g. grammar, punctuation, and spelling).*"

Section 3.2.2 - it was suggested that staff identify what is meant by classic literature by providing some examples of authors of classic literature. That information will be added in a parenthetical expression.

- (2) Proposal to the Michigan State Board of Education for the Preparation of Mathematics Teachers:

Section 1.5.2 - "...four basic operations (*addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division*)..."

Section 2.5 - "...concepts in grades K-8, *including prenumeration concepts; numbers (whole numbers, fractions, decimals, percents) and their relationships; four basic operations with positive and negative rational numbers; geometric concepts and spatial visualization; measurement concepts and procedures; algebraic concepts; logical conjectures and conclusions using words such as all, some and none; concepts of probability and elementary data analysis; and mathematical concepts in grades 5-8. See Michigan Curriculum Framework, 1996, page 46-62, and its successor documents).*"

Mrs. Beardmore said the other change that was suggested is wherever it states "See Michigan Curriculum Framework" and then the page numbers were listed, it was her recommendation that staff identify the "Michigan Curriculum Framework, 1996" which is a particular framework document. She said this would clarify which version was being referred to in case there were modifications to the document or changes in page numbers in the future.

- (3) Proposal to the Michigan State Board of Education for the Preparation of Physical Education Teachers:

Section 4.0 - “The teacher *knows, understands, plans and implements...*”

Sections 4.2.1; 4.2.2; 4.2.3; 4.2.4; 4.2.5; 4.2.6; 4.2.7; 4.2.8; 4.2.9; 4.2.10; 4.2.11; 4.2.12; 5.0; 5.2.1; 5.2.2; 5.2.3; 5.2.4; 5.2.5; and 5.2.6 - “The teacher *knows and understands...*”

Sections 4.3.1; 4.3.2; 4.3.3; 4.3.4; 4.3.5; 4.3.6; 4.3.7; 4.3.8; 4.3.9; 5.3.1; 5.3.2; 5.3.3; 5.3.4; and 5.3.5 - “The teacher *demonstrates...*”

- (4) Proposal to the Michigan State Board of Education for the Preparation of Journalism Teachers

Section 2.4 - “information and their rights *and responsibilities.*”

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Beardmore, that the State Board of Education approve proposed standards for the preparation of English, mathematic, journalism, and physical education teachers, as discussed in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated March 29, 2000, as amended.

Mrs. Straus said the main thrust behind these new standards is to raise the level of understanding of teachers and bring them more into the 21st Century, and include technology and to be more multi culturally aware. She said she thinks the Board has been heading in that direction for a long time. She said she is pleased that the teacher preparation institutions were included in the deliberations and development, and will, therefore, abide by the proposals.

In response to Mrs. Weiser, Ms. Wittick said teachers who hold an English endorsement typically teach at the middle school and secondary level. She said staff will present an endorsement in reading and reading specialists to the Board at the May 18, 2000 meeting. She said these specifications for reading are not addressed in the English standards.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser

Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

XV. UPDATE ON EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION

Ms. Kate McAuliffe, Assistant Superintendent, provided information on the following bills:

<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Description</u>
SB 787	Coach Background Check: Amends the Revised School Code to require a criminal background check prior to hiring an interscholastic coach.
HB 5352	Character Development: Amends the Revised School Code to require school curricula to include character development programs beginning in the 2000-2001 school year.

Mrs. Beardmore said she has received input from someone in her community who expressed interest in regarding HB 5352. She informed this person that the State Board of Education adopted a Character Education Policy at its October 24, 1996 meeting. She said this citizen has written a substitute to the proposed legislation which was introduced and is currently working with Representative Valde Garcia on this issue. She said the citizen's version of the law stipulates that upon enactment, the State Board of Education should revise its policy or the law would supercede that policy. She informed the citizen that the law should not work that way, and she feels a mandate is not necessary. She said there are a number of programs and schools which are doing many of these things, partially in response to the Board's policy.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education take a position of nonsupport of House Bill 5352.

Mrs. Straus expressed concern regarding HB 5352, and said she has seen information on Character First which is a Christian dominated curriculum and would be completely unconstitutional. She said she agrees with Mrs. Beardmore that HB 5352 is unnecessary.

Mrs. Gire said she would be uncomfortable without endorsing a specific character education program, especially since the Board has not had an opportunity to review it. She said she hesitates to be too hard, and would hope that if the Board opposes HB 5352, then Ms. McAuliffe will provide an interpretive comment at a future Board meeting.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Ms. McAuliffe said if HB 5352 is enacted, school districts will be mandated to adopt a character education curriculum.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

HB 4839/HB 4692 Shared Time: Amends the Revised School Code and the School Aid Act to provide reimbursement.

