

**Chapter 1 : Search Decisions and Orders**

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions - Senate Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC*

Goodling [Chairman of the Committee] presiding. Representatives Goodling, Martinez, and Scott. Today our hearing will focus on two things: The hearing is the second of several hearings we will have this year on testing-related matters, and as a follow-up to the national testing debate of last year. Having spent over 20 years of my life in public education, I am keenly aware of the important role academic standards and tests play in helping Americans understand how well their children are learning. I believe the best standards and assessment policies are those developed at the State and local levels, involving wide cross-sections of the local citizenry, parents, teachers, administrators, and testing experts. Any Federal involvement must be carefully and thoroughly scrutinized. Back in March of , I wrote about my concerns about spending more Federal dollars on national testing in my weekly commentary called "Plain Talk," quote: Resources would be far better spent on educating our children rather than testing them. The emphasis should be on parental involvement, adequate funding, high-quality teaching, and the development of curriculum programs that respond to the education needs of our students. That was back in We know from the National Education Goals report, at least 32 States have developed State standards, and an additional 14 report that standards development is underway. We also know that 45 States report that they have statewide assessment systems, and that 23 States report that they have aligned their assessments with their standards. An additional 21 report that they are in the process of doing so. With all these State activities on standards and assessment, the question becomes what impact would national tests in fourth grade reading and eighth grade math have upon what States and local governments are already doing in the areas of standards and assessment. Hopefully, our testimony today will help answer the question. Last year, the House and the Senate voted to prohibit pilot testing, field testing, implementation or administration of any national test in fiscal year , but did allow very limited test development activities to go forward. What, if anything, happens on national testing beyond fiscal year is an open question and subject to the actions of Congress. We have several fine witnesses with us today and I am grateful to each of you for taking the time to be here. I will now yield to my ranking colleague for any opening statement he may have. Thank you very much, Mr. Today I make the statement on behalf of the ranking member, Mr. Clay, who could not be here with us this morning, since he is traveling back from his district. I am pleased to join the Chairman in welcoming the witnesses before this Committee today. I do want to extend a special welcome to Dr. Eva Baker who is from my home State of California. It is always good to see another Californian testifying before our Committee. I do want to take a minute to explain the lack of attendance by the members that you see. We have two on our side and one on Mr. As many in the audience might know, today is the last day of our district work period. That means members are home in their districts meeting with their constituents and local officials. Unfortunately, this means only a few of our colleagues will be able to join us today. I am sure the Chairman agrees with the goal of allowing a maximum member participation, so I am at a loss as to the reason we are here today on a Monday. This is a very important topic and they should be covering it. I was one of those members, and so was the ranking member, Mr. Clay, who opposed national testing for very many of the same reasons that Mr. I have recently read articles where they say our children are learning in garbage dumps, and in many districts like mine, that is absolutely true. The deterioration of high schools and middle schools and elementary schools is deplorable, and in a country like this, we should not be allowing this to happen. There are things like the quality of environment in schools we need to address, funding to hire and train , more teachers and to reduce the class size. In our State of California, as Dr. Eva Baker knows, the Governor has called for the downsizing of classes, and with that downsize and splitting the classes up into more classes, you are going to need more teachers. Where is the money going to come from? They need to support local efforts to improve and revitalize those community schools that exist in those districts, since schools are really a responsibility of the State and local districts. That vote also was to send a message that the Congress should stop grandstanding on the issue of national testing and concentrate on assisting the educational efforts of our States and communities. If this hearing stays focused on those

