

Kentucky Board of Education Special Meeting August 23, 2017

SUMMARY MINUTES

The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) convened a special-called meeting on August 23, 2017 in the State Board Room on the fifth floor of the 300 Building, located at 300 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky. The board conducted the following business:

I. Call to Order

Chair Wheeler called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. ET.

II. Roll Call

Chair Wheeler requested that Leslie Slaughter call the roll of members and advisors. There were eight (8) voting members present and three (3) absent at the time of roll call. Board member Rich Gimmel joined the meeting later in the day. All four (4) board advisors were present. CPE President Bob King was absent; however, Sue Cain attended the meeting as his proxy.

Present Board Members

Mr. Ben Cundiff
Mr. Sam Hinkle
Mr. Gary Houchens
Ms. Alesa Johnson
Mr. Roger Marcum
Mr. Milton Seymore
Mr. Bill Twyman
Ms. Mary Gwen Wheeler

Present Advisors

Ms. Tracey Cusick
Ms. Kathy Gornik
Mr. Wayne Lewis
Mr. Joe Papalia

Absent Board Members

Mr. Grayson Boyd
Mr. Rich Gimmel
Ms. Nawanna Privett
President Bob King (Sue Cain was present as proxy)

III. Opening Remarks and Highlights from Opening Day Activities for the 2017-2018 Academic Year – Commissioner Stephen L. Pruitt

Commissioner Pruitt welcomed board members, advisors and guests in the audience. Pruitt began by expressing his gratefulness for the ability to participate in opening day festivities for several Kentucky school districts. He shared pictures of his time in the Webster County district, where he had the opportunity to visit with the district's staff, participate in the opening day themed skit and assist with delivering backpacks to every student in the county. Pruitt encouraged the board to take advantage of opportunities to participate in events like this in the future. He also thanked the educators across the Commonwealth for their commitment to their students.

IV. Administrative Regulations Related to Charter Schools

Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) Associate Commissioner and General Counsel Kevin Brown and Assistant General Counsel Amy Peabody, as well as KDE Division Director Earl Simms came forward to present the four (4) administrative regulations related to public charter schools. Chair Wheeler reminded the board that all regulations were being reviewed for a first reading and did not require action at this time. She stated that the regulations would have a second reading at the board's October regular meeting.

Prior to hearing the first regulation, General Counsel Brown provided an overview of the work that had occurred to date related to public charter schools in Kentucky. He stated that the four (4) regulations being heard were required by House Bill 520 from the 2017 legislative session of the Kentucky General Assembly. Brown indicated that a KDE webpage had been created for information related to public charter schools and that a division within KDE had been established for the work associated with public charter schools. Brown also spoke of KDE's participation in the National Alliance for Charter Schools conference, as well as making a recent visit to the Georgia Department of Education to learn more about charter school implementation in that state. Brown reminded the board of the new Charter School Advisory Council and spoke of their most recent meeting to review the proposed administrative regulations.

Assistant General Counsel Amy Peabody then explained the provisions of House Bill 520 that established the roles of the KBE, in relation to Kentucky's public charter schools. She explained that the authority granted in HB 520 was the reason for the promulgation of the four (4) administrative regulations before the board for review.

IV.A. 701 KAR 8:010, Student Application, lottery and enrollment (Review Item: 1st Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Peabody began discussion on the first proposed regulation by providing an overview of the various sections of the regulations. She summarized each section, as indicated below:

- *Section 1 defines terms utilized in the administrative regulation.*
- *Section 2 and Section 3 outline the application and lottery processes, respectively.*
- *Section 4 details the student enrollment policies that must be adopted by a public charter school, prohibits discrimination in enrollment, and addresses enrollment in conversion charter schools.*
- *Section 5 incorporates by reference a uniform charter school student application.*

Peabody noted that the document incorporated by reference was not yet finalized; however, she said a draft would be available for the second reading of the regulation in October.

Bill Twyman inquired about the proof of residency and other paperwork requirement for homeless students. KDE staff clarified that the federal law associated with the McKinney-Vento Act also applies to public charter schools. She also stated that local school districts have homeless education coordinators that also may assist in these circumstances.

Roger Marcum inquired about the policies surrounding services provided to charter school students who are expelled. Specifically, Marcum asked which party is responsible for providing such services. Peabody explained the local district would assume responsibility for services in most instances, unless the student met the provisions set forth in statute that permit another school from preventing admission. Peabody stated that the due process provisions apply for protection of these students and charters would follow the same protocols as local districts.

