Call to Order

The P-16 Council convened December 16, 2003, at the Council on Postsecondary Education office in Frankfort, Kentucky. Chair Gail Henson called the meeting to order and invited Education Cabinet Secretary Virginia Fox to address the Council.

Remarks by Education Cabinet Secretary Fox

Secretary Fox spoke of how the Governor's reorganization gives opportunity for every player in education to work together. She emphasized that the Governor plans to focus on early childhood and closing the education achievement gap. Other areas of emphasis include working with children at risk and their families and dealing with health and under-education issues. Health, education, and early intervention are parts of one package. Virtual universities, adult literacy, and the GED are keys to addressing some of Kentucky's educational problems. Secretary Fox clarified that her interest and role will be to help eliminate policy barriers to a seamless education system in Kentucky. She said that she will ask the agencies in the newly organized Education Cabinet (the Education Professional Standards Board, the Kentucky Department of Education, the Council on Postsecondary Education, Workforce Development, the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority, and Kentucky Educational Television) to collaboratively identify the changes that need to be made, by either regulation or executive order, to reduce impediments to educational attainment, and she will bring these to the next session of the legislature. She will encourage the agencies to work together to solve specific problems in the interest of Kentucky's children and their families. She pledged to be in close contact with representatives from these agencies.

Secretary Fox noted that two other agencies, the University of Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service and Kentucky State Police, both of which are located in every county in the Commonwealth, are potential outreach mechanisms. She told the Council that she will work with the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission and with the P-16 Council on how to remove barriers and unnecessary complications to the delivery of education and other needed services to the state's children and families.

Secretary Fox expressed her gratitude for the opportunity to address the P-16 Council and promised to be faithful in attendance.

Dr. Henson thanked Secretary Fox for attending and for her comments.

Roll Call

The following P-16 Council members were present: Lydia Coffey, Richard Freed, Gail Henson, Susan Leib, Kim Townley, and Gene Wilhoit. Jim Applegate represented Thomas D. Layzell.

The following members were absent: Peggy Bertelsman, Barton Darrell, Thomas D. Layzell, Hilma Prather and Paul Whalen.

Approval of Minutes

The September 9, 2003, minutes were approved by acclamation.

2+2 Teacher Education Agreement

Dr. Carolyn O'Daniel of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System opened the discussion on the 2+2 Teacher Education Agreement. Dr. O'Daniel began by recalling that about two years ago she and Karen Adams, then dean of the College of Education at Western Kentucky University, addressed the Council about this initiative. She reported that considerable progress has been made, and she shared an abbreviated report that she and colleagues Jack Rose of Murray State University and Lucian Yates of Kentucky State University recently shared with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Two years ago at the National Association of System Heads annual K-16 Summer Institute, Kentucky's state P-16 team decided that the Commonwealth's public and private institutions and the Kentucky Community and Technical College System could collaboratively create a high-quality 2+2 teacher preparation program that will be accessible to all Kentuckians who want to become teachers. The intent was to create a seamless system whereby students can begin teacher preparation as early as high school and continue either in a local community and technical college or in the virtual university, and then transfer into a bachelor's degree program. The team began working with the CPE, the universities, the KBE, the EPSB, and the KCTCS. The P-16 Council also was very supportive of this initiative.

Dr. Adams and Dr. O'Daniel assumed the roles of co-chairs of a statewide steering team. When Dr. Adams left for central Michigan, Dr. Rose assumed the role of co-chair. The steering team consisted of five of the deans of education at the public institutions, Dr. William Brown from Lindsey Wilson College (who created a Web site and shared the group's planning process with all of the independent colleges), representative KCTCS faculty and staff, a representative from the KDE, Dr. Dianne Bazell from the CPE staff, and Dr. Marilyn Troupe from the EPSB. Benefits were identified that would appeal to a broad range of potential applicants, including rural and urban students, under-represented ethnic and gender minorities, economically and socially disadvantaged students, GED completers, and high school students.

The program offers geographically accessible programs using alternative delivery mechanisms, and it has multiple entry and exit points. It also accounts for mandates of the *No Child Left Behind* legislation that requires not only highly qualified teachers in every classroom, but also highly qualified teacher aides and paraeducators. The program is expected to reduce the proportion of out-of-area and emergency certified teachers and increase teacher quality.

