



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

April 9, 2014

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

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (chair), Mr. Troy Albert, Mr. Dan Elsener (secretary), Dr. David Freitas, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Ms. Andrea Neal, Ms. Sarah O'Brien, Dr. Brad Oliver, Mr. Tony Walker, Mr. B.J. Watts and Ms. Cari Whicker.

Board Members Absent: None.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and roll was called. The roll reflected all members present. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Superintendent Ritz stated she wished to add an action item to move the CoreLink administration to the fall. Mr. Albert, Ms. Whicker and Dr. Freitas agreed with adding this action item, and it was added. Superintendent Ritz then moved discussion item H before the action on CoreLink. All members approved the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to approve the minutes from the March 12, 2014 meeting. Dr. Freitas so moved and Sarah O'Brien asked that the minutes provide additional detail about the motion that she had made at the last meeting regarding standards implementation. She referred to the bottom of page 12 of the March 12,

2014 minutes and specifically asked that the late spring/early summer dates be included. All voted to approve of the minutes with this change.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz reported that initial data regarding IREAD-3 had been released. She went on to say the information will be added to compass and an official release will be coming. She stated that the four star schools will be released the coming Monday and the graduation rate for 2014 will be ready for the coming Tuesday. Further, she informed the Board there will be a future meeting regarding board operating procedures and that the assessment subcommittee will follow the business meeting today.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Dr. Oliver expressed appreciation for the work of the CCR panel. Superintendent Ritz echoed that statement. Mr. Walker commented that Calumet High School in Gary has used New Tech as a turnaround model going into its fourth year and is the first in the country. He said this would be a good source of information for an alternative turnaround model because it has shown a lot of promise. Mr. Hendry congratulated the Arsenal Tech basketball team for their state championship.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public signed up for public comment.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Albert moved to approve the consent agenda and B.J. Watts seconded. All members of the Board voted in favor of approving the consent agenda.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS - ACTION

A. *Hamilton Heights School Corporation v Fayette School Corporation*

- Superintendent Ritz asked Dr. Michelle McKeown, General Counsel to the Board, to address the Board concerning this matter. Dr. McKeown summarized a memo

she provided to the Board; she stated that her recommendation was that 20-35-8-2 applied in this area, which would reverse what the IHO had recommended. She further noted that it was only her recommendation and that the Board, as the ultimate authority, could determine otherwise. Dr. McKeown's recommendation would require the transferor school to pay actual costs rather than the formulaic cost. Superintendent Ritz clarified that both parties agreed it was a case involving a child with disabilities and that transportation was provided pursuant to the IEP. Dr. McKeown clarified that her position would mean adopting Hamilton Heights' recommendation in terms of actual cost but citing to 20-35-8 rather than 20-26. Dr. McKeown described that this was an issue of first impression. Superintendent Ritz asked for clarification regarding how applicable this would be to students without special needs. Dr. McKeown responded that this situation involved a student with disabilities and the decision would only apply to students who fall within the parameters of 20-35-8-2.

- Ms. Neal asked if Dr. McKeown's recommendation would deter corporations from accepting special needs students. Dr. McKeown responded that the reverse would be true since the transferor corporation would be responsible for the actual costs of transportation; she also pointed out that the transferor corporation is the corporation of legal settlement that receives the property tax levy, which is how schools generate transportation dollars. Dr. Freitas inquired about a potential appeal, and Dr. McKeown explained that it could be appealed to civil court. Mr. Walker asked about adopting the memo as an opinion; Dr. McKeown stated it's not currently in the proper format for an order of the Board.
- Dr. Oliver moved to accept Dr. McKeown's recommendation, and Mr. Elsener seconded. Mr. Walker then requested an amendment to have a written legal opinion prepared for later approval. Dr. McKeown said she would be happy to prepare the memo for the Board to adopt as an order. Mr. Hendry said the Board could take action today and then request a formalized order or opinion be prepared subject to Board approval at the next meeting. Dr. Oliver amended his motion to include preparing the memo for public release and then to bring back a proposed order for the Board to approve at the next meeting. Mr. Elsener said his second stands. A vote was then taken; Mr. Elsener, Dr. Freitas, Mr. Hendry, Ms. Neal, Ms. O'Brien, Dr. Oliver, Mr. Walker, Mr. Watts and Ms. Cari Whicker voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Albert voted no, and Superintendent Ritz abstained. The motion carried 9-1.