Board Advisor Wayne Lewis, who also serves as the chair of the Charter School Advisory Committee, provided a summary of the Council's feedback on this regulation. Lewis noted that there was strong endorsement for a single, unified student application. He said that some of the most promising research related to charter schools compares data from the student application and enrollment processes. Lewis said that a unified application will help the state moving forward, in terms of data and high-quality research.

One recommendation noted by Lewis involved the inclusion of greater specificity on what occurs when a student applies to a charter school after the enrollment period ends. He also recommended additional clarity on the permissiveness of single-sex schools. Peabody indicated that she has asked the United States Department of Education (USED) for clarity on this matter. She stated that that USED allows for single-sex schools, but noted that the school and district must comply with federal regulation that requires the offering of comparable opportunities to that of the opposite gender. Peabody clarified that such opportunities may be co-ed in nature or single-sex opportunities for the opposite gender and do not have to exist within a charter environment.

Chair Wheeler asked about the intent to ensure equal opportunities for low-income students. Peabody and Lewis explained that the Kentucky statutes allow for the inclusion of demographic information during the application phase; however, they said it is not required. Board member Milton Seymore expressed the importance that the regulations ensure support for students who are in the most need of such support.

Bill Twyman asked about students who, after being enrolled, decide that they no longer want to be enrolled at the charter school. Specifically, Twyman asked what the process would be. Peabody explained that the student may voluntarily transfer to another school within the resident school district. She explained that the charter cannot un-enroll a student without consent and cannot prohibit a student from un-enrolling.

IV.B. 701 KAR 8:020, Evaluation of authorizer performance (Review Item: First Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Chair Wheeler began by clarifying that, based on Kentucky's law, the authorizers of public charter schools may be local boards of education or the mayors of the cities of Lexington and Louisville. Peabody agreed and explained that this administrative regulation establishes the process to be used to evaluate the performance of a charter school authorizer and to address deficits in that performance.

Peabody provided an overview of each section of the regulation, which is summarized below:

- *Section 1 defines terms utilized in the administrative regulation.*
- *Section 2 requires authorizers to create policies and procedures governing the authorizer's duty to review charter applications, including a strategic vision for chartering, and transparency in the criteria and evaluation of charter applications, charter performance, renewal, non-renewal, and revocation.*
- *Section 3 creates the general standards for authorizer performance, including training requirements for authorizers.*
- *Section 4 outlines standards of authorizer performance related to the charter application process.*
- *Section 5 outlines standards of authorizer performance related to charter contracts, including pre-opening requirements, financial solvency requirements, closure requirements, and requirements related to the duties of the charter board of directors.*
- *Section 6 outlines standards of authorizer performance related to charter school monitoring, including enforcement of the charter contract by the authorizer and actions required of an authorizer if a charter school's operating expenditures falls below two percent (2%) or if an authorizer otherwise suspects a charter school may close prior to the end of the school year or charter term.*
- *Section 7 outlines standards of authorizer performance generally regarding charter approval, revocation, renewal, and non-renewal, including requirements for charter application approval.*
- *Section 8 provides the charter school closure protocol requirements.*
- *Section 9 provides the KBE the authority to require investigation of an authorizer.*
- *Section 10 provides the actions to be taken in response to failures in authorizer performance.*
- *Section 11 provides the annual reporting requirements for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) on the statewide performance and evaluation of charter authorizers and charter schools.*
- *Section 12 incorporates by reference a uniform charter contract, charter application, and notice of intent.*

Peabody noted that the documents incorporated by reference were not yet finalized; however, she stated they would be available for the second reading of the regulation in October.

Bill Twyman asked about a local board's ability to deny an application, based on current financial hardship of the district. Peabody and Lewis both explained that a district superintendent may submit a letter to the authorizer, citing such concern; however, they clarified the letter itself could not become criteria for an application's denial and that it is simply a piece of evidence which may be used for decision-making. Peabody reminded the board of the appeals process to the state board, which may be utilized when an application is denied.

Peabody also explained that a guidance document was being developed for the application review process, which may be used by authorizers. She stated that this document would not be incorporated by reference and would only serve as a tool for guidance.