Mrs. Straus said the Charlotte decision many years ago indicated that home schooled students could, if they chose, participate in non core curriculum classes. She questioned whether students would want to take core curriculum classes in a public school if they were already being home schooled.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. McGuire, that the State Board of Education take a position of nonsupport of House Bills 4839 and 4692.

Mr. Ellis said that there is a growing consensus in the Legislature and the Attorney General's Office that the Charlotte ruling may not be appropriate for today's school structures.

Mr. Warren said the Charlotte case established a bifurcation which is probably obsolete and is based on a case precedence law that has been overturned. He said he has done much research on this particular issue in addition to the most recent case law, and has found that the trend is to go the other way, an infringement of the free exercise clause to deny nonpublic school students the right to attend a public school. He said it is also a complicated constitutional and policy issue, and he feels that the proposed law is based on existing 25 year old case law that has been overturned by current U.S. Supreme Court decisions. He said half of the Parochial Amendment was thrown out as unconstitutional because of precedence and the free exercise clause.

Mr. Warren said he supports that concept because any student should be entitled to go to a public school because parents pay taxes and are constituents of the district. He said the Board is an advocate of public education, and he does not know how it can prohibit a student from attending a public school simply because there are typically home schooled.

Mrs. Straus said the law currently states that a home schooled student may attend a public school.

Mr. Warren said they can only attend a public school for non core classes, but if they want to attend a math and science center they should be allowed that opportunity, and the Board should encourage that.

Mrs. Straus said that is a different interpretation of the proposed law and the Board's responsibility.

Mr. Warren said it depends on how you define a public school student. He said they are children whose parents live in the state of Michigan and pay taxes, and live in the school district. He asked why should they be denied the right to go to the public school for a core class just because they are home schooled.

Ms. McAuliffe said the other complication in this issue is what is considered core and what is not core. She said it is much easier to define at the high school level, but elementary school classrooms are not as clearly defined. She said there will probably be a substitute offered that would allow a school the option of whether it will want to participate or not.

Mrs. Beardmore suggested that it may be premature for the Board to take a position at this time.

The vote was taken on the motion

Ayes: McGuire, Straus

Nays: Beardmore, Gire, Moyer, Warren, Weiser

Absent: Wise

The motion failed.

HB 5212	Annual Report: Amends the educational requirements in the Revised School Code governing the local annual report.
---------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mrs. Beardmore said many people have expressed a desire to rate districts, and generate a consumer report on the school as if there were no one else in that community who had responsibilities toward student achievement. She said if HB 5212 were enacted, expenditures from the Department would be involved, and therefore, she would like to know where those funds would come from. She expressed concern that even if a school did not appear to be doing well on the proposed report, it could still be a quality school with much to offer students and parents.

Ms. McAuliffe said that is one of the basic concerns with the bill. She said the other question people have asked is what do parents really want to know. She said HB 5212 requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review the data collection every few years in partnership with representatives of the community including realtors and parent/teacher associations.

Ms. McAuliffe said the Department of Education's budget bill has passed the Senate, and has been referred to the House Education Committee for review. She said members of the House Education Committee have indicated that they will not hold a hearing until after they travel to Benton Harbor Public Schools to receive public input.

XVI. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION SELECTION PROCESS

Mrs. Beardmore said in cooperation with staff in the Department of Management and Budget, Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary, issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to search firms. She said the deadline for receiving responses was Monday, April 10, 2000. She said at its March 16, 2000, meeting, the Board established a meeting date of April 17, 2000 to determine which search firms would be allowed to make presentations. She said only three responses were received, and therefore, she suggested that the April 17 meeting will not be necessary. She said the Board had also set a tentative meeting for May 2, 2000, to take place in the Detroit area so search firms coming from out of state would not have to travel to Lansing.

Mrs. Beardmore said two Board members have now expressed conflicts for May 2, and so it is necessary to determine an alternate date for the presentations to take place. She said it is important that all Board members have an opportunity to attend the presentations and be part of the resulting decision of who will conduct the superintendent search. She said she feels that the meeting should take place during the first four days of May.

Mrs. Hamilton reminded the Board that May 4, is the Teacher of the Year luncheon.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Mrs. Hamilton said she did not think it would be feasible to meet prior to May 1. She said the RFP actually stipulated May 2, and it would, therefore, be difficult for those companies to be prepared much earlier than that date.

Mrs. Straus said she has a speaking commitment at 9:00 on May 1.

Mrs. Beardmore suggested that the meeting could take place in the afternoon of that day. She said each presenter would be allowed an hour to an hour and half, and so an afternoon meeting would be feasible for May 1.

