

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

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

July 15, 1999
9:30 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 A. Wise, Treasurer
Mrs. Sharon Gire, NASBE Delegate
Mr. Clark Durant
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire

Absent: Mrs. Eileen L. Weiser
Governor John Engler, ex officio

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Ellis called the meeting to order at 9:50 a.m.

II. AGENDA MATERIALS

- A. State Board of Education Minutes/Actions of Meeting of June 24, 1999
- B. Grant Awards - Funding for Career and Technical Programs - 1998-99 under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Public Law 101-392
- C. Grant Awards - Even Start Family Literacy Program
- D. Grant Awards - 1999-2000 Homeless Students' Assistance Grants Programs
- E. Grant Awards - Child Care and Development Fund Grant Program for Three-Year-Old Children, the Three-Year-Old Preschool Program
- F. Grant Awards - Michigan School Readiness Competitive Grant Program
- G. Grant Award - Michigan School Readiness Program Evaluation Grant

- H. Grant Awards - Approval for Child Care and Development Fund for School-Age Child Care

III. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED TO BOARD

- A. Information Regarding Warwick Pointe Academy - Memorandum dated July 12, 1999, from Superintendent to the Board

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

- A. Funding for Career and Technical Programs -1998-99 Under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Public Law 101-392 - added to agenda
- B. Even Start Family Literacy Program - added to agenda
- C. 1999-2000 Homeless Students' Assistance Grants - added to agenda
- D. Child Care and Development Fund Grant Program for Three-Year-Old Children, the Three-Year-Old Preschool Program - added to agenda
- E. Michigan School Readiness Competitive Grant Program - added to agenda
- F. Michigan School Readiness Program Evaluation Grant - added to agenda
- G. Child Care and Development Fund for School-Age Child Care - added to agenda
- H. Approval of Criteria for the 1999-2000 Goals 2000 Grant Program - Cycle 9 - added to agenda
- I. Approval of Proposal from the University of Michigan - Flint for a New Fine Arts Program as a Group Major and a Group Minor at the Elementary Level - removed from agenda
- J. Report on Educational Legislation - removed from agenda
- K. Approval of Continuation Grant Application to Centers for Disease Control for FY 2000 Funding for HIV/STD Prevention; Expanded Program in Health Education and Infrastructure for School Health Programs, and the Criteria for Special Project Grants in the Above Areas for FY 2000 - removed from agenda

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

The vote was taken on the motion.

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

The motion carried.

V. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS AND GUESTS

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

VI. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

There were no awards and/or recognitions presented at the State Board of Education meeting.

VII. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES/ACTIONS

- A. Approval of Record of the Committee of the Whole Meeting of June 23, 1999.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education approve the record of the Committee of the Whole meeting of June 23, 1999.

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

The motion carried.

- B. Approval of State Board of Education Minutes/Actions of Meeting of June 24, 1999.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mrs. Straus, that the State Board of Education approve the minutes/actions of the meeting of June 24, 1999.

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

The motion carried.

VIII. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

The following items were provided to the Board:

- A. Report on Personnel Status
- B. Report on Department of Education Cosponsorships
- C. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers
- D. Report on Proprietary Schools
- E. Report on 1998-2001 Intermediate School District Plans for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services
- F. Report on the 1998-2001 Michigan Department of Corrections Prison Schools Plan for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services
- CC. Funding for Career and Technical Programs - 1998-99 Under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Public Law 101-392
- DD. Even Start Family Literacy Program
- EE. 1999-2000 Homeless Students' Assistance Grants
- FF. Child Care and Development Fund Grant Program for Three-Year-Old Children, the Three-Year-Old Preschool Program
- GG. Michigan School Readiness Competitive Grant Program
- HH. Michigan School Readiness Program Evaluation Grant
- II. Child Care and Development Fund for School-Age Child Care

Mrs. Beardmore said the approval process for the grant awards has changed since the Supreme Court upheld Executive Order 1996-12, and as a result of conversation held yesterday, she is responsible for the appearance of the seven grant award items presented in the Board members' agenda folders and Report of the Superintendent. She apologized to the Board for the short notice and promised that they will be presented in a more timely manner in the future.

Mr. Ellis provided an oral report on the following:

A. Detroit Reform Board

Mr. Ellis referred to an article in the Detroit News titled, Major School Changes Urged, dated July 15, 1999, and suggested that the Board read it carefully. He said he believes it identifies the immensity of the problems facing Detroit Public Schools, and provides a framework of critical areas for the public.

B. Changes in Department of Education Procedure as a Result of the Executive Orders

Mr. Ellis said he and Mrs. Beardmore have been working together on implementation of the Executive Order, and share a common frustration on how to bring closure to the last three or four items. He said as soon as schedules permit, further consultations will be made.

IX. CONSENT AGENDA

G. Approval of Criteria for the 1999-2000 Grants to Provide Technical Assistance for Low Achieving Schools - removed from consent agenda and placed under discussion items

H. Approval of Criteria for the 1999-2000 Goals 2000 Grant Program - Cycle 9 - added to agenda

I. Adoption of Resolution Honoring Linda Bruin

J. Appointment of a Committee of Scholars to Review Cleary College, Ann Arbor, Michigan, for Authority to Grant a Master of Business Administration Degree

Mrs. Beardmore said Item G, Approval of Criteria for the 1999-2000 Grants to Provide Technical Assistance for Low Achieving Schools, is part of the funding of existing programs working with school districts and buildings which have the greatest difficulty in meeting the standards and benchmarks, and as part of the effort in providing technical assistance to low achieving schools. She said staff have also been working on a new process for accountability/accreditation, and because it is a very complex matter, she wished to make a statement requesting the involvement of many of the groups that work with the Board.

Mrs. Beardmore said for several months the State Board of Education has been encouraging staff in the development of a new system of accountability/accreditation for schools. She said at its May 20, 1999 meeting, the Board approved a framework which, when complete, will define schools as "summary," "with recognition,"

“moderate,” or “low” level of academic achievement, via MEAP and other criteria. She said the intent is continuous improvement of student achievement, and adequate yearly progress in student achievement must be shown in each level.

Mrs. Beardmore said it is important for all elements of the education community to be part of determining how these results may be attained. She said without full participation and support, education in Michigan cannot improve adequately, and Michigan students will be ill-prepared for the future. She said, therefore, the Board invites groups such as the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB), Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA), Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP), Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association (MEMSPA), Michigan Education Association (MEA), Michigan Federation of Teachers (MFT), parent/teacher associations, Middle Cities Association, Michigan Association of Public School Academies (MAPSA), representatives from the Governor’s office, and from the Legislature to work with Department staff to determine how to reach the goal of improved academic achievement and in closing the gap between and among various populations in Michigan education.

Mrs. Beardmore said it is vitally important that everyone involved with education work together to develop this process, and the Criteria for the 1999-2000 Grants to Provide Technical Assistance for Low Achieving Schools item is a small part of the continuous school improvement procedure, which actually began in 1986 and has been a long term endeavor.

Mrs. Gire and Dr. Moyer offered support for Mrs. Beardmore’s statement, and Dr. Moyer said many people addressed the Board at the June meeting regarding the concept of collaboration. He said he realizes that staff is under a great deal of pressure relative to various time lines, but this is going to cause the Department to step back and see the broader perspective and will make implementation later on much easier.

