

Call to Order The State P-16 Council met June 20, 2007, at 9:00 a.m. at the Kentucky Department of Education, State Board Room, Frankfort, Kentucky. Chair Mark Wattier presided.

Roll Call Members present: Dale Duvall (Local P-16 Councils), Jo Carole Ellis for Edward J. Cunningham (Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority), Jeanne Ferguson (Kentucky Board of Education), Bonnie Lash Freeman (Kentucky Board of Education), Sarah Hawker (Kentucky Adult Education), Thomas D. Layzell (Council on Postsecondary Education), John Marks, Kevin Noland (Kentucky Department of Education), Laura E. Owens (Education Cabinet), Beth Smith, Mark J. Wattier (P-16 Council Chair, Council on Postsecondary Education).

Approval of Minutes The minutes of the March 21, 2007, P-16 Council meeting were approved with changes.

Report from the Secretary of the Education Cabinet Secretary Laura Owens noted that the Cabinet was proceeding to address issues that Senate Joint Resolution 125 had raised, even though it did not pass. A task force is being convened that will bring together involved agencies and state and local representation to accelerate this process. It is scheduled to meet soon. She introduced John Marks, the new executive director of the Office of Career and Technical Education. She also introduced Mike Kendrick, the deputy executive director. Secretary Owens has been invited to join a panel sponsored by the Education Commission of the States that is scheduled to meet in July in Philadelphia to address state-level P-16 issues. It is an honor to have been one of only two states to be invited to present on this panel.

Discussion of Interagency Implementation of HJR 145, the Civics Education Resolution Robin Chandler, Office of Teaching and Learning, explained the involvement of multiple agencies in the implementation of HJR 145. This resolution required the collection of data. It asked for information on curriculum and assessment requirements at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels regarding the constitution and democratic processes and about requirements for teacher competency in those areas.

Ms. Chandler represents a team of people from the KDE, colleges and universities, and other agencies that have been reviewing these requirements in terms of civic engagement. At the elementary and secondary levels, there is required government and civics content at every grade level, as well as required assessments. She passed out information regarding the state level content standards and the assessment blueprint based on that content. She also included assessment results from the last CATS assessment, which showed that students conceptually rank above 50 percent on the assessment. Students are, nevertheless, scoring around the mean of 2.2 of 4.0 on the open response section of the assessment, which includes questions that require application of concepts and higher-order thinking skills.

Ms. Chandler elaborated on the members of the multi-agency team that have been working on these issues. Chair Mark Wattier asked if there were trained political scientists on the work group. She responded that content experts are

not on the work group but are consulted and deliver the content in the content academies that train teachers. The Civics Teacher Network is helping teachers assemble units of study to teach student engagement. Ms. Chandler further outlined the involvement of the Secretary of State's office in these initiatives. She clarified that districts are in the process of linking what they teach to a set of standardized course codes so that data may be collected about the courses offered in these areas.

Tom Layzell, CPE president, raised the question of what problem the resolution was designed to address. Ms. Chandler suggested that it could be related to concerns raised at the national level regarding a lack of knowledge, on the part of adults and students, about basic democratic institutions, as well as what legislators may be finding when they visit schools. Kevin Noland, KDE interim commissioner, confirmed her response. Dr. Layzell asked what more could be done. Ms. Chandler replied that the content has been available to teachers, but instructional examples, as well as the development of specific modules accompanied by assessment questions, will assist teachers in knowing how to more effectively teach the content. Ms. Chandler clarified that the modules will constitute a course that can be used as a whole or in part. They will be developed down to the lesson plan level with extensions for students with disabilities.

Dr. Wattier felt that the answer to Dr. Layzell's question could be that the legislature is deciding to enter the culture wars, addressing the question of what it means to be an American. Dr. Layzell questioned, if such information is out there, why are the assessment scores still average. Are there things at the postsecondary level that can be done to prepare teachers or to deliver content more effectively? Ms. Chandler responded that teacher preparation is critically important and noted that actual student engagement is not always addressed in civics teacher preparation programs. Dr. Layzell explained that he is trying to understand why so many students are coming to college unprepared. Ms. Chandler responded that there are limitations on the state assessment system and what it can measure. A single assessment score may not be an accurate measure of student preparedness. Further, due to the accountability tied to it, teachers spend much of their time teaching what will be covered on the CATS assessment, and civic engagement is not something that can be assessed through that mechanism.

