Leadership Council Meeting Minutes
June 5, 2013

Leadership Council Members Present: Donlynn Rice, Joel Scherling, Freida Lange, Marilyn Peterson, Brent Gaswick, Dean Folkers, Margaret Worth, Diane Stuehmer, Mark Schultz, Russ Inbody, Mary Ann Losh, Gary Sherman, Scott Swisher, Roger Breed, Melody Hobson, Brian Halstead

Also present: Paul Haas

2. Communications (Scott Swisher)
Marilyn Peterson will be appointed Assistant Commissioner effective July 1, 2013, upon retirement of Dr. Breed. In addition to Brian Halstead, Marilyn Peterson will be available part time to assist with Commissioner Office responsibilities.

1. Appropriate Use of Federal Funds for Conferences/Meeting (Margaret Worth/Paul Haas)

Handouts: Federal Regulations and US Dept. of Education FAQ Related to Meetings and Conferences Paid for With Federal Funds; FAQ to assist US Dept. of Education Grantees to Appropriately use Federal Funds for Conferences and Meetings

Margaret Worth reviewed the handouts. Employees are urged to carefully review the guidelines. Any questions can be directed to Margaret Worth or Paul Haas. Directly contacting the U.S. Department of Education for approval of certain items may be needed when in doubt. Reasonable and necessary purchases would be the guideline to follow. These guidelines will be implemented as of June 5, 2013.

3. Statewide Content Repository (Brent Gaswick)

Handouts: BlendEd article on SAFARI; BlendEd article on eLearning System; SAFARI Montage

Brent provided an update and overview of the Safari Montage Learning Object Repository, which is an ESU lead project that NDE will be able to participate in.

The State Board Room will be set for video conferencing later this summer.

4. Project Partnering Discussion (Brent Gaswick)

Any projects created by team members would be open to all staff at NDE to offer advice and make staff aware of projects taken on by NDE teams. Hopefully this will reduce duplicate efforts and sharing resources.
5. Discussion of NDE To Do List (Roger Breed)

Handout: DRAFT///"TO DO LIST" On-going and Next 6-9 months

Dr. Breed reviewed a draft list of “To Do’s” for NDE as well as a To Do List for the next 6-9 months.

Other input to these lists?
- Deadlines are Deadlines (Inbody) – ON-GOING
- Reauthorization of ESEA (Marilyn Peterson) – beyond board purview
- Latino/Native American Achievement Studies – ADD TO LIST for P-16

Other suggestions should be shared with Dr. Breed.

6. Accreditation, CIP School Visits for 2013-14 (Freida Lange)

Handout: 2013-14 External Review Visit and Report Schedule

Freida Lange shared information on upcoming visits and reviews of schools. Please share this info with staff who may be currently working with the districts. Interest and/or questions in serving on a team should be directed to Freida Lange.

7. Potential Dates for 2013-14 NDE/ESUCC Strategic Planning Meetings (Freida Lange)

Handout: Draft dates for ESUCC Meeting Dates

Please review for conflicts and contact Freida Lange.

8. Legislative Update (Brian Halstead)

Handouts: Bills Enacted in First Session; Legislative Resolutions Calling for Interim Study

Brian Halstead provided a review of the handouts. Any questions should be directed to Brian Halstead.

9. Getting the News Out About Nebraska Schools (Betty VanDeventer)
No report.
10. Topics for All Staff (Roger Breed)
   • Federal Funds Use
   • Chain of Communication
   • Project Sharing (Brent)
   • Statewide Learning Repository (Brent)
   • State Board Actions
   • Super Day June 19 – Power of Data
   • New Staff (Joel Scherling)
   • BRIDGE presentation

11. FAFTA – Russ Inbody
    Russ reported on contact from an Auditor of FAFTA.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Frequently Asked Questions to Assist U.S. Department of Education Grantees To Appropriately Use Federal Funds for Conferences and Meetings

Using Federal Grant (Discretionary and Formula) Funds to Host a Meeting or Conference

1. May a grantee receiving funds from the U.S. Department of Education (Department) use its Federal grant funds to host a meeting or conference?

   Yes. Federal grant funds may be used to host a meeting or conference if doing so is:
   
   a. Consistent with its approved application or plan;
   b. For purposes that are directly relevant to the program and the operation of the grant, such as for conveying technical information related to the objectives of the grant; and
   c. Reasonable and necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of the approved grant.

2. What are examples of “technical information” that may be conveyed at a meeting or conference?

   Examples of technical information include, but are not limited to, the following, each of which must be related to implementing the program or project funded by the grant:
   
   • Specific programmatic, administrative, or fiscal accountability requirements;
   • Best practices in a particular field;
   • Theoretical, empirical, or methodological advances in a particular field;
   • Effective methods of training or professional development; and
   • Effective grant management and accountability.

3. What factors should a grantee consider when deciding whether to host a meeting or conference?

   Grantees should consider whether a face-to-face meeting or conference is the most effective or efficient way to achieve the desired result and whether there are alternatives, such as webinars or video conferences, that would be equally or similarly effective and more efficient in terms of time and costs than a face-to-face meeting. In addition, grantees should consider how the meeting or conference will be perceived by the public; for example, will the meeting or conference be perceived as a good use of taxpayer dollars?

4. Are there conflict-of-interest rules that grantees should follow when selecting vendors, such as logistics contractors, to help with a meeting or conference?

   Grantees, other than States, must, as appropriate, comply with the minimum requirements in 34 CFR 74.42 and 80.36(b)(3) and should follow their own policies and procedures (or their local or State policies, as applicable) for ensuring that there are no conflicts of interest in the procurement process.

5. When a meeting or conference is hosted by a grantee and charged to a Federal grant, may the meeting or conference be promoted as a U.S. Department of Education event?

   No. Meetings and conferences hosted by grantees are directed by the grantee, not the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, the meeting or conference may not be promoted as a U.S. Department of Education meeting or conference, and the seal of the U.S. Department of Education
must not be used on conference materials or signage without Department approval. In addition, all meeting or conference materials paid for with Federal grant funds must include appropriate disclaimers, such as the following, which is provided in EDGAR § 75.620 and states:

The contents of this (insert type of publication; e.g., book, report, film) were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Using Federal Grant Funds to Pay for Food

6. When a grantee is hosting a meeting, may the grantee use Federal grant funds to pay for food, beverages, or snacks?

Generally, there is a very high burden of proof to show that paying for food and beverages with Federal funds is necessary to meet the goals and objectives of a Federal grant. When a grantee is hosting a meeting, the grantee should structure the agenda for the meeting so that there is time for participants to purchase their own food, beverages, and snacks. In addition, when planning a meeting, grantees may want to consider a location in which participants have easy access to food and beverages.

While these determinations will be made on a case-by-case basis, and there may be some circumstances where the cost would be permissible, it is likely that those circumstances will be rare. Grantees, therefore, will have to make a compelling case that the unique circumstances they have identified would justify these costs as reasonable and necessary.

If program offices have questions, they should consult with their program attorney.

7. May Federal grant funds be used to pay for food and beverages during a reception or a "networking" session?

In virtually all cases, using grant funds to pay for food and beverages for receptions and "networking" sessions is not justified because participation in such activities is rarely necessary to achieve the purpose of the meeting or conference.

8. May a grantee enter into a contract with a hotel under which Federal grant funds will be used to provide meals, snacks, and beverages as part of the cost for meeting rooms and other allowable conference-related costs?