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

- G. (this item was removed from the consent agenda, and placed under discussion items);**
- H. approve the criteria for the 1999-2000 Goals 2000 Grants Programs - Cycle 9, as described in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated June 30, 1999;**
- I. adopt the resolution honoring Linda Bruin, as attached to the Superintendent’s memorandum dated July 12, 1999;**

- J. approve the Appointment of a Committee of Scholars to review Cleary College's request to grant a Master of Business Administration degree with committee members being Keith Clouten, Library Director, Andrews University, to review library; Maureen A. Fay, President, University of Detroit Mercy, to review housing space and administrative facilities; David E. Fry, President, Northwood University, to review curriculum; and Frederick Whims, Professor, Michigan State University, to review faculty credentials as contained in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999. Such appointment and review being in accordance with the educational sections of Act 327, P.A. of 1931, as amended.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Beardmore, Durant, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Wise
Absent: Weiser**

The motion carried.

The resolution honoring Linda Bruin is attached as Exhibit A.

- X. APPROVAL OF CRITERIA FOR THE 1999-2000 GRANTS TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS**

Mrs. Gire said she requested that this item be removed from the consent agenda because staff has worked very hard on the new accreditation/accountability process, and she questioned whether the groups receiving the grant were working in conjunction with the Department's efforts.

Dr. Smolen said this item has been written with the new configuration in mind. She said the criterion for the negotiated grants have been altered slightly, and therefore, Board approval is necessary.

In response to Mrs. McGuire, Dr. Buch said schools where fewer than 25% of the students score in the highest level, and do not show improved student achievement receive the most intense technical assistance. She said it would be reasonable to expect assistance at this level to include an onsite mentor.

In response to Mr. Durant, Dr. Buch said of the 288 schools receiving assistance last year, approximately 80 received an intensive level of mentoring in components which were not enhanced according to the old categories. She said staff is trying to analyze data received regarding the types of services provided and how they relate to test scores, but because many of the mentoring programs did not begin until January, 1999, and the MEAP tests were given in the spring, there has not been enough time to determine if the programs will have an impact.

Dr. Buch said staff visited some of the schools to determine what administrators and parents felt has been most helpful in implementing change. She said many stated that the most consistent support was received from the outside expert. She said when the mentor was able to attend a group meeting involving school staff and parents, they were able to provide feedback relating to their particular situation which affected classroom practices and the mood of the school. She said because the grant does not end until December 30, 1999, a final report will not be available until after that time.

Mrs. Straus said the report received from the Achievement Group and the Coalition for Essential Schools at the June 4, 1998 Board meeting led her to believe that each school receiving assistance had a mentor or coach who spent a great deal of time within the school. She said comments received today indicate that the mentor is typically only available by phone.

Dr. Smolen said the Achievement Group and the Coalition for Essential Schools place a person or team within a school, but the funding for that service is approximately \$12,000 per building. She said the Department is still not able to put a mentor in each school for long periods of time, but does require three visits and that they be available by phone. She said there simply are not enough qualified and willing people to fill each and every position.

In response to Mr. Ellis, Dr. Smolen said the Coalition for Essential Skills based their programs on a year to year schedule, however, the Department required a commitment for multiple years. She said the Coalition has approached schools indicating that they would continue to work with them, but not through the Michigan Department of Education.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Dr. Buch said because no programs were available for the 1997-98 school year, services for the 1998-99 school year were able to utilize two years of funding equaling \$3 million. She said, therefore, the amount allocated for the 1999-2000 school year is back to the single year funding amount of \$1.5 million.

Mr. Ellis said these moneys are not part of the Department budget, but are actually allocated and controlled by the Legislature in the School Aid Bill.

Mrs. Straus said it is evident schools respond in a positive manner and student achievement improves by placing a mentor or coach within the building at least 50% of the time. She said it does not make sense to reduce funding for a successful program, and feels the Board should address the Legislature on this matter.

Dr. Smolen said many school districts replace principals and staff frequently, which causes a delay because new employees must go through the leadership workshops. She said it is not only an issue of funding or simply keeping a mentor within a school, but also of continuity of staff.

Mrs. Straus said she feels that frequent changes in school staff is a good reason to ensure that a mentor or coach is in place, but the Board must take action to ascertain that more resources are dedicated to this type of activity.

Mrs. Gire said the Board has expressed the desire in the past to address the Legislature, and she feels it is imperative to emphasize that more funding is needed to assist and improve teaching and learning within at risk schools. She said even though it is part of the supplemental budget, the request must be made during the full budget process. She said the Board should be specific in what it feels is necessary, and direct staff to pull data together to support the request.

Mrs. Wise expressed concern that students were being lost in the system, and stressed the importance of keeping faces on the statistics. She said although it is important that the upcoming students receive assistance in achievement, she asked what help is given to the current students who are not doing well on the Michigan Educational Assessment Programs (MEAP) tests.

Mrs. Gire said that exact point has been debated in the Legislature. She said the law states that individual students should receive assistance to bring his or her scores up, but if a school district is lacking in ability, then she has concerns regarding the individual students not receiving the education they deserve.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. McGuire, that the State Board of Education approve the Criteria for the 1999-2000 Grants to Provide Technical Assistance for Low Achieving Schools as outlined in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999.

Mr. Durant asked that the criteria be modified to include language that schools or districts develop a plan to target and promote the number of tutors working with children in schools. Mrs. Straus and Mrs. McGuire agreed to include Mr. Durant's request as a friendly amendment to the motion.

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Beardmore, Durant, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Wise
Absent: Weiser**

The motion carried.

XI. APPROVAL OF FRANKLIN UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OHIO TO OFFER A BACHELOR DEGREE BY MEANS OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION IN COOPERATION WITH MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. Ellis said Franklin University is requesting the approval of the State Board of Education to offer a Bachelor of Science Degree program through electronic means to Michigan residents in cooperation with Michigan community colleges.

Mr. James Folkening, Director, Office of Postsecondary Services; and Mr. David Hanson, Specialist, Accreditation and Approval, provided information regarding Franklin University's proposed Bachelor of Science Degree.

Mr. Folkening introduced Dr. Julie Barry, Regional Director for Franklin University, and Dr. Norman Schlafman, Vice President, Macomb Community College.

Mr. Folkening said the information provided to the Board includes a profile of Franklin University, a copy of a signed formal agreement between Franklin University and Delta College, and a description of the articulation of Franklin University and community colleges in Michigan with a fact sheet that attempts to answer questions which may arise regarding the programs.

Mr. Folkening said Department staff visited Franklin University in Columbus, Ohio and was provided an opportunity to examine the learning system developed by the Franklin University staff. He said Department staff also had conversations with various community colleges and reviewed the proposed programs. He said support services are provided by the community colleges which participate in the program, and he feels it is a unique aspect of this program.

Mrs. Straus said she asked to have this item removed from the May 20, 1999 agenda because she had some concerns regarding giving authority to an institution based in Ohio, as opposed to a Michigan based college or university. She said there was consensus from the Board at the June 24, 1999 meeting to postpone action until the July 15, 1999 State Board of Education meeting. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Straus expressed appreciation to staff for the additional information and said it has been quite helpful to the Board in making an informed decision.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Beardmore, that the State Board of Education authorize Franklin University, Columbus, Ohio to complete the filing of an Application for a Certificate of Authority to Conduct Business in Michigan as a Foreign Corporation which would have as its purpose in Michigan "To offer a Bachelor of Science degree program through electronic means to Michigan residents in cooperation with Michigan community colleges with said Michigan residents possessing an associate degree." Such approval is taken in accordance with Act 327 P.A. of 1931, as amended as contained in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 12, 1999.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Durant, Gire, McGuire, Straus, Wise

Nay: Moyer

Absent: Weiser

The motion carried.