Eastern Kentucky University, Kentucky State University, Morehead State University, and Murray State University are participating this year in a three-way partnership along with the KCTCS and the KDE to offer the KCTCS introductory course EDU 201, Introduction to American Education, to high school students. The universities will assure that the NCATE standards and the program requirements are met, as well as the KCTCS curricular requirements. Two different sets of institutions will monitor and assure that SACS accreditation standards are met. The high schools provide the instructors for the courses, except in western Kentucky where MuSU is providing an instructor. Students will receive KCTCS credit, and the universities guarantee the acceptance of that credit toward four-year degrees.

In October 2003, the statewide 2+2 articulation agreement was signed by the KCTCS, all eight public institutions in the state, five independent institutions, and the statewide agencies and associations—the EPSB, the KDE, the CPE, and the Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities. The 2+2 degree involves credit of which no less than 60 hours is applicable toward every teacher preparation degree offered by the participating universities and colleges. The 16-hour certificate program is embedded, and it is aligned with the competency assessment developed by the KDE.

The statewide steering team is still active and will meet again in early 2004. Members recognize that this is a first step and that there is additional work to do. They want to identify a liaison in each of the districts to work with the secondary, the two-year, and the four-year institutions. The team also will work to create strong alliances between the education faculty and the arts and sciences faculty on the KCTCS campuses in order to ensure that the students are adequately prepared to pass the PRAXIS and transfer successfully to the four-year institutions.

Dr. O'Daniel acknowledged the importance of monitoring transfer student progress, comparing it with native student progress, and continuing to improve the program based on feedback reports. Dr. Applegate noted that the CPE is creating a feedback report to monitor all transfer students.

Dr. O'Daniel explained that the associate degree curriculum has two tracks, one of which includes the 16-credit hour certificate for paraeducators. Both tracks culminate in an associate of applied science in education. Each of the participating four-year institutions agreed to accept at least 60 credit hours for at least one of their programs, though there is variation among the institutions with respect to the number of options and tracks within each program for which transfer credit would apply.

Commissioner Wilhoit observed that he continues to hear from students who have difficulty transferring from four-year to four-year institutions. Dr. Applegate responded that the 2+2 program is designed for transfer from two-

year to four-year institutions, which is a different issue. About 800 students a year transfer from four-year to four-year institutions, and some of them still with difficulties that the CPE continues to monitor and address.

Dr. Townley said that it is important to communicate the transfer agreement to counselors and make sure they can articulate what students need to do if they choose to transfer.

Dr. Applegate agreed, adding that the CPE is planning regional workshops with the KCTCS faculty. The CPE also has organized a statewide transfer committee that includes the KCTCS and the four-year universities. The CPE staff continues to work with the statewide transfer committee, registrars, and others who work directly with the students to make sure they know how to implement the transfer frameworks.

Dr. Applegate also noted that the CPE conducted an analysis of the number of credits required for a transfer student to earn a four-year degree compared to the number required of native students who earn four-year degrees. The results indicated that the transfer students are graduating with just about the same number of hours as the natives.

Dr. O'Daniel pointed out that a brochure is being developed with basic information about the 2+2 Teacher Education Agreement. The brochure that will be distributed statewide will include a phone number people can call to request more information.

Commissioner Wilhoit responded that the transfer agreement information should be disseminated throughout the education system so that students can be made aware of the options at the middle school and high school levels and throughout their educational experiences.

Dr. Henson congratulated those who had developed the 2+2 program, stating that it is a model for other such agreements.

Local P-16 Councils

Dr. Henson invited Mr. Gary Wiseman and Dr. Barbara Stonewater to present an update on the work of the local P-16 councils.

Mr. Wiseman, chair of the Kentucky Regional/Local P-16 Network, reported that he and Dr. Bazell had been invited to New Jersey by the leaders of its statewide P-20 initiative to share Kentucky's lessons learned in forming local councils. He added that he and former KDE deputy commissioner, Dr. Lois Adams-Rodgers, also had spoken on Kentucky's accomplishments to P-16 leaders in Tennessee. Kentucky is clearly seen as a leader in P-16 efforts. Local councils are strong, and the network continues to meet regularly. A priority of the Bluegrass Region P-16 Council is to refocus and expand the use of the Individual Graduation Plan and develop a comprehensive program. Another

important focus of the council is to review comprehensively the State Scholars Program and to ascertain how it would affect the high school curriculum and students. The IGP is a very important component of that.