Federal grant funds may only be used for expenses that are reasonable and necessary. In planning a conference or meeting and negotiating with vendors for meeting space and other relevant goods and services, grantees may only pay for allowable costs. If a hotel vendor embeds food and beverage costs into a hotel contract for meeting space, the grantee should work with the hotel to have the food and beverage costs identified and "backed out" of the contract, and have the price they are paying for meeting space appropriately adjusted to reflect the fact that food and beverages are not being purchased. The fact that food and beverages are embedded in a contract for meeting space does not mean that the food and beverages are being provided at no cost to the grantee.
9. What if a hotel or other venue provides “complimentary” beverages (e.g., coffee, tea) and there is no charge to the grantee hosting the meeting?

The grantee has an obligation, under these circumstances, to confirm that the beverages are truly complimentary and will not be reflected as a charge to the grant in another area. For example, many hotels provide complimentary beverages to all guests who attend a meeting at their facility without reflecting the costs of those beverages in other items that their guests or, in this case, the grantee purchases. As noted above, it would not be acceptable for a vendor to embed the cost of beverages in other costs, such as meeting space.

10. May indirect cost funds be used to pay for food and beverages?

The cost of food and beverages, because they are easily associated with a specific cost objective, such as a Department grant, are properly treated as direct costs, rather than indirect costs. As noted above, Federal grant funds cannot be used to pay for food and beverages unless doing so is reasonable and necessary.

11. May Federal grant funds be used to pay for alcoholic beverages?

No. Use of Federal grant funds to pay for the cost of alcoholic beverages is strictly prohibited.

12. May a grantee use non-Federal resources (e.g., State or local resources) to pay for food or beverages at a meeting or conference that is being held to meet the goals and objectives of its grant?

Grantees should follow their own policies and procedures and State and local law for using non-Federal resources to pay for food or beverages, including its policies and procedures for accepting gifts or in-kind contributions from third parties. However, if non-Federal funds are used to pay for food at a grantee-sponsored meeting or conference, the grantee should make clear through a written disclaimer or announcement (e.g., a note on the agenda for the meeting) that Federal grant funds were not used to pay for the cost of the food or beverages. Grantees should also be sure that any food and beverages provided with non-Federal funds are appropriate for the grantee event, and do not detract from the event’s purpose.

13. May grantees provide meeting participants with the option of paying for food and beverages (e.g., could a grantee have boxed lunches provided at cost for participants)?

Yes. Grantees may offer meeting participants the option of paying for food (such as lunch, breakfast, or snacks) and beverages, and arrange for these items to be available at the meeting.

Using Federal Grant Funds to Pay for Costs of Attending a Meeting or Conference Sponsored by ED or a Third Party

14. May grantees use Federal grant funds to pay for the cost of attending a meeting or conference?

If attending a meeting or conference is necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of the grant, and if the expenses are reasonable (based on the grantee’s own policies and procedures, and State and local laws), Federal grant funds may be used to pay for travel expenses of grantee employees, consultants, or experts to attend a meeting or conference. To determine whether a meeting or conference is "necessary," grantees should consider whether the goals and objectives of the grant can be achieved without the meeting or conference and whether there is an equally effective and more efficient way (in terms of time and money) to achieve the goals and objectives of the grant (see
question #3). To determine whether the expenses are “reasonable,” grantees should consider how the costs (e.g., lodging, travel, registration fees) compare with other similar events and whether the public would view the expenses as a worthwhile use of Federal funds.

15. What should a grantee consider when planning to use Federal grant funds for attending a meeting or conference?

Among other considerations, grantees should consider how many people should attend a meeting or conference on its behalf. The number of attendees should be reasonable and necessary to accomplish the goals and objectives of the grant. The grantee should also determine whether it is necessary to attend the entire meeting or conference, or whether attending only a portion of the meeting or conference is reasonable and necessary.

16. What travel expenses may be paid for with Federal grant funds?

Grantees may use Federal grant funds for travel expenses only to the extent such costs are reasonable and necessary and do not exceed charges normally allowed by the grantee in its regular operations consistent with its written travel policies. In the absence of an acceptable written policy regarding travel costs, grantees must follow the Federal travel and subsistence rates established by the General Services Administration. 48 CFR 31.205-46(a) (established under subchapter I of Chapter 57, Title 5, United States Code (“Travel and Subsistence Expenses; Mileage Allowances”)). Federal grant funds may be used to pay expenses for transportation, per diem, and lodging if the costs are reasonable and necessary. Grantees should follow their own travel and per diem rules and costs when charging travel expenses to their Federal grant. As noted in the cost principles, grantees that do not have travel policies must follow:

...the rates and amounts established under subchapter I of Chapter 57, Title 5, United States Code (“Travel and Subsistence Expenses; Mileage Allowances”), or by the Administrator of General Services, or by the President (or his or her designee) pursuant to any provisions of such subchapter shall apply to travel under sponsored agreements (48 CFR 31.205-46(a)).

See 2 CFR Parts 220, 225, and 230.

Questions Regarding the Allowable Use of Federal Grant Funds

17. What resources are available to help grantees determine whether costs associated with meetings and conferences are reasonable and necessary?

Grantees must follow all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements in determining whether costs are reasonable and necessary, especially the U.S. Office of Management and Budget’s Cost Principles for Federal grants that are set out at:


18. May Federal grant funds be used to pay for entertainment?

Federal grant funds may not be used to pay for entertainment, which includes costs for amusement, diversion, and social activities.

19. Is it allowable for a person whose travel costs are being paid with Federal grant funds to attend a conference in Washington, DC, and lobby members of Congress while in town?

Appropriated funds may not, except under very limited circumstances,¹ be used for expenses related to any activity designed to influence the enactment of legislation, appropriations, regulations, administrative actions, or Executive Orders proposed or pending before the Congress or the Administration. To the extent that a portion of time at a conference is spent on lobbying activities, costs associated with the lobbying, including transportation to and from Washington, DC, lodging, and per diem, may not be charged to the Federal grant. For example, if a meeting or conference lasts for two days and a visit to lobby a member of Congress requires an additional day of travel, 1/3 of all costs involved in attending the meeting or conference, including travel to and from Washington, DC, may not be charged to the grant.

20. What are the consequences of using Federal grant funds on unallowable expenses?

The Department may seek to recover any Federal grant funds identified, in an audit or through program monitoring, as having been used for unallowable costs, including unallowable conference expenses.

21. Whom should grantees call if they have specific questions about the allowable use of Federal grant funds?

Grantees are encouraged to contact their U.S. Department of Education program officer to discuss the allowable use of Federal grant funds, including the allowable use of Federal grant funds for meetings and conferences.

¹ 2 CFR Part 230 (Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations), Appendix B., 25(b) and 2 CFR Part 220 (Cost Principles for Educational Institutions), 28(b).
Federal Regulations and U.S. Dept. of Education FAQ Related to Meetings and Conferences Paid for With Federal Funds

Allowable Costs In General

1. The U.S. Department of Education EDGAR regulations (34 CFR 80.20) specify that in determining allowable costs states must follow:
   a. OMB cost principles;
   b. Program regulations; and
   c. Terms of the grant.