XII. PRESENTATION REGARDING PERIODIC REVIEW PROCESS AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Dr. Carolyn Logan, Director, Office of Professional Preparation Services, and Ms. Sue Wittick, Education Consultant, Office of Professional Preparation Services, provided information, a slide presentation, and responded to questions from the Board pertaining to the teacher preparation and periodic review process.

Dr. Logan thanked the Board for the opportunity to discuss the periodic review/program evaluation process, which is a major function of the Office of Professional Preparation Services, and allows staff to assist the State Board of Education in exercising the oversight authority of the teacher preparation and other programs for preparation of educational personnel. She said staff must keep in mind that the main purpose is the preparation of students for their chosen career, and the primary challenge is the alignment of teacher preparation standards with the K-12 Standards and Benchmarks. She said some progress has been made to assist teacher preparation institutions in this area, and determine what students should know to become effective teachers.

Dr. Logan said MCL 380.1531 of Act 451 of PA 1976 of the Michigan School Code authorizes the State Board of Education to determine the requirements for, and issue all licenses and certificates for teachers in public schools. She said when the term teacher certification is used it actually relates to the official recognition of the Board that an individual has met the State requirements. She said an entity exists in every state which is responsible for certification and in essence sets the policy for the requirements and conduct of educational professionals.

Dr. Logan said after successful completion of a teacher preparation program, a student is considered a graduate and the institution that student attended makes a recommendation to the Michigan Department of Education for a provisional certificate. She said the Client Services Unit issues the certification on behalf of the Board. She said when staff receive a recommendation from a higher education institution to issue a provisional certificate, it means that all requirements for initial certification have been met. She said at some point in time, it may be necessary to change the certification system to include an initial or standard teaching licence, and possibly eliminate the provisional certification because there are no other provisions to be met.

In response to Mrs. Wise, Dr. Logan said the titles are dictated by statute, but are identified in the Administrative Rules Governing the Certification of Michigan Teachers and the Board is involved in the rules process.

Dr. Logan said in some states, a teaching certificate is only necessary to teach in a public school, but because of teacher shortages, some states are beginning to make accommodations. She said that is not the case in Michigan because of the Nonpublic School Act which contains a provision declaring that instructors in non-public schools

should be of no less quality than public schools. She said unless there is a case built for provisions which would preclude a person from being certified, it is expected that a private school teacher would hold a certificate.

Dr. Logan said there are approximately 31 teacher preparation institutions in Michigan, and she regrets that staff had not identified for the Board which schools were private or public, or National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited. She said that information will be provided to the Board at a later date. She said a college or university wishing to receive approval to offer a teacher preparation program must first develop a plan to determine a structure for certification and the endorsement areas to be provided. She said the design of the program must comply with the Administrative Rules.

Dr. Logan said because individuals do not always stay within the confines of a given state boundary, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education (NASDTE) was established which developed a contract that would allow a state to review credentials received in another state.

XIII. RECESS

The Board recessed at 11:20 a.m. and reconvened at 11:40 a.m.

XIV. PRESENTATION REGARDING PERIODIC REVIEW PROCESS AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS - Continued

Ms. Wittick said from time to time institutions submit an application for approval as a Michigan teacher preparation institution. She the most recent application was from Cornerstone College which was approved in April. She said the application process requests the institution to provide information in the following categories: a general description of the proposed program, the state need for teachers in certification areas that they propose to address, the production potential of the institution, and the objectives for their particular program. She said the application must also include the program design, information on faculty who will be providing the program, admissions policy, course sequences, institutional resources and facilities, information on their plans for student teaching, library resources, and media and technology resources. She said this requirement constitutes a legal framework by which teacher certification is administered in most states.

Ms. Wittick said there are three types of institutional approval: (1) preliminary approval, (2) final approval, and (3) probationary approval. She said the preliminary approval authorizes an institution to proceed with the teacher education program identified in the request, without the authority to make recommendations for certification. She said some institutions may chose to partner with another institution during their preliminary approval period.

Ms. Wittick said the probationary approval authorizes an institution to recognize candidates for certification under the limits stipulated in the probation. She said before the termination of the probationary approval, the institution must present evidence stating that it qualifies for final approval, or shall be granted a three-year extension of the probationary period. She said an extension may be granted by the Board when problems are identified prior to final approval. She said probationary approval may be granted prior to regional accreditation of the institution.

Ms. Wittick said final approval authorizes the institution to recommend candidates for certification subject to the policies of the State Board of Education. She said the requirements of the certification from the approved institutions will be subject then to the periodic review program evaluation process which operates on a five-year cycle.

In response to Dr. Moyer, Dr. Logan said she believes the Department's responsibilities lie with quality preparation regardless of whether it is public, independent, or a for-profit institution. She said staff would adhere to the standards adopted by the Board, and no special provisions would be made for a for-profit organization.

Ms. Wittick said institutions seek initial approval for specialty programs which lead to certification in vocational or special education areas, specialty programs which lead to additional endorsement for previously certified teachers, or post baccalaureate programs which qualify candidates for certification. She said when staff is satisfied that an institution is ready for preliminary inspection, a Committee of Scholars representing all facets of teacher preparation and university administration is assembled in order to conduct a comprehensive site visit at the requesting institution. She said this committee is charged with verifying plans and development presented in the preliminary approval plan, and will investigate all aspects of the institution's capacity and potential of developing a quality teacher preparation program. She said recommendations from the Committee of Scholars and from the Department are provided to the Board for consideration of request for institutional approval. She said the Committee of Scholars may remain the same throughout each phase of the approval process.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Dr. Logan said a review of records prior to 1991 reveals fragmented records at best which means that it was necessary to bring teacher preparation institutions in line with the standards. She said that was one of the reasons that the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process was developed as it currently exists. She said the Committee of Scholars plays a very important role and is comprised of veterans in the teacher preparation process. She said they not only inspect, but also provide technical assistance if necessary. She said the various components of the application process are essential to the operation of a teacher preparation institution.

Ms. Wittick said there are many different situations which would cause an institution to request approval from the Board, such as a new program that has not been offered before, a new department, amendments or revisions to existing programs. She said experimental programs also require Board approval, and according to Administrative Rule 390.1153, the State Board may waive courses any time a specific requirement is chosen for an experimental teacher preparation program. She said staff receive requests for new endorsement codes similar to the English as a Second Language (ESL) or the Technology and Design that was approved by the Board two years ago.

Ms. Wittick said when an institution sends an application packet to the Department for evaluation, it is then forwarded to a special area consultant for a thorough review. She said the Office of Professional Preparation works closely with program specialists within the Department, as needed, to insure that the program meets all of the standards. She said after the consultant is satisfied, the Office of Professional Preparation will recommend it for approval to the State Board of Education.

Ms. Wittick said the need for a systematic approach for the periodic review teacher education programs was addressed as a priority at a conference of the Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) in 1984, and where the initial proposal was developed. She said NCATE and other relevant agencies revised and refined the proposal and addressed concerns which were identified through two public hearings. She said the proposal for periodic review and program evaluation, including the establishment of a 22 member council was first approved by the Board in May 1985 and later revised in 1992. She said in 1989 during that period of time between the initial approval and the approval of the revised proposal, the Board approved Michigan certification and the option to become a member of NCATE.

In response to Mrs. Beardmore, Dr. Logan said the proposal was developed in 1985 but was not implemented immediately because of staffing problems. She said the Office of Teacher Certification was at one time funded by a line item in the Department's budget supported by state revenue, but is now self supporting through a fee system.

