



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

143 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

February 6, 2014

Indiana Government Center South – Auditorium
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board Members Physically Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (chair), Mr. Dan Elsener (secretary), Dr. David Freitas, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Ms. Andrea Neal, Ms. Sarah O'Brien, Dr. Brad Oliver.

Board Members Participating by Phone: Mr. Tony Walker, Mr. B.J. Watts and Ms. Cari Whicker.

Board Members Absent: Mr. Troy Albert.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and called roll. The roll reflected the absence of Mr. Troy Albert. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Superintendent Ritz stated that a letter D - Review List of Schools Requiring SBOE Action in Assignment of Technical Assistance was added to New Business which was originally scheduled for the day before. Also, Gary Community Schools and Edison Learning Operations Maintenance and Repair Agreement Update was added as a new discussion item. Ms. O'Brien moved to approve the extended agenda at the Superintendent's invitation and Dr. Freitas seconded the motion. The Board voted to approve the extended agenda. Superintendent Ritz stated she wanted to have board comments and other comments at the end and asked if any Board members object; none objected.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda consisting of 1 item was presented to the Board. A motion was made to approve by Mr. Hendry and seconded by Ms. Neal. The vote was 10-0 to approve.



IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Superintendent Ritz began by saying she would take public comment after the new business presentation so members of the public could hear the issues they plan to comment on first.

V. NEW BUSINESS - ACTION

A. Testing Window Extension Options

- Superintendent Ritz invited Dr. Michele Walker, from the Department of Education (“Department”), to speak on this topic. Dr. Walker referenced a memo the Department provided to the Board on January 29, 2014, regarding some options the Board had in extending the testing windows for the ISTEP+ Applied Skills and IREAD-3 tests. Dr. Walker gave some background information that the weather had necessitated extending the window. She contacted the vendor to get options for extending the window. Dr. Walker then laid out the three options to choose from for both tests. With respect to the ISTEP+ applied skills test: option A is a 1 day extension, option B is 2 days and option C is 3 days. 4 questions will be given in each session in addition to the writing prompt. She mentioned these extensions will not delay test results for ISTEP.
- For IREAD the Board has two options Dr. Walker explained; the window can be extended by one day or two days but extending two days would delay return of results by a day. Superintendent Ritz asked how many hours the test would be and Dr. Walker responded that it depends on the grade. She expounded that in grades 3-8 students would be taking one ELA session with four items, one math session with four items and a writing prompt. Students in grades 4-7 would be taking an additional science or social studies session; three hours would be the maximum length of the test. If they gave one session each day the most they would need is 4 days. Superintendent Ritz pointed out that the window would start on March 3 and could conceivably go to March 21 and that window is quite large.
- Superintendent Ritz mentioned that she has been hearing from superintendents requesting the starting date of the window be moved back so the whole entire window is moved. Dr. Walker explained that the vendor would not have the staff to score the open ended items. The applied skills item scores would not come back until May and results not until July or August. Superintendent Ritz asked about May testing dates and Dr. Walker said the Board will have to decide whether to change the multiple choice window. She recommended the Board wait until March to decide. She explained that every day delay in the multiple choice



window is a day delay in the results including weekends. Dr. Walker next spoke about ECAs. She said the late winter window is February 10 to March 7. She said they could extend the window but the vendor would charge \$5,000 a day to extend the window for the ECAs.

- Superintendent Ritz then invited speaker Mary Gallagher from K12. She stated she is an operations manager and works closely with Hoosier Academies. She said they have been working with Dr. Walker's team and iterated that an extension is fine, but if the opening date of the window is moved it would create huge logistical problems for Hoosier Academies because of all the planning that takes place. It would also cause frustration to students.
- Ms. O'Brien asked Dr. Walker if the Department saw any pros or cons of any of the options. Dr. Walker responded that there is no drawback on any of the options. She reiterated that IREAD-3 option B would delay results by a day. Mr. Hendry asked if the extension times had changed. Dr. Walker responded she is not aware of that but pointed out that the day extensions are business day extensions; the ISTEP test extension options would be 5 business days, 6 business days or 7 business days. Superintendent Ritz asked for a motion to approve one of the options. Mr. Elsener asked what the Superintendent's preference was and she responded that she would like to see Option C for the applied skills test and Option B for the IREAD-3. Dr. Oliver so moved and Mr. Elsener seconded. The Board voted and approved adoption of Option C for ISTEP applied skills and Option B for IREAD-3 by all participating members (10-0), thereby extending the windows for both tests to March 21, 2014.
- Dr. Walker then gave some information about the statewide readiness test that occurred on February 4. She explained that the test was around 3rd or 4th grade content, with no stakes and anyone could participate. It was just to make sure they had personnel on the machines that would be used for testing. Dr. Walker also added that iPads will be used for CoreLink and the multiple choice assessment.