IX. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION – STUDENT SUCCESSES

There was no discussion regarding this agenda item.

X. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

H. Transition to College and Career Ready Assessments

- Dr. Michele Walker, Director of Student Assessment for the Indiana Department of Education (“Department”), provided the Board with information concerning this agenda item. She referred to a PowerPoint presentation and memorandum prepared for the Board. She outlined opportunity to learn and opportunity to access the assessment. She explained opportunity to access the assessment means ensuring students and educators have access to new technologically advanced item types. She spoke about the transition to new standards and a new assessment. Dr. Walker mentioned the federal requirement to have a college and career ready assessment by the spring of 2015. She went on to explain technology enhanced item types, referring to the PowerPoint slide provided. She outlined, among other things in the presentation, drag and drop and multiple correct response.
- Ms. Neal expressed concern about the use of the word “construct” in some of these examples. Ms. Neal stated she did not think students were constructing an answer but instead choosing from a list of options in the drag and drop. With respect to ELA, Dr. Walker referred to the PowerPoint presentation for examples of questions that involve problem solving rather than just multiple choice; students can give reasoning to support their positions. Ms. Neal referenced a study that concluded that students’ reading comprehension goes down when using an iPad and tablets versus paper. She asked if there would be flexibility for schools that prefer to give paper testing. Dr. Walker responded that anytime item types are changed a comparability study is done. Dr. Walker described that when building assessments, they must ensure it’s for all students. With regard paper/pencil, they look at the capacity to transition to online so in some cases it would not be required. Dr. Walker stated that the subcommittee will have to grapple with the issue of whether a school that has capacity can choose to give paper tests instead.
- Dr. Freitas stated it’s important to have formative components within summative assessments so that schools can receive diagnostic information back.

He said further that technology enhanced testing allows for this diagnostic information to be received faster. Dr. Freitas asked that the diagnostic component be included in the RFP. Dr. Oliver asked to hear for about CCRTA, and expressed concern over the number of tests in the transition phase. He asked why the Board doesn't go down the path of piloting a test tied to the new standards.

- Dr. Walker moved on to explain the assessments. She started with ISTAR, for students with cognitive disabilities, which needs to be aligned with college and career readiness. She discussed IMAST, which will not be offered after the next two years because of the move to college and career ready assessments. Dr. Walker moved on to explain the CoreLink item bank, which will help the transition process. She explained there are 10 items for math and 10 items for English/language arts. ISTEP will be administered for one more year along with a college and career ready assessment. She explained that the specifications for the college and career ready assessment will be determined in May.
- Dr. Walker stated that CoreLink can be looked at as the college and career ready phase 1. Dr. Oliver said he can't trace back where the Board approved the college and career readiness assessment. He expressed concerned about CoreLink and getting out ahead of the standards. He then asked when the Board adopted CCRTA. Dr. Walker responded that CCRTA is a transition test to help schools prepare for the new standards. She explained it will not be used for accountability and will meet the U.S. Department of Education's ("U.S. Department") requirement of a college and career ready assessment. Superintendent Ritz added that in December the Board approved the assessment windows for these two transitions before the college and career ready assessment in 2015-16. Dr. Walker said it's a unique situation. Dr. Oliver questioned why students should face four assessments. He expressed concern over whether CoreLink is worth taking away class time from students. Dr. Walker stated that CoreLink is a matrix sampled assessment; there are four forms that will provide aggregate data for schools to let schools know how students did on the college and career ready assessment. She said there are no stakes and it's a pre-test essentially.
- Dr. Walker said the Department would like to move CoreLink to September. Superintendent Ritz asked Dr. Walker to explain the phases. Mr. Walker asked if the U.S. Department is requiring CoreLink; Dr. Walker said they do not but do require a college and career ready transition. Dr. Walker said it will help mitigate effect of the new standards on students and teachers. She explained that no

other test does that. Mr. Walker said he thought CoreLink was aligned to common core. Dr. Walker explained it is but the items Indiana is using is aligned to Indiana. Superintendent Ritz explained CoreLink can be aligned to our standards. Ms. Whicker asked about piloting a new assessment that would be the year before and if that would meet the requirements of the waiver. She expressed concern over a pre-test and post-test based on two different test systems. Dr. Walker said the CCRTA, or phase 2, would be aligned to the exact same standards as the assessment of 2015-16. She said a lot of focus will be on the transition from one assessment to the next. She said they will be mindful of redundancies so students won't be double tested. Mr. Elsener asked what percentage of teacher evaluations are based on what students actually learn. Dr. Walker said she believed that to be a local issue. Mr. Elsener said he thought the Board passed something. He said that would be good information to bring to the Board.

