



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

April 28, 2014

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room B
302 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 announced there is an action item that needs to be added. The item was the third resolution from the roundtable; three board members approved and it was added.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Superintendent Ritz stated there were no minutes to approve today.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz stated that she did not have a statement for this meeting.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Superintendent Ritz asked if there were any Board member comments or reports and there were none.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Superintendent Ritz announced that each member of the public will have three minutes to address the Board. The first speaker was Kelley Faler. Ms. Faler stated that she wanted to make the Board aware of some graduation rate data. She said the IDOE has a goal of a 90% graduation rate. She said the graduation rate for students who can pay for a school lunch is 94.9%; for those who cannot pay for lunch the rate is 85.9%. She said this is based on 2012 data and continued that for Hispanic students the rate is 83.7% and 81.2% for English learners. The rate for special education is 72.7%, she said. Ms. Faler also commented on the trends in the data that concerned her. She mentioned college remediation rates specifically.
- Jackie Rhoton was the next speaker announced by Superintendent Ritz. Ms. Rhoton stated that she has been in front of the Board many times before. She said she went to every evaluation meeting, including the one on Valentine's Day. She said she appreciated the time the experts spent but that it wasn't out of the goodness of their hearts because they got paid for it. Ms. Rhoton said the final result of the standards is shameful. She cited comments she claimed members of the panels said during the panel meetings that caused her concern.
- The next speaker was Don Bowman. He said he has been to many nations and seen many things. He went on to say this nation is engaged in a battle to see if it can endure. He said we have to fight for what our forefathers created and the words they spoke.
- Lem Dixon had the floor after Mr. Bowman. He spoke about a Coleman report written by an expert named Coleman; he said this expert is anti-family and that is part of the DNA of the standards before the Board. He stated the math standards were pretty good. However, he said his friend Mike Pence is making a blunder and so is the Board. He proposed recommending to the Roundtable the usual practice of cut rate cut scores; he also recommended asking the Roundtable to set ISTEP cut rate scores at their usual levels and then at Common Core rigor levels. He said this will absolve the Board of misinforming students and all the others with defective degrees. Mr. Dixon finished by saying he has not been impressed with the process.

- Tim McRoberts was invited by Superintendent Ritz to speak next. He began by expressing that he is the principal at Speedway High School and the President of the Indiana Association of School Principals. He said on behalf of principals in Indiana they are in favor of passing the standards before the Board today. He said he has traveled around the state and principals and administrators are ready to move forward. He also said he is representing the 31 teachers in his building and they are ready to move forward with the new standards we well.
- Sue Lile took the floor and opined that she and others were happy when Indiana decided to drop Common Core. She went on to say experts Sandra Stotsky and James Milgram were ignored in the standards process. She stated they are heroes and wanted to set the records state regarding this matter. Ms. Lile said the new Indiana standards are not benchmarked and urged the Board to reject the standards.
- Suzanne Sherby spoke about the legal requirements of the standards process, and expressed that the new Indiana standards fail to meet those requirements. She said they are a cut and paste job that rely heavily on Common Core. She went on to say it's sad to see Indiana follow the national lead. Ms. Sherby said the new standards ignored the Massachusetts, California, and old Indiana Standards. She said it is a concern to there that there was no review of the final draft. She concluded by saying the Board has the opportunity to inject some sanity into this rodeo.
- Stephanie Engelman said Indiana deserved better than what the federal government provided. She said we still have Common Core in Indiana. Ms. Engelman stated the Board has the power to be more than a rubber stamp. She described the new standards as a sloppy rewrite.
- Superintendent Ritz invited Heather Crossin as the next speaker. She stated she is deeply troubled with the new standards. She said she lost faith in the process and the result. Ms. Crossin said the process was a shame and was not fully transparent. She said she was shocked when Indiana employed national evaluators and was very concerned about the speed of the process. Ms. Crossin said all this money was spent and all we have is Common Core rebranded.
- Sierra Bowman had the floor after Ms. Crossin. She began by expressing concerns about how close the new standards are to the Common Core standards. She said she expected some similarities, but not like 80% similarities. Ms. Bowman said she is concerned about the term college and career ready because that is a Common Core term. She said she saw a textbook that had an exercise that suggested there was something wrong with the Bill of Rights, other than the First Amendment. She also