Dr. Stonewater reported on northern Kentucky initiatives. Kenton County is one of the five pilot school districts for the Kentucky Scholars initiative. Dr. Stonewater mentioned discussions that had taken place about how to increase employer engagement with students with respect to planning their high school coursework. She explained that the local council is involved in several follow-up projects related to the American Diploma Project and higher achievement for all students. Related to the writing portfolio, the council also is pursuing a writing project that will involve five high schools and three postsecondary institutions in northern Kentucky. The project objective is to add an analytical writing piece to the portfolio and then to have Northern Kentucky University, Thomas More College, and Gateway Community and Technical College use those writing pieces as part of course placement determination.

A steering committee is considering the implications of the ADP benchmark report for northern Kentucky. There is a great deal of interest and excitement about using the ADP benchmark standards and the work samples that come with it in reviewing the curriculum in northern Kentucky. One of the challenges is to marry the benchmarks with the current demands on teachers to teach the core content and the Program of Studies, which prepare students for taking the CATS tests.

Also, the KCTCS is working with the Ford Foundation to develop a number of career pathway projects throughout the state, and Gateway will be one of those pilot projects. Northern Kentucky is very involved in developing initially a manufacturing career pathway program with a seamless transition from middle school to the highest degree. Plans are to use this program as a model and, with or without Ford Foundation money, to develop a similar kind of program in allied health.

The goals of the northern Kentucky council are seamless transition and well-designed pathways allowing students to progress through the educational system.

Mr. Wiseman reported that the Bluegrass Regional Council will sponsor a meeting in February with regional math teachers of the Bluegrass Region and the director of the Kentucky Early Mathematics Testing Program to obtain and review feedback from teachers on the ADP math benchmarks.

Dr. Stonewater elaborated on what the analytical or academic piece of the writing portfolio might be in the northern Kentucky pilot project. Current thought is that will be an analytical piece that relates to the student’s future academic plans. If plans entail college, then a research paper may be

appropriate; but if the student is directed toward a high-demand job or career technical program, then perhaps a different kind of writing sample would be in order. Further discussion emphasized critical thinking and analysis as needed components for the writing piece.

Starr Lewis of the KDE added that in January a group will meet to discuss how to communicate the idea that the transactive component of the writing portfolio could be a research project or something more technical. There have been difficulties in communicating that the transactive piece is supposed to pertain to analytical writing.

Ms. Lewis also noted that there is not a strong match between the Program of Studies and the core content when considering alignment between the ADP and Kentucky standards. For instance, the ADP benchmarks include speaking and listening, research, and technology skills. These are in the Program of Studies but, because Kentucky does not assess those, they are not in the core content. Ms. Lewis emphasized the importance of the crosswalk between KDE standards and ADP benchmarks including the Program of Studies as well as the core content.

Dr. Stonewater mentioned that northern Kentucky is collecting first-year writing samples from Northern Kentucky University, Thomas More, and Gateway as part of the project, and she has already received several sample from Gateway. Some of these samples will be reviewed at the upcoming meetings along with samples from other institutions. Dr. Bazell noted that the KCTCS appears to demonstrate the most hesitation about the feasibility of using the writing portfolio for postsecondary placement purposes. Dr. O'Daniel explained that two KCTCS faculty workgroups have been addressing the issue of assessment and placement policies at the KCTCS. Both of these groups have expressed doubts that the high school writing portfolio is a match for placement into English 101, but view the analytical component as the missing piece and are willing to work to help the KDE make that adjustment.

Regarding the organizational and infrastructure of the local councils, Dr. Stonewater replied that most are working on common themes of curricular alignment and high school to college to work transitions, though each area is doing it differently. Stability of purpose and action is difficult to maintain since consistent leadership is lacking. Only one local council has even a part-time staff person.