Ms. Wittick said the periodic review program evaluation council is charged with the following functions: (1) propose standards for teacher education programs in Michigan subject to State Board of Education approval, (2) establish, update and publish guidelines covering the type of evidence which must be provided by an institution to demonstrate that its programs meet the standards of quality established by the Council, as well as by the State Certification Code, (3) review the reports of the program review teams, (4) make recommendations regarding the status of the institution being reviewed, and (5) carry out such other functions as the council identifies. She said council members are updated on a regular basis on the current approval status of each institution, and the development of the current process is largely the result of this council.

Ms. Wittick said NCATE is a non governmental, nonprofit coalition of thirty national organizations representing educators and the public, all of whom are committed to quality teaching and teacher preparation. She said it is a national organization comprised of teacher educators, higher education representatives, classroom teachers, state and local policymakers, the public, content specialists, and specialized professional associations.

Mrs. Straus asked if the Department has a Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process in place, why is NCATE necessary.

Mrs. Beardmore said members of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) have expressed concern regarding NCATE because the primary focus is on input rather than results, and she feels that builds on Mrs. Straus' question. She said she thinks it is partly because NCATE is at the national level, and there is an understanding that the NCATE accreditation translates from state to state. She said she thinks that it is important to know whether they have moved away from that focus on input.

Dr. Logan said NCATE is an organization and does not have approval authority unless a state wishes to grant it. She said Michigan institutions are given an option to utilize NCATE which is known to be expensive and has higher standards than the state. She said the standards which have been set by the Board are seen as the minimum level necessary to receive approval, and if a college or university wishes to be NCATE accredited, they must be willing to meet those requirements.

Dr. Logan said many people believe that institutions should be able to choose between NCATE or a new organization called the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) which has been primarily supported by the independent colleges and universities. She said Michigan has a Board approved process in place, and institutions must meet those criteria if they wish to function in this state and be approved by the Board as a teacher education institution.

Mrs. Beardmore said she was surprised to hear that NCATE's standards are higher than the Board's. She said it concerns her that NCATE's focus seems to be on measuring the size of the buildings and space per student, and not insuring that students are properly prepared to teach in their chosen area of expertise. She said many years ago, the Board established entry level competencies and she asked when and how those competencies would be affected particularly if the institutions are given a choice of NCATE, TEAC, or the state standards, which would be as demanding as either of those other organizations.

Dr. Logan said the difference between NCATE and the Department may simply be in either the questions asked or the attention paid to certain details. She said for example, NCATE considers the composition of the faculty, and the highest degree earned to be important issues, but the Department would allow a faculty review to be

part of the periodic review program evaluation process. She said that even though the highest degree earned is significant, there are certainly more critical areas to be considered. She said in the interest of not putting educational institutions through massive changes, it may behoove NCATE and the Department to merely let the differences exist and focus on the dynamics relating to what students should know and be able to do to be effective teachers.

Mr. Ellis said the Michigan Constitution is clear regarding institutions of higher education and states, “nothing in this section shall be construed in any way to infringe upon constitutional authority of the governing board to the institutions of higher education to be solely responsible for the control and direction of all expenditures of the institution authority.” He continued by saying, “and the power of the boards of institutions of higher education provided in this constitution to supervise or inspect institutions and control and direct expenditures funds shall not be limited by this section.” He said the State Board of Education must cooperate with the mechanism in place because it is limited in its authority to mandate.

Mrs. Straus said even if that was not in the Michigan Constitution, results are best obtained by cooperation.

XV. RECESS

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened at 1:35 p.m.

XVI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

- A. Mr. Gary Analco, and Mrs. Carol Analco, 11150 Riverview, Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439. Mr. and Mrs. Analco and their sons, Casey and Colin offered comments regarding the Michigan School for the Deaf.
- B. Ms. Lynn Ovington, 2154 East Whittemore Avenue, Burton, Michigan 48529. Ms. Ovington offered comments regarding Warwick Pointe Academy, and the Michigan Educational Assessment Program.

Mr. Ellis said the Board has received a memorandum dated July 12, 1999, regarding Warwick Pointe Academy in their Informational Folders. Mr. Ellis said the Department has no investigative authority regarding public school academies, and staff have identified steps to eliminate the problem outlined by Ms. Ovington.

Mr. Ellis said the mechanism within the Department for schools found to have acted inappropriately on the MEAP are offered a choice of retaking the test or accepting a zero. He said that is the limit of the Department’s authority. He said parents should address concerns and problems to the proper agencies, and the Department of Education cannot be responsible for those responses.

Mrs. Straus said she believes that all correspondence and/or telephone calls received from parents experiencing problems should be given the courtesy of a response. She said if it is not an area that falls within the Department's jurisdiction, then they should be directed to the proper agency or organization.

Mr. Ellis said a meeting was held recently with Warwick Pointe Academy and Central Michigan University to address the concerns expressed by Ms. Ovington and other parents, and as noted in the July 12 memorandum to the Board, Warwick Pointe Academy has requested a neutral-party test administrator to monitor their testing procedure.

Mrs. McGuire expressed concern that the letter received from Ms. Ovington and received by the Department has not been given the attention it deserves. She said she agrees with Mrs. Straus that it is only common courtesy to respond even if it is to inform the constituent that the Michigan Department of Education is not the proper agency to follow up on the complaint, and refer them to the proper department or organization.

Mrs. Beardmore expressed concern with the individual results and wondered what has happened to them. She said she assumes that the results are distributed by the vendor who sends them to the school, and the school then forwards them to the parents. She said unless the same students are retested, the validity of the scores will never be known. She said she thinks the Board needs to look very seriously at how letters are responded to, and how helpful staff can be to people who write to the Board or the Department.

- C. Ms. Cyndi Raslich, 5213 West Ray Road, Linden, Michigan 48451. Ms. Raslich offered comments regarding Warwick Pointe Academy and her child's education.
- D. Ms. Pam Korb, 4351 Maplewood Meadows Avenue, Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439. Ms. Korb offered comments regarding Warwick Pointe Academy.

Mrs. Beardmore said it should be noted that there is neither a penalty stipulated in the law nor a mechanism within the Department relating to the action requested by the parents making the accusations against Warwick Pointe Academy.

Mr. Ellis said it is not possible to prove that the Warwick Pointe Academy administrators have lied, but there was some indication of excessive erasing on the MEAP tests from Warwick Pointe Academy which led staff to believe they needed to be reviewed.

Mrs. Gire said it seems that there are a couple of different issues being discussed: (1) the Department's response versus the action people would like to see, and (2) the Department's policy regarding correspondence received

from constituents. She said she is concerned about the perception that the Board and the Department are a bureaucracy and do not respond to letters received. She said she feels that it is a courtesy to respond in some form, even if it is only to direct the letter writer to another department or agency.

Mr. Ellis said staff will put together the sequence of events regarding the correspondence received on Warwick Pointe Academy and provide the information to the Board a future meeting.

XVII. PRESENTATION REGARDING PERIODIC REVIEW PROCESS AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS - Continued

Ms. Wittick said the partnership agreement with NCATE allows the college or university to receive a one time visit by a joint team which consists of representatives of public and independent institutions of higher education, K-12 teachers, administrators, and a balance of gender and ethnic backgrounds. She said the team contributes directly to the review utilizing both NCATE and state specialty area program standards. She said Michigan's current periodic review process mirrors NCATE's process as recommended by the Periodic Review Council and approved by the State Board of Education.

Ms. Wittick said in Michigan, the review visit typically begins on Sunday morning, and concludes on Wednesday at noon. She said NCATE's Board of Examiners reviews the rejoinder and the team report, and issues a decision regarding accreditation. She said procedures utilize a Periodic Review Council which reviews the report of the team and the rejoinder, and makes a recommendation to the State Board of Education.