programs and the efforts of States to assess their students, I believe it will be useful in our deliberations. While the topic of national testing is sure to come up in this context, I would be strongly disappointed if this hearing breaks down into another partisan attempt of discrediting the efforts of the administration. This hearing should be a substantive policy discussion over the testing issues which confront this Committee, not an effort to gain support for an ideological agenda. I have a great respect for the Chairman and have always admired his work, both presently and when they were in the Minority. I hope this Committee stays away from efforts to demagogue national testing and focuses on addressing the many pressing issues we must deal with this year in a bipartisan fashion. That has been the tradition of this Committee for so many years, and I want to thank the Chairman for it. I would just like to add, in talking in the discussion of testing and the work the first witnesses are going to cover you know, I have always wondered, ever since I was a child in school and studying myself, we have periodic tests in the class, but they are only to give us a grade, not to measure what we need or what we are lacking; and I always thought the testing in this country ought to really take on a nature of testing for, not just the sake of measuring across the board in a State against other children or on a national basis, States against States or countries against countries, to find where they are. Maybe that is why there ought to be a national testing center, so we can all measure to the same thing. But really the tests still only tell you where they are. Did that sound like an effort to bring about a bipartisan effort? He did not write that speech, though. At any rate, I too had a lot I wanted to do back in the district, even today, but when you are stuck with 7 legislative days in February, 8 legislative days in April, unfortunately, we are going to have to do some of these on days we are not actually in session. Our first panel, Dr. Much of his current work focuses on educational assessment, particularly as a tool of education policy. His recent research has included studies of assessment-based education reforms in Vermont, Maryland and Kentucky. These studies explore both the program, the effects on schooling, and the quality of their assessment. We will begin with Dr. I would like to thank you and the members of the Committee for the invitation to come here today. Testing, as you know, is a very technical enterprise and it often seems rather mysterious. My goal today is to strip away a bit of the mystery and discuss a few of the basic principles that underlie testing. I would be happy to turn from those general principles to the specific controversies of voluntary national testing and other controversies that face you this session if you would like. The first of the general principles I would like to stress is the notion of tests as samples. That is basically what educational tests are. When teachers go about doing that, they often have a very small domain in mind can these kids factor quadratic equations, say, or fit linear equations and so they can sample very well, their tests can be reasonably complete. When policy-makers want information from tests, it is usually to support very broad inferences, such as how well have kids mastered the cumulative mathematics curriculum through grade 8, which the proposed voluntary national test would assess, as does the National Assessment of Educational Progress. That in turn leads to one of the seemingly arcane focuses of the current debate, which is something called "matrix sampling. So your sample of cumulative mathematics learning is likely to be pretty weak. One response to that problem is to write a very big test, something that might take an individual kid a day or day and a half to take, and break it up into pieces, I take one piece, you take the second piece and you take the third piece and so on, and in the end you assemble all the pieces together and get, say, a score for a school or a State, for a district. That score then reflects a very broad test, reflects a good sample of the domain, and gives you some confidence that the trends you are seeing are really trustworthy. That is why the National Assessment of Educational Progress is matrix sampled. It allows the assessment to include far more questions than you could ask any one kid. The drawback of matrix sampling is it generally gives you inadequate scores for individual kids, because they only take chunk A and not the whole thing, and it is for that reason that the proposed Voluntary National Tests would not be matrix sampled and would instead represent a smaller sample of the domain. Another currently prominent part of the debate is the notion that tests should be standards based. Standards-based assessments are currently the vogue. The difference between standards-based and other assessments are often a little overstated though. To understand that, you have to go back to what test scores are. They could just as easily have called it or a To make sense of the numbers, you have to have something to compare it to. One obvious comparison is the performance of other kids. The way you know a 4-minute mile is fast is you know that virtually nobody can run it. It has

nothing to do with the nature of the test, whether it is multiple choice or anything else. It simply says you are interpreting scores in terms of comparisons to other people or other nations. Standards-based assessment typically involves setting judgmental standards about what kids should know and reporting how many kids get there. But, in fact, that kind of reporting and norm-based reporting often go hand in hand. National data assessment uses both. You can go home and tell your constituents that X percent of kids in your State reached proficient; you can also tell them whether your State looked good or bad compared to the other States. Neither of these are entirely good or entirely bad, they are just partial ways of making sense of test scores. The final point I would like to make is something called the "Lake Wobegon effect. What this comes from, and it is an issue you will have to grapple with in dealing with the Voluntary National Tests, is "teaching to the test," analogous to the Post Office saying we will worry about the addresses that were sampled in West Virginia but not the rest of the State. Teaching to the test can have positive elements as well if a teacher says, I realize now there are these new topics I have to teach; but the negative aspect of teaching to the test is when someone realizes that scores count a great deal and says, I am going to worry about what happens to be sampled on the tests at the expense of other things the test is supposed to represent. If not absolutely meaningless, badly inflated. So in designing an assessment program, you have to find ways to combat that and to avoid misleading the public. Finally, what does this imply for the issues facing you? One of the generalizations that people often make is that tests should be designed for particular uses, and you can see one aspect of that from what I have said. A test that is designed to be strong as a measure of aggregate performance, State performance, may be designed in ways that are absolutely inappropriate for devising for producing scores for individual kids.