Dr. Bazell noted that the CPE staff is developing a Web site where local councils can display and share information about their agenda, but that the American Diploma Project has helped to focus a good deal of activity at the local level. Local councils have requested further information about the ADP and have convened groups of high school teachers and postsecondary faculty to discuss drafts of the benchmarks. Several local councils have already begun the

process of revising their minimum graduation standards in light of the ADP benchmarks. Other than curricular issues, some local councils are focused on dual enrollment and dual credit issues, through the Discover College model. Most local councils are addressing high school to college transfer and workforce transition.

Commissioner Wilhoit commented that local council initiatives, responses to ADP standards, and the lack of resources for local councils are all examples of issues relevant to the state P-16 Council. The Council has rightly invested much faith in the local P-16 councils, but without appropriate resources, continuity and support, the councils' effectiveness will be diminished. It is appropriate for the state P-16 Council to ensure that the local councils have the resource base to function.

Dr. Applegate responded that the CPE will post a call for proposals for small grants of up to $20,000 to create new local councils and to establish or sustain activities of current local councils. He noted that Kentucky has received national attention for its development of local P-16 councils, and that the Go Higher campaign picked up on that, along with its promotion of adult education. Because of efforts to improve education and to create a seamless transition, Kentucky was one of three states chosen as a national model for the pathways network of the LUMINA Foundation. This campaign could draw large sums of money from national sources to promote college access.

Dr. Freed asked that the regional network develop a systemwide council reporting system to keep the state Council informed of local meetings and activities. Dr. Stonewater and Mr. Wiseman agreed that this is important and that they will work with state staff on developing a reporting process.

Dr. Applegate added that the councils have a listserv for communicating between/among local councils, but a Web site is being developed to post best practices, ideas, and activities.

Dr. Sue Moore of the CPE staff agreed that Commissioner Wilhoit's concern for communication between the state P-16 Council and the local councils is critical. In the review of the P-16 action agenda, goals, and indicators, this relationship needs to be revisited to strike a delicate balance between the grassroots efforts and the state P-16 agenda.

Dr. Bazell noted that local districts have been sensitive to the minimum high school graduation requirements, or the Program of Studies. Local districts are free and encouraged to go above that minimum level, and some have taken the initiative to do so. That is the spirit in which local councils are working. They see the ADP benchmarks not in conflict with CATS, but instead moving CATS standards to a higher level.

Dr. Stonewater added that the question remains regarding how to develop a prototype curriculum suggested in mathematics and English language arts, incorporating as much as possible of the ADP benchmarks, and at the same time supporting the core content and the Program of Studies for which teachers are responsible. Walton Verona is one district that is poised to adopt the college preparatory curriculum as the minimum curriculum, so that implies that some students will enroll in advanced courses.

Commissioner Wilhoit said that educators cannot assume that what is being tested or what is in the Program of Studies is going to remain constant.

Feedback on what teachers perceive to be important and whether there is a direct alignment of that in our Program of Studies would be helpful.

Commissioner Wilhoit asked the P-16 Council to monitor and sustain the involvement of a community/technical college and a university in each of the local councils. To be successful, it is essential that higher education agencies, the technical college system, and the four-year institutions work together. Dr. Bazell responded that part of the funding process requires the involvement of a university or KCTCS representative. Also, the CPE has not routinely funded single counties, unless they are very large like Jefferson and Pike counties. She added that Jefferson is now willing to move outside its sphere as Greater Louisville.

Dr. Moore suggested that the P-16 Council members be given a list of local council memberships. Dr. Bazell agreed to provide that at the next meeting.

Dr. Henson asked that the state P-16 Council be advised of local council network meetings. Dr. Stonewater responded positively, noting that 20-25 people usually attend the meetings.

Setting P-16 Council Priorities

Referencing the priorities that emerged from the 2003 NASH K-16 Summer Institute State Team meeting, Dr. Henson noted that it is impossible to consider and do them individually, but that they fit under the three goals that previously had been set by and for the state P-16 Council. She directed the Council to revisit the three goals in light of the NASH team priorities and Kentucky's efforts to provide a seamless system of education. She asked members to provide input from their various perspectives about the implications for the work teams in terms of policies, actions, and organizational priorities. Deputy Commissioner Linda France of the KDE provided charts listing the three Council goals. Members worked individually and posted their input under appropriate goals. The objective was to identify key issues that will guide the Council's focus for the next several months.