Milton Seymore then asked about the requirements surrounding budget information from the charter provider, asking if there was a minimum amount of funding that would need to be available in order to have an approved application. Peabody explained that the future funding for public charter schools was unknown. She stated House Bill 471 from this past legislative session only addressed the state's current biennial budget. She explained that there are grant opportunities the state may pursue to assist with start-up costs. Wayne Lewis added that applications are permissible without additional start-up funds beyond what the state determines to be available. Earl Simms shared that start-up grants with external partners from the private sector also exist.

Bill Twyman asked about the state's facility guidelines and whether these would apply to charter schools. Peabody explained that the facilities must meet safety laws; however, other requirements could possibly be waived.

Wayne Lewis went on to say that the future plans of the General Assembly as to public charter school funding is not known; however, he said the conversation to date has only involved what was reflected in House Bill 471, which is to utilize the SEEK per-pupil allocation. Kevin Brown reminded the board of a webinar that he and Commissioner Pruitt created in April to discuss the current language of House Bills 520 and 471.

Rich Gimmel inquired about the religious exemption provision in light of the recent Missouri Lutheran Supreme Court decision. Kevin Brown indicated that KDE legal staff have not analyzed this particular case and stated they would be willing to do so prior to the second reading of the regulation.

Sam Hinkle asked for clarity on section 4(1) and the intent behind the proposed language related to the exclusion of corporate entities serving on a board of directors for a charter school. Hinkle expressed concern that the language, as drafted, was not applicable. After much discussion, KDE staff agreed that the language was not clear and agreed to revisit the issue prior to the second reading. Chair Wheeler asked for board members to send additional feedback and proposed amendments to the KDE General Counsel.

Amy Peabody explained that an optional scoring rubric was being developed for potential use by authorizers, but was not yet completed. She stated that, given the current timelines, authorizers may wish to prepare to utilize their own charter authorization rubric during the interim. She also shared that a charter contract performance framework was being developed for optional use. Again, Peabody stressed that tight timelines may provide a reason for authorizers to move forward for now with their own framework. Board member Ben Cundiff stated that, until this framework is completed, the state board needs to be thinking about such criteria. He said that this guidance would be important for consistency when appeals are received by the KBE.

Chair Wheeler asked if applications could be submitted before the administrative regulations were final. General Counsel Kevin Brown clarified that the statutes imply that the regulations must be promulgated before applications could be taken. He stated that January of 2018 was the anticipated timeline for when applications could be accepted for the first time.

Rich Gimmel inquired about the authorizer trainer requirements and who was responsible for approving these. Amy Peabody stated that KBE would be approving these requirements through the regulation. Kevin Brown also said that there was hope that the Kentucky School Boards Association (KSBA) could provide some training as part of their annual conference this coming February; however, he noted training completed prior to finalization of the regulations may still be counted. Gary Houchens inquired whether a lack of such training would prevent an application from being approved. Amy Peabody stated that this would not be grounds for an application denial.

The board had extensive discussion about Section 7(2)(d) of the regulation, which relates to due process hearings for student suspension and expulsion. Roger Marcum expressed his belief that a local district superintendent should have the option of being present for these meetings, if that district will be expected to assume services for the child upon expulsion. Several board members suggested that the language include a permissive statement regarding the allowance of the superintendent to be in attendance, so long as the regulation was clear that the superintendent would not be part of the decision-making process. Marcum explained that his concern centered more on the transition planning of services, as opposed to that of the decision made for expulsion.

Wayne Lewis reviewed the feedback from the Charter Schools Advisory Council for the board. Those specific recommendations can be found in the memo provided by the Council that is posted on the board's online materials site. KDE staff agreed to revisit the areas where additional clarity was recommended.

Joe Papalia referenced the state of Indiana where private schools were being encouraged to apply for charters. Both Amy Peabody and Ben Cundiff clarified that, should a private school apply for a charter in Kentucky, student tuition is not permissible. Wayne Lewis went on to explain that, while private schools are not prevented from applying, all requirements (such as open enrollment) do apply once a charter is granted.