Jim Applegate, CPE's vice president for academic affairs, presented positive statistics on the civic engagement of Kentucky students. Jeanne Ferguson asked whether we are trying to do too much, and instead should concentrate on more basic instruction. Ms. Chandler felt that the mission of schools is to impart knowledge of the real world and examples of how students might apply this knowledge in their adult lives. Sarah Hawker commented that the modules could be very beneficial to adult education students.

Dr. Applegate felt that the purpose of the resolution was to get students more civically engaged. The National Survey for Student Engagement noted that Kentucky, while above average on student community engagement, scored below average in the area of student voting. He discussed the Kentucky Campus Compact and noted that all comprehensive institutions in the state are members of the AISCU American Democracy Project. He also mentioned that colleges and universities are funding student internships to the Washington Center. The final report will include a more detailed account of activities.

Ms. Chandler called attention to the EPSB data in the report. Dr. Layzell noted that when the final report is made, it would be helpful to think about the next steps that are needed to improve both students' knowledge of civics and democratic processes and the level of their civic engagement.

*Update from Local
P-16 Councils*

Dale Duvall discussed the training and attrition of teachers and leaders. Representatives from Morehead State University convened a discussion with superintendents of schools in the area that they serve. Several of those districts have struggling schools. MoSU provides 70 percent of the teachers in the surrounding school districts. Dr. Duvall noted that if these districts have problems, MoSU has a problem, too, and must address it. He noted that MoSU was requesting funding for the joint mathematics initiative between them and local school districts that he had presented at the previous meeting. He observed that the university is entering into special partnerships with school districts to allow students in teacher preparation programs entry into schools during the sophomore year so they can decide early on if they will be satisfied with a career in teaching.

Dr. Duvall reported there are now 20 local or regional P-16 Councils and that many of them share concerns. These include student readiness for postsecondary education, professional development programs, and creating public awareness of critical P-16 issues.

*Kentucky River
Regional P-16 Council
– Ron Daley, Director,
University Center of
the Mountains*

Dale Duvall introduced Ron Daley, director of the University Center of the Mountains, who discussed the activities of the Kentucky River Regional P-16 Council. This local council serves the Kentucky River Area Development District (Breathitt, Knott, Leslie, Letcher, Perry, and Wolfe counties). Mr. Daley noted that under the CPE "Double the Numbers" initiative, his area has a special challenge. It has the lowest percentage of college graduates of any area in the state—only 8.6 percent as opposed to 17.1 percent in the rest of the state. Displaying a map, he showed that 75 counties statewide have less than 11 percent of college graduates. The next map showed 38 counties that fell behind the average in other areas of the state in the number of college graduates during 1990–2000. To address these concerns, the community settled on the idea of the University Center of the Mountains, which is a unique concept, and a model for rural America. It uses the facilities of Hazard Community and Technical College, and faculty come from various regional institutions to address the degrees needed to facilitate economic development of the community.

The Kentucky River Regional P-16 Council has struggled to get more business participation and is working to get out the message that the same skills students need to be college-ready are the same ones needed to be work-ready. It has institutionalized its message across the network. Mr. Daley discussed the education empowerment zone that the council has created and the interagency involvement around professional development. The council also recently initiated a Youth Leadership Summit. He discussed the work of the council's four committees and noted that this work raises special challenges and requires strong leadership and support. Sometimes communities feel that merely establishing a P-16 council is sufficient; however, hard work is necessary to make and maintain progress.

Dianne Bazell, CPE assistant vice president for academic affairs, pointed out the map of the P-16 councils. The CPE will include funding for local P-16 councils either in its budget request or in the joint CPE/KBE budget request. Dr. Bazell commended the Kentucky River P-16 Council for using data to develop and support its initiatives.

*Update on Proposed
CPE Regulation
Changes/Revisions in
College Readiness
Thresholds*

Jim Applegate noted that at a previous meeting, the P-16 Council reviewed the final report of the Developmental Education Task Force, which made six recommendations. One recommendation was for postsecondary education to work with middle and high schools to develop a portfolio of interventions around EPAS and college readiness. The CPE has devoted its share of Title II funds for teacher professional development to support instruction in the use of student assessment data to provide appropriate intervention. The CPE is discussing how to improve teacher professional development, and CPE staff have met with Secretary Owens, who is convening a group to address what is currently being done in professional development. They are moving forward on funding the recommendations of the Developmental Education Task Force report and are discussing inclusion of these recommendations in the CPE budget. Another task force recommendation encourages involved agencies to work together in a collaborative P-16 framework to reduce the numbers of unprepared students entering college and to provide support and assistance when unprepared students are admitted into college.