To explain the impetus for this work, Dr. Bazell reported that the NASH state P-16 team, knowing that there should be a unified discussion leading to a vision

statement and focus for the P-16 Council, listed the issues together in July and reported them to the Council in September 2002. The vision, mission, goals, and objectives have all been previously agreed upon, although the indicators of progress are still being developed. The intent was to characterize how agencies work across organizational lines to form the work of the P-16 Council, which is more than just the sum of its parts.

Dr. Freed asked what the Council hopes to do once the agenda is redefined. Dr. Henson responded that the intent is to merge the priorities with the P-16 Council goals and objectives. The discussion will affect the agenda for the next couple of years and will help the Council determine its agenda focus in the context of its mission.

Dr. Applegate added that the P-16 Council members can report back to their agencies on the Council's discussions about seamlessness, the achievement gap, a default curriculum, or other issues. This will let the agencies know that the P-16 Council supports the efforts of its partner agencies. The representatives to the P-16 Council also can determine the leading agency for specific change, support, collaboration, and feedback.

Dr. Bazell pointed out that Secretary Fox also has promised to work to eliminate policy and other barriers to the Council's work. Commissioner Wilhoit noted that the Council's work is taken seriously by its partner agencies, and the agencies include P-16 Council reports on the agendas for their meetings. He also mentioned that the local P-16s are doing what they are doing because of the initiative taken at the state level.

Linda France reported on the responses to "Goal 1: All educators shall be qualified and competent by 2006."

Ms. France reported that some of the notes relate to revisions to objectives. Other responses include improving effectiveness of the KEMTP program, improving teacher preparation, such as using master teachers in a clinical training model, using master principals in a clinical training model, offering faculty development options for teachers, and modifying the content area of master's degree programs. Other input related to recruitment, such as setting priorities for recruitment, identifying incentives for teachers in high-risk schools, and providing some loan forgiveness in shortage career areas. Another suggestion advocated revising the postsecondary reward system to support college and university faculty working directly with the public schools and adult education programs. Still other notes revolved around professional development, not only using data to inform decisions about professional development needs, and strengthening professional development more generally and across the board.

Dr. Henson brought attention to the lack of master's degree programs in content areas and suggested that the CPE address this issue.

Commissioner Wilhoit responded that the P-16 Council's work is to discuss and resolve issues that cannot be resolved by a single organization. He said that professional development for teachers is one of these issues. Teachers feel that they do not have a set of professional development options to pursue, and they cannot get the kind of experiences they need at the universities. The other side of the concern is that the universities have found that teachers can go through the administrative certification process very quickly using adjunct faculty. This is productive and financially lucrative for universities. He predicted that in the long run this will be more costly as there are professional responsibilities that align with the EPSB's competencies that must shape future conversations. The KBE needs to determine how well its development opportunities are aligned with the university system.

Dr. Leib added that this situation of professional development options is going to become even more critical with the federal mandates of the *No Child Left Behind* legislation. The federal government defines a highly qualified teacher as one who has a bachelor's degree in any major and can pass the PRAXIS exam. Nothing is said about teacher preparation or pedagogy, which the EPSB feels are essential to teacher preparation. This makes it even more important for the universities to understand and support the professional development needs of teachers. The universities need to offer programs in content areas so teachers do not feel compelled to seek options through the KyEducators.org, virtual universities, or other alternative options. If the trend continues, the universities will be marginalized and even eliminated, and teachers will lose a critical part of professional development.

Dr. Leib noted that there are already four states in the nation that have passed laws declaring people in their respective states to be certified to teach if they have bachelor's degrees and pass the PRAXIS II exam. Teachers from these states will come to Kentucky so a cohesive response to the implications of this is needed. Commissioner Wilhoit observed that teachers are not taking the alternative options for professional development merely because they are easier or more convenient, but because the teachers are finding that the alternative experiences more closely align with what they are expected to do in the classrooms.