IV.C. 701 KAR 8:030, Revocation and nonrenewal process for authorizers (Review Item: First Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Amy Peabody explained that this administrative regulation establishes the procedural requirements for a charter school's appeal of an authorizer's decision to revoke or non-renew an approved charter. She clarified that this regulation is not intended to address an appeal of a denied application. She provided a summary of the regulation sections, which are highlighted below:

- *Section 1 defines the terms utilized in the administrative regulation.*
- *Section 2 provides the authorizer policy and procedure requirements for transparency in its revocation and non-renewal of charters and appeals of these decisions.*
- *Section 3 includes the requirements for an appeal of a revocation or non-renewal decision.*
- *Section 4 provides the procedural requirements for an emergency action by the authorizer.*
- *Section 5 provides the circumstance for the KBE's automatic affirmation of an authorizer's decision to revoke or non-renew a charter.*
- *Section 6 incorporates by reference a uniform notice of appeal form.*

Amy Peabody noted that the document incorporated by reference was not yet finalized; however,

she said it would be available for the second reading of the regulation in October. She also drew attention to one area of the regulation where input was needed by the board. She indicated that Section 3(2) at the bottom of page two (2) provided two options for language related to appeals. Wayne Lewis stated that the Charter School Advisory Council strongly endorsed option #2 during its meeting discussion. After much conversation, the board agreed with the recommendation of the Council.

Bill Twyman asked Division Director Simms if he had prior experience with charter revocation or non-renewal of contracts. Simms stated that he had non-renewed two charter schools as an authorizer and had worked through the closure process for both schools. He went on to say that the proposed regulatory language was very thorough and reflective of other state policies regarding this topic.

Chair Wheeler asked Amy Peabody to recall the timeline requirements associated with the appeals process. Amy Peabody explained that some requirements were included in statute, while others were in the proposed regulation. She stated that she could combine this information into a timeline to be shared with the board before the second reading. Peabody said that the appeal notification would be received by the Commissioner's office and time-stamped, then forwarded to the KBE.

No further questions were noted on this administrative regulation.

IV.D. 701 KAR 8:040, Conversion charter school creation and operation (Review Item: First Reading) - Kevin Brown, KDE Associate Commissioner and General Counsel

Amy Peabody explained that this administrative regulation establishes the process to be used to convert an existing public school to a charter school. She noted that state statute indicates three (3) possible ways in which a school can be eligible for conversion. Those include:

- 1) Being a persistently-low achieving (PLA) school that has 60% of parents sign a petition;
- 2) Having 60% of parents sign a petition for a non-PLA school and the local board votes in favor after the petition; or
- 3) Local board of education votes for conversion without a petition.

Amy Peabody then described the highlights of each section of the proposed regulation, as shown below:

- *Section 1 defines terms utilized in the administrative regulation.*
- *Section 2 provides the requirements for a petition to convert an existing public school to a charter school and for the separate charter application required in addition to the petition for conversion of an existing public school.*
- *Section 3 provides the requirements for conversion of an existing public school to a charter school after authorizer approval.*
- *Section 4 includes provisions regarding school district employees and conversion charter schools.*
- *Section 5 includes provisions regarding students and conversion charter schools.*
- *Section 6 includes provisions for operation and reversion of a conversion charter school to*

a school under the authority of the district.

- *Section 7 incorporates by reference a uniform charter school conversion petition.*

Peabody noted that the document incorporated by reference was not yet finalized; however, she said it would be available for the second reading of the regulation in October. She then spent time discussing the proposed language surrounding the reversion of a charter school within Section 6(2) of the regulation. Wayne Lewis stated that the Charter School Advisory Council felt that this language went further than the law allows. Amy Peabody indicated that KDE legal staff had begun drafting amendments for the second reading to address this concern.

Chair Wheeler asked whether a petition was an official application. Amy Peabody confirmed that these were not one in the same. She explained that, after the petition has been circulated and meets the requirements, an application may be submitted. Chair Wheeler asked what would happen if no applications come forward after the successful petition. Amy Peabody replied that the conversion process would not be fulfilled, should that occur; however, she said that the petition should signal conversation between the school district and the local community.

Chair Wheeler then asked Wayne Lewis if there was any additional feedback from the Charter Schools Advisory Council. Lewis said that there was no additional feedback from the Council to be shared at this time. No additional questions were noted by board members or advisors. General Counsel Kevin Brown stated that weekly meetings between KDE staff and Wayne Lewis would continue, in preparation for the second reading of the regulations. Commissioner Pruitt thanked Mr. Lewis for his collaboration and active involvement in the drafting process. Lewis thanked the department for involving him throughout the process.