The current Mandatory Admissions Regulation set college readiness thresholds at 18 on the ACT tests in English, mathematics, and reading in 2000. The purpose of proposed revisions recommended by the task force is to revise these standards based on what is known about college readiness in 2007. In the proposed regulation, the English/language arts cut-off score remains at 18, but the mathematics cut-off score is raised to 19. This was a compromise, as both postsecondary mathematics faculty and ACT research agreed that readiness for college algebra is indicated by a mathematics sub-score of 22. Nineteen is the score at which Kentucky's statewide mathematics placement policy will guarantee placement in a credit-bearing mathematics course (though not algebra) to any student admitted into a public institution in Kentucky. Based on ACT research, the task force recommends that the reading threshold be raised to 21. The purpose of the change is to send an honest, clear, consistent message statewide that, regardless of where a student intends to attend, this is the level of attainment needed.

Dr. Applegate noted that the most important thing about the regulation is reference to the skills required. This regulation places greater responsibility on public postsecondary programs. It says if a student comes in under these criteria, certain things must happen. First, they will be given a placement test. They could receive a score that indicates that they are currently college-ready and then be moved into a credit-bearing course. If not, it requires the institution to provide assistance the very first semester. It then requires the institution to ensure that the student enrolls in the appropriate credit-bearing course immediately upon completion of the assistance. He clarified that assistance does not necessarily equate to a full course. It is understood that differentiated learning should be provided based on student need. Specific plans will be required from all institutions as to how they will implement these requirements on their campus.

Dr. Applegate then outlined the regulation review process that will be undertaken. He feels that the proposals will ensure that incoming students get the help they need. He noted that only 63 percent of these students come from Kentucky high schools (others may be adult or out-of-state students) and that this needs to be kept in mind as this process unfolds.

Linda France, KDE deputy commissioner, noted that once these thresholds are increased, there will be a corresponding increase in the numbers of students requiring developmental coursework. She introduced Michael

Hansen, field scientist from the CNA Corporation currently working with the KDE. Dr. Hansen was asked to examine the effects of the policy change. He clarified that his role was to provide the KDE with independent research analysis of educational issues of interest. Dr. Hansen feels that there are potential impacts for students. He noted that for individuals who are attending college, the intent of the changes appears to be to ensure that they are placed in coursework that more closely aligns with their level of preparedness. The data are clear that the chances for success are increased for that population. He went on to identify some unintended consequences, commenting that the data are not sufficiently detailed to give an estimate as to how large these effects might be. The first issue is related to admissions. While this policy does not directly relate to admissions, there will be students who may choose not to attend college because of these requirements. Requiring students to take additional developmental coursework will increase the amount of time necessary to complete college and delay graduation and eventual entry into the paid workforce. Thus, some students may choose not to enroll in college because of the increased financial consequences. If the policy goal is to double the numbers of students attending college, this policy may not be supportive of the goal. Dr. Hansen's final comment related to using the ACT for determining which students are placed in the developmental education pool. He noted that not all students who have high scores on the ACT are successful in college. In the data provided by the CPE, there are students who do well on the ACT but do not do well in college and students who do poorly on the ACT who do very well in college. So high scores on the ACT will not guarantee successful completion of college. One possible response would be to have no ACT cut-off score but to require all incoming students to take placement exams.

Dr. Applegate noted he had seen no data that would suggest that higher cut-off scores would serve as a disincentive to college attendance. He felt that under current practice, colleges and universities are taking students' money/financial aid, not getting them the help they need, and then students are gone after their first year. He pointed out that the work to determine cut-off scores began with work around the American Diploma Project, and a number of experts involved felt that this was a good way to indicate a concern in these areas that could be followed up with a placement test. Further, using the ACT provides a connection with K-12, since every junior in Kentucky will take the ACT in spring 2008. He felt that organizing around the ACT, using the PLAN and EXPLORE assessments, would help high school teachers know whether students are on target to score well on the ACT in sufficient time to allow interventions to raise their performance to the necessary level. He felt that this, in conjunction with Senate Bill 130, provided transparency so that all involved would better understand the expectations. Another concern was that colleges use different placement tests.