Dr. Applegate pointed out that some Kentucky institutions offer alternative certifications, and work should continue to broaden those options. The recent Teacher Quality Summit hosted at EKU focused on teachers' professional development and how better to align institutional offerings with the professional development needs of teachers. The CPE staff will be publishing *Kentucky Teacher* and considering various mechanisms for communicating

university options to teachers and confirming to universities the strong demand for online offerings for master's degree programs in content areas.

Commissioner Wilhoit suggested that the P-16 Council sponsor alternative professional development or models as a partnership between higher education, the institutions, and the schools. Teachers have no scheduled time to work collaboratively with other faculty, but they are required to seek professional development opportunities on their own time. Perhaps, even if in only one school district, a model could be developed where the university and the department of education offer professional development opportunities. That district could become the satellite campus. He added that professional development should be linked to the improvement plans at the various district because each district is aware of its own deficits and strengths and can determine its professional development needs in the context of its classroom instruction delivery. Through the universities, the work can be linked to dual credit.

Another member pointed out that while a number of institutions have implemented many programs, teachers seeking alternative route programs are often required to take an additional 60 hours. Alternative or not, teachers are unwilling to do this. Recently, a teacher with a master's degree in special education and 27 years of teaching experience wanted to get an endorsement in another area of special education and was told by one of the institutions that she would need an additional 60 credit hours. At the same time, the federal government defines a highly qualified teacher as one who has a bachelor's degree and passes the PRAXIS, so the extra courses can be bypassed. It is difficult to convince teachers to seek university-based preparation for teaching when they can find jobs without it.

Dr. Applegate suggested that the P-16 Council gather information and discuss what is happening with alternative certification and then meet with the provosts and deans of education to discuss these issues. The Council could serve as a catalyst for realizing and eliminating barriers to teacher preparation and professional development at the universities.

Dr. Applegate reiterated his concern about the inequity of teaching resources, noting that research continually reveals that low-income schools consistently receive fewer resources, including effective teachers. He asked for a discussion on incentives such as loan forgiveness for qualified teachers who will teach in low-income or high-need areas or special education.

Dr. Leib responded that learning also is affected by other factors besides teacher effectiveness, such as a student's family and living environment. She also suggested that the universities do not see their main institutional role as that of improving education, but instead assume this a responsibility of the department of education. She said that discussions about improving teacher

education should not only include deans of education but also other deans, provosts, and presidents and should result in consideration of teaching load and concrete steps about how faculty across the campus might improve education.

Dr. Henson recognized John Drake of the KDE to report on the Title II mathematics and science teaching professional development alliances. Mr. Drake said that Title II, Part A, provides for partnership grants that connect to the issues of teacher professional development. Title II, Part B, grants have recently been awarded, and these grants are designed to address the same issue. These partnerships include the requirement that a mathematician and scientist or engineer be in partnership with at least one low-performing school and with the KDE. The higher education connection includes the CPE. Dr. Henson asked for more information on these Improving Educator Quality grants for the next meeting.

Another member recalled that the largest grant the University of Kentucky ever received was $22 million from the National Science Foundation for the professional development in mathematics and science for teachers in Appalachia. Accompanied by graduate students to relieve faculty of paperwork and other duties, UK's mathematics faculty offer professional development opportunities to teachers in Appalachia. The UK mathematics faculty regularly teaches mathematics to elementary teachers. This represents an exceptional effort to offer professional development options.

Ms. France brought up for future P-16 Council discussion the idea of using Individual Graduation Plans because preparation programs may begin to shift if student needs and outcomes are looked at differently.

Dr. Henson said that the March P-16 Council meeting will focus on teacher issues, including recruitment, professional development, retention, and external factors such as the conflicting definitions of a highly qualified teacher.

Dr. Freed reopened the discussion about Council representatives going before the legislature to speak about the Council's activities and goals. Commissioner Wilhoit agreed that the legislature may appreciate this opportunity and suggested that early in the session may be the best time for this discussion. Dr. Bazell suggested a double-sided, one-page document to highlight the P-16 Council mission statement, vision, and the three goals, along with a review of what the Council has done over the last four years. Dr. Henson agreed that the legislators might be interested in hearing from the Council. Dr. Stonewater noted that the Prichard Committee has been working with the legislature on funding education across the spectrum, and that a unified message from the Council about what this has meant in this state would be a complement to the partnership's efforts to get the legislature to look at education as a total system. Dr. Applegate suggested that the CPE should discuss the best approach to this, recalling Secretary Fox's offer to work with the Council to remove barriers.