- said she was aware of another textbook that had an exercise that was almost like an exercise to practice to be on death panels. She asked the Board to vote no.
- Ann Harvey was next to speak. Ms. Harvey stated she has heard some statements today against Common Core. She referenced information she heard from Chris Wallace's show on Fox News about Indiana being the first to drop out of Common Core. She stated she was happy at first until it was clear the new standards are Common Core.
 - Michelle McCarthy mentioned her educational background and that she is an adjunct professor. She said Senate Bill 91 was important to move beyond Common Core. She said the standards process has failed the children of Indiana because it goes against Senate Bill 91. Ms. McCarthy expressed concern about the speed of the process, lack of review of the final draft, and lack of benchmarks. She asked the Board to go back to the old Indiana standards.
 - Wesley Myronson stated that he has several concerns about the standards. He said these standards were not created by Hoosiers for Hoosiers. He gave the example of Sujie Shin from California. He said WestEd was founded for the implementation of Common Core. He said the new standards are Common Core standards and they are a monstrosity. Mr. Myronson said the problem is the involvement of Washington and asked the Board to reject the new standards.
 - David Lantz spoke next. He expressed concern over the grants from the Gates Foundation to WestED.
 - J.D. Miniear commented that he is a federal candidate for the House of Representatives. He said he is a republican and discussed support for things like school choice and vouchers. He went on to state that he has had interactions with the conservative evaluators brought in to review the new standards and they were very concerned. He said he wants to go to Washington and help Indiana out. He wants to work with representatives who want to defund the U.S. Department of Education and Race to the Top. He posed the question of whether there is a smidgen of Common Core in the standards.
 - Superintendent Ritz introduced Erin Tuttle. Ms. Tuttle stated that the new standards don't meet the requirements of Senate Bill 91; specifically, the requirement that the standards meet national and international benchmarking. She said cutting and pasting from standards that are independently benchmarked doesn't mean the new standards will then be benchmarked as a set. She said the former Indiana standards are better. She asked why Indiana would move from the best to fair.

- Dianne Finney said she has a master's degree in education and has been substitute teacher. She said education has been dumbed down since the old Indiana standards. She said some of the standards are too hard to understand. She expressed concern over Obamacare in Common Core and said it does not belong in a curriculum.
- Cheryl Ferguson began by stating the standards are not written with what is developmentally appropriate for children. She said all kids learn and grow and different rates. She expressed concern about removing playtime from Kindergarten. Ms. Ferguson said the standards are experimental and could cause great harm.
- Mary Kurdys said she was concerned about some of the Common Core materials her grandchild was coming home with after school. She stated the new standards are Common Core. Ms. Kurdys also said the Superintendent is the only elected official and the creation of the Center for Education and Career Innovation has come between "us". She concluded by saying her grandson is not a worker he's a human being.
- Matt Madleski spoke next and began by commenting on the confusing nature of the Common Core standards. He said he was part of the base for the Republicans, but with this vote and this lie he is no longer. He said Governor Pence lied when he wrote a recent article in the Star and that that was the second biggest lie behind Barack Obama's statement that if you like your healthcare plan you can keep it. Mr. Madleski stated that dissent was ignored during the process. He criticized the reliance on Sujie Shin; describing her as an outsider from "the great Midwestern state of California." Mr. Madleski also pointed out the Ms. Shin is from Berkley, what he described as a "hotbed of Midwestern values."
- Victoria Zink had the floor next. She mentioned speaking to Governor Pence at the MS walk. Ms. Zink said the new standards before the Board make her sad. She said at one point she went home and cried because of the current situation. She asked if the Board has children that will be effected by the new standards. She mentioned President Obama's kids will never be affected by Common Core.
- Kathy Crawford was the next speaker. She started by saying the new standards are a step down and just a cut and paste of Common Core. She urged the Board to go back to the old Indiana standards. She said the process was not transparent because the public comments were not posted for others to see. She said the time to speak at the standards hearings was only 3 minutes. She said all Board members should have been sitting in on all the standards meetings. She said the Board members that were there were too busy on their phones to listen.