**Chapter 2 : Welcome to the Senate Standing Committee on Education | Senate Education Committee**

*Full Committee Hearing: States Leading The Way S, S, S, S., a bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.*

Parents and districts can access facilitation, mediation, and due process hearing options through SDE Dispute Resolution to resolve disputes involving students with disabilities. Any individual or agency can file a state administrative complaint alleging a district has violated the IDEA. Who are the people who provide dispute resolution through the SDE? The office maintains a list of qualified and experienced contractors throughout the state who are our facilitators 18 , mediators 8 , complaint investigators 7 , and hearing officers 3. These contractors are assigned on a rotational and geographic basis. Do I have to start with one dispute resolution option before trying another option? Each process serves a different purpose and the four processes facilitation, mediation, state complaints, and due process hearings are not hierarchical; they are not mutually exclusive. Additionally, we will offer mediation as a matter of course when a state complaint or a due process hearing is filed. How does contacting the Dispute Resolution Office impact the relationships between parents and schools? The presence of conflict can create tension, but having assistance to work through it can improve what may be strained interactions. Efforts to resolve disputes at the least adversarial option appropriate can be proactive and beneficial in improving relationships for the long term. Conflict unresolved can be detrimental to relationships. Facilitation What is facilitation? Facilitation is a voluntary process where a trained and impartial third-party helps establish a common agenda and keeps the meeting focused and moving forward. Most special education meetings do not need the services of a facilitator. Generally facilitation is requested when parents and school personnel are experiencing challenges in communicating, or a meeting may be expected to be highly complex or possibly difficult. Any IDEA related meeting may be facilitated and can be requested by a parent or a district representative. Who is the facilitator and how is a facilitator assigned? The Dispute Resolution Office maintains a list of qualified facilitators who are knowledgeable in laws and regulations of special education and related services, as well as the art of running meetings. Facilitators are independent contractors who are assigned by the SDE Dispute Resolution Coordinator on a rotational and geographic basis. What does a facilitator do? A facilitator will contact parties to determine a collaborative agenda, aid parties in keeping meetings focused on the student, provide opportunities for teams to resolve conflicts as they arise, and supports the participation of the team members. Facilitators are not decision makers nor are they members of teams. Facilitators assist in generating ground rules, maintain open communication among team members, clarify points of agreement and disagreement, and maintain impartiality. Do I have to try facilitation before I request mediation or file a complaint or a due process hearing? Facilitation is mutually exclusive from the other dispute resolution processes of mediation, state complaint, or due process hearing. Facilitation can be requested at any time. Is there any cost for facilitation? Facilitation is free to all participants and contractors are paid through the State Department of Education. How do I request facilitation? Mediation What is mediation? Mediation is a voluntary process where a trained and impartial third-party facilitates problem-solving over very specific special education concerns. The goal of mediation is for the parties to reach a signed agreement resolving the issues. Who is the mediator and how is a mediator assigned? States are required to maintain a list of individuals who are qualified mediators and knowledgeable in laws and regulations relating the provision of special education and related services. Mediators are specially trained in both special education and in advance conflict resolution. Mediators are independent contractors who are assigned by the SDE Dispute Resolution Coordinator on a rotational and geographic basis. What does a mediator do? Mediators help each party clearly communicate concerns, find common ground, and explore possible solutions. The mediator does not make decisions, but rather helps all participants reach their own mutually agreeable resolution. Mediators help parties craft a formal agreement that is legally-binding on the parties and can be used to amend an Individualized Education Plan IEP. Do I have to try mediation before I file a complaint or a due process hearing? Mediation is mutually exclusive from the other dispute resolution processes of facilitation, state complaint, or due process hearing. Mediation can be requested at any time.