Ms. Wittick said although the team works together, NCATE staff concentrate on the review of the unit standards, while Department staff focus on the Michigan standards and the specialty area programs.

Ms. Wittick said when institutions prepare their specialty area program descriptions in anticipation of the periodic review visit, they provide a list of elective courses, a designation of the program offering options, a general description of the program, course description for all required courses, a matrix which shows all of the program standards the student will have met by taking the courses, and the requirements in the program.

Ms. Wittick said institutions are required to use either State Board of Education approved or NCATE specialty organization standards in subject areas where they have been established. She said there may be instances where professional organization standards are followed, for example, the National Association of Schools of Music has guidelines for music programs in the music education program. She said institutions are allowed to use the Michigan Test for Michigan Certification objectives in those areas where there are no professional organization standards, such as in

humanities or fine arts programs. She said because Michigan standards and the approximately eighteen NCATE specialty organizations are aligned with the national K-12 standards, there is some expectation that specialty organizations will also align with Michigan's K-12 frameworks and benchmarks.

In response to Mrs. McGuire, Dr. Logan said staff in the Office of Professional Preparation, and the Office of Career, Curriculum, and Technical Services have been working in conjunction with one another to align the teacher preparation standards with the core curriculum. She said a draft for English Language Arts will be presented to the Board at a future meeting.

Ms. Wittick said by February 2000 each of the thirty-one teacher preparation institutions will have experienced a periodic review visit. She said the process begins with the institution preparing reports indicating the NCATE standards, Michigan standards, and specialty program descriptions according to the guidelines provided by staff. She said team members are carefully selected from a pool of available reviewers who have been trained in the periodic review/program evaluation process. She said they carefully review the large volume of program materials, and institutional reports prior to the visit, plan questions to ask, resources to investigate, and individuals to interview when onsite. She said the team chair, the Department's consultant, and/or the chair of the NCATE team attend a previsit meeting at the institution, which occurs approximately six weeks before the scheduled visit. She said the first morning of the team visit begins with a thorough review of the documents that the institution has provided which include a course syllabi, vita, minutes of meetings, budget, advising records and enrollment policies, and a variety of other documents. She said team members interview administrators, faculty, students, support staff, observe classes, visit schools which accept student teachers trained at the institution, examine resource centers, library and facilities for technology, and meet with curriculum faculty, and advisory committees.

Ms. Wittick said team members gather Monday evening to compare notes and make plans to ask specific questions, and Tuesday evening draft their reports on the units and the specialty area programs. She said an exit interview is held on Wednesday morning where the team recommendations are summarized orally. She said the finalized report is forwarded to the institution which then has an option to prepare a rejoinder to the report, addresses each of the findings and provides additional information or plans for change which the institution will initiate. She said the rejoinder typically only addresses areas where standards are not met or there were weaknesses in programs recommended for conditional approval.

Dr. Logan said that quite often the institution will indicate in its rejoinder what was misinterpreted, not observed, or investigated by the team. She said the rejoinder is also where an institution may wish to call the team's attention to specific areas included in the information received at the beginning of the visit.

Ms. Wittick said the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council will review the team report and rejoinder, and make a recommendation to the State Board. She said upon recommendation by the council, the State Board of Education typically approves programs for five years, but many are only approved for two years with weaknesses and/or conditions. She said many of the programs adhere to a large number of standards, and therefore, if a couple are not met, the recommendation is made with weaknesses noted. She said if either a large number or all of the standards are not met, it will result in a recommendation of conditional approval.

Ms. Wittick said the terminology may be changed if the Board revises the review process for a second round of periodic review. She said some of the programs were initially approved many years ago, and are being compared to a new set of standards that were not in place when the programs were originally conceived. She said it is quite common to see some gaps, discrepancies and program weaknesses. She said it should also be noted that there are students currently in all of these programs who have the expectation that they will be able to complete them and be recommended for certification. She said if the Board were to remove approval on a program, it would impact those students, and therefore, would be a difficult decision to make and would cost the institutions money.

Ms. Wittick said a change in the emphasis and the second round of review would allow a more continuous improvement model so that an institution's programs keep getting better, and, as new standards are developed by special organizations, programs would need to be continually adjusted.

Ms. Wittick said a year and two years after the visit, the institution must prepare an annual report of progress focused on eliminating any weaknesses or deficiencies, and a review is conducted by staff in the Office of Professional Preparation Services until all of the weaknesses have been addressed satisfactorily. She said when revised program materials are submitted, they are reviewed again by the Department curriculum specialists who compare the original program materials, the initial review of those materials, the team reports, the rejoinder, and the materials that have been submitted with the annual report. She said consultants focus first on programs which were given a two year approval because they have an approval period that may have expired. She said when Department staff is satisfied that the program and unit deficiencies are corrected, then a periodic review status report is prepared so the program can be reissued until the next scheduled Periodic Review/Program Evaluation.

Ms. Wittick said there are several positive aspects of the periodic review/program evaluation process.

- (1) The Office of Professional Preparation now has an updated record of current program offerings. She said she has found programs dating back to 1945, so it is no surprise that so many of the programs have weaknesses or deficiencies.

- (2) All programs have been reviewed according to current standards.
- (3) Institutions have insight into ways to improve their programs.
- (4) There has been a sharing of successful program ideas between institutions.
- (5) Communication has improved between teacher education faculty and specialty-area faculty.
- (6) Practicing K-12 teachers have provided insights regarding the needs of new teachers.
- (7) Institutions have become increasingly sensitive to the needs of new teachers, to K-12 curriculum, and to the value of community support and involvement in their programs.
- (8) Institutions have become more acutely aware of the value, quality, and need for the teacher preparation programs they offer.
- (9) Content-area faculty have increased their awareness of how they are modeling pedagogy in their classes.
- (10) Content-area faculty have increased their awareness of program standards, K-12 curriculum, and course content specifically needed by new teachers.

Ms. Wittick said the lessons learned from the current process include:

On-site review teams

- (1) There has been difficulty in recruiting team members.
- (2) Making judgements in a wide variety of specialty areas.
- (3) Amount of time and effort needed.
- (4) Expense to the state.
- (5) Lack of consistency in decisions between teams.

Specialist review of programs

- (6) Lack of content experts.
- (7) Limited perspective.
- (8) Lack of time due to other responsibilities.

Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council

- (9) Limited time for review and decision-making.
- (10) Decisions made without adequate information.
- (11) Meeting schedule may cause delays in State Board of Education action.

Program Standards

- (12) Variety of different standards used.
- (13) Appropriate program standards sometimes difficult to find.
- (14) Team recommendations have not been consistent between institutions.

Feedback to the Institutions

- (15) Minimal feedback to institutions.
- (16) Delays in reports and feedback to the institutions.
- (17) Lack of consistency in the reports.

State Board of Education Approval Terminology

- (18) New language is needed to support a continuous improvement model.