B. Approval of Special Education Grant Withholdings

Superintendent Ritz invited Melissa Ambre, from the Department, to speak on the matter. She discussed the turnaround withholdings for Gary Community School Corporation (GCSC) and Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) for the fiscal year 2014. She said the Department has updated the amount of tuition support for both districts based on the updated special education counts. The superintendents of both districts agreed with the Department's calculation. Upon invitation by the Chair, Mr. Freitas made a motion to approve the adjustment to tuition support for IPS and Ms. O'Brien seconded. All 10 Board members voted in favor. Dr. Oliver voted to approve



the adjustment to tuition support for GCSC and with Ms. O'Brien's second all 10 Board members participating voted in favor.

C. Approval of Additions to Board Operating Procedures

Superintendent Ritz mentioned that the operating procedures were the result of a collaborative effort. Dr. Oliver thanked the small group work and moved to adopt the consensus draft, seconded by Andrea Neal. Dr. Oliver then stated there was one parking lot item left and that there would be continued discussion on that issue. Dr. Freitas asked about how the procedures can be amended in the future and Superintendent Ritz recommended adding that as a parking lot issue. The Board voted 10-0 in favor of adopting the additions to the Board Operating Procedures.

D. Review of List of Schools Requiring SBOE Action in Assignment of Technical Assistant Teams

Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey was asked to speak on this issue. She explained that there are 7 schools involved and then turned it over to Board Director Anne Davis to expound. Ms. Davis said it's imperative that the Board receive the quality reviews before the end of the school year and that is why it was added as an action item. Superintendent Ritz clarified this pertained to quality review teams for the year 4 schools. Ms. Shockey said the team would include local people in the district, would be doing evaluations in the building and would be giving the Board periodic reports. Mr. Elsener moved to approve and Mr. Hendry seconded; all 10 members voted in favor.

VI. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

A. HEA1005 Update

Ms. Shockey and Dr. Walker spoke on this matter. Ms. Shockey began by stating that the group, including Dan Clark at the Education Roundtable ("Roundtable") and Sarah at the Commission on Higher Education ("CHE"), met and clarified questions from the field, which they put into a memo for the Board.

Note: *Cari Whicker, who was participating by phone, left the conference*

- Ms. Shockey continued that the issue was time sensitive because of the spirit of 1005 and the testing window opened at the end of January, 2014. She said the two questions that



were causing the most difficulty were the number of students and the ways they were being identified. She explained they were using two measures, the ECA cut scores and PSAT scores based on the recommendation of the college board and the CHE for students who need remediation, typically when they get to higher education. She further explained there was a difference in the sophomore score in this recent guidance than what was sent originally. Originally, she explained, the sophomore guidance was a PSAT cut score of a 46 and they adjusted it to 42 based on the fact that schools felt the 46 cut score resulted in an over-identification of students. This was based on the recommendation of the college board and what you would expect a sophomore to score and not need remediation in higher education.

- Ms. Shokey stated the other change was that juniors and seniors got a caveat in the identification of who needed to take the test if the student had received another indicator of college and career readiness after a PSAT or ECA failure, like the ACT, SAT or passing the Accuplacer placement some students take when enrolling in dual credit. Ms. Shockey also clarified that in the guidance juniors are required to take Accuplacer; sophomores were included in the pilot year to give schools more flexibility and because early identification is paramount. Superintendent Ritz clarified by inquiry that it is only required for juniors. Ms. Shockey went on to explain that the PSAT was chosen as an indicator because, as the CHE and Roundtable pointed out, there are many students that pass the ECA but still need remediation in college, necessitating another indicator. The PSAT was a convenient choice because Indiana already pays for it and most students already take the test. Dr. Walker added that the PSAT test is a measure of college and career readiness.
- Dr. Oliver said a concern is that the PSAT is an aptitude test and not an achievement test. He also asked if the Board must promulgate a rule on the issue. He went on to inquire if local school officials will be asked about the issue. Ms. Shockey responded that since the test is a pilot test they do plan on having local school counselors, principals, superintendents, etc. comment on the experience. Superintendent Ritz clarified that when they give a diagnostic assessment it does not automatically mean remediation, the data from Accuplacer must be looked at and applied appropriately. Superintendent Ritz also expressed concern with what was passed in the statute because the Department knew when they started implementation it would be something new in the middle of the year for students. Ms. Neal asked if its standard practice to use the same company for both assessments. Dr. Walker said because Vincennes University and Ivey Tech were utilizing Accuplacer it was recommended they use it for the pilot. She clarified that seniors were a local decision in terms of whether to take it or not. She also said they needed another assessment as the ECA is not a measure of college and career readiness and the PSAT does measure college and career readiness. Dr. Oliver inquired about the timeline so the field