Dr. Layzell added that the "Double the Numbers" initiative has a ripple effect across many areas. The Developmental Education Task Force initiative, which was driven by the Double the Numbers initiative, will require the CPE to look at some things differently. It will require a look at the financing of developmental education. It will clearly require a look at teacher preparation programs. It is not just ramping up standards for its own sake; rather, it is about doing an array of things differently. The CPE has attempted to define what it means for the state to reach at least the national average in educational attainment. Postsecondary education must address many issues, and it needs the assistance of the K-12 sector.

Kevin Noland asked for clarification of what help is being requested. He felt that in order to fully address the issue, there must be more under discussion

than mere academic preparedness. He noted that, while the ACT is a college predictor, it is only about 49 percent successful in predicting college success. This is because there are other issues involved that have a high impact on college success. These may be family or relationship issues; they may be financial issues; they may be motivation, study, or organizational skills; or the ability to take the initiative when parents are not closely supervising students. So, he asked, as we look at these "gatekeepers" (whether ACT or placement exams), are there ways to diagnose and address the nonacademic issues involved? Unless we identify those other nonacademic issues and try to provide assistance in addressing those, we will not be successful regardless of the student's ACT score. He requested some examples of institutions in Kentucky that are doing a good job of looking at all those factors and helping their students to succeed. Dr. Layzell offered Murray State University as an example and surmised that part of what higher education has to do is look at some interventions that had been put in place a while back but discontinued, such as interventions to assure that students get up and get to class. He is not sure that it is broadly understood in higher education what will be required in order to achieve success. Chair Mark Wattier noted that part of Murray's success is related to the fact that it has fully embraced the concept of standing *in loco parentis* to their students. Many faculty members are more involved with their students within and outside of class, and they have initiated an early alert system to let them know when students are exhibiting difficulties.

Ms. France emphasized that she feels that it is incumbent on the K-12 sector to work with students while they are still in high school to better prepare them, especially since we now have PLAN, EXPLORE, and ACT assessments to provide data. The K-12 sector wants to do more to prepare these students to keep them out of developmental education courses, especially since the increased numbers of students will raise concerns about how to find sufficient numbers of teachers and how to serve these additional numbers of students.

Dr. Hansen indicated that one way to avoid the unintended consequences might be good communication. The fact that this is not a part of admissions policy should be clearly communicated to students. He also noted that merely changing a threshold does not make anyone more prepared for college. The new threshold will define the class of those whom we consider underprepared but that is not the same as those who actually are underprepared. Any process that more closely matches the student level of preparedness with the level of difficulty of the course, however, will be an improvement.

Dr. Bazell noted that while we are still working on teacher preparation and professional development, we should also recognize how much work has been completed in standards alignment for college readiness.

Bonnie Freeman maintained that the EPAS system would really make a difference in how counselors and teachers work with students, so they must be assisted by the provision of appropriate supports. They are asking what to do with the scores and how they should change their instruction to support this work. She also asked how support would be provided to adult education students. She further commented that she continues to find teachers who believe and communicate to others that some students should not go to college, and this is very disheartening. Secretary Laura Owens highlighted that the postsecondary pathway chosen by some students may not be college but they all need to be prepared for any path that they choose.

Sarah Hawker noted that in the coming year adult education is emphasizing higher scores and diminishing remediation for students. Secretary Owens noted that adult education students still take the Test for Adult Basic Education

(TABE) assessment that identifies areas of weakness that may be in need of remediation. Dr. Applegate noted that we also often fail to take note of the WorkKeys assessment that assesses workplace readiness and is available to students under SB 130.

Dr. Duvall asked whether, as we communicate to schools and districts the ACT scores that are needed, are we in danger of deemphasizing the CATS scores in these schools? Some comments indicated a belief that this would be a positive occurrence. Ms. France addressed the issue by clarifying that the CATS test is a standards-based assessment required by *No Child Left Behind* that assures parents and legislators that our teachers are teaching to the curriculum standards. As noted in the earlier review of the CATS assessment blueprint for civics education, the CATS assessment keeps us on track that the state's curriculum standards are being taught and tested. It is a test for a very different purpose than the ACT, although the ACT has become an important element of our assessment system. Without curriculum standards, our teachers will again be in a position of teaching to moving targets.