- Kate Johnson was introduced next; she said she is part of an organization called Stand for Children in Indiana. Ms. Johnson thanked all those involved in the standards process for the countless hours spent. She stated they endorse the new standards and related materials, believing they will raise the bar for Hoosier students.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS - ACTION

A. Adoption of Indiana's Academic Standards for Mathematics (2014)

- Superintendent Ritz announced the first action item. She introduced Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent for the Department, Molly Chamberlain, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer for the Center for Education and Career Innovation, and Sam Snideman, Director of Alignment and Readiness at the Indiana Center for Higher Education, to give a presentation regarding the new standards and the process. Mr. Snideman spoke about the process undertaken in the adoption of new standards. He highlighted the combined 6,000 hours spent by the experts, the 2,000 plus public comments, inclusion of educators and industry leaders, and independent reviewers. Mr. Snideman also explained the diverse makeup of the expert reviewers and the people who testified at the hearings. Mr. Snideman went on to explain the sets of standards the reviewers used to assemble Indiana's new standards; he expressed that the process started out with very high quality standards. He moved on to explain the guiding principles for standards review: 1) clarity, 2) high rigor, 3) specific but not prescriptive, and 4) grade level progress that makes sense. Mr. Snideman stated that Indiana's new standards hit all those marks.
- Dr. Chamberlain presented next. She outlined how the English/language arts standards were created. She gave examples of how specific standards evolved into the final products and walked through the very rigorous process. Ms. Shockey then expounded on what Dr. Chamberlain said. She began with a specific math grade 4 data analysis standard. She started with the end product and then explained how the standard developed, outlining how exhaustive the process was. Ms. Shockey explained that every source standard was evaluated, discussed, edited, and rewritten as needed for college and career readiness. Ms. Shockey went on to say

- for the first time ever the new standards take into consideration trigonometry, calculus, pre-calculus, finite, and data and statistics; this adds a lot of rigor to the standards. She stated that media literacy was included and outlined other areas showing the strength of the process. Ms. Shockey then explained what happens next, including implementation and assistance.
- Superintendent Ritz moved to adopt the math academic standards for 2014 as recommended by the Indiana Roundtable; Mr. Albert seconded the motion. Ms. Neal then gave a statement; she began by stating that leading mathematicians have described the math standards as poorly written, disorganized, and erroneous. Ms. Neal went on to say that while many of the complaints revolve around the high school courses, the problems begin around grade one. She gave a specific example of a grade 1 standard that Professor James Milgram called a monstrosity, she said. Ms. Neal then quoted Professor Hung-His Wu and Professor Alexander Hahn, who both disapproved of parts of the new standards. Ms. Neal recommended delaying the adoption of the math standards until they can be improved and the errors can be fixed.
 - Dr. Oliver expressed appreciation to all those participating in the standards process. Dr. Oliver said the people on the Board are educators but also parents. He said fear can sometimes outpace fact. He said politics has been interjected into the process too much; he explained the vote is not about Common Core, it's about the new standards before the Board. Dr. Oliver spoke about adopting Indiana's own assessment. He reiterated the work of the expert volunteers who gave over 6,000 hours of their time. He concluded by expressing the importance of local educators in the implementation of the standards and adoption of curriculum and materials.
 - Mr. Hendry stated he has a vested interest in Hoosier public education as a result of his two young children. He said he was pleased this debate could be brought to a close and new standards could be adopted that will help prepare students for life after high school. He emphasized that the standards alone will not be enough; he said we must continue the hard work of ensuring that all of our schools are performing at high levels. Mr. Hendry concluded by expressing the importance of sticking to these standards rather than continuously moving the "goal posts" on educators and students.
 - Dr. Freitas also commented before the Board's vote. He mentioned the great work of all those involved in the process and appreciated the comments from the public. He said there are some unanswered questions. Dr. Freitas first asked about the similarity between the new standards and Common Core. Ms. Shockey responded that some of the original sources of Common Core were from Indiana's old academic

standards. Additionally, the law required they start with Common Core in the standards process. Dr. Chamberlain explained that many of the concepts are universal. Dr. Freitas clarified the difference between standards and curriculum. He asked about the current Common Core textbooks. Ms. Shockey explained that a lot of the current materials can be used. Dr. Freitas also inquired about the ACT test. He asked if students would be at a disadvantage since the ACT is aligned with Common Core. Mr. Snideman responded that the tests are aligned to measure college and career ready skills; he went on to discuss the universality of these skills. He said the skills will be the same. Mr. Snideman said the new standards will ensure students are as-prepared or more prepared than Common Core standards. Lastly, Dr. Freitas asked about how the standards will affect the average learner. Ms. Shockey stated we want to have specific implementation plans in place.