knows what's coming. Ms. Shockey responded that no one has started giving the assessment yet and there is no feedback from the field so she doesn't have a good answer at this point. Ms. Shockey then relayed something Special Assistant to the Governor Clair Fiddian-Green said which was that the Board does not have to promulgate a rule on the issue it just has to adopt guidance.

- Ms. Ritz invited Tim East from Zionsville Community Schools to speak. He stated that Zionsville supports the spirit of college and career readiness legislation but his concern is that the mandate is unfunded. He said Zionsville does not have good funding and had concerns regarding the expense of remediation of an over-identified group of students and the effect that would have on the school, like offering fewer courses to redirect funds for remediation. He said it will take away from resources keeping students on track. He asked the Board for an additional waiver for the over-identified students in performance qualified schools. Superintendent Ritz expressed concern over the unfunded mandate.
- The next speaker was Scott Smith, the coordinator of assessment and data analysis for the Brownsburg Community School Corporation. He spoke about the selection criteria for students needing remediation. He asked that the Board consider requiring a student fail both the ECA and the PSAT rather than one or the other. He said the current criteria grossly over-identifies at-risk students who in the school's practical experience are not at-risk students. He pointed out that by every other metric applied by the Board Brownsburg is exemplary. Yet according to the criteria in HEA1005 41.7% of the students at Brownsburg are at-risk in terms of college and career readiness. He further said the 41.7% includes sophomores. Mr. Smith stated there are students who perform well in ECAs but not on the PSAT and that the two tests are not identifying students at-risk equally. He went on to say that the 41.7% represents 720 students. Of those 609 were identified by the PSAT and 111 were identified by the ECA. Further, all 111 did not reach the cut score on the PSAT. He said if a change is not made the 111 will be lost in a sea of over-identified students. Mr. Smith stated that they track actual data from students after high school graduation and that 12% of students are actually not college and career ready.
- Dr. Oliver inquired about the Board's options here; whether the Board could change the guidance now or would the Board have to wait until it deals with adopting the actual guidance. Superintendent Ritz said she believed the Board has the authority to change its guidance. Dr. Michelle McKeown, Board Counsel, commented that she agreed the Board owns the guidance, that the guidance issued is compliant with HEA1005 and that one option is the Board could make the sophomores group "recommended" not "required" for sake of clarity. Dr. McKeown went on to say the Board could use its staff and Department staff to utilize CHE data or to recommend other measures. Dr. McKeown explained that HEA1005 does not require the PSAT, just an indicator beyond the ECA and guidance based



on that. Dr. Oliver asked about accepting the recommendation of Brownsburg. Superintendent Ritz clarified that the Department wanted to just use the ECA with a smaller identified group; the Board decided it wanted to go to the Roundtable, a conversation was had with Representative Behning and the CHE and it was decided that the ECA and PSAT would be used. She went on to say is that Indiana has been assessing one course in Math; Algebra. She mentioned there is a gap of students who are passing ECAs but are not college and career ready and the Accuplacer diagnostic test shows this gap. Superintendent Ritz said she sympathized with the field in what is a difficult issue. Mr. Elsener said he appreciated the presentation and asked Mr. Smith how much the sophomore exemption would help now. He responded that exempting sophomore students would probably take away about half of the 720.

- Dr. Freitas said there were 10,000 students needing remediation last year and that concerned him. He said we need to make sure we are making data driven decisions based on data from the whole state. He asked if the Board could get true data from the entire state to analyze rather than just anecdotal evidence. Dr. Walker reiterated that the current guidance only identifies students who need to take the Accuplacer diagnostic, not who automatically need remediation. Dr. Freitas said he thinks the Board should look at data first and then go back to the guidance. Ms. Neal said she thinks many students look at the PSAT as a practice test, and that the scores may not carry as much weight. Dr. Walker responded she shared that concern and that the PSAT was chosen in addition to the ECA because the ECA does not measure college and career readiness. Ms. Shockey said they will have good data to bring back to the Board around April; she also said the Board could delve more into HEA1005 at the next meeting. Superintendent Ritz made it clear sophomores would not be required. Dr. Walker added that schools have flexibility to choose when, within the window, to take the test and it's not a timed test.