- Dr. Walker then moved on to the phases. She explained that CoreLink is phase 1. She stated they want to work with teachers on the sample items in the spring. Dr. Walker said it's important to give schools some information regarding how they are doing with the new content; schools will get some hard data. She reiterated it's a no stakes test that will produce data for feedback. She explained the new proposed window is September 2-30th. Superintendent Ritz said the Department met with stakeholders on this issue. She said we don't want to see students and teachers anxious over the new standards, which is why the Department wants to do this in phases. Dr. Oliver offered comments on this issue. First, he said CoreLink is not required by the waiver. Second, he said there is a disconnect between what is being said today in the meeting by the Department and what he is hearing from the field. He said we assume CoreLink will be aligned to standards before we have the standards and that makes no sense. He recommended referring this to the assessment subcommittee. Dr. Oliver went on to say he understood there will be an issue with data in 2015 but the Board can consider other options to address this issue.
- Superintendent Ritz said the question before the Board is whether CoreLink should be moved to the fall. Superintendent Ritz said there is a motion and invited a second; Mr. Albert seconded. Ms. O'Brien asked if CoreLink can be dropped. Dr. Walker responded that the challenge is there would not be an assessment on the ground by September. She reiterated that it's already paid for and minimal. Ms. O'Brien expressed concern over undue stress on students that CoreLink could cause. Ms. O'Brien said the older students will understand the

test is a no stakes test but not necessarily the younger students. Superintendent Ritz expressed the importance of a transition plan because of the rigor of the new standards. Ms. Whicker stated she would prefer piloting the new test in 2015, dropping CoreLink and spending more time in the classroom. Mr. Watts said if we can't guarantee the CoreLink test is aligned then it would be a mistake to administer it. Dr. Walker responded that once the final standards are approved they would go back and change out any items that need to be changed out to ensure it's aligned. Superintendent Ritz stated all assessment sessions will be aligned to the new standards.

- Dr. Oliver reiterated that it will not be possible to align CoreLink even if administered in September. Dr. Walker explained that the people who are selecting the questions for CoreLink at the Department know the standards very well and that she does not have concerns about alignment. Dr. Freitas recommended tabling the issue and letting the assessment subcommittee review it and then discuss at the next meeting. Superintendent Ritz expressed concern over notice to schools if the Board waits to move the test. Superintendent Ritz responded the Department is very sensitive to recent feedback from the field. Ms. O'Brien recommended dropping the CoreLink test for May and then discuss the issue further to determine if and when it's given in the fall. Superintendent Ritz stated there is a motion on the floor to move the test to September and that there is a second. Mr. Walker said his vote would be to not administer CoreLink. Dr. Oliver asked if Superintendent Ritz would entertain withdrawing her motion and instead entertain a motion like what Ms. O'Brien and Mr. Walker expressed; dropping CoreLink in May and have further discussions on the issue after the subcommittee ponders it. Upon inquiry by Mr. Watts, Dr. Walker said the test could be made optional in September. Superintendent Ritz withdrew her motion and replaced it with a motion to drop CoreLink in May and remand the issue to the assessment subcommittee to discuss a transition plan. Mr. Watts seconded. Mr. Hendry said he is supportive of this motion as well as the one withdrawn. All members voted yes. Superintendent Ritz announced a ten minute recess.