2. OMB cost principles (OMB Circular A-87, Section C (2 CFR 225, App. A)) specify that costs be:
   a. Necessary and reasonable;
      i. A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost. Reasonableness is particularly important when the governmental unit or component is predominately federally-funded. In determining reasonableness of a given cost, consideration shall be given to:
         1. Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the governmental unit or the performance of the federal award;
         2. The restraints or requirements imposed by such factors as: Sound business practices; arm’s-length bargaining; federal, state and other laws and regulations; and terms and conditions of the federal award;
         3. Market price for comparable goods and services;
         4. Whether the individuals concerned acted with prudence in the circumstances considering their responsibilities to the governmental unit, its employees, the public at large and the federal government; and
         5. Significant deviations from the established practices of the governmental unit which may unjustifiably increase the federal award’s cost.
   b. Allocable to the Federal grant award;
      i. A cost is allocable to a particular cost objective if the goods or services involved are chargeable or assignable to such cost objective in accordance with the relative benefit received;
      ii. All activities which benefit from the governmental unit’s indirect cost, including unallowable activities and services donated to the governmental unit by third parties, will receive an appropriate allocation of indirect costs;
iii. Any cost allocable to a particular federal award or cost objective under the principles provided for in 2 CFR 225 may not be charged to other federal awards to overcome fund deficiencies, to avoid restrictions imposed by law or terms of the federal awards, or for other reasons; and

iv. Where an accumulation of indirect costs will ultimately result in charges to a federal award, a cost allocation plan will be required as described in Appendices C, D, and E to 2 CFR 225.

v. Authorized or not prohibited under state law;

vi. Conform to any limitations or exclusions set for the in OMB A-87, federal laws, terms and conditions of the federal award, or other governing regulations as to types or amounts of cost items.

vii. Be consistent with policies, regulations, and procedures that apply uniformly to both federal awards and other activities of the governmental unit.

viii. Be accorded consistent treatment. A cost may not be assigned to a federal award as a direct cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances has been allocated to the federal award as an indirect cost.

ix. Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other federal award in either the current or a prior period, except as specifically provided by federal law or regulation.

x. Be the net of all applicable credits.

xi. Be adequately documented.

Allowable Costs for Conferences and Meetings

3. OMB cost principles (OMB A-87, No. 27 (2 CFR 225, App. B)) specify that the costs of meetings and conferences, the primary purpose of which is the dissemination of technical information, are allowable.

a. The U.S. Dept. of Education FAQ, May 2013, (Question No. 1) says that federal grant funds may be used to host a meeting or conference if doing so is:

i. Consistent with its approved application or plan;

ii. For purposes that are directly relevant to the program and the operation of the grant, such as for conveying technical information related to the objectives of the grant;

1. Technical information includes, but is not limited to, the following, each of which must be related to implementing the program or project funded by the grant (Question No. 2):

   a. Specific programmatic, administrative, or fiscal accountability requirements;

   b. Best practices in a particular field;

   c. Theoretical, empirical, or methodological advances in a particular field;

   d. Effective methods of training or professional development; and
e. Effective grant management and accountability.

iii. And reasonable and necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of the approved grant.

1. The following factors should be considered when deciding whether to host a meeting or conference (Question No. 3):
   a. Whether a face-to-face meeting or conference is the most effective or efficient way to achieve the desired result and whether there are alternatives, such as webinars or video conferences, that would be equally or similarly effective and more efficient in terms of time and costs than a face-to-face meeting.
   b. How the meeting or conference will be perceived by the public; for example, will the meeting or conference be perceived as a good use of taxpayer dollars.

Allowable Costs for Meals, Beverages, and Snacks at Conferences and Meetings

4. OMB cost principles (OMB Circular A-87, No. 27 (2 CFR 225, App. B)) specify that the allowable cost of meetings and conferences may include the cost of meals, transportation, rental of facilities, speakers’ fees, and other items incidental to such meetings or conferences (but not entertainment – amusement, diversion, social activities).

   a. The U.S. Dept. of Education FAQ, May 2013, (Question No. 6) says that the cost of food, beverages, or snacks may be allowed rarely on a case-by-case basis when the grantee makes a compelling case that the unique circumstances they have identified justifies these costs as reasonable and necessary.
      i. There is a high burden of proof to show that paying for food and beverages with federal funds is necessary to meet the goals and objectives of a federal grant.
      ii. The grantee should structure the agenda for a meeting so that there is time for participants to purchase their own food, beverages, and snacks.
      iii. When planning a meeting, grantees may want to consider a location in which participants have easy access to food and beverages.

   b. The FAQ (Question No. 7) says that in virtually all cases, using grant funds to pay for food and beverages for receptions and “networking” sessions is not justified because participation in such activities is rarely necessary to achieve the purpose of the meeting or conference.

   c. The FAQ (Question No. 8) says that food and beverage costs embedded in a vendor contract for a meeting or conference should be “backed out” if they are not reasonable and necessary (see above).

   d. The FAQ (Question No. 9) says that when a hotel or other venue provided “complimentary” beverages (e.g. coffee, tea), the grantee has an obligation to confirm that the beverages are truly complimentary and will not be reflected as a charge to the grant in another area, for example, for the cost of the meeting room.
e. The FAQ (Question No. 10) says that indirect funds should not be used to pay the cost of food and beverages because they are easily associated with a specific cost objective, such as a grant, and therefore are properly treated as direct costs rather than indirect costs.

f. The FAQ (Question 11) says that the use of federal funds to pay for alcoholic beverages is strictly prohibited.

g. The FAQ (Question 12) says that grantees should follow their own policies and procedures and state and local laws for using non-federal funds to pay for food and beverages. Grantees using non-federal funds to pay for food or beverages should make clear in a written disclaimer or announcement that federal grant funds were not used for food or beverages and should ensure that the food and beverages are appropriate for the event and do not detract from the event’s purpose. 

i. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. 81-1182 and DAS Accounting Manual Section #AM-005, General Policies No. 1, the Department may sponsor conferences and pay conference expenses, including meals and beverages (non-alcoholic), of a non-employee if sufficient money is collected from the non-employee, or other non-State sources, to cover the cost.

h. The FAQ (Question 13) says that grantees may offer meeting participants the option of paying for food and beverages, and arrange for those items to be available at the meeting.

Consequences

5. The U.S. Dept. of Education may seek to recover any federal grant funds identified, in an audit or program monitoring, as having been for unallowable costs.
SAFARI Montage Total Solution Overview

SAFARI Montage provides K-12 school districts with a comprehensive solution for their digital media networking and visual instruction needs. In addition, SAFARI Montage is interoperable with virtually all classroom technology and most enterprise district systems. The full suite of integrated modules provides a single interface for users to access and manage all digital and visual resources from within the school district network or from home.

LEARNING OBJECT REPOSITORY

- OUTSTANDING EDUCATIONAL CONTENT
  - Curriculum-rich and correlated to state standards and common core

- SAFARI MONTAGE CREATION STATION
  - DISTRICT & USER-GENERATED CONTENT FOR A UNIFIED LEARNING OBJECT REPOSITORY

- SELECTIVE VIDEO STREAMING
  - MANAGE LIVE STREAMS & IPTV

- WAN MANAGER
  - ENTERPRISE NETWORK
  - DIGITAL MEDIA MANAGEMENT
  - Intelligent control of media delivery throughout the district and to the home

- SAFARI MONTAGE SUPETUBE™
  - A School District Community Media Portal

- PATHWAYS SM™
  - CLASSROOM DEVICE CONTROL & SCHEDULING

- MANAGED HOME ACCESS
  - Connects teachers, students and parents to the district's content from home

- NEW!
  - SAFARI MONTAGE Live-SI (SMLS)
  - Interactive videoconferencing on-demand at your desktop

- NEW!
  - SAFARI MONTAGE NETWORK-DVR (With Channel Guide)
  - Capture streamed video for future viewing

Christy Burnette
Nebraska Education Consultant
Haddock Education Technologies
Email: Christy@gohaddock.com
Phone: 402.314.1134
BlendEd

Blended learning is an educational model that combines traditional face-to-face classroom methods, with at least some level of online delivery and participation.

BlendEd Components

Learning Object Repository (LOR) Content System
A statewide digital content repository for existing and future collections of multimedia learning objects and course materials of all types (e.g. audio, video, digital images, textual)—standards-aligned and appropriately cataloged and classified.

Learning Management System (LMS)
A statewide learning management system to allow teachers to access, create, organize instructional content; perform testing; support collaborative learning activities; and deliver instruction to students.

Federated Directory Services System (LDAP)
A statewide directory services structure that facilitates single sign-on access to all instructional resources for every teacher and learner.