B. Standards Review Update

- Superintendent Ritz mentioned there are several speakers on this matter. Ms. Shockey began by discussing the commitment to have college and career ready standards in Indiana. She went on to say the deadlines should be met. They plan to bring a draft of the standards and recommendations from the Roundtable at the April Board meeting. Teachers can then go home for summer knowing what they need to teach in the fall. She said there is an evaluation team in addition to the technical, advisory and college and career ready teams to help build the most rigorous academic standards in the county. Ms. Shockey presented a draft definition of college and ready readiness. She went on to explain the goals of the evaluation team and the team membership; including that team members are members



- from the tech and advisory teams. Half of the members are practitioners and half are experts in their fields of study. Ms. Shockey then laid out the timing of the process and explained Sujie Shin, a national expert, helped in this evaluation process.
- Molly Chamberlin, the Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer for the Center for Education and Career Innovation, was the next speaker. She explained that the standards are sovereign standards that emphasize college and career readiness. The members of the evaluation teams were selected from the Technical, Advisory and College and Career Ready panels. Members include K-12 teachers with a broad range of experience and knowledge and higher education subject matter experts. They have been asked to evaluate for math 4 sets of standards and for English 3 sets of standards. The reason there are 4 sets for math is that they wanted the team to evaluate the 2009 standards that were adopted but never implemented on account of common core. These standards will be evaluated against objective criteria.
 - Ms. Chamberlin explained the teams have three criteria when evaluating standards: (1) whether the standard is strongly aligned with college and career readiness; (2) whether the standard is partially aligned with college and career readiness; or, (3) not aligned at all. The teams will also consider additional factors like whether there is bias or pedagogy embedded in the standards and whether they are clear and for the right grade level. The panelists are to submit their electronic forms by February 10, 2014. The results will then be compiled and reconciled. Ms. Chamberlin continued by saying they would be looking for consensus evaluations and the draft standards would be ready on February 14, 2014. The draft will go back to the college and career ready panel for review and then public comment will commence after that. Ms. Chamberlin added it would then go to the Roundtable followed by review by the Board by April. Mr. Walker asked at what point the Board would be able to see a side by side comparison. Ms. Shockey responded that they could do that prior to April. Dr. Oliver said he appreciated the efforts of the Department and Board staff in creating this process that includes subject matter experts.

NOTE: *Mr. Elsener left the meeting*

- Dr. McKeown point out that the Board now had only had 6 members physically present and that according to Board rules 7 members must be physically present for telephonic participation to be allowed. She recommended amending the rules to allow for a fewer number of members required to be physically present. Ms. Neal moved to amend the policy to reduce the requirement of 7 present to 6, seconded by Mr. Hendry and all 6 members votes aye. Ms. O'Brien asked how the common core bill would affect their procedures. Superintendent Ritz responded that it was amended so it is not in conflict. Dr. Freitas



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

143 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

commended the work in putting together this process. He clarified that they will not be bringing common core before the Board. Dr. Freitas expressed that he thought it was a good idea to look at the standards thrown out and analyze the criteria used to throw those standards out. Ms. Shockey responded that thrown out standards can be rescued later on down the road. Ms. Chamberlin expounded that the team can look to another state or write their own standard.

- Superintendent Ritz invited the first speaker, Jackie Rotun, to the floor. She read a comment from David Reed. He expressed that common core is untested and was happy the board was looking to new standards. He was concerned the new standards would be the same as common core.
- The next speaker was Debi Ketron, representing the Indiana Association of Home Educators. She stated that they are concerned about the use of the phrase college and career ready since it is used in common core. She said the Constitution of Indiana does not allow for federal involvement in Indiana's educational system. She said a well-rounded education is required, not just college and career readiness. She said she wants to protect state sovereignty and her concern is that common core will just be repackaged. Tying the new standards to common core will force home schoolers to teach from those standards.
- Kelley Faler was next to take the floor. She said it is disturbing that the state would cede any authority to the federal government with regard to academic standards. She mentioned concern for Hispanic students, students that do not speak English natively and poor students. Standards should address these students more effectively she said. She concluded by asking the Board to adopt the Indiana standards in place before 2010.
- Superintendent Ritz invited the next speaker, Erin Tuttle, to the floor. She said she is a member of Hoosiers Against Common Core. She said she is happy there will be a change. She was concerned about membership on the various review committees. She noted some red flags in the selection process; namely, that 5 of the selected members testified in favor of common core in front of the legislature on their own and 6 members publicly supported common core. In terms of the college and career ready panel, she expressed concern about the fact that there weren't enough people who taught math and English on the panel. Dr. Oliver pointed out that it's important that members be selected based on qualifications, not whether they are for or against common core. He also pointed out that there are other experts on the panel like the chairman of the math department at Ball State. He stated that the process is a neutral process. Ms. Tuttle said there is a difference between a professor of math and a professor of math education.
- Heather Crossih took the floor next. She wanted to make comment about the 2009 math standards. She said the adoption of those standards seemed much more in depth than those before the Board now. She stated the old standards were rigorous and compared