-- RECESS--

A. SBOE Staff Updates

- Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education Innovation, then took the floor. Ms. Fiddian-Green stated Dr. Oliver had asked for a summary of all the new legislation enacted this past session. She said a high level summary was provided for the Board and went through new laws that require Board attention. The first act she discussed was HEA1004, the new pre-k pilot. She explained the Board must approve a new kindergarten readiness assessment pursuant to HEA1004. Ms. Fiddian-Green then moved on to HEA1028. This act HEA1028 deals with adult high schools. She explained the Board has to adopt an alternative accountability system for these schools that measures, among other things, college and career readiness. Ms. Fiddian-Green moved next to HEA1213. She outlined that this act concerns the CTE diploma bill. She said the Board is required to consider any changes to the Core 40 diploma before December 1, 2015. The next act was HEA 1388, which relates to teacher preparation programs. She explained that starting next year there is going to be a role played by the Board. Ms. Fiddian-Green then discussed SEA205, which requires authorizers to submit an annual report to the Department and the Board. She explained the Board now has a greater role in ensuring the authorizers are held accountable for the performance of their charter schools. Ms. Fiddian-Green added that there is another mandate that the Board decide what happens after turnaround interventions following the 5 year contract period no later than December 31 of the fifth year of an intervention. Ms. Fiddian-Green then discussed SEA321, which involves charter network funding, she said. This is related to charter school organizers that operate more than one charter school; they may receive money at the organizer level that can be distributed across its schools like a district does today. Lastly, Ms. Fiddian-Green explained SEA363, which pertains to the complexity index. She said the largest role here is for the Department but it does allow for the Board to adopt pertinent emergency rules.
- Dr. McKeown had the floor next to discuss the CEEP contract. She stated the 2013 budget bill provides a line item for the Board to enter into a contract with CEEP, and in September of 2013 the Board entered into a contract with CEEP through Board staff. She went on to discuss the 5 specific items: 1) changes in the school funding formula, 2) trends in the free and reduced lunch program and free textbook program, 3) ADM and high school graduation trends, 4) outcome based incentive finding and linkages to state school accountability law, and 5) review of the prime time grant incomes. She said there was a delay in that report. CEEP needed to enter into a data share agreement with the Department legal team and that the Department's legal team expressed concerns regarding

whether the agreement complied with FERPA. Over the last few weeks, Dr. McKeown worked to convey that the arrangement would not violate FERPA and was continuing to work to draft language with which everyone was comfortable. She stated that she was confident that they would be able to complete the data share agreement and get the report to the Board soon.

B. Lead Partner Monitoring Updates

- Superintendent Ritz invited Teresa Brown, Assistant Superintendent of Outreach for the Department, to speak. Ms. Brown invited lead partners and school staff to move to the front in case there are Board questions. She discussed site visits, meetings with administration teams and lead partners. Specifically, she started with two lead partners at Broad Ripple Magnet High School. She started with Scholastic's goals and plans to reach those goals, referring to a slide show presented to the Board. Ms. Brown said TNTP and Scholastic work as partners there. She then moved on to TNTP and outlined their goals. Ms. Brown explained the observations from the site visits, beginning with strengths they observed and then moving to areas that need development. She then moved to what the next steps are. Superintendent Ritz commented that she has seen the monthly graduation rate status update with the superintendent in action. She commented that she was impressed with things put in place to ensure students have what they need to graduate.
- Ms. Brown discussed George Washington next. She began by explaining the goals and ways to reach those goals. She outlined observations from site visits, continuing to refer to the slide show detailing this information. Superintendent Ritz commented on the importance of positive behavior intervention supports, which was one of the issues Ms. Brown discussed. Ms. Brown also spoke about John Marshall. She outlined the goals, plans to reach those goals, site visit observations and then explained what will happen in the future, which were all detailed in the slide show. The lead partner with Voyager spoke about improvements at John Marshall, stating that it is a "new day" at John Marshall. Superintendent Ritz said she was happy outreach was involved and thanked Ms. Brown for the presentation. Dr. Freitas inquired asked what mechanism the Board has at the state level to share the best practices, the actions that have worked best in improving turnaround schools. Superintendent Ritz explained that issue will be discussed in discussion item D later at this meeting. Ms. Brown responded that the outreach staff has been able to take statewide best practices

to benefit all focus and priority schools. Dr. Freitas mentioned he has gotten great feedback regarding this program. Mr. Elsener commented that over the years the Board had sent teams to schools that were failing. He commented that there was often difficulty getting information and responses from school leadership. He commended Superintendent Ferebee in this regard for his great work. He said Dr. Ferebee is setting a pace as a great leader.