V. LUNCH - 12:00 p.m. ET (Provided for KBE members, invited guests and the Commissioner's Planning Committee members only)

The board recessed for lunch at approximately 12:05 p.m. ET.

VI. Administrative Regulation Related to New Accountability System

The board reconvened from lunch at 1:00 p.m. ET. Chair Wheeler welcomed KDE Associate Commissioner Rhonda Sims, Division Director Jennifer Stafford and Brian Gong from the Center for Assessment to the table for the presentation. Chair Wheeler stated that this was a third reading of the administrative regulation and stated it would require board action.

VI.A. 703 KAR 5:270, Kentucky's Accountability System (Action/Discussion Item: 2nd Reading) - Rhonda Sims, KDE Associate Commissioner and Brian Gong, Center for Assessment

Rhonda Sims began with opening remarks about the changes that had occurred between the board's second and third readings. She said that the changes were a direct result of the feedback received from the board. Commissioner Pruitt framed the discussion by reminding the board that the conversation on this regulation should be about how to rate schools and districts on their performance relative to student achievement. He said that a second conversation after the one on

the new accountability system would be about the minimum high school graduation requirements and what the board wishes for a high school diploma to truly mean in the future. Commissioner Pruitt also publicly thanked those in the audience who served on the various committees by asking them to stand for recognition.

Rhonda Sims started the discussion with the topic of long-term goals. She stated that board members had expressed a desire for the goals to be revisited during the last review of the regulation, citing the concern that they were not ambitious enough. Sims explained that KDE staff utilized a different methodology to propose the new goals being presented. She asked Brian Gong to explain the formula used for calculating the new goals. Brian Gong shared that the new formula is based on where student groups are performing now, where are they projected to be in 2018-19 (the first year of accountability) and the end goal of 100% proficiency. He stated that the goals take into account the baseline and reduces that percentage by half. Gary Houchens asked for clarity on the former goals and whether they proposed the same reduction of 50%. Sims and Gong both explained that the old goals were built on a gap-to-group comparison, rather than a group-to-proficiency goal. Chair Wheeler noted that the revised goals were more ambitious, particularly for the state's lower-performing sub-groups.

Roger Marcum stated that he supports the revised goals, but said he supports them with some concern. He noted that the goals were raising the bar significantly for the state. He expressed worry that there were not adequate resources available to support such high expectations. Marcum urged those education shareholders who advocated strongly for the board to revisit the goals to assist with promoting the need for additional resources. He went on to say that the most important resource that the state can provide is quality classroom teachers and that the pension crisis, as well as other things, are hindering that from happening.

Board Advisor Kathy Gornik stated that she still felt like the proposed goals were too low. She stated that the numbers associated with goals still left students and families behind. Ben Cundiff said that proper support to schools on how to achieve these long-term goals was critical to the state's success. Sam Hinkle indicated that he agreed with Roger Marcum's comments and hoped that the higher standards would help the board to effectively advocate for needed funding and other resources. He said that then the board could focus on the strategies or the "how" for achieving the goals.

Board Advisor Wayne Lewis stated his support for the direction that the board had taken with the revised goals. He felt that they were more ambitious than Kentucky had set in the past and were more aggressive than most other states. He expressed his hope that the board would adopt the proposed goals. He then went on to say that local districts are best equipped to figure out how to meet the challenge.

Roger Marcum said that one resource of support was that of the KDE. He said the department had proven models of success, particularly in the area of school turnaround; however, he stated that there were issues of capacity for the department to take on the support of additional schools and districts in need. Bill Twyman said that he, too, supported the goals, but with the expectation that resources are provided to attain them.

Chair Wheeler echoed the gratitude of many other board members for KDE staff's work on the revised goals. She stated that attainment of the goals will take a lot of resources, commitment, and change of mindset. Sam Hinkle stated that the current baseline is built on standardized testing, yet the state has expressed an interest in moving to more competency-based education and assessment. He noted that these efforts will be more costly and that the board needed to be mindful of this.

Ben Cundiff expressed his belief that the goals would not be achievable without more funding from the General Assembly. He went on to say that additional taxes may be necessary; however, he noted that most aren't willing to advocate for this. Sam Hinkle agreed and stated that being in favor of anything that does not involve tax reform is less than mediocre.