favorably with other high performing nations. She said the panel should look at the 2009 standards to determine if they should be adopted and if not it should be explained why they don't meet the definition of college and career readiness. Dr. Walker clarified that the 2009 set of standards will be reviewed as part of the process.

C. Gary Community Schools and Edison Learning Operations Maintenance and Repair Agreement Update

- Superintendent Ritz started by commenting on the poor condition of the Theodore Roosevelt building in Gary after visiting the school with Mr. Walker. Superintendent Ritz stated she gave a directive to Edison and GCSC to identify which areas of the school had heat and what spaces were needed. She then asked Mr. Walker to speak on the matter. He explained the bad effect the weather has had on the Roosevelt building. He did not believe there was any negligence on the part of GCSC or Edison. He said the unfortunate situation is that the building is just too old and proper repairs have not been made. The water distribution system was not replaced when it should have been. It's estimated that it will cost about a million dollars to fix the pipe system. Mr. Walker said he is uncomfortable with kids in a school that he can't guarantee is safe. He stated that the problem now is not the heating, the problem now is the considerable mold in the school. The school was tested and there was mold found that could expand into other areas. Pipes in the ceiling are leaking near air ducts and mold spores could be throughout the building by the ventilation system. He also expressed concern about liability of the state if the school is not made safe for the students. Mr. Walker said he would have voted to close the school had he been on the Board at the time that issue was before it. He went on to say the estimated cost to fully repair the school was 4-5 million dollars at the time of takeover and Edison did 1-2 million of the repairs on their own.
- Superintendent Ritz said an air quality assessment would be done. She also mentioned that this school could operate with up to 4,000 students but currently has 550 students. Superintendent Ritz clarified that they are not conducting classes and do not have students where mold has been tested and found.

Note: *Tony Walker, who was participating by phone, left the meeting.*

- Superintendent Ritz said she has a meeting with Dr. Cheryl Pruitt, superintendent of GCSC, the coming Monday. She continued that Gary has the room to relocate these students but there would be challenges associated with that as well. Superintendent Ritz said she did not believe it would be feasible to repair the building. Ms. O'Brien asked if there had been



an inspection by the fire inspector. Ms. Ritz was not sure but responded that most of the standing water had been cleaned up.

Note: *Tony Walker rejoined the meeting.*

- Superintendent Ritz asked Mr. Walker if he knew whether the fire inspector had been to the building. Mr. Walker responded that it had only been inspected for mold to his knowledge. Mr. Hendry said it looked like according to the contract it was the responsibility of the school district to make major repairs. Mr. Walker said the issue is what constituted maintenance, which is the responsibility of the school corporation. There is disagreement over whether maintenance includes capital improvements. He also stated that the state has a duty independent of the duties of Edison and Gary as a result of the takeover. Dr. McKeown mentioned if the issue is a lack of funds there are Indiana statutes that could be utilized to provide loans. Dr. Freitas expressed that he liked the option of finding other space for the students. Mr. Hendry said short term options should be looked at if the building is unsafe now. Superintendent Ritz said she will report back to the Board after her meeting with Gary superintendent Dr. Pruitt the coming Monday.

VII. BOARD OPERATIONS

Superintendent Ritz proposed moving the April meeting date on account of spring break. The Board agreed to move it to April 9, 2014.

VIII. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz expressed her thoughts on the significant makeup days many school corporations have now. She first mentioned adding hours to equal days rather than requiring full add-on days, which she called a partial waiver. In addition, professional days, etc., could be used as schools days. School boards would have to approve this. She also mentioned e-learning as a way to make up days only if the stringent criteria is met. Superintendent Ritz said she would be issuing options soon so schools have as much flexibility as possible. Dr. Oliver suggested with a conditional waiver they must specify exactly which option they are going to choose. Superintendent Ritz agreed and said evidence would be required. She moved on to A-F and said they would be having a meeting in late February to discuss. Also, Superintendent Ritz said she is expecting ESEA waiver monitoring part B soon and that the Board will get the report as soon as she gets the report.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

143 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adjourn, Ms. Neal so moved and Dr. Freitas seconded. All 6 members present in person voted in favor.