Additionally, mediation is offered when a complaint or due process hearing is filed. Is there any cost for mediation? Mediation is free to all participants and contractors are paid through the State Department of Education. How do I request mediation? Who can file an IDEA state complaint? Any individual or agency who believes that a district has violated the IDEA can file a state complaint, including a parent or any other individual or organization. It is preferred that you file your IDEA state complaint using the State Complaint Request Form, however, any signed written request that includes all the required information shall initiate the state complaint process. What is the difference between an individual vs. Most state complaints allege that an individual student has been impacted by a district not following some part of the IDEA. This would be an individual state complaint – a complaint about an individual student. A systemic state complaint would allege that a district has a system-wide practice that has violated the IDEA for two or more students. A systemic complaint requires the complainant provide the names of all affected students in addition to providing facts to support the allegations for all students named. What is the time limit for filing an IDEA state complaint? A state complaint must allege a violation that occurred not more than one 1 year prior to the date that the complaint is received by the district. How long does it take for an IDEA state complaint to be investigated? The timeline for the resolution of a state complaint is 60 days. The SDE will resolve the complaint by: The SDE will issue a written corrective action plan addressing how the district shall remediate any denial of services, and provide training or other technical support to insure the district has solved for any noncompliance. Expedited Due Process Hearings What is expedited due process hearings? An expedited due process hearing is an administrative hearing to resolve disputes concerning discipline of a student with disabilities. An expedited due process hearing is a request to have an independent hearing officer review a disciplinary decision within twenty 20 school days, with a decision rendered within ten 10 days of the hearing. Who can file an expedited due process complaint? A parent or adult student may file an expedited due process complaint if: A district may request an expedited hearing if the district believes maintaining the current placement or returning the student to the prior placement is substantially likely to result in injury to the student or others. How do I file a due process complaint? It is preferred that you file your expedited due process complaint using the Expedited Due Process Hearing Request form, however, any written request that includes all the required information shall initiate the expedited due process complaint process. What is the time limit for filing an expedited due process complaint? The Dispute Resolution Coordinator will appoint a hearing officer within five 5 days of a request, with a resolution session occurring within seven 7 days of receiving a request, unless parties agree to waive the resolution session or attend mediation. The hearing shall occur within twenty 20 school days of the request, with a decision rendered within ten 10 school days of the hearing. What is a Resolution Meeting and who can attend? The resolution meeting is held within seven 7 days of a parent filing an expedited due process hearing and provides an opportunity for parties to resolve the disagreement prior to the initiation of an expedited due process hearing by discussing the facts that form the basis of the complaint and possible solutions. Other participants may include the student, or an advocate. What happens at an expedited due process hearing? An expedited due process hearing is conducted by a hearing officer appointed by the State Department of Education who will take evidence from both parties and make a decision about a dispute. Do I need an attorney? However, because of the legal nature of the proceedings, parents often are represented by counsel but may go to a hearing and represent themselves. Districts will usually have an attorney represent them in a due process hearing. Where can I find more information about expedited due process hearings? For specific information regarding the expedited due process hearing procedures and rights, please refer to the procedural safeguards document and Chapter 13 of the Idaho Special Education Manual. Due Process Hearings What is a due process hearing? A due process hearing is a formal complaint regarding the identification, evaluation, educational placement, or the provision of a free appropriate public education for a student with a disability or suspected of having a disability. A due process hearing is a request to have an independent hearing officer determine a special education decision. Who can file a due process complaint? A parent, school district, or charter school may file a due process complaint. It is preferred that you file your due process complaint using the Due Process Hearing Request form, however, any written request that includes all the required information shall initiate the due process complaint process. What

is the time limit for filing a due process complaint? There are limited exceptions to this timeline. Please refer to the procedural safeguards document for additional information. The resolution meeting is held within fifteen 15 days of a parent filing a due process hearing and provides an opportunity for parties to resolve the disagreement prior to the initiation of a due process hearing by discussing the facts that form the basis of the complaint and possible solutions. Parents and relevant members of the Individualized Education Plan IEP team, and a local education agency representative who has decision making authority must attend the resolution meeting. What happens at a due process hearing? A due process hearing is conducted by a hearing officer appointed by the State Department of Education SDE who will take evidence from both parties and make a decision about a dispute.