A show of hands indicated that Mrs. Straus was the only Board member present who could not attend a meeting on May 1.

Mr. Warren offered the use of Honigman, Miller, Schwartz, and Cohn as a possible meeting place.

Mrs. Beardmore said an offer has graciously been offered by Wayne Regional Educational Service Agency.

There was consensus to meet in the Detroit area at 1:00 p.m. on May 1, 2000, to hear formal presentations from the three search firms that submitted proposals.

Mrs. Beardmore said Mrs. Hamilton will verify that the three search firms as well as Mrs. Wise will be able to attend a meeting on that day.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education cancel its scheduled meeting of April 17, 2000.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

XVII. APPROVAL OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR THE TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

Mr. Warren said he asked that this item be removed from the consent agenda because of its connection with the Partnerships for Success. He said this item sets the criteria for the Title I School Improvement Funds which strongly encourages state educational agencies to target local education agencies to schools with the greatest need for assistance, and provide each recipient with an amount large enough to effectively leverage school improvement.

Mr. Warren expressed concern that the proposed criteria recommends distribution of a small amount of money to many schools instead of focusing on targeted schools with the greatest need. He said if the Board identified the schools with the most particular need, then he believes it would be more advantageous than spreading the money around thinly even though the distribution must be tied to the Michigan Educational Assessment Program tests.

Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Superintendent for Education Services, said much of what the Department does with accreditation is tied to federal program requirements. He said the proposed criteria must be tied to the lowest performing schools as measured by the state testing system. He said staff has recommended that the Board target schools who are below standard in two of the tested subject areas which is estimated to be approximately 90 schools. He said on that basis, staff believes that the payout for available grant sources will average \$60,000 per school. He said if the Board wants to target schools that are not meeting standards in three of the tested areas, that would reduce the number of school buildings to somewhere between 40 and 50, and would increase the resources available for buildings to approximately \$110,000 or \$115,000. He said this is a Title I program, and if the Department is to receive funding in this cycle, staff must submit a plan based on a criteria to the United States Department of Education by May 1, 2000. He said if a decision cannot be made and the funds are not received, the Department will receive money in the second funding cycle but that is really a 12 month funding cycle.

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mrs. Straus, that the State Board of Education approve modified eligibility criteria for the Title I school improvement funds described in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated March 29, 2000, ,to target schools who are below standards in at least three of the subject areas.

In response to Mrs. Beardmore, Dr. Williamson said one element of the federal program is to encourage breaking down geographic boundaries of schools. He said it is true that schools must commit to opening up the boundaries to let children attend higher performing schools, but he does not believe there is a restriction of how much of the resources may be used in that element of the program. He said that is also not a consideration with staff who review the applications. He said they only consider commitments to systemic change.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Dr. Williamson said this program is another element of technical assistance as discussed earlier in the meeting by the Board. He said staff have placed it in the strengthening practice area. He said many of these schools will receive the \$65,000 for comprehensive school reform, and staff anticipates it will make the comprehensive school reform effort that much more focused and stronger in these buildings. He said this will be used to synergize resources, not to create additional add on programs.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

XVIII. REPORT ON CONSENT AGENDA

- J. Approval of Eligibility Criteria for the Title I School Improvement Funds - removed from consent agenda and placed under discussion items
- K. Approval of Criteria for Competitive Grants Under Part C (Early Intervention Services) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- L. Receive the Report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council for Alma College and Approve the Professional Education Unit and the Specialty Studies Programs

- M. Receive the Report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council for the University of Detroit Mercy and Approve the Professional Education Unit and Specialty Studies Programs
- N. Approval of Recommendation of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Status Report on the University of Michigan - Flint Teacher Preparation Program
- O. Approval of Special Education State Plan as Required for Application for Funds Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- P. Approval of Appointments to the Special Education Advisory Committee

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mrs. Weiser, that the State Board of Education approve the items listed on the consent agenda as follows:

- J. this item was removed from the consent agenda and placed under discussion items;**
- K. approve the Criteria for Competitive Grants Under Part C (Early Intervention Services) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as identified in the Attachment of the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 29, 2000;**
- L. (1) receive the report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council on the Alma College professional education unit and specialty studies programs; (2) conditionally approve the Alma College professional education unit (initial level) for two years (1999-2001); (3) approve the Alma College initial/undergraduate-level English; speech; psychology (secondary major and minor, elementary major); Sociology; Social Studies; Biology; Chemistry; Physics; Music Education (secondary and K-12 majors); Art Education; Health, Physical Education and Recreation; and Early Childhood Education programs for five years (1999-2004); (4) approve, with strengths noted, the Alma College initial/undergraduate-level General Science, French, German, and Spanish programs for five years (1999-2004); (5) approve, with weaknesses noted, the Alma College initial/undergraduate-level History and Business Administration programs for two years (1999-2001); and (6) conditionally approve, the Alma College initial/undergraduate-level Economics; Political Science; Psychology (elementary minor); and Music Education (elementary and secondary minor) programs for two years (1999-2001), as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 29, 2000;**