Statewide Professional Development (PD) System
A comprehensive system of professional development to provide technology-assisted instructional design training, embedded professional development, and PD content shared between and among the NDE, ESUCC, higher education and other educational partners.

Evaluative System
A persistent system of assessment and analytics that enables the diagnosis of specific student achievement problems and the identification of curriculum or teacher shortages (e.g. science, technology, engineering, mathematics, English language learners, credit recovery, advanced placement, etc).

The Nebraska BlendEd eLearning System

The goal of Nebraska’s BlendEd eLearning System is to implement instructional and content technologies to enhance teaching and learning to improve learning outcomes for students of all ages.

Implementation of the BlendEd eLearning System will enable teachers to access, create, and share learning objects and other educational content that will enrich and deepen the learning experiences available to all Nebraska students.

Blended education has been promoted by educational researchers as one of the most promising recent innovations to access and develop content for 1) a traditional face-to-face classroom; 2) an existing video distance learning classroom; or 3) students outside the confines of the classroom and the normal school day. Blended education allows flexibility in access and delivery to include support for traditional face-to-face (synchronous) instruction and online (asynchronous) instruction and allows for any time, any place, any path, any pace learning. This will expand learning opportunities for students in high demand areas, including the STEM subjects (i.e. science, technology, engineering, and math) and the world languages.

This project will encourage educational entities to collaborate and establish a plan of action to promote the appropriate adoption of these instructional tools, technologies, and associated instructional techniques. Implementation will include strategic phases of capacity building over the next four years to reach the greatest number of teachers and students in the most effective manner possible.

The Nebraska BlendED Initiative will truly be a ‘blend’ of efforts by partners from education, business, state government and charitable foundations working together to advance learning outcomes to produce career and college ready graduates.

For more information please contact Matt Blomstedt at 402-499-6756 or matt@esucc.org
SAFARI Montage not only supports Blended Learning... SAFARI Montage is Blended Learning.

The digital revolution has impacted education as profoundly as it has other areas of our lives, maybe even more so. Every one of us moves seamlessly from the realm of the physical world into and out of that of the online world—the network, the cloud, the Internet. Pens, pencils, notepads, and books have not gone away. They simply have taken on a costarring or supporting role in our lives. Along the same lines, face-to-face meetings have to some extent given way to online communication, whether through text messages, e-mails, blogs, or social media.

The same is true in education. Hard copy media and classroom instruction have not gone away. They remain valuable tools in a kit that now must include an array of online options. This combination of teaching methodologies and instructional tools is called ‘blended learning’, and it has become a critical piece of the foundation of teaching and learning in the digital age. Blended Learning Methodology combines classroom, online and mobile learning to provide information and instruction to learners on a 24/7, ‘anytime/anywhere’ basis, engaging students using technology they know and understand in their everyday lives.

SAFARI Montage facilitates Blended Learning, by supporting each of the three pieces of its methodology. First and foremost, the SAFARI Montage Learning Object Repository (LOR) provides a dedicated space for uploading, storage, and management of all of the District’s digital resources. It’s important to understand that the LOR is not simply a directory for saving files. Schools and Districts discovered early on that attempting to store digital assets unmanaged was a futile effort, one that was expensive and ineffective. To be utilized effectively in an educational environment, digital resources need to be archived with very specific attributes attached:

- Proper naming protocols- for consistency and easy identification
- Metadata- for fast access through maximum searchability
- Standards alignment- all resources in the system can be aligned to Common Core standards as well as local standards
- Digital Rights Management- for licensing compliance and control of District assets

SAFARI Montage supports classroom, online and mobile learning:

Classroom- The SAFARI Montage system is a highly user-friendly system accessible in the classroom by teachers and students. Whether used in a group setting to display video or other digital resources, or used by individuals via desktop, laptop, or mobile device, SAFARI Montage provides easy access to all digital assets as needed within the classroom.

Online- SAFARI Montage allows access to pre-approved web resources, and in fact, accepts URL’s as storable digital assets in the LOR. These online resources are fully searchable and can be aligned to standards just as with all learning objects in the system.

Mobile- SAFARI Montage is accessible on all varieties of mobile devices, including smartphones, tablets, netbooks, and laptops. The system works with iOS and Android platforms, and SAFARI Montage provides a free iOS app.
1. **Teacher/Principal Evaluation Model.** Pilot year (17 districts) in 2013-14 - revisions summer of 2014 - publication of models in fall of 2014. (D. Price and N. Becker)

2. **NePAS and LB 438.** Continue to refine State of Schools Report (SOSR) and explore ways to shorten timeline of reporting out results and to identify priority (high need) schools. (V. Foy, Assessment Team)

3. **SLDS Grant.** Runs for next two years. Four objectives: 1) Create and implement data dashboard. 2) Statewide system of professional development training for data analysis. 3) Build a research and evaluation operation collaboratively with research community. 4) Enhance SLDS for sustainability. May also involve new rule on data and sharing of data by school districts, ESU’s, Learning Community and NDE (LB 262). (D. Folkers, DRE Team)

4. **ACT Pilot and Research Study.** 2013-14 is the third and final year for the state-paid pilot ACT test in the eight school districts. Final test will be given in the spring of 2014. Research reports will be produced this fall and continue until the fall of 2016. (J. Moon, Assessment Team)

5. **Truancy Task Force.** Continues on an annual basis to focus on overall improvement of school attendance and to comply with NRSS 79-527.01. Revise Rule 12 and 13 to close attendance gap for exempt school students. (Deputy Commissioner, State Board)

6. **P-16 Goals.** Continue work on Goal 2 – Eliminate Achievement Gap (Native American strategic planning process and Hispanic-Latino Student Achievement Study), Goal 3 – SLDS and Goal 4 – 90% Graduation Rate. (All)
DRAFT//‘TO DO LIST’ – Next Six to Nine Months
July 2013

1. Revisit, revise, reprioritize Board goals (Fall of 2013 – State Board)

2. Review and revise Language Arts and Mathematics Standards, including consideration of alignment study with common core state standards. Include in this process a joint agreement with the public postsecondary institutions that the revised standards reflect college and career ready expectations. (D. Rice - Curriculum Team, Deputy Commissioner)

3. Revise Rule 10 to include new social studies standards and other changes as appropriate. (Assistant Commissioner, F. Lange – Accreditation Team)

4. Revise Rules 20 and 23 to align educator preparation programs to teacher/principal frameworks and changes in PPST, Praxis, Content Tests (Certification Requirements). (S. Katt – Adult Program Services Team)

5. Revise Rule 51 creating new Rule 52 to include new federal expectations and clarity between preschool and school age programs. (G. Sherman, Special Education Team)

6. Expand Early Childhood Education efforts by revising Rule 11, creating Kindergarten assessment and considering involvement in federal ECE initiative. (M. Hobson, Early Childhood Team)

**Board Committee Work:**

**Policy Committee** – 1) A new accountability policy that reflects NePAS, 2) A Family/Community engagement policy, 3) Role of State and NDE with regard to Non-Public Schools, 4) A policy regarding teacher preparation, 5) A policy regarding a systematic review of Rules, 5) A review and possible policy on safety and security of schools.

**Accountability Committee** – 1) Determine process for identification of schools that have an unacceptable performance and what/how NDE should intervene to support improvement (LB 438), 2) Discussion of strategies to close learning/graduation rate gaps, 3) Evaluation model for teachers and principals, 4) Setting common education data definitions (CED’s).