**Chapter 3 : "OVERVIEW OF TESTING/STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS IN THE STATES"**

*Hearing to review the Fiscal Year funding request and budget justification for the U.S. Department of Education.*

Virgin Islands in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria. The full text of the letter is available here and below. I write to you, again, to request that the Committee on Education and the Workforce hold a hearing with officials from the U. Department of Education and the Office of Management and Budget to examine whether the federal response afforded the Territories the resources and flexibility needed to reopen and resume operations in public schools and institutions of higher education. Virgin Islands Board of Education reported that post-hurricane school enrollment dropped by nearly 4, students. Of 32 schools in the territory, 10 closed. At least eight schools were condemned due to irreparable damage. As a result, many schools had to operate on double session schedules so that students could at least receive days of instruction. However, the sessions did not allow students to receive the required 1, hours of instruction. Temporary repairs prioritized replacing ceiling and floor tiles, sanitization, and safe treatments for mold. Puerto Rico also continues to deal with serious trauma. Recently, the government finally acknowledged that the initial count of 64 lost lives was grossly inaccurate. Sadly, George Washington University researchers – the team tasked with the official recount – anticipate that a second analysis will reveal a higher mortality count. Although electricity has been restored, the power grid remains fragile and officials acknowledge that the island is not prepared for the current hurricane season. Compounding the trauma and anxiety are hastily implemented reforms and school closures without community input from citizens relying on schools as anchor institutions for a return to stability. This summer, more were summarily closed before the start of the school year – effectively cutting one-third of public school options from the island within a year. Families only learned of those closings with the rest of the public from the news media. The first day back to school in Puerto Rico was nothing short of chaotic. Many students returned to temporary classrooms on which the island has spent millions in FEMA aid. Educators continued to wait for replacement books, computers, and repairs in classrooms they could not occupy despite overcrowding. Hundreds of displaced teachers awaited school reassignments. This month, PRDOE announced that it will spend less than 10 percent of the funds on hiring school nurses to address trauma and nutrition. Although schools have been in session for over a month, it is still unclear how or when the rest of the funds will be spent to meet the needs of students and teachers.

## Chapter 4 : Hearings | Committee on Higher Education

*On November 17, , the Committee held a hearing to examine: The state of information technology at the Education Department; Its compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA), the Federal Information Technology Reform Act (FITARA), and the recommendations of the inspector general (IG).*