Dr. Logan said as staff and the Board begin to consider modifications to the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process, they must become aware of any requirements set forth by the United States Department of Education (USDOE). She said beginning in 2000, the USDOE will require that each state provide to the Secretary of Education (1) the description of the Teacher Certification and Licensure Assessments and any other certification and licensure requirements used by the state; (2) the Standards and Criteria prospective teachers must meet in order to attain initial teacher certification or licensure and to be certified or licensed to teach particular subjects or in particular grades within the state; (3) a description of the extent to which the assessments and requirements are aligned to the state's standards and assessments for students; (4) the percentage of teacher candidates who passed each assessment used by the state and the passing score for each assessment; (5) the percentage of teaching candidates who passed each assessment, disaggregated and ranked by the teacher preparation program from which the candidate received the candidate's most recent degree; (6) information to the extent in which teachers in the state are given waivers of state certificated or licensure requirements, including the distribution of such teachers across high and low poverty school districts and across subject areas; (7) a description of the state's alternative routes to teacher certification, if any, and

the percentage of such teachers certified in this manner who pass the state teacher certification and licensure assessments; (8) a description of proposed criteria for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs within the institutions of higher education within the state, including indicators of teacher candidate knowledge and skills, and information on the extent to which teacher or prospective teachers are required to take examinations or other assessments of their subject matter knowledge in the area or areas in which the teachers provide instruction, the standards for passing such assessments; and (9) the extent to which teachers or prospective teachers are required to pass such assessments to teach in specific subject areas or in particular grades.

Dr. Logan said in accordance with the provisions of Title II, this information will be used to provide Congress a report on teacher qualifications and preparation in the United States for use in identifying state eligibility for receipt of a Title II grant, comparing state's efforts in improving teacher quality, and reporting national mean and median scores of any standardized test used by more than one state.

Dr. Logan said staff has drafted a revised Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process which will consist of two sections, and has not yet received any input from the higher education community. She said Section I would include a general review, and more specifically, a review of the regulatory/policy requirements, diversity, faculty, parent/community involvement, technology, field placement, and teacher candidate performance. She said each area is important to receive a well rounded picture of what kind of job the institution is doing in preparing students to become effective teachers.

Ms. Wittick said staff conducted a pilot to evaluate mathematics review programs for those institutions which were scheduled for the periodic review last year. She said a panel was assembled consisting of mathematics content experts, an elementary teacher, a district math coordinator, public and private math faculty members, and a member of a teacher preparation unit. She said the group reviewed the program in a conference type format so they could discuss the programs together and provide an opportunity for institutions to talk about their respective programs. She said feedback was given to the institutions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of their programs. She said it is hoped that the conference will eventually eliminate the need for a rejoinder process and provide a venue for continuous improvement rather than requesting Board approval again and again. She said staff envisions the review conference to be held yearly in the core curriculum areas, and the panel members would be experts in their fields.

Ms. Wittick said the plan for the pilot was developed with the support of the curriculum specialists in the Department, and many discussions have taken place regarding the pros and cons of the current process and what could be done so that the review of the specialty area programs would be stronger. She said feedback from the teacher preparation institutions and the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council has been positive.

Dr. Logan said now that the Board has received the vision for change, she will share the information with the institutions. She said as staff consider any type of model or approach to restructure, they will be guided by some principles and a set of common standards to which all institutions should be held accountable regardless of their program and size. She said this is to ensure a fair and equitable system.

Dr. Logan said staff would also take into consideration the institutions decision of utilizing either TEAC, NCATE, or the Board approved standards. She said the approval and review process would be supportive of the decision and blended where necessary. She said staff would accept the accreditation program approval decisions and look for ways to use the information by only being concerned with items not covered by that framework. She said staff would also look for and would be guided by a commitment to continuous improvement. She said that would be the driving factor and overarching purpose of any review and approval process.

Mrs. Beardmore said this information has been helpful for Board members who may not know the process, why it exists, and its intended purpose. She said she appreciates the new system in that the Board receives information, staff outlines concerns and makes recommendations for approval. She said the Board is kept updated on changes made and comments received from the content consultants. She asked how the Board will continue to be informed if continuous progress is being made. In response, Dr. Logan said because the Board has oversight responsibility, a report will be provided indicating the weaknesses from a public perspective. She said staff will continue to work with the institutions in assisting their efforts toward improvement.

Mrs. Straus said this system has helped some institutions improve, and even though she feels it is a step in the right direction, there is still much to be done. She said she reviewed the 5th grade Social Studies MEAP test recently and wondered how institutions can assure that elementary teachers are able to teach all of the subjects necessary for students to excel on the MEAP tests. In response, Dr. Logan said it has been determined what students need to know and be able to do, and so it is possible to develop the standards for teachers which will enable them to support that instruction to students.

Mrs. Gire said the thrust of the question was what changes does the Board need to make to build a model of collaboration with higher education which forms both a dynamic process for the teacher preparation program, and continuing education. She said many of the elementary teachers she has met with over the last two or three years have stated that they have taken classes in economics, political science, or history, but it was not the primary focus of their training. She asked what the Board can do so teachers are not teaching to the MEAP tests, but are prepared and up-to-date in terms of where the Board and Department thinks they should be. In response, Dr. Logan said it is imperative to have a process for program approval and updated, relevant, and significant standards for the preparation of teachers. She said the Board has been more articulate in its expectation of what students should know and be able to do than

it has been for teachers, so there is much work to be done. She said staff will report to the Board regarding the progress of the revised standards for teacher preparation. She said staff was overwhelmed by the same questions raised by Mrs. Straus and Mrs. Gire, but concentrated on the core content areas by ensuring that they aligned with the K-12 Standards and Benchmarks. She said once the teacher preparation standards are approved by the Board, she will communicate them to the higher education institutions. She said it will be necessary to review the standards from time to time, and to consider the data which will be received from the institutions regarding how their teacher candidates have performed on the test.

Mr. Durant said the information presented has been very interesting, and he appreciates all of the effort involved. He asked if the Board requires college professors to be certified. In response, Dr. Logan said college professors are not currently required to be certified, however, there has been considerable discussion regarding setting standards for teacher educators.

Mr. Durant said there has been much concern expressed regarding standards, but even though they may search for some certified teachers, many of the premier high schools that he is aware of do not place a high emphasis on that qualification. He asked if there has been a study conducted to compare the performance of students who attend these premier high schools with those in similar traditional public schools that do require certified teachers.

Dr. Logan said she is not aware of any studies, however, she would be able to provide some information which was presented to the Board at the June 3, 1998, Committee of the Whole meeting.

Mr. Durant said even though the presentation focused primarily on inputs, Dr. Logan has stated that NCATE is trying to look more at outcomes, and he wonders if the Board and the Department will learn something from conducting a comparative study on schools which are focusing on outcomes, results for their students and the colleges they go to, and if the method of hiring teachers is different from what has been presented today.

Dr. Logan said it would be difficult to compare a professionally trained teacher with a person who is not because of the discrepancies in backgrounds, and students are not always consistent. She said non professionally prepared people working as teachers may be able to work very well with some but not all students, and it would hard to get a grasp of it by only looking at inputs.

Mr. Durant said he agrees that it would be difficult by only looking at inputs, but the Board and staff talk about best practices frequently, so perhaps the Board should look at best schools and determine if they are doing things differently than traditional public schools. He said the Board may learn from that and determine that the teacher certification system is too burdensome a process and is a barrier to finding exactly the differentiated abilities that Dr. Logan spoke about.

Dr. Logan said she thinks outputs are a goal and admitted that just because a student completes a teacher preparation program, it does not necessarily mean they will be a good teacher. She said because children are involved, however, she would rather place her bet where she thinks her greatest chances are for the greatest return.

Mr. Durant said he is sure that the heads of those schools are having identical feelings. He said administrators do not typically take chances, so in many cases they have developed a very demanding screening process because they do not want to hire someone who cannot teach. He said it is evident that the Board is not looking for outcomes, and he feels that before an enormous commitment is made, the premier high schools should be explored.

Dr. Logan said if the Board is interested in that information, staff will certainly develop a report on the issue.