C. Aggregate Teacher Evaluation Report

- Superintendent Ritz said this is the first time we have gathered this type of data. She said the data is from the 2012-13 school year and only from the schools/districts that had an evaluation system in place that complied with the law. In the future, the schools that did not have an evaluation system in place will have that opportunity as the result of a new law. She invited Sarah Pies, Educator Effectiveness Specialist at the Department, to speak. Ms. Pies started by saying the schools had four months to provide data to the Department and revise or edit the data if they felt necessary. She went on to explain you can't compare the school data with the corporation data because there could be a teacher that works in multiple buildings and the teacher would be reported in each school s/he worked in.
- Dr. Freitas asked if the data will be used in the reaccreditation in colleges of education. Risa Regnier, Assistant Superintendent of School Support Services with the Department, had the floor to answer the question. She responded that in the future they will be looking at trend data for that purpose, and more data than provided at this meeting will be made available for reaccreditation. Superintendent Ritz spoke about capturing the amount of ineffective teachers. She explained teachers with a rating must be reported. She explained many ineffective teachers do not have an end rating because they retire, resign etc. Superintendent Ritz explained they put them in an N/A category.
- Dr. Oliver thanked Superintendent Ritz for the data. He stated there have been questions about how much we can trust the data given the percentages. He said he is hearing from the field that a lot of principals are hesitant to mark new teachers in the lower categories because that means they go without a pay raise. Dr. Oliver went on to state the use of Rise 2.5 was a concern. Finally, he expressed concern about how comfortable principals are at using the tool with the training they have received. Mr. Hendry commented that he found it hard to believe that a system where only a handful of people are marked as needing

improvement can be accurate. He said we need to look into how this happened. Mr. Hendry iterated that it's important for the effective teachers to get the recognition they deserve and that those needing improvement get the assistance they need. He said it's not fair to parents, students and teachers.

- Ms. Whicker expressed concern over the system being punitive. She state this creates a feeling of wanting to give good ratings so teachers can get cost of living raises. On the other hand, RISE was supposed to help struggling teachers, like first year teachers with a steep learning curve, get the help they need. These teachers should still get raises, she said. Superintendent Ritz expressed agreement with Ms. Whicker's comments. She went on to say the highly effective teachers can turnaround a school and that it's important to focus on increasing the number of highly effective teachers. Mr. Elsener inquired about the Department's role in the confusion with RISE. He said he would like to see more information to look at this issue more closely, like if there is a correlation between student performance and teacher ratings. Mr. Elsener also stated he would like to know what percentage of student achievement was used in the performance evaluation. Superintendent Ritz responded that was a local decision. Mr. Elsener said he hoped we can get that information. Mr. Walker asked if principals are affected by outcomes of these evaluations. Ms. Pies responded that they aren't. Superintendent Ritz announced a recess for lunch.

-- RECESS --

D. School Intervention Supports and Funding

- Superintendent Ritz introduced Charlie Geier, Director of Early Learning and Intervention at the Department, and Cindy Hurst, Title I Coordinator at the Department, to present to the Board. Mr. Geier explained how school grant opportunities are distributed and administered, and discussed plans for the future. He outlined the various types of grants, referring to a slide presentation. Mr. Geier said the Department approves the grants and then provides monitoring and assistance. The next step is looking at the funding, carryover and reallocation, he added.
- Ms. Hurst began by stating that the grants are all about student growth and improvement. She said the focus of these grants is disadvantaged students in high poverty schools. Ms. Hurst then went through each grant one by one referring to a slide presentation for the Board. She started with Title I, Part A

grants and then moved to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds (“ARRA”). She said no additional ARRA funds are available. Ms. Hurst then moved on to Title I, 1003(g) grants. She explained all priority schools are eligible. Funds are granted to the Department and then the Department provides sub-grants to F schools through a competitive process in an effort to turn these schools around. Schools must also implement one of four school improvement models, she said.