**Standards Committee** – 1) Revision of reading/language arts and mathematics standards (with an eye toward alignment with common core state standards and validation of ‘college and career ready’ as appropriate), 2) fine arts standards, 3) career readiness standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Date of Review</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>External Review due by April 1, 2013 with at least 30 days prior to the external review visit. Assist reports are due at least 30 days prior to the external review visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>External Review due by April 1, 2014 with at least 30 days prior to the external review visit. Assist reports are due at least 30 days prior to the external review visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>External Review due by April 1, 2015 with at least 30 days prior to the external review visit. Assist reports are due at least 30 days prior to the external review visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>External Review due by April 1, 2016 with at least 30 days prior to the external review visit. Assist reports are due at least 30 days prior to the external review visit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Bold text = Systems Accredited
- Italic text = Candidate for Systems Accreditation
- Gray text = Nonpublic, non-charter
### ESUCC Meeting Dates for 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 2013</td>
<td>3-5:00pm CT</td>
<td>ESU 10, Kearney</td>
<td>Regular Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin Days</strong></td>
<td>July 31 – Aug 2</td>
<td>Conference Room F</td>
<td><strong>Waiting to hear if can get closer to Conference – Wingate/Fairfield</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4, 2013</td>
<td>1-5:00pm CT</td>
<td>ESU #10, Kearney</td>
<td>Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 2013</td>
<td>8:30am CT</td>
<td>ESU #10, Kearney Conf. Room C</td>
<td>Budget Hearing Regular Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2013</td>
<td>8:30am CT</td>
<td>Lincoln Country Inn &amp; Suites</td>
<td>Planning Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19, 2013</td>
<td>1-5:00pm CT</td>
<td>ESU #3, LaVista Niobrara/Missouri Room</td>
<td>Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20, 2013</td>
<td>8:30am CT</td>
<td>ESU #3, LaVista Sarpy/Washington Niobrara</td>
<td>Regular Meeting / DL NESUBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2014</td>
<td>1:30pm CT</td>
<td>NASB Office Lincoln</td>
<td>Regular Meetings/ DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2014</td>
<td>1-5:00pm CT</td>
<td>ESU 11, Holdrege</td>
<td>Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5, 2014</td>
<td>8:30am CT</td>
<td>ESU 11, Holdrege</td>
<td>Regular Meeting/ DL Business Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2014</td>
<td>1-5:00pm CT</td>
<td>ESU #3, LaVista Niobrara/Missouri</td>
<td>Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3, 2014</td>
<td>8:30am CT</td>
<td>ESU #3, LaVista Cass/Douglas</td>
<td>Spring Strategic Plan Implementation Mtg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6, 2014</td>
<td>1-5:00pm CT</td>
<td>ESU #10, Kearney Conference Room A &amp; C</td>
<td>Work Session (Polycom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 2014</td>
<td>8:30am CT</td>
<td>ESU #10, Kearney Conference Room C</td>
<td>Regular Meeting / (Polycom) DL NESUBA – Conference Room B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
2013 Legislative Session
103rd Legislature, First Session
June 6 & 7, 2013

BILLS ENACTED IN FIRST SESSION

LB 125E ........................................Hearing Date: January 24, 2013 – Government Committee
.......................................................... Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Lautenbaugh

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to boards of education of Class V school districts

SUMMARY: The bill would amend several sections of statutes to reduce the number of board members for a Class V School District from twelve (12) to nine (9), to provide for an election of these board members during the primary and general election for officers of a city of the metropolitan class beginning in 2013.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

-------------------------

LB 242 ........................................Hearing Date: February 11, 2013 – Executive Board
EXECUTIVE BOARD PRIORITY BILL............................................ Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Howard

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to adoption of administrative rules and regulations

SUMMARY: Whenever an agency has not promulgated regulations within three years after the effective date of legislation that requires the adoption of regulations, the legislative committee that has subject matter jurisdiction over the matters included in the legislation shall hold a public hearing to determine the reason that such rules and regulations have not been enacted. In addition, the Public Counsel for the Legislature would have authority to investigate violations of the administrative procedures act by an agency that fails to promulgate regulations as required.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

-------------------------

LB 262 ........................................Hearing Date: February 5, 2013 – Education Committee
.......................................................... Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Cook

ONE-LINER: Provide duties relating to sharing of student information

SUMMARY: The bill requires the State Board of Education to promulgate rules and regulations providing for and requiring the uniform sharing of student data, records, and information among school districts, educational service units, learning communities, and NDE. The Legislature finds and declares that sharing of student data, records, and information among school districts, ESU’s, learning communities, and NDE to the fullest extent practicable and permitted by law is vital to advancing education in the State, and that whenever applicable law permits the sharing of student data, records, and information, each school district, ESU, and learning community shall comply unless otherwise prohibited.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.
LB 263E ................................. Hearing Date: February 20, 2013 – Retirement Committee RETIREMENT COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILL................................. Approved By Governor INTRODUCED BY: Retirement Committee

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to government retirement systems

SUMMARY: The bill adds definitions for retirement application and retirement date; specifies that permanent part-time employees who are 18 or older may participate in the retirement system within the first 30 days of employment; clarifies employer contributions; stipulates that funds forfeited by employees who terminate before vesting will be used to either pay fund expenses or reduce employer contributions related to the defined contribution benefit; and allows for the waiver of required minimum distributions for 2009 per 401(a)(9)(H) of the Internal Revenue Code for both plan participants and beneficiaries.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LB 332 ...................................... Hearing Date: March 4, 2013 – Education Committee ................................................................. Approved By Governor INTRODUCED BY: Senator Harms

ONE-LINER: Change application provisions relating to the Access College Early Scholarship Program

SUMMARY: The bill adds “or other official designated by the school” to a school counselor as to local school officials who can verify and submit an application for the Access College Early Scholarship Program.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LB 363 & LB 363A .................. Hearing Date: February 6, 2013 – Government Committee ................................................................. Approved by Governor INTRODUCED BY: Senator Avery

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to access to public records

SUMMARY: The bill adds that a government entity is not required to produce public records that already are available to the public on-line so long as the requestor has “reasonable access” to the Web. The bill proposes to add some clarifications/restrictions to what can be used to figure costs of reproduction by government entities when charging and/or estimating that for public records requests. Finally, the bill adds a provision that provides a requestor of public records has a ten day timeline to respond to the government agency’s cost estimate and statement of its position on the request.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LB 366E & LB 366AE ............ Hearing Date: February 4, 2013 – Education Committee SENATOR COOK PRIORITY BILL ............................................. Approved by Governor INTRODUCED BY: Senator Cook

ONE-LINER: Adopt the Remedial Adult Education Innovation Act
SUMMARY: The bill creates the Diploma of High School Equivalency Assistance Act to provide financial assistance to institutions which offer high school equivalency programs in order to defray the costs associated with participation in such programs. The State Board of Education may promulgate rules and regulations to carry out provisions of the act. Education Innovation Funds are to be used by NDE to provide each institution offering a high school equivalency program a one-time payment for the acquisition and upgrade of equipment and software necessary to administer examinations for diplomas of high school equivalency.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

LB 407E ........................................Hearing Date: February 11, 2013 – Education Committee EDUCATION COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILL............................................ Approved By Governor INTRODUCED BY: Senator Sullivan

ONE-LINER: Change calculation provisions under the Tax Equity and Educational Opportunities Support Act

SUMMARY: The bill changes the base limitation rate for 2013-14; changes local effort rate for 2013-14 and 2014-15; clarifies that expenditures included in poverty and limited English proficiency allowances cannot be included in other allowances; provides additional budget authority for early childhood education programs when programs move from grant funds to calculation in TEEOSA; continues budget exclusion for voluntary termination agreements but only when districts prove a net savings in salary and benefits over a 5 year period; for 2013-14 only, 2% additional budget growth with 75% board approval; beginning with 2013-14, $30 million in teacher education allowance with distribution based on teacher education points, 50% of teacher education allowance paid as teacher education aid, $20 million in instructional time allowance with distribution based on the average days in session in excess of 175 days multiplied by formula students, and 50% of instructional time allowance paid as instructional time aid; and beginning with 2014-15, summer school allowance limited to reported summer school expenditures that are not included in other allowances, and the averaging adjustment threshold would be the average basic funding for all school districts with 900 or more formula students.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