- M. (1) receive the report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council on the University of Detroit Mercy professional education unit and specialty studies programs; (2) conditionally approve the University of Detroit Mercy professional education unit (initial and advanced levels) for two years (1999-2001); (3) approve the University of Detroit Mercy initial/undergraduate-level Language Arts, English, Speech, Social Studies, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Business Education, Health, Computer Science, Emotionally Impaired, Learning Disabilities, Early Childhood Education, and Waldorf Education programs for five years (1999-2004); (4) approve the University of Detroit Mercy advanced/graduate-level Computer Science, Guidance and Counseling, Emotionally Impaired, Learning Disabilities, Early Childhood, General Elementary K-5 (for secondary certificate), Preliminary School Psychologist, and Curriculum and Instruction programs for five years (1999-2004); (5) approve, with weaknesses noted, the University of Detroit Mercy initial/undergraduate-level Biology, Chemistry, and Physics programs for two years (1999-2001); and (6) conditionally approve the University of Detroit Mercy initial/undergraduate-level General Science program for two years (1999-2001), as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 29, 2000;**
- N. approve the University of Michigan - Flint History, Political Science, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics, and General Science (elementary and secondary) specialty studies programs until the next full Periodic Review/Program Evaluation review, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 29, 2000;**
- O. approve the State Plan for Special Education for Federal Fiscal Year 2000 for transmittal to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated April 7, 2000; and**
- P. approve the nominees listed in Attachment B of the Superintendent's memorandum of March 29, 2000, and appoint those individuals to serve as members of the Special Education Advisory Committee for the respective terms so specified.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Wise

The motion carried.

XIX. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

- Q. Human Resources Report
- R. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers
- S. Report on a Modification to the Previously Approved Clare-Gladwin Regional Educational Service District Special Education Plan
- T. 1999-2000 Parent Involvement and Education Grant Program
- U. 1999-2000 Competitive Mini Grant to Revise the High School HIV/STD Prevention Program
- V. Full-Day Services in Michigan School Readiness and Head Start Programs
- W. State Improvement Grant (SIG)
- X. Title II - Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Improving America's Schools Act
- Y. Annual Report on the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification
- Z. Goals 2000 Cycle 10

Mr. Ellis provided an oral report on the following:

- A. Berrien County

On behalf of the State Board of Education, Mr. Ellis thanked Berrien County Intermediate School District for hosting the April 13, 2000, Board meeting, and said the support received for the meeting was very much appreciated. He said the Board should have noticed Southwestern Michigan is significantly different socially, and culturally in how they relate to one another. He said this part of the state will function very well with the Department of Career Development (DCD), and Berrien County has been the prototype of many proposed policies which are now in the process of being implemented.

Mrs. Straus said the Board has requested that Ms. Barbara Bolin, Director, Department of Career Development, be invited to discuss policy and administrative issues with the Board at its next meeting as a result of the transfer of staff from the Department of Education to the DCD.

Mr. Jerry Reimann, Superintendent, Berrien County Intermediate School District, thanked Mr. Ellis and the Board, and said Berrien County is proud of many of the programs at the intermediate school district. He extended an invitation to the Board to hold its meeting in Berrien County again in the future.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board has, for approximately fifteen years, taken steps to promote career development. She said this is not a new initiative implemented by the DCD. She said she thinks that the focus on the new department and the support from the administration that it receives bodes well for students throughout Michigan. She emphasized that it is important for Ms. Bolin to hold discussion with the Board very soon.

XX. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

There were no awards and/or recognitions presented at the meeting.

XXI. APPROVAL OF CHANGES FOR THE HOME ECONOMICS ENDORSEMENT

This item was removed from the agenda.

XXII. REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE REGARDING SCHOOL SAFETY

There was no report by subcommittee regarding school safety.

XXIII. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

There were no comments by State Board of Education members.

XXIV. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Board members were asked to submit agenda items for the May meeting to the Administrative Secretary. Mr. Ellis said Department staff, the Board President, and Vice President would be meeting within the next couple of weeks to develop and finalize the agenda.

XXV. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. May 18, 2000
- B. June 22, 2000
- C. July 20, 2000
- D. August 24, 2000

XXVI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert S. Moyer
Secretary