Mr. Durant said there has been much talk of best practices, and yet the premier high schools seem to have figured it out because many people stand in line to enroll. He said he does not want to get into the political side of it, just the practicality issue and whether or not putting a good man or woman into a classroom will enable children to be able to compete and go to the best colleges or excel in whatever they choose to do with their lives. He said the State Board of Education should consider that there may be something other than the established system which would be less cumbersome and more streamlined. He said the Board should also step back from the political side of it and wonder why people want to attend these schools.

Mrs. McGuire thanked staff for their time and efforts in putting together the presentation. Mrs. Straus said she appreciates the information and feels the Board needed to be updated on this issue.

Mrs. Beardmore said she appreciates the information presented to the Board and looks forward to a more formal recommendation of issues to consider. She said she does not want to get into a lengthy debate regarding certification because it does not guarantee excellence, but it does assure a level of competency. She said that is particularly important as the Board moves toward competency based rather the time based teacher preparation. She said there is a learned skill in teaching which is not inherited in everybody no matter how knowledgeable they may be in a field of study. She said it is difficult to make a comparison of what happens in public schools vis a vis what happens in the best nonpublic schools because there are so many variables.

Mrs. Beardmore said she is anticipating that somewhere in the next several months the Board will begin to look at major changes in teacher certification requirements, the standards and expectations, and the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) scores which are often used as a base. She expressed concern that so much focus is placed on MEAP scores because there is much more to education, and she would like the Board to be able to consider issues beyond test scores. She said the Board is losing sight of the purpose of education which is not just to get children into

college or employed. She said they are simply a part of the responsibility of educators to prepare children for their future which includes becoming part of self government, to be capable involved citizens. She said the Board is overlooking that almost completely and needs to get back into a balance of higher education, life long learning, an academic nature, employment and citizenship, which is far from periodic review, but it connects. She said the Board and the Department have worked hard to develop the process for many years, and it is a major system, but every little part affects every other part and the Board must keep it as a unified, coherent system. She said that is what she thinks everyone is trying to do.

No action was taken on this item.

- XXVIII. RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW/PROGRAM EVALUATION COUNCIL FOR CORNERSTONE UNIVERSITY AND APPROVE THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT AND SPECIALTY STUDIES PROGRAMS
- XXIX. RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW/PROGRAM EVALUATION COUNCIL FOR HILLSDALE COLLEGE AND APPROVE THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT AND SPECIALTY STUDIES PROGRAMS
- XX. RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW/PROGRAM EVALUATION COUNCIL FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN - ANN ARBOR AND APPROVE THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT AND SPECIALTY STUDIES PROGRAMS
- XXI. RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW/PROGRAM EVALUATION COUNCIL FOR OLIVET COLLEGE AND APPROVE THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT AND SPECIALTY STUDIES PROGRAMS
- XXII. APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL FROM LAKE SUPERIOR STATE UNIVERSITY FOR A NEW COMPUTER SCIENCE PROGRAM AS A MINOR AT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS
- XXIII. APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL FROM AQUINAS COLLEGE FOR A NEW LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM AS A GROUP MAJOR, A GROUP MINOR, AND AN ADDITIONAL ENDORSEMENT AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL
- XXIV. APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL FROM MADONNA UNIVERSITY FOR A NEW MATHEMATICS PROGRAM AS A MAJOR AND AS A MINOR AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL

- XXV. APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL FROM SIENA HEIGHTS UNIVERSITY TO AMEND ITS GRADUATE MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION PROGRAM AS AN ADDITIONAL ENDORSEMENT AT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS TO COMPLY WITH NEW STANDARDS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION
- XXVI. APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL FROM WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY TO AMEND ITS GRADUATE MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION PROGRAM AS AN ADDITIONAL ENDORSEMENT AT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS TO COMPLY WITH NEW STANDARDS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION
- XXVII. APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL FROM MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY TO CONVERT IS UNDERGRADUATE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVEL SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS: EMOTIONALLY IMPAIRED, LEARNING DISABILITIES, HEARING IMPAIRED, AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED INTO K-12 PROGRAM ENDORSEMENT
- XXVIII. RECEIVE THE PERIODIC REVIEW/PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS REPORT ON THE ANDREWS UNIVERSITY TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM
- XXIX. RECEIVE THE PERIODIC REVIEW/PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS REPORT ON THE HOPE COLLEGE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

Mr. Durant moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education:

Cornerstone College (XVIII)

(1) receive the report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council on the Cornerstone University professional education unit and specialty studies programs; (2) approve the Cornerstone University professional education unit (initial level) for five years (1998-2003); (3) approve the Cornerstone University initial/undergraduate-level Language Arts; English; Communication Arts; Social Studies; History; Psychology; General Science; Biology; Biology (Clinical Lab); Chemistry; Mathematics; Spanish; Music Education; Art Education; Health, Physical Education and Recreation; and Early Childhood programs for five years (1998-2003); and (4) conditionally approve the Cornerstone University Physics program for two years (1998-2000), as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

Hillsdale College (XIX)

(1) receive the report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council on the Hillsdale College professional education unit and specialty studies programs; (2) conditionally approve the Hillsdale College professional education

unit (initial level) for two years (1998-2000); (3) approve the Hillsdale College initial/undergraduate-level English, Speech, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Latin, Music Education, Art Education, Computer Science, Philosophy, and Early Childhood programs for five years (1998-2003); (4) approve with weaknesses noted, the Hillsdale College initial/undergraduate-level French, German, and Spanish programs for two years (1998-2000); and (5) conditionally approve the Hillsdale College General Science and Health, Physical Education and Recreation programs for two years (1998-2000), as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

University of Michigan - Ann Arbor (XX)

(1) receive the report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council for the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor professional education unit and specialty studies programs; (2) approve the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor professional education unit (initial and advanced levels) for five years (1999-2004); (3) approve the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor initial/undergraduate-level Language Arts, English, Social Studies, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, General Science, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, French, German, Latin, Spanish, Russian, Music Education, Health, Physical Education, Dance, Environmental Studies, and Computer Science programs for five years (1999-2004); (4) approve, with weaknesses noted, the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor initial/undergraduate-level History and Physics programs for two years (1999-2001); (5) conditionally approve the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor initial/undergraduate-level Fine Arts program for two years (1999-2001); (6) approve the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor advanced/graduate-level Reading, Library Media, Learning Disabilities, Masters with Elementary Certification, and Masters with Secondary Certification programs for five years (1999-2004), as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 9, 1999;

Olivet College (XXI)

(1) receive the report of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Council on the Olivet College professional education unit and specialty studies programs; (2) approve the Olivet College professional education unit (initial level) for five years (1999-2004); (3) approve the Olivet College initial/undergraduate-level Language Arts, English, Social Studies, History, Political Science, Sociology, General Science, Business Administration, and Art Education programs for five years (1999-2004); (4) approve, with weaknesses noted, the Olivet College initial/undergraduate-level Speech, Psychology, and Computer Science programs for two years (1999-2001); and (5) conditionally approve the Olivet College initial/undergraduate-level Biology; Chemistry; French, Spanish; Music

Education; and Health, Physical Education, and Recreation programs for two years (1999-2001), as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 9, 1999;

Lake Superior State University (XXII)

Approve the proposal for a new Computer Science program as a minor at the elementary and secondary levels as submitted by Lake Superior State University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

Aquinas College (XXIII)

Approve the proposal for a new Language Arts program as a group major, a group minor, and an additional endorsement at the elementary level as submitted by Aquinas College, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

Madonna University (XXIV)

Approve the proposal for a new Mathematics program as a major and as a minor at the elementary level as submitted by Madonna University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

Sienna Heights University (XXV)

Approve the proposal to amend the graduate Middle-Level Education program as an additional endorsement at the elementary and secondary levels to comply with new standards for teacher preparation as submitted by Siena Heights University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

Western Michigan University (XXVI)

Approve the proposal to amend the graduate Middle-Level Education program as an additional endorsement at the elementary and secondary levels to comply with new standards for teacher preparation as submitted by Western Michigan University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

Michigan State University (XXVII)

Approve the proposal to convert the undergraduate elementary and secondary level Special Education programs: Emotionally Impaired, Learning Disabilities, Hearing Impaired, and Visually Impaired, into K-12 program endorsements as submitted by Michigan State University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999;

Andrews University (XXVIII)

Approve the Andrews University Chemistry, Physics, and General Science specialty-studies programs until the next full Periodic Review/Program Evaluation review, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999; and

Hope College (XXIX)

Approve the Hope College History specialty-studies program until the next full Periodic Review/Program Evaluation review, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated June 30, 1999.