LB 408E ........................................Hearing Date: February 4, 2013 – Education Committee .......................................................... Approved By Governor INTRODUCED BY: Senator Sullivan

ONE-LINER: Change dates and provisions relating to certification and distribution of state aid

SUMMARY: The bill changes the certification date for 2013-14 TEEOSA Aid and 2013-14 Budget Authority from March 1, 2013 to June 1, 2013.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

LB 410E ........................................Hearing Date: February 25, 2013 – Education Committee EDUCATION COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILL............................................ Approved By Governor NDE TECHNICAL AMENDMENT BILL INTRODUCED BY: Senator Sullivan

ONE-LINER: Change and eliminate provisions relating to education
SUMMARY: This is the Department of Education’s technical bill for the 2013 Session. The bill repeals obsolete education statutes and harmonizes education statutes with current practices including provisions regarding rules and regulations, kindergarten admission, enrollment option, access to school files, attendance reporting, pupil transportation, early childhood education, educational service units, distance education reimbursement, learning community reporting, disclosure of certain records and private postsecondary schools.

Board: On January 28, 2013, the State Board voted to Support LB 410, with staff testimony.

**********************************

LB 429 & LB 429A ................. Hearing Date: February 8, 2013 – Government Committee
SENATOR CRAWFORD PRIORITY BILL .................................................. Approved by Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Crawford

ONE-LINER: Require disclosure of state contracts

SUMMARY: This bill would require the Department of Administrative Services to post a copy of each contract or subcontract, as further defined, funded with state funds, and any related documents on its website. The bill also would require the State Treasurer to provide a link on its website to the contracting information on the website of the Department of Administrative Services.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

**********************************

LB 483 & 483A ....................... Hearing Date: February 22, 2013 – Judiciary Committee
SPEAKER PRIORITY BILL ................................................................. Approved by Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Bolz

ONE-LINER: Provide for a reentry planning program in adult correctional facilities

SUMMARY: This bill creates a two year pilot project that the Department of Correctional Services shall establish to provide an evidence based program of parent education, early literacy, relationship skills development and reentry planning which will involve family members of incarcerated parents prior to their release.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

**********************************

LB 495E & 495AE .................... Hearing Date: March 19, 2013 – Education Committee
SPEAKER PRIORITY BILL ................................................................. Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Sullivan

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to the Education Innovation Fund and early childhood grant reporting

SUMMARY: This bill authorizes the allocation of money for the Early Childhood Education Grant Program for children three to five and for the Early Childhood Education Endowment Cash Fund from lottery funds. The bill also eliminates funding from the Education Innovation fund for NDE’s longitudinal data system, NDE’s Student Leadership and Extended Learning Act, Multicultural Education, and NDE’s Certification Investigations which is included in NDE’s general funds under LB 195.

For 2013-2014, $1,750,000 would go to NDE for early childhood grants, and $1,000,000 would go to the Early Childhood Education Endowment Cash Fund for Sixpence grants (for children birth to age three). For 2014-2015, $1,850,000 would go to NDE for early childhood grants, and $1,000,000 would go to the Early Childhood Education Endowment Cash Fund
for Sixpence grants. For 2015-2016, 1,950,000 would go to NDE for early childhood grants, and $1,000,000 would go to the Early Childhood Education Endowment Cash Fund for Sixpence grants.

The bill also clarifies that both NDE and the Endowment Board of Trustees must submit evaluation reports to the State Board and the Legislature each odd numbered year. This bill also requires that the Education Committee hold a hearing about the report. Up to 5% of the total appropriation from state general funds for the Early Childhood Education Grant Program may be reserved by NDE for evaluation and technical assistance.

**Board:** On February 4, 2013, the State Board voted to Support LB 495, with staff testimony.

**LB 497E........................................Hearing Date: March 19, 2013 – Education Committee
SENATOR SULLIVAN PRIORITY BILL............................................Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Sullivan

**ONE-LINER:** Change distribution and provide for a study of the Education Innovation Fund

**SUMMARY:** Continues to authorize expenditures for the Excellence in Teaching Act. Amounts are not changed from the current authorizing legislation (beginning in 2013-14, the amount available is reinstated to 1 million dollars). Language is added to require that no funds received as allocations from the Education Innovation Fund for EIA can be obligated for payment to be made after June 30, 2016, and that contracts need to include a clause to communicate this requirement to recipients. Beginning July 1, 2016, Education Innovation Fund is renamed as the Nebraska Education Improvement Fund. The bill further creates a study, to be conducted by the Education Committee regarding the potential uses of the funds available to education from lottery proceeds and the study is to be completed by December 31, 2014.

**Board:** The Board took no position on this bill.

**LB 500.................................Hearing Date: February 26, 2013 – Transportation Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Brasch

**ONE-LINER:** Change school bus operation provisions

**SUMMARY:** This bill would prohibit the operator of a school bus from loading or unloading of pupils outside of the corporate limits of any city or village or on any part of the state highway system within the corporate limits of a city or village if the operator does not have at least 400 feet of clear vision in either direction of travel.

**Board:** The Board took no position on this bill.

**LB 507E & LB 507AE..........................Hearing Date: February 20, 2013 – HHS Committee
SENATOR BOLZ PRIORITY BILL.................................Approved by Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Campbell

**ONE-LINER:** Adopt the Step Up to Quality Child Care Act

**SUMMARY:** This bill requires NDE and the Department of Health and Human Services to collaborate with community and statewide partners to develop, implement, and provide oversight for a quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) for child care and early childhood education programs. The bill phases in required participation of defined child care and early childhood education programs. For all other early education and care programs, the bill allows but does not require
participation in the QRIS. This bill also requires NDE to create the Nebraska Early Childhood Professional Record System by March 1, 2014. NDE and DHHS may promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the Act.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LB 510 .................................. Hearing Date: February 6, 2013 – Government Committee
................................................................. Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Scheer

ONE-LINER: Change Open Meeting Act telephone conference call provisions and authorization for videoconferencing and teleconferencing

SUMMARY: This Bill would amend the Open Meetings laws to permit the ESU Coordinating Council to hold meetings by videoconferencing.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LB 553E & 553AE ....................... Hearing Date: February 6, 2013 – Retirement Committee
RETIREMENT COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILL..........Passed/Override Governor’s Veto
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Nordquist

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to school employee retirement

SUMMARY: The bill creates a new second tier within the School Retirement Plan for participants on or after July 1, 2013 that would be based on the highest salaries for five years rather than the current three years and the maximum cost-of-living adjustment would be 1%. The amortization method in the School Employees Retirement Act would be changed from level dollar to level percentage of salary beginning July 1, 2013; The existing 9.78% employee contribution rate would remain in effect; and the State would increase supplemental contributions to the School Plan from 1% to 2% of the compensation of School Plan members beginning July 1, 2014.