Dr. Bazell reported on issues posted under “Goal 2: Curricula and competency standards shall be aligned from each level of the system to the next.”

Comments included developing a coordinated system to reduce the dropout rate in high schools, adult education, and the KCTCS; skill and competency verification; continued support for physical and mental health and wellness P-12 programs, articulation agreements, and increasing and supporting local P-16 councils. The bulk of the notes dealt with alignment, including early childhood to K-12 and adult education. One suggestion was to revisit the core content and Program of Studies in light of the ADP benchmarks with an aim toward a single document reflecting state standards consistent with the ADP. One note from the Department of Education advocated revising the writing portfolio requirements to align with the ADP transactive goals, examining ADP benchmarks to reinforce high school standards for all students, and analyzing the ADP benchmarks, adjusting Program of Studies and Kentucky core content accordingly. Others included decreasing barriers between systems, requiring foreign language proficiencies, aligning college credit standards across the public and independent postsecondary institutions, adopting a single rigorous high school and adult education default curriculum to prepare all students for college and work, implementing systemwide college readiness standards throughout the postsecondary system, and establishing transition exams to be administered at the end of the high school sophomore year in order to address learning needs of students in a timely manner. Other suggestions from the KDE included examining core curriculum and Program of Studies, planning transitions between levels, middle to high, the ACT, and GEAR UP, and communicating the IGP so students can plan high school.

The other main issue dealt with examining the achievement gap and making it a top priority to assist local and regional councils in their efforts. Others items included increasing the number of children enrolled in quality early care and education programs, using the high school feedback report to monitor the numbers of underprepared students entering postsecondary education, creating an adult education feedback, revisiting the achievement gap for minorities and poor students at all levels, and developing a coordinated system.

Dr. Applegate responded that the P-16 Council had already endorsed the concept of a rigorous default high school curriculum. The Council also has acknowledged that the universities and colleges need to clearly communicate a single standard of college readiness.

Commissioner Wilhoit discussed high school restructuring initiatives in light of the discussion about college readiness. He reported that about eight schools in the state are engaged with the KDE in an Action Research project to redesign secondary education. Emerging from this is consensus for a rigorous curriculum, with the realization that with embracing various delivery options for that rigorous curriculum one must remain committed to the end-learning

goal. Future high schools may look very different from those of today. Challenges to alternative delivery systems include convincing parents that are satisfied with the current model to embrace the idea of change and providing the services and support required for these alternative delivery options.

Dr. Applegate responded that not all the responsibility lies with the high schools, and he mentioned grants that are currently being offered for institutions to redesign their lower-division mathematics and other high-demand core courses. A goal is to have universities modularize core content courses, identifying skill levels, putting as much as possible online, and offering dual credit. Students will know that if college readiness is identified as level five and they are at level four, they must keep working. Students who reach level five early can keep learning with continuity. Remediation is the result of a mutual disconnect that must be fixed with secondary and postsecondary agencies working collaboratively.

Mr. Wiseman acknowledged that mathematics readiness is a major problem that needs immediate attention. Commissioner Wilhoit concurred, noting the reasons for the disparity between mathematics and language skills. There is a solid research base in language instruction, but not in mathematics instruction. The teaching of language skills and teaching of mathematics skills are different disciplines. Most elementary teachers are well versed in language skills, but not in mathematics. The middle school curriculum appears to entail more numeracy than algebra and geometry-based learning. Even though the KBE has established a set of standard requirements, the results vary widely by school. Teacher knowledge and instructional delivery are problems at the secondary level plus the fact that there is no agreement at the postsecondary level about math requirements. Where there is agreement, there is a major philosophical difference in the business community and the higher education community.

Ms. France mentioned an upcoming meeting with representatives from 16 districts, an area high school, and ACT representatives to discuss the Bridges project. Director of the Bridges Project Dr. Robert McCabe and others who understand high school to college transition have offered to involve some of the schools and postsecondary institutions in a project that invites schools to think differently about scheduling students, assessing performance and competency, and planning accordingly. The meeting will be held prior to the February 11 joint meeting of the KBE and the CPE.