Background[ edit ] The hearings were one of a number of Discovery Institute intelligent design campaigns that sought to establish new science education standards consistent with conservative Christian beliefs, both in the state and nationwide, and reverse what they saw as a domination in science education by actual science, specifically the scientific theory of evolution , which they viewed as atheistic , in direct conflict to their religious beliefs. Kansas Board of Education elections in gave religious conservatives a majority. In , prompted by the Kansas Intelligent Design Network [8] and the Discovery Institute , the board sought new high school science standards. Board member Connie Morris sent a taxpayer-funded newsletter to constituents calling evolution an "age-old fairy tale" that was defended with "anti-God contempt and arrogance. Their proposals were rejected by the science standards committee made up of Kansas scientists and educators appointed by the Board of Education, and were also rejected by 12 independent scientists who reviewed the proposed revisions. The pro-intelligent design group, the Intelligent Design Network, invited 22 witnesses. Among these were a number of non-scientists, and a number of scientists with no professional experience in biology. New science standards[ edit ] On November 8, the Kansas Board of Education approved the following changes to its science standards: Provide a definition of science that is not strictly limited to natural explanations. We also emphasize that the Science Curriculum Standards do not include Intelligent Design, the scientific disagreement with the claim of many evolutionary biologists that the apparent design of living systems is an illusion. While the testimony presented at the science hearings included many advocates of Intelligent Design, these standards neither mandate nor prohibit teaching about this scientific disagreement. State that evolution is a theory and not a fact. Require informing students of purported scientific controversies regarding evolution. Opposition to new standards[ edit ] In addition to the over 70 scientific societies, institutions and other scientific professional groups that have issued statements supporting evolution education and opposing intelligent design, the Kansas Board of Education was presented a letter from 38 Nobel laureates, the Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity Nobel Laureates Initiative, calling upon the Board of Education to reject intelligent design and support the teaching of evolution. As the foundation of modern biology, its indispensable role has been further strengthened by the capacity to study DNA. In contrast, intelligent design is fundamentally unscientific; it cannot be tested as scientific theory because its central conclusion is based on belief in the intervention of a supernatural agent. Discovery Institute spokesman Casey Luskin in February coined the term "false fear syndrome" of those who said it was, and said: This is a political tactic based upon misinformation, misrepresentation, emotions, and false fears. In discussing Discovery Institute radio commercials supporting their campaign airing in Kansas on the blog of William A. Having been born and raised there I would love to claim to be from the first state to teach ID. The entire purpose behind all of this is to shift it into schools The problem is, if you are not going to be dogmatic in Darwinism that means you inevitably have to point out a fault or at least an alternative to Darwinism. So far, the only plausible theory is ID. If one is to challenge Darwin, then one must use ID. When you do that, you have to invoke the idea of ID. In an interview of Stephen C. For example, the National Association of Biology Teachers in a statement endorsing evolution as noncontroversial quoted Theodosius Dobzhansky " nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution " and went on to state that the quote "accurately reflects the central, unifying role of evolution in biology. The theory of evolution provides a framework that explains both the history of life and the ongoing adaptation of organisms to environmental challenges and changes. Teaching biology in an effective and scientifically honest manner requires that evolution be taught in a standards-based instructional framework with effective classroom discussions and laboratory experiences. Two intelligent design proponents, John H. The Scientific Alternative to Evolution National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly, Autumn were instrumental in pushing for the successful adoption of the new standards, including submitting a

Suggested Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law [30] and numerous other documents. Decision[ edit ] On November 8, , the Board of Education voted to instruct science students along the lines of the Discovery Institute, that evolution could not rule out a supernatural or theistic source, that evolution itself was not fact but only a theory and one in crisis, and that ID must be considered a viable alternative to evolution. List of participants[ edit ] The following is a list of those who testified in the Kansas evolution hearings in order , most of whom are affiliated with the Discovery Institute and all of whom are intelligent design advocates or other forms of creationists , or advocates of some other form of anti-evolution. April 19, Prehearings Statements Pedro L. Irigonegaray for mainstream science May 5, William S. The Scientific Alternative to Evolution. Sanford - Cornell University Associate Professor of Horticultural Sciences, inventor of the " gene gun ," intelligent design advocate. A senior professor of biology derided the speech as "religion masquerading as science. Intellectuals Who Find Darwinism Unconvincing. Managing Director of Intelligent Design network, inc. May 12, Closing Statements Pedro L. Irigonegaray for mainstream science Result[ edit ] The Kansas Board of Education voted 6â€”4 August 9, to include greater criticism of evolution in its school science standards, but it decided to send the standards to an outside academic for review before taking a final vote. The standards received final approval on November 8, The new standards were approved by 6 to 4, reflecting the makeup of religious conservatives on the board. While other states were backing away from teaching alternatives to evolution, the Oklahoma House passed a bill Thursday, March 2, that contained Discovery Institute language encouraging schools to expose students to alternative views about the origin of life. Popular reaction included the creation of the intelligent design parody Pastafarianism the worship of a Flying Spaghetti Monster. Its founder insisted it should be offered as a "third" theory on origins, suggesting possible legal action if it was not included and intelligent design was. On August 1, , 4 of the 6 conservative Republicans who approved the Critical Analysis of Evolution classroom standards lost their seats in a primary election. The moderate Republican and liberal Democrats gaining seats, largely supported by Governor Kathleen Sebelius , vowed to overturn the school science standards and adopt those recommended by a State Board Science Hearing Committee that were rejected by the previous board. Francis in the northwest corner of the state, pointed to the "liberal media" for her loss, noting that "liberal opportunists" do not mind "slandering people and harming their families and their reputation and their business and their communities and their state The definition of science was once again returned to "the search for natural explanations for what is observed in the universe.