The Class V school district retirement plan will also incorporate a second tier of benefits for employees hired on or after July 1, 2013; the final average salary would be averaged over 5 years instead of 3 years, and a 1% maximum COLA would apply to those in the new tier. Benefits for employees who are members prior to July 1, 2013 would remain unchanged. The Class V school district retirement plan employee contribution rate would be increased from 9.3% to 9.78% beginning September 1, 2013 with no sunset; and the state statutory contribution rate would be increased from 1% to 2% of total compensation beginning July 1, 2014 with no sunset.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LB 556 & 556A............................ Hearing Date: February 14, 2013 – HHS Committee
SENATOR McGILL PRIORITY BILL......................... Approved by Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator McGill

ONE-LINER: Provide for telehealth services for children, change the medical assistance program, and provide duties for the Department of Health and Human Services

SUMMARY: The bill requires DHHS to promulgate rules and regulations providing for telehealth services for children’s behavioral health. The intent of the Legislature is that behavioral health screenings be offered by physicians at the time of
childhood physicals and that results of any behavioral health screening or any related documents shall not be included in
the child's school record and shall not be provided to the child's school or any other person without the express consent of
the child's parent or legal guardian. The University of Nebraska Medical Center is required to create a pilot program that
would demonstrate a method of addressing the unmet emotional or behavioral health needs of children that can be
replicated statewide.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

**************************

LB 561E & 561AE ......................... Hearing Date: March 7, 2013 – Judiciary Committee
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILL........................................... Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Ashford

ONE-LINER: State findings and intent for changes to the juvenile justice system and a funding mechanism

SUMMARY: The bill makes numerous changes to laws related to juvenile justice and would expand the Nebraska
Juvenile Services Delivery Project statewide by July 1, 2014. Office of Probation Administration would take on duties
previously provided by Office of Juvenile Services and establishes limits on the sending of juveniles to secure detention or
youth rehabilitation treatment centers. Funding provided to create or expand community based programs. Director of
Juvenile Diversion Programs created to assist in creation and maintenance of juvenile pre-trial diversion programs.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

**************************

LB 585 ..................................... Hearing Date: February 26, 2013 – Education Committee
SENATOR SMITH PRIORITY BILL ........................................... Approved By Governor
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Smith

ONE-LINER: Provide, change, and eliminate provisions relating to learning councils

SUMMARY: The bill makes changes to the levy authority for a learning community council and provides levy authority
for early childhood education programs. School districts that are members of a learning community would not be required
to provide free transportation for open enrollment students who transfer within a school district or transfer to a school
district that is not adjacent to their resident school district. The bill would allow one or more members of a learning
community to establish a pathway program and provides the criteria for selecting students for a pathway program. Specific
duties and responsibilities for the advisory council are provided in the bill.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

**************************
**BILL ADVANCED FROM COMMITTEE & PENDING**

**LB 438 ........................................Hearing Date: February 25, 2013 – Education Committee**
**SENATOR ADAMS PRIORITY BILL ........................................... On General File**
**INTRODUCED BY: Senator Adams**

**ONE-LINER:** Provide for priority schools

**SUMMARY:** The Education Committee amendment to the bill would amend the Quality Education Accountability Act to require beginning with data from the 2013-14 school years indicators selected by the State Board of Education for the accountability system shall be combined into a school performance score and district performance score. State Board shall establish levels of performance based upon school performance scores and district performance scores. Up to three schools per year shall be designated by the State Board as priority schools. The Commissioner of Education shall appoint an intervention team for each priority school, and the intervention team, the local school board, and priority administrators and staff shall develop a progress plan that is approved by the State Board. The State Board of Education will reevaluate the progress plan for any school that remains in priority status for five consecutive years. The Commissioner of Education shall report progress of priority schools annually to the Governor, Clerk of the Legislature, and the chairperson of the Education Committee of the Legislature.

**Board:** On February 4, 2013, the State Board voted to Support LB 438, with staff testimony.

**LB 470 ........................................Hearing Date: February 5, 2013 – Education Committee**
**INTRODUCED BY: Senator Scheer**

**ONE-LINER:** Adopt the Superintendent Pay Transparency Act

**SUMMARY:** The Education Committee amendment to the bill would require a school districts and educational service units in their budget statements separate identification and description of all current and future costs for superintendent services or administrator services. The bill would also require boards to publish a copy of any superintendent contract or administrator contract for ESU’s at least 3 days before meeting where contract would be considered. In addition, within after meeting to approve such contract, boards would be required to publish a copy of such contract and reasonable estimate of cost as a result of contract which can be accomplished by posting on web page of district or ESU. The school district and ESU would file a copy of the approved contract and/or amendment with the Department of Education by the next succeeding August 1. Failure to file the documents may result in the withholding of state and local funds until the filing requirement is met. The Department of Education must post the approved contract and/or amendment on its website. This bill contains the Emergency Clause.

**Board:** On January 28, 2013, the State Board voted to remain Neutral on LB 470.

**-----------------------------------------------**
BILLs HELD IN EDUCATION COMMITTEE

LB 47 ........................................Hearing Date: January 29, 2013 – Education Committee
..........................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Ashford

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to career academies

SUMMARY: This bill amends last year’s LB 870 concerning career academies. It provides a funding structure for career academies that are organized on a consortia level with three or more school districts participating with a community college, publicly funded four-year college or university and at least one other public agency, private business, private-industry group or other privately funded entity. The bill also provides for an Industry Credential Assessment Fund to be created to defray the cost to graduates of a career academy of the assessment cost to obtain an industry-recognized credential.

Board: On January 28, 2013, the State Board voted to Support LB 47, with staff testimony.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

LB 116 ........................................Hearing Date: January 29, 2013 – Education Committee
..........................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Harms

ONE-LINER: Provide requirements for dual-enrollment courses

SUMMARY: The bill identifies that a dual-enrollment course must be comparable to a postsecondary educational institution in terms of: rigor; syllabus, textbook, and course requirements; and, student assessment. Further, it requires that the instructor possess a master’s degree and at least 18 hours of graduate-level student in the content area. For career and technical education courses, the faculty requirement is the postsecondary’s equivalent faculty hiring requirements. It specifies that dual-enrollment courses offered by a postsecondary educational institution approved by the Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education to offer such courses shall follow enrollment standards approved by the Commission and the State Department of Education – or the credits will not be transferable to public postsecondary educational institutions in Nebraska.

Board: On January 28, 2013, the State Board voted to Oppose LB 116, with staff testimony.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

LB 131 ........................................ Hearing Date: March 12, 2013 – Education Committee
..........................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Nordquist

ONE-LINER: Adopt the Tobacco-Free Schools Act

SUMMARY: This bill seeks to prohibit the use of tobacco products by students, staff, or visitors at any time on school property or at any off-campus school-sponsored event to promote and protect the health and well-being of all students and staff of all school districts in Nebraska. This is inclusive of vehicles used by the school for the purpose of transporting students, staff, or any other persons.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
LB 143 ................................................................. Hearing Date: March 12, 2013 – Education Committee
.................................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Bloomfield

ONE-LINER: Authorize schools to adopt a child sexual abuse policy as prescribed

SUMMARY: NDE would be required to develop a model sexual abuse policy by July 1, 2014 to assist schools who may elect adoption of such a policy. If schools elect the development of a policy, the policy shall be published in an appropriate school publication and presented to students in an age appropriate educational program. Staff training would be provided as deemed appropriate by school administration.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

************************************************

LB 201 ................................................................. Hearing Date: February 19, 2013 – Education Committee
.................................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Haar

ONE-LINER: Authorize emergency expenditures by school districts and educational service units

SUMMARY: This bill would provide Class I, II, III, IV or VI school boards and educational service unit boards the authority to make emergency expenditures regardless of existing statutory limitations (expenditures and/or levy limitations) and requirements in the event of a disaster or emergency. Class V school districts are excluded from this provision of law. A majority vote of the board of education or the educational service unit board is required to authorize the emergency expenditure. The vote to approve the emergency expenditures may not be made unless a city, village, county or inter-jurisdictional emergency management director under the Emergency Management Act has issued a certificate indicating the expenditures are necessary in the public interest for emergency management purposes.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

************************************************

LB 275 ................................................................. Hearing Date: March 12, 2013 – Education Committee
.................................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Nordquist