As discussion transitioned to other aspects of the regulation, Rhonda Sims explained that additional terms had been added to the definitions section at the request of the board, several existing terms had been defined with greater clarity and technical edits had also been provided throughout. At that time, Roger Marcum suggested KDE staff highlight changes that had been proposed during the second reading. KDE staff agreed to move forward in this fashion. Highlights of the changes summarized by staff included the following:

- the inclusion of an “or” statement within the military readiness transition indicator, requiring either military enlistment OR completion of two Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) certificates of training and enrollment in the third credit of the program, in addition to the minimum score on the Armed Forces Qualifying Test (AFQT) of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB);
- inclusion of the term “student group”;
- new and more simplistic language around statistical tests;
- inclusion of an English Learners (EL) growth table; and
- additional detail on the identification of the bottom 5% of schools, as required by ESSA.

Bill Twyman asked if there was a direct correlation between growth and proficiency. Brian Gong stated that there was not a strong correlation, citing that high growth does not always result in high proficiency and high proficiency does not always result in high growth.

Board Advisor Joe Papalia referenced the state's intention to modify the minimum high school graduation requirements and how these changes may impact the graduation rate goal, as well as ratings for schools. Rhonda Sims stated that the standards would need to be revalidated, if changes occur. Brian Gong said that the state could choose to recalibrate or simply live with the lower ratings.

Sue Cain referenced the proposed measures for the academic readiness transition indicator at the high school level and asked if the board wished for there to be at least two (2) scores for the Cambridge exams (rather than just one), similar to the other requirements in this category. KDE staff indicated that this was a typo and said the issue would be rectified. Sue Cain also asked if a combination of the readiness indicators would be permissible to demonstrate readiness. Commissioner Pruitt explained that these decisions could be discussed as a matter of internal policy.

Chair Wheeler asked for staff to revisit the section pertaining to relative weighting. Rhonda Sims explained that a range of weights for each indicator was being proposed at this time, until a standards-setting process could be conducted to validate the weighting. Sims did explain that the academic measures must be given more weight than the other indicators within the system, per ESSA requirements.

Gary Houchens referenced the opportunity and access measure for whole child supports and inquired whether the board wished to require three (3) measures, rather than two (2). He noted that the Local Superintendents Advisory Council (LSAC) was split on this issue, but the School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council (SCAAC) favored a requirement of three (3). Rhonda Sims said that, due to the feedback being inconsistent, the change in the recommendation did not occur. Jennifer Stafford noted the concern of district resources, should the requirement be increased.

Alesa Johnson asked about the alternative plan for any opportunity and access measures that may be questioned by the USED for their inability to be disaggregated. Commissioner Pruitt stated that those items would become reported measures, rather than measures for inclusion in the formal rating.

Chair Wheeler asked staff to remind the board about the discussion related to world language and global competency. Specifically, Chair Wheeler inquired as to why this piece is only reflected in the high school accountability system. Commissioner Pruitt explained that the new social studies standards would address the concept of global competency and that world languages are reflected in the opportunity and access indicator; however, he noted that the scaling of world languages has been difficult, due to funding limitations for the hiring of world language teachers at the lower grade levels.

Roger Marcum recognized the superintendents that were in attendance at the meeting. He expressed his appreciation for their involvement in the process. He stated that the development process gave him confidence to vote in favor of the proposed system, given the buy-in from a local level that had been made evident.

Seeing no further discussion, Rich Gimmel voted to approve 703 KAR 5:270 as amended. The motion was seconded by Ben Cundiff and it carried by unanimous voice vote.

Bill Twyman thanked Rhonda Sims, Brian Gong and KDE staff who were involved in the development of the new system. Sam Hinkle also expressed his appreciation for the Commissioner's leadership during the development process, citing deep engagement of education shareholders and an intentional focus on awareness and education of the proposed system.

VII. Appointment of State Evaluation Appeals Panel (SEAP) Members – Mary Gwen Wheeler, KBE Board Chair

Chair Wheeler appointed the following board members to serve on the State Evaluation Appeals Panel (SEAP) for this year:

- Ben Cundiff
- Rich Gimmel
- Gary Houchens

She stated that this was an ad-hoc committee, with an anticipated meeting in October.

Chair Wheeler called for a motion for approval. The motion was made by Roger Marcum and seconded by Alesa Johnson. The motion carried by voice vote.

VIII. RECESS

A motion for adjournment was made by Bill Twyman and seconded by Milton Seymore. The motion passed by voice vote and the board adjourned at 2:25 p.m. ET.