- The next grant she discussed was Title I, 1003(a); she said this is the grant where the state has the most flexibility in terms of allocation. She added these grants serve focus and priority schools and there is not a competitive element to it anymore. Ms. Hurst stated this grant is designed to support school improvement plans. Mr. Geier explained there was a misuse of funds in 2012 discovered and the Department will have to use 1003(a) funds to pay it back. He added that the Department has been working with the US Department of Education on this issue. Mr. Geier went on to explain the levels of priority for schools receiving these funds and the amount of funds allocated to each category.
- Mr. Elsener asked if Mr. Geier was suggesting taking the money and spreading it to more schools. Mr. Geier responded the more students impacted by these dollars the better. Mr. Elsener expressed concern and said touching more schools may not be the right answer with a limited amount of funds. He said he believed the focus should be on the schools in the toughest situations. Superintendent Ritz explained the plan and strategies in place for implementation. Mr. Walker stated he liked the overall plan presented by Mr. Geier and stated it’s important to continue the commitment and not pull money too quickly. He expressed he didn’t want to see a school on the path to success and then the money is pulled out.
- Ms. Hurst then outlined projections for the future. She explained total allocation from the federal government is \$259,223,947. She added that \$10,000,000 is for school improvement and that carryover funds won’t be available until late fall or early spring. Mr. Geier then explained how that \$10,000,000 is allocated. Dr. Freitas inquired about accountability, and how we know the money is making a tangible difference. Ms. Hurst said the monitoring process is the highest with SIG schools. She explained site visits and constant communication with these schools. She stated that reports are created after each site visit so that the Department can track progress. Further, she said schools also provide data to look at along with state data to track growth. Dr. Freitas asked if they keep information tracking student achievement. Ms. Hurst said they do get updated

information with each site visit. Mr. Geier explained that SIG grants are often written for specific purposes and the grantees are required to provide data to the Department can see whether the grant is having a positive impact.

- Dr. Freitas then asked about whether grants are renewed for schools that have not shown progress. Ms. Hurst explained this was an issue last summer with SIG schools. She explained they had to renew because they didn't have new ISTEP and ECA information, meaning they couldn't make decisions across the board regarding student improvement. She stated they did ask schools coming into the next year to submit an application and data regarding their indicators. Mr. Elsener asked about explicit conditions to be eligible for renewal. Ms. Hurst responded she believed that it's in the letter to SIG schools that they are not guaranteed money. Mr. Elsener said it would be better if conditions were explicit and clear.
- Leslie Ballard, State Director at AdvanceEd, was the next speaker. She started by explaining some of the history of AdvanceEd. She discussed the uniqueness of AdvancEd in that they provide accreditation services along with continuous improvement. She said they serve 800 schools and over 50 districts in Indiana. Ms. Ballard explained continuous improvement and the process of accreditation, using a slide presentation. She said their standards are based on highly effective schools research. Ms. Ballard outlined institution expectations as well, including a self-assessment involving all stakeholders and an external review.
- Heather Kinsey, Vice-President of Development at AdvancED, spoke about her role working with state departments of education. She shared some of the work AdvancED does with state partnerships, including the ASSIST diagnostic and improvement platform. Superintendent Ritz added that this will allow school improvement data to be quantified. Ms. Kinsey went on to explain the classroom observation tool that looks through the eyes of the student. ASSIST also creates reports like improvement plans. Superintendent Ritz announced a short recess.

-- RECESS --

E. Standards Review Update

- Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, was the first to speak to this discussion item. She first gave a review of the overall standards review process. Ms. Shockey then moved to what has occurred since the last board meeting. She explained the Evaluation Panel met on March 12 and 13th

working on “draft 2.5” as things evolve from public comment. Ms. Shockey then discussed a breakdown of the types of public comments and expert comments they have received. She mentioned that they recently learned that Dr. Sandra Stotsky hosted her own session with a group of literacy teachers for them to provide feedback. Ms. Shockey said Sujie Shin will come before the Board with syntheses of the expert feedback.