- Mr. Elsener stated this is our solution to upgrade in Indiana. He commented that the energy of those that disagree should stay with curriculum and materials. He added that as we unpack the standards we will get better at implementing them.
- Ms. Whicker said she is a representative of all teachers who couldn't make it today. She said she sent many teachers a copy of the standards and appreciated all the input received. Ms. Whicker went on to state that they appreciate the standards, the process, and the rigor level. She said it's not possible to get all Hoosiers to agree on the standards, but we can all agree on the process.
- Mr. Walker said we should be careful not to overemphasize the impact of standards on student success. He stated the standards aren't a ceiling, they are a floor. Mr. Walker said it will take work beyond the standards to ensure student success, including parental involvement.
- The Board then took a vote and the following Board members voted to adopt the 2014 Indiana math standards: Mr. Albert, Mr. Elsener, Dr. Freitas, Mr. Hendry, Ms. O'Brien, Dr. Oliver, Mr. Walker, Mr. Watts, Ms. Whicker, and Superintendent Ritz. Ms. Neal voted no. The motion carried 10-1.

B. Adoption of Indiana's Academic Standards for English/Language Arts (2014)

Superintendent Ritz moved to adopt the standards for the 2014 English/language arts standards as recommended by the Roundtable. Dr. Freitas seconded and Superintendent Ritz asked if there was any discussion. Mr. Watts spoke as a classroom teacher. He said he forwarded the standards to teachers and received positive feedback about all the standards. These educators were excited about the new standards. Mr. Watts said he is proud to support the process. Ms. Neal

commented that the standards before the Board today are not uncommonly high; they diminish the importance of literature in the classroom. She said as an English teacher she finds the new standards are less rigorous than prior standards. Ms. Neal said the new standards lack requirements that students read important literary pieces. She urged the Board to vote no and reinstate the 2006 Indiana standards. The Board then took a vote and the following Board members voted to adopt the 2014 Indiana English/language arts standards: Mr. Albert, Mr. Elsener, Dr. Freitas, Mr. Hendry, Ms. O'Brien, Dr. Oliver, Mr. Walker, Mr. Watts, Ms. Whicker, and Superintendent Ritz. Ms. Neal voted no. The motion carried 10-1.

C. Roundtable Resolution Regarding Exemplary Materials

Superintendent Ritz moved to adopt the Roundtable's resolution as presented; Dr. Oliver seconded. Dr. Freitas asked that public testimony be allowed regarding this issue before the information is sent out. He asked for a caveat in the motion for the resource guides to come back to the Board for approval. Dr. Freitas made a motion that the Board must approve before the guide will be sent to schools and Dr. Oliver seconded. Mr. Elsener asked about hearings in the process and Superintendent Ritz said that's not part of the process. Superintendent Ritz explained what's being presented are recommendations because curriculum is handled at the local level. Superintendent Ritz said she was concerned with adding the word "approval" to the resolution because of local autonomy. She went on to say she would be happy to bring it to the Board for input prior to June 15. Superintendent Ritz said resource material process continues. Dr. Freitas said the intent of the motion was not to take away local control, but to make sure there is a substantial discussion and that comments are considered. He asked what it would hurt to take a vote on it. Superintendent Ritz said there would be a robust discussion. The Board voted on the motion for an amendment to add the words "and approval"; all Board members voted in favor and the motion carried 11-0. The Board then voted on the resolution with the amendment; 10 Board members voted in favor and Ms. Neal voted no. The motion carried 10-1.

IX. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION – STUDENT SUCCESSES

There was no discussion regarding this agenda item.

X. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

There was no discussion regarding this agenda item.

XI. BOARD OPERATIONS

Board operations was not discussed.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adjourn, Mr. Elsener so moved and Ms. Neal seconded. All 11 members voted in favor and the meeting was adjourned.