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Beardmore, Durant, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Wise
Absent: Weiser**

The motion carried.

XXX. UPDATE ON FEDERAL ISSUES

Ms. Roberta Stanley, Director, Office of Administrative Law, provided information and distributed the following documents to the Board: (1) "Title I Portable Entitlement"; (2) "H. R. 1995"; and (3) Committee on Education and the Workforce News Release titled, "Goodling, Gorton, and Republican Leadership Introduce Academic Achievement for All Act, Straight A's Will Provide Freedom and Accountability."

No action was taken on this item.

XXXI. REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION

This item was removed from the agenda.

XXXII. APPROVAL OF CONTINUATION GRANT APPLICATION TO CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL FOR FY 2000 FUNDING FOR HIV/STD PREVENTION; EXPANDED PROGRAM IN HEALTH EDUCATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE FOR SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAMS, AND THE CRITERIA FOR SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS IN THE ABOVE AREAS FOR FY 2000

This item was removed from the agenda.

XXXIII. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

A. Legislative Agenda - Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer that, since the State Board of Education must focus on setting policy about education and inform the Legislature of financing necessary to fund its initiatives, the State Board must set a proactive legislative agenda for the 1999-2000 legislative session; therefore, directs Department staff to identify appropriate legislative initiatives to accomplish and/or progress toward the Board's four priorities and identified strategies.

Mrs. Beardmore said that once the legislative initiatives have been identified by Department staff and approved by the Board, Ms. Kate McAuliffe, Director, Government Services and Customer Satisfaction, will be asked to actively promote the initiatives with members of the Legislature.

Mrs. Gire said at previous meetings, the Board has discussed trying to work with the House and Senate Education Committees, but has not been able make those arrangements yet. She suggested the President and Vice President of the Board ask to attend the Education Committee meetings as well as the Appropriations Subcommittees on Education and speak to them regarding the priorities.

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Wise
Absent: Durant, Weiser**

The motion carried.

B. Henry Ford Community College - Mrs. Kathleen Straus

Mrs. Straus said she raised a question at the last Board meeting regarding the Board's oversight responsibilities of community colleges. She said she was especially concerned about the fact that Henry Ford Community College is building a center in Woodhaven, Michigan which is located within the service area of Wayne County Community College. She said it was her understanding that the State Board of Education must approve such action.

Mr. Ellis said it is the opinion of staff that the Board does not have jurisdiction in this matter.

Mrs. Straus said she does not think that it is a local issue, but is a policy question which may affect other community colleges in the state as well. She said she would appreciate a report at the next Board meeting.

Dr. Moyer asked if it is appropriate for the Attorney General to become involved in this issue.

Mrs. Straus said she would like to receive the report from staff before requesting the involvement of the Attorney General.

XXXIV. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE - MR. ARTHUR E. ELLIS

A. Warwick Pointe Academy

Mr. Ellis said Mr. Donald Weatherspoon, Special Assistant for Institutional Education, stated that not only were meetings held with the parents who filed the letter of complaint against Warwick Pointe Academy, but there were numerous telephone conversations as well. He said Central Michigan University has issued a report in response to each of the thirty one issues, the Family Independence Agency has addressed the preschool questions in writing, and the intermediate school district audit is not yet completed. He said Ms. Kate McAuliffe, Director, Office of Government Services and Customer Satisfaction, spoke with the parents, Ms. Lynn Ovington, Ms. Cyndi Raslich, and Ms. Pam Korb, immediately after public participation earlier in the meeting.

Ms. Jean M. Shane, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent, said Ms. Ovington told Mr. Weatherspoon that she “should have further involvement and wants to be a part of the decision making in terms of the punishments or sanctions.”

Mr. Ellis said this has been a difficult situation and staff is making every effort to resolve the issue.

B. Teacher Preparation

Mr. Ellis said the Legislature has appropriated \$236,500 to be used for a study of teacher preparation programs. He said the funds shall be used by the Department to assess the satisfaction of employing school districts of new teachers and the preparation received by the new teacher. He said the study will focus on new teachers hired in the first year.

Mrs. Wise said she feels it would be beneficial to include data received from the premier schools mentioned by Mr. Durant earlier in the meeting.

XXXV. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MONTH

Board members were asked to submit agenda items for the August 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.

XXXVI. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE - DR. HERBERT MOYER

Dr. Moyer said the Board received many reports at the June 23, 1999, Committee of the Whole meeting regarding collaborative efforts which he feels were quite outstanding. He said the possibility of a State Board of Education sponsored forum has been discussed, and he thinks that because of the importance of this issue, the Board should show support and interest in collaborative school and community efforts. He suggested that perhaps the forum could even be conducted regionally.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Family Independence Agency and the Department of Community Health are key components of the interagency collaboration, and therefore, it would be important to include them as cosponsors of the forum.

Mrs. Beardmore said it is essential to target a specific audience, and suggested that instead of having a conference type forum, it may be beneficial to utilize interactive TV. She said the Michigan Association of School Boards holds conferences utilizing a regional site which is typically an intermediate school district (ISD), but admitted that it is difficult to attract a large number of people. She said ISD employees attend, but she feels that they are duty bound and may not otherwise show an interest.

Dr. Moyer said it would be important to integrate other departments, and interface with the professional school community to encourage attendance. He said the Board is concerned about lack of support in education, and the forum may be a very strategic vehicle for generating enthusiasm and sending a positive perspective on what public education is really about.

Mrs. Wise said only 28% of the households in Michigan have children in the K-12 school system, and suggested that the message of the forum be crafted to entice people who do not have school age children to attend.

Dr. Moyer said education is not just four walls, six hours a day, and the concern of the 28% of households with children in the K-12 system, but should be the focus of the entire community.

Mrs. Straus suggested that the forum be called an economic development conference.

Dr. Moyer said the Michigan Department of Education has the resources to conduct a forum which would focus on successful school and community collaborative programs.

Mrs. Straus said she thinks Dr. Moyer is attempting to reach all members of the community to inform them of what is occurring in the schools. She said she has attended similar conferences in the past which have been sponsored by multi-purpose collaborative bodies.

Mr. Ellis said Ms. Carol Wolenberg, Deputy Superintendent for Administrative and Support Services, accepted on behalf of the Department, an award given by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in November, 1997, titled the Grace B. Flandreau Award which is given for outstanding collaboration and leadership in children' protective services. He said Michigan has been slated as host for the International Initiative Policy-Makers Seminar on October 12-14, 1999, and he suggested that perhaps the forum proposed by Dr. Moyer may be tied into that.

XXXVII. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. August 26, 1999
- B. September 15-16, 1999
- C. October 20-21, 1999
- D. November 18, 1999

XXXVIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert S. Moyer
Secretary