Dr. Henson expressed concern for students whose high schools offer no upper-level math courses and the inequality of opportunity for students to take college courses for dual credit. Even where opportunities exist for students to take courses for dual credit, there is the question of who pays for the courses. Ms. France said that the Kentucky Virtual High School is a possible solution.

Dr. Bazell reported on the issues posted under "Goal 3: Policy, financial, and aspiration barriers impeding student progress and transfer from preschool through postsecondary shall be eliminated."

Goal 3 responses included a good deal of interest in data issues such as integration of the MAX system on the Florida model, increasing data availability, identifying the 5 to10 key performance indicators that would be monitored regularly, providing data for local P-16 councils that indicate student performance from elementary school through college, and using the high school feedback to monitor the performance of under-achieving students for remedial purposes. Others included communicating the relationship and alignment between the state and local councils, advocating to the legislators for more funding at all levels, contemplating the input of local P-16 councils in the legislative session, communicating the use and importance of the IGP, publicizing the KHEAA loan programs for teachers, removing policy barriers to alternative paths to secondary and postsecondary programs, and developing statewide articulation agreements beginning with early childhood education. The bulk of the notes focused on integration across the system. The following notes also were listed: developing policies for dual credit, making more college level courses available to high school students, addressing funding policies with respect to dual credit enrollment (including making KEES funds available for dual enrollment purposes), and transition issues between early childhood and K-12. In summary, notes included articulation agreements, data integration, communication across sectors, and removing policy and funding barriers for merging resources.

Commissioner Wilhoit mentioned that one of the barriers for many young people is that they do not know the options that are available to them in life, and they do not have people to guide them through the instructional process. A Council project might be supporting the development of documents that would follow children through their education. The process would begin with early conversations with families and parents, recognizing the importance of family involvement in getting students headed in the right direction. Other steps might include helping families gain access to information in the students' early years, setting higher expectations, changing the way adults interact with students in the educational experience, and considering how to link the high school experience to the college experience. Revamping counseling programs to include family outreach would be part of a comprehensive campaign to let parents and communities know what is available for them in terms of health care, societal relief, early child care, the importance of early intervention, and access to information about opportunities and options. The Go Higher campaign would assist with these efforts. Consistent and effective use of the IGP could be one avenue of monitoring students through the system.

Dr. Applegate reported that a $400,000 grant from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education supports the development of an advising network

called UCAN that will provide information and assistance to those considering college. He explained that the KYVU Call Center staff will be able to answer questions and/or connect callers to the key institution advisor. The challenge is to make people aware of the site and encourage them to use it.

Dr. Bazell drew attention to the importance of implementing a middle and high school curriculum that does not foreclose opportunities for college going and skilled employment, since not every student knows what he or she wants to do after graduating from high school. The key is to prepare these students to be able to make these choices for themselves.

Dr. Applegate reiterated his concern with the disparity in minority and poor education levels and suggested that representatives from schools across the nation that have successfully addressed this issue be invited to a future meeting. Commissioner Wilhoit observed that Kentucky also has model schools that have successfully addressed these issues. He noted there is no single solution or program, but a set of practices and beliefs, and suggested that it would be helpful for the Council to host a forum for representatives from these model schools.

The Council discussed the dropout rate in relation to better counselor training and the predominant belief in various sectors of Kentucky that disadvantaged students cannot attain high levels of academic achievement. Dr. Applegate pointed out that efforts to change that perception must continue.

Dr. Freed noted that foreign language options should be required at least at the secondary and postsecondary levels. Commissioner Wilhoit responded that there is a severe shortage of foreign language teachers. Dr. Henson acknowledged that universities often discontinue foreign language offerings due to cost.

Dr. Henson thanked the Council for an interesting and fruitful meeting. She noted that discussion at the March 22, 2004, meeting will focus on teacher quality. Discussion will include recruitment issues, training, alternative certification, professional development, and external influences affecting teacher quality. The June meeting will focus on the ADP benchmarks and curriculum alignment. Dr. Applegate asked for continued discussion about Commissioner Wilhoit's notion of new models and a satellite campus.

Next Meeting The next meeting is March 22, 2004.

Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.