ONE-LINER: Adopt the Nebraska Coordinated School Health Act

SUMMARY: The bill would create the Nebraska Coordinated School Health (CSH) Act by transferring $200,000 from the Education Innovation Fund to the Nebraska CSH Fund on July 1, 2013 and July 1, 2014. This fund would be administered by the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) to award competitive grants to school districts to establish school-based health centers (SBHC) and to administer NDE’s CSH program. Ninety percent of funds would be used for school districts to establish SBHCs and 10% of funds would be used to support NDE’s CSH program. In order for school districts to be eligible for these grants, they would seek funding from NDE, demonstrate a relationship with a sponsoring facility, demonstrate long-term financial sustainability of the SBHC, create a School Health Center Advisory Council, and provide 50% matching funds. These matching funds could include in-kind contributions, grants, etc. Preference would be given to school districts that show one of the following: are in an area designated as a health professional shortage or as a medically underserved area or population, and/or the majority of their students are eligible for free/reduced price lunches. Funds can only be used for capital construction and start-up costs for SBHCs and not for on-going operations, administration, or service delivery. Schools could only receive funding once for the same SBHC, but could apply for and receive funding for multiple SBHCs within the same district. They could only receive such grant funding in a fiscal year. NDE will be responsible for establishing an application process consistent of application procedures and deadlines, criteria for selection and evaluation, criteria for determining the amount and duration of grants, reporting requirements, etc. and
may adopt rules/regulations if needed to carry out this Act. If, within 5 years of the grant, school districts would utilize the SBHCs created under these funds for something other than the purposes outlined in the grant, they would be required to repay the Nebraska CSH Fund the entire amount plus interest on the funds until the grant is repaid.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

LB 301 ........................................Hearing Date: February 19, 2013 – Education Committee
.................................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Carlson

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to transfer of property between school districts

SUMMARY: This bill would allow a property owner that has transferred property through free holding provisions, to file a petition, before June 1, to transfer the property back to the original school district. The school board of the original school district shall approve or disapprove the re-transfer of the property on or before July 15. The county would reattach the property back to the original school district with an effective date of August 15. This bill has the Emergency Clause.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

LB 365 ............................................. Hearing Date: March 18, 2013 – Education Committee
................................................................. Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Avery

ONE-LINER: Require instruction in certain emergency procedures as a prerequisite to high school graduation

SUMMARY: The bill requires all students enrolled in a Nebraska public high school to complete an instructional program on first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), and operation of an automated external defibrillator (AED) and successfully pass a written test on CPR and operation of an AED. The instruction program needs to be based on guideline established by the American Heart Association (AHA), the American Red Cross, or another nationally recognized program. The instruction can be taught by an educator or instructor certified in CPR and operation of an AED, a member of the AHA, American Red Cross, or an emergency care provider licensed under the Emergency Medical Services Act. School administrators can waive the requirements for a student with a disability or a student who holds a valid certificate in any of the required areas of instruction. Instruction can include hands-on training with simulators to supplement cognitive skills training or a video presentation.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

LB 367 .............................................Hearing Date: February 4, 2013 – Education Committee
.................................................................Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Cook

ONE-LINER: Adopt the Twenty-First Century Developmental Education Act

SUMMARY: Proposes to provide tuition funds that would flow through NDE to community colleges for the purposes of paying for 30 credit hours of developmental education for individuals who are 16 years of age or older and test below college level on the ACT Compass college-placement test. NDE would be responsible for developing rules and regulations for the application and awarding of the funds.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.
LB 512 ........................................Hearing Date: February 25, 2013 – Education Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Scheer

ONE-LINER: Change provisions relating to academic content standards and statewide assessment and reporting

SUMMARY: This bill amends sections 79-760.01 and 79-760.02 of the Quality Education Accountability Act. The proposed amendment gives the State Board more authority to determine when and how standards should be reviewed and/or revised by altering the following language: “The State Board of Education shall develop a plan to review and update the standards for each subject area not less than every five years and may modify the standards as it deems appropriate.” The bill also opens up the possibility to administer assessments that may be a part of a multi-state effort with language that reads: “or administer assessment instruments that measure student knowledge relative to common academic content standards adopted by a consortium of states in particular subject areas.”

Board: On January 28, 2013, the State Board voted to Support LB 512, with staff testimony.

LB 540 ........................................Hearing Date: March 18, 2013 – Education Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Chambers

ONE-LINER: Prohibit rules and regulations requiring teachers to lead pledge of allegiance

SUMMARY: This bill would amend 79-318 (the general statutory authority of the State Board of Education) to specify that nothing in this statute authorizes the State Board to adopt regulations requiring teachers in public schools to lead students in the Pledge of Allegiance and to nullify any such existing regulations. The Bill would similarly amend 79-724 (the Americanism statute) and 79-725 (the character education statute).

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

LB 575 ........................................Hearing Date: March 18, 2013 – Education Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Haar

ONE-LINER: Provide for professional development training for school board and learning community coordinating council members

SUMMARY: On or after January 1, 2014, all newly elected or appointed school board members and members of the learning community coordinating council will be required to participate in twelve (12) hours of professional development training specific to the responsibilities of board members. The training must be completed within 180 days of the appointments. Board members, or members of the learning community coordinating council, who have served one year or who are reelected must receive eight (8) hours of professional development per year. Areas of training include: powers and duties of school board members, public record law, education standards, financial and fiduciary duties, education law, labor law, ethics, and information specific to their district. The State Department of Education is charged with providing the professional development training, although they may approve training by other entities that may be used to fulfill the required 12 or 8 hours of professional development. A data base of all board members who have, or have not, completed the required training must be maintained by the State Department of Education, any association of school boards, and each local school board and the learning community coordinating council. This data will be used to assess who has completed the required training. If any board member has not completed the training, the State Department of Education must notify the Election Division of the Office of the Secretary of State with the names, making them ineligible for reelection or reappointment during the first election cycle following the term for which he or she did not complete the training.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.
LB 619 ........................................ Hearing Date: March 12, 2013 – Education Committee
.......................................................... Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Haar

ONE-LINER: Require instruction in sexual health education

SUMMARY: This bill seeks to require all public schools to provide age appropriate, medically accurate instruction in comprehensive sexuality education. It requires that NDE adopt and promulgate rules and regulations to carry out this bill, as well as develop and maintain a list of sexual health education curricula consistent with the requirements.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

OTHER LEGISLATION HELD IN COMMITTEE

LB 276 ................. Hearing Date: March 14, 2013 – Health & Human Services Committee
SENATOR KOLOWSKI PRIORITY BILL ........................................ Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Nordquist

ONE-LINER: Change reimbursement provisions under the Early Intervention Act and require a Medicaid state plan amendment

SUMMARY: The bill provides for direct Medicaid payment to school district and ESUs by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for the following additional special education related services: audiology, counseling, psychology, behavioral services, nursing, nutrition, personal assistance, social-work, transportation, and vision services (currently speech therapy (ST), physical therapy (PT) and occupational therapy (OT) are directly reimbursed). DHHS will not receive funding from NDE for annual claims exceeding 3 million dollars for these additional services. Any amount certified to the state budget administrator in excess of 3 million dollars shall be adjusted proportionally in relation to the amount of federal Medicaid funds paid to school districts and ESUs.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.

LB 505 ........................................ Hearing Date: February 26, 2013 – Banking Committee
SENATOR COASH PRIORITY BILL ........................................ Held In Committee
INTRODUCED BY: Senator Coash

ONE-LINER: Provide requirement for insurance coverage of autism spectrum disorders

SUMMARY: The bill was introduced to establish insurance requirements for coverage of services for individuals with an autism spectrum disorder. The bill would require insurance coverage for screening, diagnosis, and treatment of an autism spectrum disorder in an individual under twenty-one years of age. Treatment could include applied behavior analysis or other evidenced based care and would be limited to a $70,000 per year maximum benefit for three years. After three years a treatment the maximum coverage amount would reduce to $20,000 until the individual reaches twenty-one years of age.

Board: The Board took no position on this bill.
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