*Kentucky Dual Credit
Task Force – Briefing
Paper and Discussion
of Implementation
Issues*

Joel Vargas, program director for Jobs for the Future, a nonprofit, research, and advocacy organization, presented highlights of the two papers, the *Briefing Paper to the Kentucky Dual Credit Task Force*, and the *Recommendations for Data Collection and Analysis to the Kentucky Dual Credit Task Force*. In early February, Jobs for the Future was hired by the Kentucky Dual Credit Task Force to engage in a dialogue about how the state's dual credit policies could be enhanced. There are two phases of the work: the first was a review of eligibility and finance issues in dual credit programs; the second was a more long-term assessment of what data and analyses would be necessary to evaluate the utility and success of dual credit programs.

In Phase 1, the central questions were:

- How can Kentucky structure dual enrollment eligibility to maximize student access while maintaining high quality, college-level standards?
- How can Kentucky finance dual enrollment to achieve the task force's vision of improving high school achievement, postsecondary access and success, and workforce readiness for all students?

The report recommended that the state adopt policies that emphasize access, rigor, relevance, and high support and that are consistent with the principles outlined below:

- All high school students should receive opportunities to take college courses based on demonstrations of their readiness in subject areas corresponding to the course(s) taken.
- The academic standards and assessments used to determine eligibility for college course-taking should be consistent statewide and tied to transparent state standards and assessments aligned with standards for college and workforce readiness.
- The state should widely develop schools, programs, and courses that provide underrepresented and underprepared high school students with the support they need to become eligible for, and succeed in, college courses.
- Cost should not stand in the way of access for students who are eligible for college courses.

- The state should only fund courses and programs that lead to a postsecondary degree or occupational credential. At least some of these should be offered on college campuses.
- The state should adopt a do-no-harm approach to its current dual enrollment efforts, allowing them to continue. Any state financial support for dual enrollment, however, should require that new or existing programs conform to state dual enrollment policy.

Kentucky's current policies and practices were reviewed in light of the principles, which raised policy questions for discussion, as well as the related issues of teacher qualifications and course quality.

Dr. Bazell noted that CPE staff wanted to ensure that we were dealing with availability of online courses as a method of content delivery. Linda Pittenger clarified that content availability through online courses would be a critical part of the state's strategy. She clarified that the recommendations from this dialogue would come before the KBE in August and would then be brought back to the State P-16 Council after that review.

The second phase of the work undertaken related to data collection and analysis. Jobs for the Future provided a conceptual framework to guide the Dual Credit Task Force in the development of a dual enrollment research plan in Kentucky. The report also identified gaps in data and shortcomings of the current data systems and provided recommendations for next steps as a means to think about the key priorities.

*Advanced Placement
Enterprise of Kentucky
(APEK)*

Linda France shared information about the Advanced Placement Enterprise of Kentucky (APEK). She noted that Joanne Lang, vice president, Kentucky Science and Technology Corporation (KSTC), was unable to attend the meeting since the grant proposal was due the next day and she was involved with last minute preparations.

Kentucky was one of 21 states invited by the National Mathematics and Science Initiative (NMSI), to submit a proposal for incentives for students and teachers to take a more rigorous Advanced Placement curriculum. Kentucky submitted a pre-proposal and appears to be very well situated to take advantage of this funding. The grant, if received, will be for \$13 million over a six-year period. Kentucky has identified 41 high schools in 26 districts that are ready to become involved. The grant closely mirrors what Senate Bills 1 and 2 (2006 General Session) were designed to do: provide incentives for enrolling and excelling in the AP courses and assessments.

The grant is modeled on a program in Texas called AP Strategies. The proposal requires Kentucky to follow that model closely. It identifies and serves two types of schools. The first are *launch schools*, where very few students are taking AP courses and there is a very narrow selection of courses. Students from launch schools earn financial incentives to pass the AP assessments with a score of three or above. Teachers also earn financial incentives of up to \$1500 per teacher based upon the performance of their students. The second type of schools is *gain schools*. Gain schools already have a wide array of AP courses being taught which students are passing but room for growth remains. Students in gain schools do not receive financial incentives

Kentucky is positioned well and received a large number of very strong letters of support. The terms of the grant stipulated that the funding, which comes from the Exxon Mobile Company (\$125 million), must go to a 501(c)(3) corporation. Joanne Lang has been a member of the STEM Task Force, and

because of this involvement, KSTC was a natural choice as a supporting partner. The Partnership for Successful Schools has been involved, as has the CPE. On July 11, a team from AP Strategies will be in Kentucky to interview key stakeholders to see if the state is sufficiently prepared to support this kind of initiative. On July 27, the state will be notified as to the outcome of the proposal. Information provided indicated 10 states would be funded during the first year based upon readiness.