## Chapter 5 : Home - Education Committee

*Educator Conduct Hearings. If the State Board of Education intends to suspend, limit or revoke an educator's license or deny an educator's application for licensure, the educator has the right to request an administrative hearing to challenge the State Board's intended action.*

Here are the procedures which you should follow if you disagree with a decision of the school or local school board. You can first attempt to resolve the problem by asking to appear before the local board at a scheduled board meeting to voice your concerns. This is not a "formal hearing" for appeal purposes. You do not have to take this step, but sometimes it will lead to resolution of the problem. If the local board refuses to hear your concerns or if you are dissatisfied with the decision, you may request a "formal hearing" from the local board. You should write a letter to the local school superintendent stating the reasons why you believe there has been a violation of state law including State Board Rules and asking that a formal hearing be held. State Board Rule

The local board of education shall notify the parties of the time and place of the hearing. The local board of education shall sign and issue subpoenas. All witnesses shall testify under oath and shall be subject to cross-examination. The local board of education shall require the testimony and other evidence to be transcribed by a court reporter or recorded by other appropriate means. Thus, a formal hearing is just that a formal proceeding almost like a court proceeding where parties are allowed to present testimony and witnesses and the local board will make a formal decision. Again, merely appearing at a scheduled board meeting or executive session will usually not be considered a "formal hearing" for appeal purposes unless the above conditions are met. If a local school board refuses to grant you a formal hearing or fails to follow specified timelines and procedures, you should consult with a private attorney about further proceedings. After the hearing, the local board of education must notify in writing all parties within 15 days of its decision. The local board of education is also required at that time to notify the parties of their right to appeal to the State Board of Education. After a hearing under the procedures set forth above, either party may appeal to the State Board of Education by filing a written request for appeal with the local school superintendent. This request must state the question in dispute, the decision of the local board, and a concise statement of the reasons why the decision is being appealed. This appeal should be addressed to and filed with the local school superintendent within 30 days of the decision of the local board of education. The request for appeal should not be sent directly to the State Board of Education. A transcript of the proceedings must also be filed. Upon receipt of the request for appeal, the local schools superintendent will transmit to the state school superintendent a copy of the appeal request together with the transcript of evidence and proceedings, the written decision of the local board, and any other information in the file relating to the appeal. The local school superintendent has 10 days after receiving the request for appeal to transmit the documents to the State School Superintendent. If the appeal is in proper form, the State School Superintendent, through the Legal Services division, will inform the parties that the appeal has been docketed and what types of information will be required and what time lines to follow.

## Chapter 6 : Hearings | Committee on Education

*Hearings on state takeover of JCPS will begin in September. Jefferson County Public Schools will get its chance to argue against a state takeover at a multi-day hearing that begins Sept.*

## Chapter 7 : Kansas evolution hearings - Wikipedia

*OAH will be conducting all state-level hearings in the Complaint Resolution Program for the Department of Child Support Services. Department of Rehabilitation Hearings OAH contracts with the Department of Rehabilitation to provide mediation and fair hearing services.*

**Chapter 8 : Procedures for Formal Hearings & Appeals to the State Board of Education**

*The Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) is a quasi-judicial tribunal that hears administrative disputes. OAH is divided into two, statewide divisions: General Jurisdiction Division and the Special Education Division.*

**Chapter 9 : Dispute Resolution / Special Education / Idaho State Department of Education (SDE)**

*The Kansas evolution hearings were a series of hearings held in Topeka, Kansas, United States from May 5 to 12, by the Kansas State Board of Education and its State Board Science Hearing Committee to change how evolution and the origin of life would be taught in the state's public high school science classes.*