- Ms. Neal expressed concern on relying on Sujie Shin to synthesize the feedback from the five experts because of her involvement in Common Core implementation. Ms. Neal preferred having the five experts come themselves and present their own information. Ms. Shockey responded that Sujie Shin is summarizing the information, not expressing opinion on the information. Ms. Neal stated it’s important to make the expert information public as soon as possible. Ms. Shockey stated the expert reports will be provided individually at some point and that they planned on making this information public after the College and Career Panel came together the coming Friday so it could be viewed along with the final draft. Superintendent Ritz iterated that the Indiana standards must be decided by Indiana; that Indiana does not necessarily need to accept the expert opinions.
- Mr. Hendry praised the way the process has gone under some difficult circumstances. He said further that from a business perspective it has been unfortunate that the whole discussion has been guided by what words to use in the standards rather than what will prepare students to succeed. He emphasized the importance of preparing students to be successful across state lines and in a global economy. He said he is assured the standards that will be before the Board soon will keep Indiana competitive. Ms. Neal said the errors that some of the experts who reviewed draft two identified are not the kind of problems that can be fixed quickly. She suggested getting the expert reports out now. Ms. Shockey responded the goal is that the draft the Board will see will have taken these issues into consideration, and the Board will see the final draft and expert feedback side by side. Dr. Oliver suggested an introduction that outlines the process as a preamble to the final draft.
- Mr. Walker stated he was concerned about the Board’s lack of discussion about the specific standards; a lack of discussion regarding what students need to know how to do. He went on to say that as a business person he thinks there should be non-traditional things in the standards. He said collaboration, cultural fluency, and foreign languages should be included. Mr. Walker said the Board should be able to add to the standards. Ms. Shockey said the opportunity for the

Board members to give feedback about specific standards would be the same as any other public comment. Mr. Walker said there is something missing in the process and that he has not entrusted the process to anyone. Mr. Elsener asked the Board to please read the final draft and offer comment. Ms. Shockey asked for specific feedback to be provided before the Roundtable. Ms. Neal asked when the public will get the final draft. She expressed concern over the timeline.

- Ms. Neal moved that the draft be made public at the same time the Board gets it. Mr. Walker seconded the motion. Mr. Walker said he is not comfortable not having seen the standards yet and said that we have been operating under the misconception that Indiana is an education island without regard to what's going on in the rest of the world. He said Indiana will pay the price if the standards are not aligned with Common Core, but regardless whatever the final draft looks like should be made public at the same time the Board sees it. Ms. Hendry said they would be public record when the Board gets them so it would be reasonable to put them online at the same time. Superintendent Ritz said making the draft available is not an issue for her, the issue is there is not going to be a mechanism in place for public input. Ms. Neal stated the public could email or call with concerns. Superintendent Ritz said no action is needed to just post the draft on the website at the same time the Board gets them. Dr. Freitas said he did not intend to carte blanche accept whatever comes forward. He said he felt he would let the process play out and then discuss the standards in detail at the meeting in which the Board would be voting on them. Ms. Shockey expressed that it will be difficult to discuss each discrete standard and every issue at the standards Board meeting. She stated that is why it is important to review and give a lot of thought beforehand. Dr. Freitas said there may be some conceptual or philosophical disagreements over the standards that the Board will need to discuss.
- At this time Dr. McKeown advised the Board that subject to a 2004 Indiana Attorney General opinion the Board would be taking an up or down vote on the standards recommended by the Roundtable. She said the Roundtable can make changes but this Board would not have that authority. Dr. Freitas asked what happens if the Board votes no on the standards and Dr. McKeown explained that the Roundtable could meet again and offer a new recommendation to the Board. She said that would be difficult for practitioners who would not know what we are transitioning to. Ms. Neal said we need a plan B if the Board votes no. She said it would behoove the Board to submit prior Indiana standards to the College and Career Ready Panel for a college and career ready evaluation. She proposed

getting that done in the meantime. Superintendent Ritz said the Indiana standards have been reviewed as part of the process and Board comments should come before the meeting to vote on them. Ms. Shockey said the Board can email her or Dr. Molly Chamberlain, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer at the Center for Education and Career Innovation, with feedback.

- Ms. Shockey then moved on to discuss math standards. She said in the past the standards have been through Algebra but the standards now have 7 courses in math, including Calculus and Geometry for example because feedback was in favor of standards by course.