Linda Pittenger drew attention to the grant's emphasis on students and the emphasis on teacher professional development in both the launch and gain schools. In the gain schools, 70 of the grant funds go toward professional development. Ms. France observed that all participating students will be required to take the PSAT and commented that the work has shown significant results in Texas in the required courses of science, mathematics, and English.

Joint P-16 Budget Requests

Tom Layzell discussed the previous joint budget request submitted by the KDE, CPE, and EPSB through the Education Cabinet. He noted that it was a first for Kentucky and likely for the nation. Of the joint budget proposals, the Kentucky Education Network was the only item to receive funding. He also said that the CPE would return to the legislature this year for the remaining items that did not receive funding. He noted that these types of activities drive us toward convergence and should drive us closer in issues of planning.

Kevin Noland felt that getting one of the four priorities funded the first time it was requested was a good beginning and verified we would be getting back together to plan for the upcoming session. KDE staff is required statutorily to take Council priorities to the KBE to get their endorsement for budget requests. Dr. Layzell noted this was a part of CPE's process as well. This opened other crossover initiatives with other agencies. Staff anticipate putting the data warehouse in the request. KDE's unique student identifier spurred the CPE to look more closely at implementing a way to continue tracking these students.

P-16 Quality Indicators

Dianne Bazell discussed the handout reflecting the P-16 quality indicators. She provided a brief history, noting that in 2002 the P-16 member agencies decided to develop a common vision statement, an active agenda, and some goals and indicators. This was brought to the P-16 Council, which charged staff with developing some items to serve as indicators of progress. An initial listing was developed, which was shared with the council last summer and has been modified to address the comments received at that time. This is the result, which remains in draft form. The principles on which it was developed are to:

- Focus on cross-sector transition areas ("seams") of Kentucky's P-16 education system that both reflect progress and influence the agendas of the partner agencies to effect systemwide change and further the state's goals of raising the level of educational attainment in the Commonwealth and improving the quality of life of all Kentuckians.
- Use data that are meaningful and comparable across states.
- Use data that are already collected.

Work is still underway on some additional items, including a workforce standard. The document fulfills three functions:

- To address questions regarding the effectiveness and direction of Kentucky's P-16 Council (Is the agenda working? Are partner agencies working together effectively? Which areas need more attention?).

- To align state and local agendas and provide a common set of criteria for assessing performance and progress.
- To promote the Commonwealth by communicating to others, especially businesses and other potential employers considering locating in Kentucky, that state and local leaders are focused on a shared and strategically implemented agenda to increase the level of educational attainment of Kentuckians.

Dr. Bazell reviewed specific data elements in the document and shared that she had been invited to serve on a panel at the NASH/Education Trust Conference in July about P-16 data measures. Conference organizers indicated they wanted to begin looking at a system of P-16 effectiveness measures, and she provided this information to them for review. She noted that Kentucky is again leading on these issues.

Kevin Noland requested some changes in the data measures. He asked if it would be possible to have a category of *Ninth-graders Chance for College* absent the age nineteen quantifier. Dr. Bazell noted that the *Measuring Up* study collects this data, and if different data were desired it would have to be collected in house. Commissioner Noland further felt it would be helpful to have a breakdown on degrees awarded in terms of associate, baccalaureate, master's and doctoral. Dr. Layzell noted that baccalaureate degrees constitute only about a third (or 15,000) of the degrees awarded. Many of the degrees shown as awarded are those awarded by the KCTCS. Linda France requested that we add information on AP scores and the PSAT if the NMSI grant is awarded. Dr. Layzell indicated there are quality of life indicators from the Kentucky Long Term Policy Research Center that may be helpful to include. Dr. Wattier suggested Robert Putnam's Social Capital Index as a potential source for quality of life indicators.

*Other Business -
Election of Chair*

Kevin Noland nominated KBE member Jeanne Ferguson as the chair of the P-16 Council for 2007-08. Tom Layzell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be September 19, 2007, in Conference Room A, Council on Postsecondary Education office, 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 320, Frankfort. The December meeting will be held Wednesday, December 12, 2007, at the CPE office. The meeting schedule for 2008 will be set at a later date.

Adjournment

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded and passed unanimously. Chair Ferguson adjourned the meeting.

Linda France
Former Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Learning and Results Services
Kentucky Department of Education