F. HEA1005 Update

- Ms. Shockey presented information to the Board regarding HEA1005. She stated she would be discussing other parts of HEA1005 beyond Accuplacer. She explained the Board, in consultation with the Department, has a duty pursuant to HEA1005 to develop criteria to be used to identify secondary schools with high graduation waiver rate percentages; the Board has to make a finding as to what “high” is and then require schools that meet this threshold to put a plan into action to lower that number. Ms. Shockey stated the Department has put together the data over the past five years so the Board can decide what number is the right threshold number.
- Dr. Walker explained the Board’s three criteria options. Option A is if the school exceeds ten-percent of the students receiving a waiver three consecutive years the Board would require remedial action. Option B is if the school exceeds ten-percent for two consecutive years. Option C is if a school exceeds ten-percent for one year. Mr. Walker asked why we allow this at all. He said it seems far too liberal in its use. Dr. Walker explained that we have waivers in our policy as a state because diplomas are a property right, leading to the belief that students should be able to demonstrate skills for graduation in other ways. In addition, there are unforeseen circumstances that arise like a serious illness. Mr. Elsener asked for clarification about whether the district puts together the plan or the school; Dr. Walker responded that it’s the school. Mr. Elsener expressed concern over the number of waivers, one in ten. Ms. Whicker asked about special needs students and their inclusion in the number. If they are on a non-diploma route they would not be included, Dr. Walker said. Superintendent Ritz said the plan is to have more students pass Algebra I. Mr. Albert said he doesn’t think the remediation should come after the fact. Mr. Elsener stated most improvement

processes happen after the fact. Dr. Freitas said there should be a system in place for all schools to deal with this issue. He said this is already happening and asked about building it into a continuous improvement plan. Dr. Walker said she thinks the Board has to set a number by statute but would look into this issue. Mr. Walker said he thinks the waivers undermine the credibility of the Indiana diploma.

G. Roosevelt Academy Update

Dr. McKeown referred the Board to the memo she provided. Superintendent Ritz said in summary that there really isn't a way to get the situation fixed unless the school corporation gets it fixed. Dr. McKeown agreed and went through some of the options Board staff looked into. Dr. McKeown said the corporation could request an advancement but isn't interested in that option because of its dire financial situation. Mr. Walker said we have a problem here, a way to fix it does exist and we will find it. Mr. Elsener stated we aren't looking at a mammoth bill and the corporation should take care of it. He went to express that the corporation should be taking care of this issue by properly budgeting money. Mr. Elsener was also concerned about the precedent this would set. Mr. Hendry asked if there are any material health risks. Dr. McKeown responded she doesn't have the expertise to answer that question; she said based on the reports with respect to the mold issue it appeared the students were placed in safe areas. She said she has visited the school several times and students do not appear to be in rooms with leaks or mold. Mr. Hendry asked who is responsible for ongoing maintenance. Dr. McKeown said it's a shared responsibility to a degree; referencing the shared services agreement. She also mentioned the fact that a grant was not an option because of the lack of statutory authority. Mr. Walker said this is different than other schools because of Board takeover. Mr. Elsener stated the Board didn't go into that school because things were great; the Board went in because it was a failing school and put an operator in there. The Board never assumed full responsibility for the condition of the facilities, he said. He continued that even if we could give money for this purpose the Board would end up operating a lot of schools.

I. REPA III

With regard to the adjunct permit, Ms. Regnier outlined some sample language incorporating some of the comments the Board previously made. Dr. McKeown

went through the changes to the proposed language: 1) limiting it to secondary education, 2) requiring Board approval of the pedagogy program, 3) shortening it to a 2 year span, 4) adding a work-hours requirement, and 5) changing the name to Career Specialist License. Dr. Oliver said he is struggling with the lack of monitoring of the pedagogy program. Dr. McKeown responded that the program provider would submit a plan to the Board and then have to apply for a renewal. Superintendent Ritz said this is a far lowering of the standards of becoming a teacher. She said she thinks it should be deleted. Superintendent Ritz said she is not about training teachers as they go. Ms. Neal worried about diluting the language and said she preferred an up-down vote on more robust language. Dr. Oliver asked how this is different than the flexibility we have now. Ms. Regnier outlined two current licenses that are similar, including the Advanced Degree License and the Emergency Permit. Dr. Freitas made three comments. He recommended language about renewal conditioned on meeting requirements. He recommended a definition of a secondary level. Lastly, Dr. Freitas recommended having an experience requirement prior to teaching, like a summer event. Ms. Neal said the language for the experience requirement is too limited. Dr. McKeown responded that is why they used the word “related” in the proposed language. Mr. Hendry said he generally supports this permit. The issue of the temporary superintendent’s license was raised by Ms. Regnier next, but the Board added it to next meeting’s agenda.

XI. BOARD OPERATIONS

Board operations was not discussed.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adjourn, Mr. Hendry so moved and Dr. Freitas seconded. All 11 members present voted in favor.